

**RACIAL EQUALITY BILL: JAPANESE PROPOSAL AT PARIS PEACE  
CONFERENCE: DIPLOMATIC MANOEUVRES; AND REASONS FOR  
REJECTION**

By

Shizuka Imamoto

B.A. (Hiroshima Jogakuin University, Japan),  
Graduate Diploma in Language Teaching  
(University of Technology Sydney, Australia)

A thesis submitted for the degree of Master of Arts (Honours) at  
Macquarie University.

Japanese Studies,  
Department of Asian Languages,  
Division of Humanities,  
College of Humanities and Social Sciences,  
Macquarie University,  
Sydney Australia.

2006

## DECLARATION

I declare that the present research work embodied in the thesis entitled, **Racial Equality Bill: Japanese Proposal At Paris Peace Conference: Diplomatic Manoeuvres; And Reasons For Rejection** was carried out by the author at Macquarie Japanese Studies Centre of Macquarie University of Sydney, Australia during the period February 2003 to February 2006. This work has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other university or institution. Any published and unpublished materials of other writers and researchers have been given full acknowledgement in the text.

Shizuka Imamoto

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
SUMMARY	ix
DEDICATION	x
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	xi
INTRODUCTION	1
1. Area Of Study	1
2. Theme, Principal Question, And Objective Of Research	5
3. Methodology For Research	5
4. Preview Of The Results Presented In The Thesis	6
End Notes	9
CHAPTER ONE	
ANGLO-JAPANESE RELATIONS AND WORLD WAR ONE	11
Section One: Anglo-Japanese Alliance	12
1. Role Of Favourable Public Opinion In Britain And Japan	13
2. Background Of Anglo-Japanese Alliance	15
3. Negotiations And Signing Of Anglo-Japanese Alliance	16
4. Second Anglo-Japanese Alliance	17
5. Third Anglo-Japanese Alliance	18
Section Two: Japan's Involvement In World War One	19
1. Applicability Of Anglo-Japanese Alliance And Japan's Position	19
2. Britain's Request For Cooperation, And Japan Prepares For War	20
3. Japan's Declaration Of War On Germany	21
4. Anglo-Japanese Campaign And Further Decline Of The Alliance	22
5. Call For Expansion Of The Alliance	24
6. Anglo-Japanese Secret Agreement of 1917	25
7. Japan's Gains From World War One And British Disenchantment	27
8. Japan's Unpopularity And Liquidation Of Anglo-Japanese Alliance	28
Section Three: Japan Australia Relation During World War One	30
1. Convoying Of Anzac Troops By Japanese Warships	30
2. Patrolling Of Australian Coastline By Japanese Warships	31
3. Instances Of Unfriendly Australian Attitude During The Alliance	32
3.1. Australian Hostility At Fremantle Port	32
3.2. The <i>Ibuki</i> Restrained By Australian Captain Of The <i>Melbourne</i>	33

End Notes	34
CHAPTER TWO	
FEAR OF JAPAN IN AUSTRALIA	40
1. Introduction Of Indentured Labour And Rise Of Racism	40
1.1. Introduction Of Japanese Labour	42
2. Sino-Japanese War And Fear Of Japan	43
2.1. Other Factors That Compounded Fear Of Japan	44
2.2. <i>Nan'yoo</i> And Fear Of Japan	45
3. Immigration Restriction Act	46
4. Fear Of Japanese In Queensland	47
5. Immigration Restriction Act Becomes White Australia Policy	49
6. Passport Agreement With Japan	49
7. Russo-Japanese War And Intensification Of Fear Of Japan	50
7.1. Australia Appeals For Extension Of Monroe Doctrine	50
7.2. Australia Proposes Its Own Navy Against Japan	51
7.3. Voluntary Associations Spread Fear Of Japan	52
7.4. Voices Of Reason Drown In Racist Frenzy	53
8. The Shield Is Forged	53
9. Rumours Of Japanese Espionage	55
10. Fear Of Japan In Australian Literature	56
11. Fear Of Japan Influences Foreign Policy Analysis	57
12. Fear Of Japan Continues Despite Japanese Protections In World War One	59
End Notes	60
CHAPTER THREE	
WILLIAM MORRIS HUGHES	64
1. Hughes, The Politician	64
2. Leadership Of Hughes During The Wars	65
3. Hughes And White Australia Policy	66
4. Hughes At Paris Peace Conference	68
5. Only Britain Could Have Restrained Hughes	71
End Notes	72
CHAPTER FOUR	
JAPAN'S PROPOSAL AND DIPLOMACY AT PARIS	74
1. Preparations For Paris Peace Conference	75
2. Formal Appointments For The Peace Conference	77

3. Strong Japanese Press And Public Opinion To Gain Racial Equality	77
4. Proposal On Abolition Of Racial Discrimination	78
5. The US Politics Of Race And Wilson	79
6. Informal Talks With The United States And Britain	80
7. Proposal To The League Of Nations	83
8. Racial Equality Issue Becomes Public And Japanese Efforts Outside The Conference	85
9. Japan's Expanded And Intensive Negotiations	87
10. Further Revisions To The Proposal	89
11. Negotiations With The Prime Ministers Of The British Empire	90
12. Negotiations To Obtain The Support Of Australian Prime Minister	91
13. Presentation Of The Proposal At The League Of Nations Commission	94
14. Discussion On The Proposal	96
15. Vote On The Proposal	97
16. Rejection Of The Proposal	98
17. Japanese Preparation For The Plenary Session	99
18. Declaration Of The Japanese Plenipotentiary	100
19. Failure Of Racial Equality Bill And Fulfilment Of Other Demands	101
End Notes	102
CHAPTER FIVE	
REASONS FOR REJECTION: A DISCUSSION	114
1. Prejudices Against The Japanese	114
2. British Reluctance To Support Japan	117
3. Wilson's Ruling And Lack Of US Support	118
4. Role of British Dominions	120
5. Tactical Mistake By The Japanese In Negotiations At Paris Peace Conference	120
5.1 Japanese Reliance On The US	120
5.2 A Significant Delay In Opening Negotiations With The British	121
6. Errors In Diplomacy By The Japanese	122
6.1 Compromises And Postponements By The Japanese Delegates	122
6.2 An Inappropriately Worded Speech By The Japanese	125
7. Weak Presentation And Extreme Modesty	125
7.1 Weak Language And Communication Skills	125
7.2 Extreme Modesty And Lack Of Firmness	125
8. Inexperienced Diplomacy	126

8.1 Japan's Absolute Trust In Anglo-Japanese Alliance	127
End Note	127
CONCLUSION	132
1. A Combination Of Factors Defeated Racial Equality Proposal	132
2. Inexperience In International Diplomacy	135
3. Pernicious White Australia Policy	136
BIBLIOGRAPHY	137
1. References In English	137
1.1 Articles And Books	137
1.2 Documents From National Archives Of Australia	144
1.3 Documents From National Library Of Australia	145
2. References From Published Sources In Japanese	146
3. References From Unpublished Sources In Japanese	150
4. Articles In Newspapers	150
4.1 Japan Times & Mail	151
4.2 Tokyo Asahi Shimbun	157
APPENDIX	161
COMMENTS FROM THE JAPANESE PRESS	161
Section One: Report And Analysis From Japan	162
Shock And Disappointment In Japan	163
1. Shock In Japan	163
2. Results Of The Vote	163
3. A Snub To Japan	164
4. Spirit Of Unrest In Japan	165
5. Japan Is Disgraced	166
Japan Must Rouse Public Opinion In Britain	166
1. Japan Must Rouse Public Opinion In Britain	166
Criticism Of Japan And Japanese Delegates	168
1. 'Rather Leave The League Of Nations'	168
2. Japan Government Blamed	169
3. Criticism Of The Japanese Delegates	169
4. Japan Delegates A Dismal Failure	170
5. Japan Delegates Advised To Redouble Efforts	170
6. Japan Was Not Firm	170
Praise Of Japan And Japanese Delegates	171

1. 'Japan Amendment Lacks General Approval'	171
2. Japan's Position Enhanced	172
3. Recognition For Japanese Delegates	172
4. Praise For Japan	173
Criticism Of The West	173
1. Humanity And Justice Not Respected In The West	173
2. Only The US and Britain Gain	173
3. Disbelief Of The West	174
4. Audacity Of The Anglo-Americans	174
5. 'Anglo-Saxons Want To Dominate The World'	174
6. Allies Claims A Pretension	175
7. Distrust Of England And America	176
8. World Sees The Rejection	176
Criticism Of Hughes	176
1. England Embarrassed By Hughes	176
2. Hughes Hopes Japan And Australia To Remain Friends	176
Criticism Of Wilson And The US	177
1. America Criticised	177
2. Wilson Looked Down On Japan	177
3. Wilson's Unfair Ruling	178
Criticism Of Britain	178
1. British Siding With Hughes	178
Criticism Of, And Call To Leave, The League Of Nations	179
1. Japan Advised To Leave The League	179
2. Japan Must Not Make Concessions	180
3. Japan Considers Withdrawal	180
4. No More Concessions	180
5. Call For Boycott	180
6. Japan Advised To Quit	181
7. Japan Should Not Join The League	181
8. League No Panacea	181
9. Covenant Wordy But Poor In Substance	181
10. Nothing To Rejoice	182
Section Two: Report From Australia	182
1. Australia-Japan Relation May Suffer	182

2. Hughes Motions To Keep Immigration Out	183
3. ‘Australia Solid Behind Hughes’	183
Section Three: Report From The US	183
1. US Press Sympathises With Japan	184
2. ‘Coloured People Of America’ protest	184
Section Four: Report From Britain	184
1. Commission Impressed By Japanese Delegates	184
2. Without Racial Equality, Covenant Incomplete	184
Section Five: Report From France	185
1. Wilson’s Ruling Criticised	185
2. Tribute To Japanese Delegates	185
3. French Public Opinion Supports Japan	185
4. French Sympathise With Japan	186
End Notes	186



## SUMMARY

Japan as an ally of Britain, since the signing of Anglo-Japanese Alliance in 1902, entered World War One at British request. During the Great War Japan fought Germany in Asia and afforded protection to Australia. After the conclusion of the war, a peace conference was held at Paris in 1919. As a victorious ally and as one of the Five Great Powers of the day, Japan participated at Paris Peace Conference, and proposed racial equality to be enshrined in the Covenant of the League of Nations. This Racial Equality Bill, despite the tireless efforts of the Japanese delegates who engaged the representatives of other countries in intense diplomatic negotiations, was rejected. The rejection, a debatable issue ever since, has inspired many explanations including the theory that it was a deliberate Japanese ploy to achieve other goals in the agenda.

This thesis has researched the reasons for rejection and contends that the rejection was not due to any one particular reason. Four key factors: a) resolute opposition from Australian Prime Minister Hughes determined to protect White Australia Policy, b) lack of British support, c) lack of US support, and d) lack of support from the British dominions of New Zealand, Canada and South Africa; converged to defeat the Japanese proposal. Japanese inexperience in international diplomacy evident from strategic and tactical mistakes, their weak presentations and communications, and enormous delays in negotiations, at Paris, undermined Japan's position at the conference, but the reasons for rejection of the racial equality proposal were extrinsic.

## **DEDICATION**

**Dedicated to my parents:  
Mr Yukio Imamoto and Mrs Kazuko Imamoto.**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am grateful to my supervisor Dr Misuzu Hanihara Chow, Director of MJS Centre of Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia, for accepting my research proposal and my candidature for the higher degree of Master of Arts (Honours) (Research) in Japanese Studies. I am thankful to Dr Chow for encouraging me in my research efforts throughout the duration of the master's programme. I am particularly grateful to Dr Chow for her constructive criticisms and wise counsel in writing my thesis.

I gratefully acknowledge a Teaching Development Scholarship offered by the Japanese Studies Centre of Macquarie University for the academic years 2003 and 2004. The scholarship is a part of the Nippon Fellowship Foundation Fund.

I am grateful to my teacher Dr Nachiketa Das, Director-International of Bridge Business College of Sydney, Australia, for his help and support during my research.

I am thankful to Dr Kay-Wah Chan and Mr Susumu Takita, Lecturers at Japanese Studies, Department of Asian Languages for their constructive criticism and advice on various issues related to my research project.

I am indebted to my teachers Mr Liam Morgan and Ms Kerry Laws, Lecturers at Faculty of Education of University Technology, Sydney, for writing references for me in support of my applications for pursuing a master's degree at MJS Centre.

I am thankful to Mr Greg Wilson of the Manuscript Section of the National Library of Australia, Canberra, for sending photocopies of manuscripts from the library that I had requested for my research. I also thank Mr Wilson for his clarifications on the authorships of some of the documents of the library.

I am thankful to Mr Graeme Powell, Manuscript Librarian of Australian Collection and Reader Services of the National Library of Australia, Canberra for confirming the non-existence of 'any records of either informal conversations or of formal meetings' between the Australian Prime Minister Mr William Morris Hughes (or the Australian delegation) with the leaders and the delegations from other countries during the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, at the National Library of Australia where 'the Hughes Papers (MS 1538)' are lodged.

I am thankful to Mr Mark Beasley of the National Archives of Australia, Melbourne, for providing me with the requested photocopies of the documents for my research project.

I am thankful to the staff of the National Archives of Australia, Canberra for helping me in getting the relevant materials for my research degree.

I am thankful to the staff at the National Diet Library of Tokyo for helping me in getting the relevant materials for my research project.

I am thankful to the staff at the Diplomatic Record Office of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan at Tokyo for their help in arranging for the relevant materials for my research work.

I am thankful to Mr Kenichi Koyama of the *Denshi Media Shitsu* (Internet Section) of The Japan Times for his prompt response in clarifying my doubts about the change of name the newspaper went through in the last century.

I am thankful to the staff members of the library of Macquarie University, of the Japan Foundation Library of Sydney, and the State Library of New South Wales at Sydney for helping me in conducting my literature survey for my research degree.

I am grateful to my friend Miss Yukie Matsumoto and her parents Mr Yukio Matsumoto and Mrs Asako Matsumoto for their most loving hospitality during my long stays with them in their home in Tokyo that I visited to conduct my research at the National Diet Library and the Diplomatic Record Office of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan at Tokyo.

I am thankful to my friends Dr Hazel Scott Hall and Dr Christopher Dorman for their hospitality and help during my stay in Canberra that I undertook in connection with my research at the National Archives of Australia and the National Library of Australia. I also thank Mr and Mrs Hari Madan, Mrs Jackie Yuen, Mrs Moko Eade, and Mrs Chizuru Irwin of Canberra for their help during my sojourn at their city.

I am thankful to my parents Mr Yukio Imamoto and Mrs Kazuko Imamoto, my grandmother Mrs Tomoe Imamoto, my sister Miss Sachiko Imamoto, and my brother Mr Kazushi Imamoto for their constant help and encouragement in my pursuit of my higher degree.

I thank my friends Mrs Tamae Hasegawa, Mr Takayuki Minowa, Mrs Yoshie Minowa, Mrs Yukie Nagato of Otsuka Seminar Australia at Chatswood; Mrs Linda Young, Mr Young, Miss Alice Young, Mr Mark Young, Mrs Akiko Reid, Mrs Yuki, Mr John Kuchtin, Mrs Tomoko Kuchtin of Riverwood; Mrs Noriko Kojiro-Brown, Mrs Chie Asano, Mrs Yumiko Murai, Mrs Hiromi Shizuka of Sydney Saturday School of Japanese; Mrs Eiko Onishi of Cremorne, Miss Miho Kikushima of Lane Cove, Australia; Dr (Miss) Miho Nagase, Miss Toshika Ono of Kure City; Miss Maki Ito, Mrs Mika Minami of Hiroshima; Mrs Kaoru Ishihara of Fukuoka; Tadashi Awane Sensei, Miss Asuka Todo, Mrs Yoko Miwa of Mihara; Miss Mika Hirata of Nagoya; Miss Fumiko Iguchi, Miss Naoko Arikawa of Matsumoto; Miss Ai Aoki, Mr Takanori Aoki of Litto: for encouraging me in pursuing my research project.

## INTRODUCTION

### 1. Area Of Study:

World War One broke out on 4 August 1914 and raged for four years and four months, causing eight million deaths and twenty million injuries<sup>1</sup>. After the cessation of hostilities of the war, a peace conference was convened to be held in Paris<sup>2</sup>. Paris Peace Conference commenced on 18 January 1919 and concluded on 28 April 1919, after some three and a half months of intense debate, discussions and negotiations among the representatives of various participating countries. Japan as one of the Five Powers of the day, with Britain, the US, France and Italy, and also as one of the victorious allies, had representatives on the Council of Ten<sup>3</sup> at the conference, which discussed the terms of peace.

The Government of Japan made elaborate preparations to attend the conference. On 27 November 1918, before any of the other Powers had formally appointed their delegates, Government of Japan informally designated their plenipotentiaries. On 13 January 1919, Government of Japan formally appointed Prince Kimmochi Saionji as the chief plenipotentiary and Baron Nobuaki Makino, Sutemi Chinda (Ambassador to Britain), Keishiro Matsui (Ambassador to France) and Hikokichi Ijuin (Ambassador to Italy) as plenipotentiaries to Paris Peace Conference<sup>4</sup>. Japan's agenda for Paris Peace Conference contained essentially three items, namely, a) to secure territorial and other rights in Shantung province in China, b) to secure the cession of the Pacific islands north of the Equator seized from Germany, and c) to make the League of Nations adopt the Japanese proposal on racial equality. On all other issues, the Japanese Government explicitly instructed its delegation, a) to follow always fair and moderate principles, and b) to keep constantly in close contact with the representatives of Britain and other Allied and Associated Powers<sup>5</sup>.

In 1919 Japan and Britain were bound by Anglo-Japanese Alliance presently in its seventeenth year. First signed on 30 January 1902 and later renewed twice, Anglo-Japanese Alliance had constituted the backbone of Japanese foreign policy from the Meiji Era (1868-1912) to the Taisho Period (1912-1926). As a signatory to Anglo-Japanese Alliance, Japan had responded to British requests of combating German troops in East Asia, as the hostilities in Europe commenced leading to declarations of wars in 1914 that later came to be known as World War One. Consequently Japanese troops attacked German position in Tsingtao on 26 September 1914 under protection from the Japanese and British fleet<sup>6</sup>. The German forces surrendered on 7 November 1914. During the course of the war the Japanese fleet sailed south and captured the German held islands of Jaluit, Yap, the Marshalls, the Marianas, and the East and West Carolines in the Pacific. The Japanese navy joined the British to pursue German men-of-war and convoyed troopships from British colonies to Europe. Moreover

Japanese navy in European waters fought German submarines, and in the Indian Ocean pursued and destroyed German cruisers, thus making a significant contribution to the Allied victory in the war.

Japan also responded to British request to defend Australia and New Zealand during World War One. Japan dispatched a number of ships and personnel from her Imperial navy to Australia. Despite the deep suspicion and fears of Japan <sup>7</sup>, Australia accepted Japanese naval help. The powerful Japanese battle cruiser *Ibuki* escorted and convoyed ANZAC troops from Australia to Egypt. During the war years, a great part of patrolling the Australian coastline was done by Japanese navy. Japan's contribution to the war, given in allegiance to Anglo-Japanese Alliance benefited Britain and British dominions of Australia and New Zealand.

Japan considered Britain as her great ally. Perhaps on the strength of this presumed intimacy Japan felt encouraged to propose an amendment for incorporation in the Covenant of the League of Nations. The initial draft of the Japanese proposal read:

‘The equality of the nations being a basic principle of the League of Nations, the High Contracting Parties agree that concerning the treatment and rights to be accorded to aliens in their territories, they will not discriminate, either in law or in fact, against any person or persons on account of his or their race or nationality’ <sup>8</sup>

and came to be known as Racial Equality Bill, and also referred to as Japanese proposal on racial equality.

In the early stages of Paris Peace Conference President Woodrow Wilson of the US appeared sympathetic towards Japanese proposal and so were the British. The majority of the nations at the conference expressed and maintained their support for Japanese proposal. However the Prime Minister of Australia William Morris Hughes whose country had received substantial naval help and protection by the Japanese in the just concluded World War One, mounted a vigorous campaign against Japanese proposal creating an impasse. Consequently Japanese delegates modified their proposal and wished to insert it into the preamble of the Covenant as:

‘by the endorsement of the principle of equality of nations and just treatment of their nationals’ <sup>9</sup>.

This modified proposal received the support of eleven members out of the sixteen members in attendance, excluding the chairman, of the League of Nations Commission which was preparing the Covenant. However, because of resolute opposition from the Prime Minister of Australia, Japanese proposal on racial equality failed to obtain unanimous

approval at the League of Nations Commission. President Wilson, as the chairman of the Commission, rejected the Japanese proposal since the vote was not unanimous.

Despite Japan's significant contributions to World War One as a partner of Anglo-Japanese Alliance, Japan's proposal was defeated by its own allies and Japan was utterly rebuffed. This raises the obvious question, why and how could this happen, particularly when so many rounds of behind the scenes diplomatic negotiations and delicate manoeuvres went on in Paris, between Japanese diplomats and their counterparts from other nations during the conference.

The existing literature on Japanese proposal on racial equality, to quote Shimazu<sup>10</sup> 'adopts a certain analytical position in examining the issue'. A Japanese scholar, Ikei<sup>11</sup>, contends that racial equality proposal was aimed at 'resolving the anti-Japanese immigration problems in Anglo-Saxon countries'. Sissons<sup>12</sup> discussed the racial equality proposal from Australian immigration perspective. Lauren<sup>13</sup> investigated racial equality proposal from a racial discrimination and racism point of view. Mamiya<sup>14</sup> and Nakanishi<sup>15</sup> studied racial equality proposal from the perspective of some leading Japanese personalities who participated in Paris Peace Conference. An international lawyer, Onuma<sup>16</sup> investigated racial equality proposal without any obvious analytical bias. Shimazu interested in investigating why Japan submitted racial equality proposal focused on five aspects namely: 'immigration, universal principle, great power status, domestic policies, and politics of bargaining'. MacMillan<sup>17</sup> looked at racial equality proposal in the context of the Paris Conference's attempt to end war. But none of the researchers have proposed a total picture as to what were the reasons for rejection of Japanese proposal on racial equality.

Ever since the rejection of Japan's Racial Equality Bill on 11 April 1919 at the League of Nations Commission, critics in Japan as well as outside have tried to discredit the Japanese delegation. Within Japan the expressions of shock, disbelief and anger were aired in the media. These critics claimed that Japan was not serious about racial equality issue, and Racial Equality Bill was perhaps a bluff at best or a tool for bargain at worst. Some argued that Japan neither did expect nor did intend to get its proposal on racial equality accepted. These critics accused Japan of raising racial equality issue to embarrass the Anglo-Saxons to secure its demands on territorial rights on Shantung Province and the Pacific islands<sup>18</sup>. Shimazu has used the phrase 'bargaining chip' theory to label this accusation against the Japanese delegates, and in a series of well-constituted logical arguments has demonstrated that the bargaining chip theory 'was a way of discrediting the Japanese', and the accusation of bargaining is incorrect.

Japan did secure its demands on territorial rights on Shantung Province and the Pacific islands; and Britain, France, the US and others did yield to Japanese demands on territorial rights rather easily because they wanted to appease the Japanese delegates so that they did not boycott or quit the fledgling League of Nations like the Italians had already done and the Belgians were about to do. But the Japanese delegates never had a strategy of sacrificing Racial Equality Bill to secure demands on territorial rights on Shantung and Pacific islands. Japanese delegates immediately responded to these charges of conspiracy, and utterly and firmly refuted them with strong evidences. Western sources confirmed the Japanese evidences, and one observer expressed that the Japanese argument ‘pulverised’<sup>19</sup> the critics.

Tsuzuki<sup>20</sup> in his book *The Pursuit of Power in Modern Japan: 1825-1995*, has stoked the old accusations with a twist by saying that Japan’s ‘proposal for racial equality was in fact an after thought, derived from an apprehension of possible discrimination on the Council of the League’. The author would like to counter this accusation by recording that in December 1914, only a few months after the outbreak of World War One, when France offered Japan to make a reasonable demand in return for sending Japanese troops to Europe, Japan’s main proposal was removal of racial discrimination against Japanese people settled in the foreign lands of British colonies<sup>21</sup>. Japan had time and again pointed out the issue of racial discrimination in order for its elimination. When, however, the Entente powers met in London in January 1915 to discuss what compensation could be offered to Japan, the main Japanese proposal, removal of racial discrimination against Japanese in British colonies, was quietly dropped<sup>22</sup>. So it is important to remember that Japan proposed removal of racial discrimination in British colonies, which was essentially the precursor to Racial Equality Bill, as early as 1914, even much before the Anglo-Japanese secret agreement of 1917, where Japan proposed for the cession of German islands in the south Pacific, and territorial rights in Shantung Province in China. These three Japanese demands, one of 1914 and two of 1917 of the World War One years, were to form the Japanese agenda for Paris Peace conference in 1919.

Shimazu has attempted to paint ‘a subtle and complex’ picture of Japan with her assertion ‘Japan as an arrogant, yet insecure power, dismissive of, yet sensitive to international opinion’. Shimazu concerned with the question ‘why’ Japan proposed Racial Equality Bill argues that Japan did so essentially for three reasons namely, great power status, immigration, and domestic politics. This thesis is focused on demonstrating the reasons for failure of Racial Equality Bill and therefore does not conflict with the research endeavours of Shimazu. Since the focus of this thesis lies elsewhere, an attempt at negation or affirmation of Shimazu’s<sup>23</sup> as well as Tsuzuki’s contentions, is beyond the scope of this thesis.



Shimazu's belief that Japan's racial equality proposal was not intended as a demand for universal racial equality because the Japanese continued to practise discrimination against the Chinese and Koreans is again beyond the scrutiny of this thesis.

This thesis has researched the recorded historical facts, published as well as unpublished, and the diplomatic negotiations to present a total picture of the reasons for rejection of Japan's Racial Equality Bill proposed to the League of Nations at Paris Peace Conference in 1919.

## **2. Theme, Principal Question, And Objective Of Research:**

Presented below are the theme, the principal question, and the objectives of research.

**Theme:** Investigation of historical facts and diplomatic negotiations to present a total picture of the reasons for rejection of Japan's Racial Equality Bill proposed to the League of Nations at Paris Peace Conference in 1919, in the aftermath of World War One.

**Principal Question:** What were the reasons for rejection of Japan's Racial Equality Bill presented to the League of Nations at Paris Peace Conference in 1919?

### **Objective Of Research:**

a) To identify the reasons for Australia's opposition to Japan's Racial Equality Bill presented to the League of Nations at Paris Peace Conference in 1919.

b) To demonstrate that the then prevailing White Australia Policy was responsible for a determined Australian opposition led by Australian Prime Minister William Morris Hughes to scuttle Japan's Racial Equality Bill presented to the League of Nations.

## **3. Methodology For Research:**

### **a) Collection Of Information From Published Sources:**

Bulk of the research for this thesis involves a detailed investigation of the published literature in both English and Japanese languages on the subjects of: Anglo-Japanese Alliance; Japan's involvement in World War One; Australia Japan cooperation during World war One; Fear of Japan in Australia, William Morris Hughes; Japan's preparation, negotiation, and presentation of Racial Equality Bill at the League of Nations in 1919; and the eventual rejection of Racial Equality Bill at Paris Peace Conference.

Another published primary source tapped for materials for this thesis is a range of newspapers of Japan of relevant periods of time, currently lodged in microfilm formats in National Diet Library of the Government of Japan at Tokyo.

### **b) Collection Of Information From Unpublished Sources:**

Research into the unpublished materials that exist in archives, in the form of letters, correspondences and newspaper articles, both in Japan and Australia, is conducted for a systematic collection of historical facts, and for a comprehensive understanding of diplomatic

negotiations and delicate manoeuvres to shed new lights on all the subjects detailed in previous paragraphs.

Bulk of the information on intricate negotiations between Japanese diplomats and other parties during Paris Peace Conference, and descriptions of proceedings of the events at Paris Peace Conference, have been collected from an authentic unpublished primary source, the Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan, presently lodged in the Diplomatic Record Office of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs at Tokyo. The three main documents that constitute this primary source are 1. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku*, October 1919, *Kokusai Renmei: Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai*, Vol. 3; 2. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Teppai Ni Kansuru Mondai, Taiheiyoo Mondai Kenkyuu Shiryoo*, Vol.4, 20 Sept 1921, *Kokusai Renmei: Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai*, Vol. 3, 3. *Matsui to Uchida, Kokusai Renmei: Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai*, Vol. 2.

#### **4. Preview Of The Results Presented In The Thesis:**

A thorough investigation of historical facts, and a critical examination accompanied by a new interpretation of diplomatic negotiations relevant to the presentation of Japan's Racial Equality Bill to the League of Nations at Paris Peace Conference in 1919, conducted in this thesis, has revealed some interesting new findings. The research reveals that the Japanese proposal was not rejected because of any one particular reason. A number of factors combined to defeat the adoption of racial equality by the League of Nations. In fact, in the final session of the League of Nations Commission on the evening of 11 April 1919, when Japanese plenipotentiary Baron Nobuaki Makino proposed a vote for and against the Japanese proposal, out of the sixteen members in attendance excluding the chairman, eleven members raised their hands in favour. Those in favour included the two French delegates, two Italian delegates, and one delegate each from Greece, China, Serbia, Portugal, Czechoslovakia and the two Japanese delegates. Only five delegates, one each from Britain, the United States, Poland, Brazil and Romania, voted against the proposal<sup>24</sup>. Yet the chairman President Wilson of the US overruled the wish of the majority and decreed that as the Japanese proposal was not unanimously agreed upon. He declared that he had no choice but to regard it as to have failed to be adopted. Wilson, however, on two earlier occasions, after debates to decide two vital issues, location of the League of Nations, and insertion of special reservation clause in the Covenant of the League of Nations to protect the validity of Monroe doctrine that was proposed by the Americans and vehemently opposed by the French, had taken the decision on the basis of simple majority rather than unanimity.

The key factors that came together to defeat the Japanese proposal could be listed as:  
a) resolute opposition to Racial Equality Bill from the Prime Minister of Australia determined

to protect White Australia Policy; b) opposition by the British; c) lack of US support; and d) sympathy of British dominions of New Zealand, Canada and South Africa with Australia. Hughes's determined opposition provided the convenient excuse to Britain and the US to defeat the Japanese proposal. To make matters worse the Japanese delegates, inexperienced in international diplomacy, at Paris Peace Conference appeared pliable with their numerous changes to the text of the racial equality proposal; and presented their case poorly. The existence of entrenched prejudices against the Japanese did not help their cause either. Japan failed to cultivate the British support during World War One years, a vital issue that was publicised in a letter cabled from the London correspondent of the Tokyo *Asahi* and published in *Japan Times & Mail* of 11 May 1919, the text of which is presented in Appendix I under the caption Japan Must Rouse Public Opinion in Britain. It is also important to record that Japanese diplomats during Paris Peace Conference failed to garner British support. Moreover the Japanese diplomats failed to counter Hughes and that doomed the adoption of Racial Equality Bill at the League of Nations.

The results of the systematic investigation presented in the thesis are offered in five chapters, starting from Chapter One to Chapter Five. Chapter One entitled, Anglo-Japanese Relations And World War One, has three sections, Anglo-Japanese Alliance; Japan's involvement in World War One; and Japan Australia Relation during World War One. This chapter reveals that Anglo-Japanese Alliance, on the basis of which Japan became involved in the war, had been reached due to a favourable British opinion of Japan that prevailed during the 1890s. In the second decade of its existence, particularly during the war years, the alliance declined in popularity in Britain. Once the alliance lost the support of the British, it was liquidated. These facts are used to demonstrate the importance of British support, lack of which ensured the failure of Japanese proposal on racial equality at the League of Nations.

Chapter Two entitled, Fear Of Japan In Australia, reveals and analyses the fear of Japan and grave prejudices against Japanese people that prevailed in Australia. The fear of Japan and prejudice against the Japanese, determined Australia's immigration, defence and foreign policies; and eventually led to the creation of White Australia Policy as a shield to protect Australia. Chapter Three bearing the title, William Morris Hughes, reveals fear of Japan that Australian Prime Minister William Hughes nursed. Chapter Three also demonstrates that Hughes, a champion of White Australia Policy, resolutely opposed Japan's Racial Equality Bill because he saw it as a grave threat to the very foundation on which Australia stood. Chapter Three also speculates that perhaps only Britain could have restrained Hughes from his intense opposition to the Japanese Racial Equality Bill, just as the British

Prime Minister Lloyd George had squashed the demands of Hughes in November 1918 when Hughes had hinted at reneging on Anglo-Japanese secret agreement of 1917.

Chapter Four entitled, Japan's Proposal And Diplomacy At Paris, opens with a discussion on the elaborate Japanese preparation for participation in Paris Peace Conference, and then describes the intricate and intense diplomatic negotiations conducted by the plenipotentiaries of Japan with the representatives of other participating countries, in order to get Racial Equality Bill adopted by the League of Nations. Chapter Four also presents the convergence of the key factors: resolute opposition to Racial Equality Bill from the Prime Minister of Australia determined to protect White Australia Policy; opposition by the British; lack of US support and President Wilson's decision to overrule the wishes of the majority of the delegates; and sympathy of British dominions New Zealand, Canada and South Africa with Australia; to defeat the Japanese proposal.

Chapter Five entitled, Reasons For Rejection: A Discussion, presents a detailed discussion and critical analysis of the main factors that combined to defeat Racial Equality Bill at the conference. This chapter also demonstrates that Japanese delegates although made genuine efforts at negotiations at Paris for the adoption of racial equality proposal by the League of Nations, because of their inexperience in international diplomacy committed strategic and tactical mistakes, and made some diplomatic errors that undermined their case. This chapter, moreover, presents discussions to demonstrate that inexperienced Japanese diplomacy, particularly Japanese inability to rouse British support in its favour, significantly contributed to the ultimate rejection of racial equality proposal. In the absence of a strong support from the British, Racial Equality Bill succumbed to the resolute opposition of Australian Prime Minister Hughes that spearheaded the other factors that combined to defeat the Japanese bill.

Conclusion of the thesis presents a summation of the four factors that combined to defeat the Japanese proposal on racial equality at the League of Nations.

The thesis also presents a substantial bibliography in the general area of study of the research. Certain phrases and terms such as white countries, White Australia Policy, coloured people, yellow race, etc. although sound awkward and even unpleasant, have been used in the thesis, following wide spread uses by many of the respected researchers in the area of study, liberally quoted in the present thesis.

The Appendix contains, Comments From The Japanese Press, highlighting the reactions in Japan and Australia, as gauged from the newspaper reports and articles, to the rejection of the Japanese proposal at Paris Peace Conference. This section drew materials

from a primary source, a range of newspapers of the era from Japan. The relevant newspaper reports, often in their entirety, are presented in the Appendix.

#### End Notes:

1. Alan John Percivale Taylor, *English History, 1914-1945* (Oxford University Press, 1965).
2. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. II (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1978).
3. William G. Beasley, *The Modern History of Japan*: 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1991), 207.
4. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980).
5. *ibid.*
6. *ibid.*
7. Neville Kingsley Meaney, *Towards a New Vision: Australia & Japan: Through 100 Years* (Sydney: Kangaroo Press, 1999).
8. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.2 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
9. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 411.
10. Naoko Shimazu, *Japan, Race and Equality: The Racial Equality Proposal of 1919* (London: Routledge, 1998), 4.
11. Masaru Ikei, “*Pari heiwa kaigi to jinshu sabetsu teppai mondai* (Paris Peace Conference and Abolition of Racial Discrimination)”, *Kokusai seiji* (International Politics), 1962, vol.23, 44-58.
12. David C. S. Sissons, “The Immigration Question in Australian Diplomatic Relations with Japan, 1875-1919”, *History Section* 26/821, Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science, 1971.
13. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996).
14. Kunio Mamiya, “*Okuma Shigenobu to jinshu sabetsu teppai mondai* (Okuma Shigenobu and Abolition of Racial Discrimination)”, *Waseda daigakushi kiyoo* (History Bulletin of Waseda University), 1989, vol. 22, 213-37.
15. Hiroshi Nakanishi, “*Kanoe Fumimaro ‘Eibei hon’i no heiwashugi o haisu’ rombun no haikai* (The Background of Kanoe Fumimaro’s Paper ‘Discard British and the US Proposed

- Rules for Peace’”), *Hoogaku ronsoo* (Discussion on Japanese Studies), 1993, vol. 132, 225-58.
16. Yasuaki Onuma, “*Haruka naru jinshu byoodoo no risoo* (A Far Away Ideal Racial Equality)”, in *Kokusaihoo* (International Law), *Kokusai rengoo to Nihon* (The League of Nations and Japan), ed. Yasuaki Onuma (Tokyo: Koobundoo, 1987).
  17. Margaret MacMillan, *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempt to End War* (London: John Murray Ltd., 2001).
  18. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996).
  19. Emile Joseph Dillon, *The Inside Story of the Peace Conference* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1920).
  20. Chushichi Tsuzuki, *The Pursuit of Power in Modern Japan: 1825-1995* (Oxford University Press, 2000), 208.
  21. Ian Hill Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23* (London: The Athlone Press, 1972), 151.
  22. *ibid.*, p.151.
  23. Naoko Shimazu, *Japan, Race and Equality: The Racial Equality Proposal of 1919* (London: Routledge, 1998), 2.
  24. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.13-14 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.

## CHAPTER ONE

### ANGLO-JAPANESE RELATIONS AND WORLD WAR ONE

In the early part of the twentieth century, since the signing of Anglo-Japanese Alliance in 1902, right up to World War One and the subsequent Paris Peace Conference, Britain as the head of the British Empire and British dominions, was arguably the undisputed super power of the world. Britain, the cradle of the Westminster style of parliamentary democracy, was a robust democracy where public opinion mattered a lot. In fact, Storry<sup>1</sup> in his book *Japan and the Decline of the West in Asia 1894 – 1943*, has recorded that ‘British foreign secretaries in the nineteenth century genuflected to the altar of public opinion’. The failure to rouse British support in favour of Racial Equality Bill by Japanese Government and its delegates is considered to have contributed to the eventual rejection of the Japanese proposal. In this chapter an attempt has been made to demonstrate that Anglo-Japanese Alliance, on the basis of which Japan became involved in World War One, was made possible due to a favourable British opinion of Japan that prevailed during the 1890s. An extrapolation of this historical fact could be used to contend that, had Japanese government systematically cultivated British support in its favour, Japanese proposal on racial equality probably would have been accepted at the League of Nations. Japanese government did not do much, by way of public relation exercises in Britain to arrest the sliding image of Japan. An article conveying similar sentiment was published in *Japan Times & Mail* in 1919, and is discussed in detail later in the thesis.

For a better understanding of the critical analyses and the arguments that form the main stream of the thesis, research into World War One and the decline in Anglo-Japanese relations is presented here. The chapter demonstrates that during World War One, relations between Japan and Britain deteriorated. The decline in relations, particularly during the later half of the war years, reached such a low that eventually the alliance was scrapped. British disenchantment with Japan contributed to the British delegates not supporting Japan in the League of Nations Commission for the adoption of racial equality proposal. This chapter, divided into three sections, presents a review of Anglo-Japanese Alliance; Japan’s involvement in World War One; and Japan Australia Relation during World War One.

Some historical facts used for the construction of the first two sections (Anglo-Japanese Alliance; and Japan’s involvement in World War One) of this chapter have been drawn from Volume II and Volume III of *The Diplomacy of Japan 1894-1922*, translated from *Nippon Gaiko Shi*, edited at Kajima Institute of International Peace, Tokyo. Thirty-four volumes and four supplementary volumes of *Nippon Gaiko Shi* is a colossal effort that stretched over five continuous years and involved the cooperation of more than two hundred

persons, including veteran Japanese diplomats. The first 13 volumes of *Nippon Gaiko Shi*, dealing with the period from the opening of Japan with the *Meiji* Restoration of 1868 to the Washington Conference (1921-1922) were personally edited and written by an eminent Japanese diplomat Dr Morinosuke Kajima.

Two other important sources of information are the two authoritative works on the subject: *The Anglo-Japanese Alliance: The Diplomacy of Two Island Empires* 1894-1907; and *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations* 1908-23, both written by Ian H. Nish, 'the leading European scholar in this field.'<sup>2</sup> A large number of other sources accessed for information on the subject are listed in the End Notes of the chapter.

## **SECTION ONE:**

### **Anglo-Japanese Alliance:**

Anglo-Japanese Alliance that was signed on January 30, 1902 and later renewed twice, constituted the backbone of Japanese foreign policy from the *Meiji* Era (1868-1912) to the *Taisho* Period (1912-1926)<sup>3</sup>. A detailed discussion of Anglo-Japanese Alliance is presented in order to demonstrate its importance in getting Japan involved in World War One, and perhaps on the strength of which Japan felt confident to propose Racial Equality Bill at Paris Peace Conference.

Anglo-Japanese Alliance was Japan's first alliance with a European power and therefore symbolised Japan's elevation to the ranks of world powers. For Japan, the treaty was her only important connection to the outside, the only arrangement that rescued her from isolation in a world afraid of the Yellow Peril. For Japan, the alliance therefore, was 'in a real sense an important highway'<sup>4</sup>. For Britain this alliance was a co-operation to ensure the territorial integrity of China threatened by the powers, particularly Russia, thus making it an anti-Russian front in Asia. The first Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902 was revised during the Russo-Japanese war in 1905. It was revised again in 1911 and renewed for one year in 1920. In the second decade of its existence, the Anglo-Japanese Alliance declined in popularity in Britain, before being liquidated in 1923.

The alliance established relations between Britain and Japan in the fields of military, industry and commerce. Japanese government was keen to modernise Japan and therefore was keen in building friendship with 'Britain as the most economically developed country in the world.'<sup>5</sup> Japan's industrial missions, on foreign visits, sought advice in Britain where the industrial revolution had started. In 1870 and 1873 the Japanese government raised loans in Britain for railway, as the main financial centre of the world Britain was keen on railway investment. Britain readily cooperated in such ventures essentially to influence Japan in her favour.



Britain was also eager to play a role in the modernisation of Japan's military. Japan invited Britain to help in the organisation and training of her navy. The new Japanese fleet was initially placed under the supervision of Officers of Royal Navy, on secondment to instruct at the Tokyo naval academy from 1873 to 1882<sup>6</sup>. Thereafter Japanese naval officers visited Britain for training on British ships and with British equipment that influenced Japanese naval building. Japanese Navy's decade long reconstruction programme that commenced in 1895 involved the commissioning of four battleships and numerous auxiliary ships, majority of which were constructed in the British shipyards<sup>7</sup>. This massive shipbuilding contract given to Britain created a pro Japanese feeling in Britain. Japanese naval officers favoured Britain, and modernisation of Japanese navy by 1894 was largely due to technical cooperation with Britain<sup>8</sup>.

Japan's industrialisation and modernisation engaged her in foreign trade, and she developed a considerable trade with Britain that led to a stronger friendship but did not improve the political ties.

### **1. Role Of Favourable Public Opinion In Britain And Japan:**

Views advocating an Anglo-Japanese Alliance had existed since 1870. Commentators in both Japan and Britain who noticed similarities between the two island nations portrayed Japan as Britain's natural ally. Yet Britain and Japan were still 'separated by a wide geographic and cultural gulf'<sup>9</sup>. Japan was a new addition to the world powers. These differences between the two countries were recognised but reconciled due to the assiduous campaigns by a small number of capable leaders in both London and Tokyo, who advocated an end to isolation and the necessity of an Anglo-Japanese Alliance. The actions of the alliance propagandists is described by C.N. Spinks in '*The Background of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance*' in *Pacific Historical Review*, VIII (1939) 317-339 and emphasised by Beasley<sup>10</sup>, and Nish<sup>11</sup>. Such individuals created suitable environments for justification and creation of the alliance.

A number of Britishers, like the journalists Sir Edwin Arnold, publisher and editor of the *Daily Telegraph*; Sir Valentine Chirol, foreign editor of *The Times* from 1899, Frank Brinkley, *The Times* correspondent at Tokyo from 1894, and Dr Ernest Morrison, *The Times* correspondent at Peking from 1897 advocated an alliance with Japan. The last three often made alliance the theme of their writings. Chirol was the most influential of the three and was commended in 1905 by the US President Theodore Roosevelt for originating the alliance. The knowledgeable diplomatic correspondent Chirol enjoyed the confidence of the British Foreign Office, and when he visited the Far East in 1895, 1898 and 1901, he wrote authoritative articles.<sup>12</sup> Chirol predicted that Britain would not get the cooperation in the east

of any powers other than Japan, and became convinced of the usefulness of an alliance with Japan in 1901.

A few British politicians who travelled widely also wrote advocating an alliance. Sir Charles Dilke, when he wrote *Greater Britain* in 1875, predicted that Japan might be a useful ally to Britain in the Pacific.<sup>13</sup> Admiral Lord Charles Beresford, upon visiting the Far East in 1899 also preached an alliance with Japan. George Curzon, in 1892, after serving as an under-secretary for India, travelled to the east and wrote articles for *The Times* and later for *Problems of the Far East* praising the progress in Japan. A few sentences from his writings are presented below:

‘Friendly relations between ourselves and Japan will assist her in that mercantile and industrial development, in which she is following in our footsteps, at the same time that it will confirm to us the continued command of the ocean routes; Britain is, and can remain, “the first Power on the East”; granted the continuance of peace, which Britain is not likely to break, she will be greater still.’<sup>14</sup>

Curzon came to be known as an authority on the east; and, as under-secretary at the Foreign Office (1895-8), used his knowledge purposefully. The king of Britain, Edward VII, who ascended the throne in January 1901, also influenced British foreign policy by advocating an alliance with Japan. In 1905 Edward VII, because of his friendship with the member of the Japanese royal family Prince Arisugawa, created the favourable environment for the revision of the alliance.<sup>15</sup>

Britain had two main interests in Asia: the Empire in India and the trade in China. The first was far more important than the second, and both were threatened by Russian expansion. Francis Bertie, the assistant under-secretary at the Foreign Office, also served as the head of the Asiatic Department of the Foreign Office from 1898 till 1902, was hostile to Russia and strongly advocated an alliance with Japan. He enjoyed the confidence of Foreign Secretary Lansdowne and could influence him. Bertie’s words are quoted to substantiate the claim: ‘Unless we attach Japan to us by something more substantial than general expressions of goodwill, we shall run a risk of her making some arrangement which might be injurious to our interests.’<sup>16</sup>

The prominent *Kokumin Domeikai* group in Japan opposed conciliation with Russia and advocated closer ties with Britain. Pro-British newspapers in Tokyo in 1890s and 1900s advocated friendship with Britain. Famous editors like Yukichi Fukuzawa and Takaaki Kato sponsored articles favouring alliance with Britain in newspapers like the *Jiji Shimpō* and the *Nichinichi Shimbun*. *Jiji Shimpō* founded in 1882 created a pro-British feeling in Japan. The founder, Yukichi Fukuzawa, had travelled extensively in Europe from 1860 to 1867 and

‘become imbued with much of the utilitarianism and liberalism then prevalent in Britain’<sup>17</sup>. Around Fukuzawa at Keio a group formed whose members had been greatly influenced by England and no wonder *Jiji Shimpō*’s editorials were very pro-British. Advocates of a pro-British alliance, such as, Takaaki Kato and Tadasu Hayashi, used *Jiji Shimpō* to publish their articles. Both Kato and Hayashi had spent time in their formative years in Britain. Kato (1860-1926) worked in Liverpool and London from 1883 to 1885, and Hayashi (1850-1913) visited Britain as a student in 1866-67, eventually becoming a minister in Japan in 1900. Both Kato and Hayashi were related to Yukichi Fukuzawa.

The case for alliance was raised periodically in both Britain and Japan, and gained strength after 1895, but did not carry much weight before Sino-Japanese war, as the advocates failed to influence the governments.<sup>18, 19</sup> Britain and Japan came closer after 1895, when the powers started actively intervening in the Far East. Britain’s refusal to join the Triple Intervention had created a pro-British feeling in Japan. Yet this was a flimsy foundation to base a diplomatic and military alliance. The personal ties between the two nations developed by British guidance in modernisation of Japan proved crucial. By training officers of the navy, educating the students, providing expertise in various fields, Britain created supporters in Tokyo who wanted close relations with Britain.

British opposition to Russian moves in Manchuria and Korea pleased the Japanese,<sup>20</sup> and the case for the alliance was further boosted by the co-operation between Britain and Japan over the Boxer campaign.<sup>21</sup>

## **2. Background Of Anglo-Japanese Alliance:**

After the Sino-Japanese war of 1895, victorious Japan concluded a peace treaty with China. There after Russia, France and Germany intervened, and forced Japan to return the seized Liaotung Peninsula to China. Although the Triple Intervention profoundly shocked Japan, she gave in, in the hope for future development under the concept *Gashin Shotan*, the term derived from Chinese history advising to accept momentary humiliation in the hope of future success. Britain neither interfered nor took sides during this crisis.

In September 1896 Russia signed a secret treaty of alliance with China that envisaged Japan as the enemy<sup>22</sup>. On the strength of this treaty Russia expanded its presence in China and leased Liaotung Peninsula vacated by Japan under pressure. Russian push was backed by her ally France and supported by Germany, both of whom had leased territory in China. Britain also held leases in China and demanded more every time other powers obtained concessions. However Britain’s interest in China was essentially commercial, and therefore Britain wanted China’s territorial integrity protected. Russia’s aggression threatened British interests in China but also the security of British India. Therefore in January 1898 Britain

started negotiation with Russia to settle bilateral disputes. Russia however did not favour a general agreement as proposed by Britain. Consequently in March 1898 Britain initiated negotiations for an Anglo-German alliance that dragged on till the following year yet did not yield any satisfactory agreement. In such a circumstance the British Colonial Secretary Joseph Chamberlain also suggested Japanese Minister to Britain Mr Takaaki Kato to propose a Japanese alliance with Britain. Minister Kato recommended the suggestion to the Japanese government headed by Prime Minister Ito Cabinet who failed to reach a decision to respond. Subsequently Britain managed to sign limited agreements with Germany and Russia regarding China. In April 1899 the agreement between Britain and Russia was signed.

In 1900 Boxer Rebellion broke out in China in response to the race for concessions by the world powers. An international force was arranged where Japan played a major role by sending twenty thousand troops.<sup>23</sup> *The Cambridge History of Japan*, however, records that Japan protected Western interests in China, and Japan dispatched ten thousand soldiers, approximately the same size of troops sent by all the western powers combined<sup>24</sup>. Although there is a considerable discrepancy between the two sources as to the number of Japanese troops sent to quell the Boxer rebellion, there is a general consensus on Japan's role as the protector of Western Interests in China during the Boxer rebellion. While the international force captured Peking and made the Chinese to submit, Russia arbitrarily occupied many key places in Manchuria and marched troops in to North China.

Russian aggression during Boxer Rebellion prompted signing of an Anglo-German entente, the Yangtze River Agreement. Germany, however, later declared that the above agreement could not be applied to Manchuria. This came as a great disappointment to both Britain and Japan. None the less Britain continued with her efforts to forge an alliance with Germany. By 1901, however, Britain realised the futility of her efforts and finally decided to try an alliance with Japan. After the Triple Intervention, Japan learnt that military victory alone was not enough to maintain her position in the Far East, and that she required a suitable foreign policy.<sup>25</sup> In Japan two schools of thought surfaced, one advocated a compromise with Russia and the other an alliance with Britain. Russian drive towards Manchuria and Korea caused great insecurity among the Japanese. Both Britain and Japan lodged a protest with Russia over the secret Russo-Chinese agreement restoring Manchuria to China.

Russian occupation of Manchuria threatened British position in China, and Japan viewed Russian occupation as a threat to Korea. The allocation of Boxer indemnity had brought Britain and Japan closer, and presently they developed a common interest of resisting Russia.<sup>26</sup>

### **3. Negotiations And Signing Of Anglo-Japanese Alliance:**

Early in 1901, negotiations between Britain and Japan commenced. Japanese Minister Hayashi met with British Foreign Secretary Lord Lansdowne on 15 May 1901 and the negotiations intensified. During this period British Government eagerly hoped to sign an alliance with Japan lest Japan signed an agreement with Russia.<sup>27</sup> On 31 July 1901 Hayashi in a meeting with Lansdowne stated that Japan had an indirect interest in Manchuria. But Japan feared that Russia from Manchuria would go on to occupy Korea, which Japan would be forced to prevent. So Hayashi considered it vital to oust Russia from Manchuria. Lansdowne responded that Britain was not interested in Manchuria, but did not want to see Korea occupied by Russia. Consequently Japanese and British views converged.

Two problems, however, quickly appeared. Britain wanted the alliance to apply to defend India that Japan did not accept, and Britain did not endorse Japanese position in Korea. Discussion of these issues, and distribution of naval forces, lasted into November.<sup>28</sup> In subsequent cabinet meetings held both in Japan and Britain right up to the last week in January in 1902, numerous alterations were made to the draft of the agreement. On January 30, 1902 at five pm Lord Lansdowne and Minister Hayashi signed the first Anglo-Japanese Alliance at the British Foreign Office and also exchanged the Confidential Notes.<sup>29</sup>

#### **4. Second Anglo-Japanese Alliance:**

Russo-Japanese war of 1905 substantially changed the political environment in the Far East and that prompted modifications to first Anglo-Japanese Alliance. In the meantime political environment in Europe had also undergone substantial change. Britain's four year long negotiations with Germany that had started in 1898 proved futile and finally Britain gave up the idea of an alliance with Germany.<sup>30</sup> Britain instantly changed her policy and approached France and Russia. On 5 April 1904 France and Britain signed one agreement and two declarations settling bilateral disputes.

Having signed the Entente Cordiale with France, Britain wished an understanding with Russia. Since Russia desired to march to the East with German help, the Far Eastern issue had become the central point of conflict between Russia and Britain. By signing the alliance with Japan, the undisputed power of the Far East, Britain thought of arriving at an agreement with Russia.<sup>31</sup> This logic prompted Britain support the arrangement between Japan and Russia after the signing of Anglo-Japanese Alliance. Britain generally supported Japanese policies before and during the Russo-Japanese war, but carefully avoided annoying Russia so that future reconciliation with Russia was not in jeopardy. British King Edward VII even said, 'the aim of Anglo-Japanese Alliance was "plutot a contenir le Japon"<sup>32</sup>', when he had a talk with Izvolskii, the Russian minister at Copenhagen in April 1904. Nish<sup>33</sup> has recorded

that 'the alliance also performed the negative function of preventing Japan from going over to the Russian camp in 1901'.

The French Government offered help for Russia and Britain to reach an understanding because of the view that the Anglo-Russian rivalry only benefited Germany.

Because of Japanese victory in Russo-Japanese war, Britain felt no need to fear Russia in the immediate future<sup>34</sup>. However despite substantial losses in the Russo-Japanese war, Russia posed a serious threat to British India. The close ties between Russia and Germany made the threat very real. Thus Britain first from national defence point of view, and secondly for gaining bargaining power in negotiating with Russia that was about to start, wished to modify Anglo-Japanese Alliance, and extend it to India. Moreover the safety of Britain's trade with China now depended on the protection afforded by Japanese navy.

Both Britain and Japan had benefited from first Anglo-Japanese Alliance in the first three years since the signing in 1902. Both countries wished continuation of the alliance with some modifications. Japan desired to revise the alliance by stretching its validity by seven more years and to use the revised alliance in case Korea was made a protectorate.<sup>35</sup> Britain opposed the proposition and insisted on changing the existing defensive treaty into an offensive and defensive alliance and also making it applicable to India. Japan noted the proposed modifications and on May 26, 1905 agreed because of the considerations that the offensive and defensive alliance a) would make Russia fear Japan and b) would not make Japan isolated in the world.<sup>36</sup>

Issues related to Korea and India, and military cooperation were settled to mutual satisfaction. The negotiations took six months and the alliance was signed on 12 August 1905.

### **5. Third Anglo-Japanese Alliance:**

Britain and Japan benefited from a lasting partnership secured by Anglo-Japanese Alliance. The alliance was dynamic and kept changing its nature.<sup>37</sup> The alliance attained its zenith during the period from 1902 to 1905 and after the Russo-Japanese war its fortune faded.

In fact after the signing of the second Anglo-Japanese Alliance, it gradually lost popularity in Britain, and there were even public utterances that the alliance should be discontinued. However, British leaders, particularly Foreign Secretary Sir Edward Grey, wished its continuation, essentially in an attempt to counter Germany.<sup>38</sup> Finally on 13 July 1911, the third Anglo-Japanese Alliance was signed, so that Britain could challenge Germany when a contest for supremacy between the two countries appeared inevitable.

Anglo-Japanese Alliance in the second decade of its existence, particularly during the duration of World War One, declined in popularity in Britain. Lack of British support for the alliance, even hostility towards it, meant its doom. Eventually the alliance was liquidated on 13 December 1921. Decline and liquidation of the alliance is discussed in the next section to demonstrate that with the decline of the alliance the British support for Japanese causes also declined.

## **SECTION TWO:**

### **Japan's Involvement In World War One:**

This section demonstrates that Japan responded to the crisis in Europe that subsequently came to be known as World War One, essentially as an ally of Britain bound by Anglo-Japanese Alliance. Japan keen in maintaining its position of pre-eminence in East Asia, once requested by its ally Britain, declared a war on Germany and quite willingly and efficiently conducted the war leading to the surrender of German forces in East Asia. Japan's role as an ally of Britain, perhaps gave Japan the confidence of proposing Racial Equality Bill at the League of Nations some four and a half years later.

However, during the course of war, Japan's image in Britain suffered and Anglo-Japanese Alliance lost its popular appeal among the British. The second decade of the existence of the treaty, since the signing of Third Anglo-Japanese Alliance in 1911, was the period of alliance in decline. The decline can not be ascribed to any one incident. Relations between Britain and Japan began to strain at all spheres, particularly on policy over China that spawned hostility. The good name of the alliance declined in Britain. While it was greeted in 1902 as the start of Open Door Doctrine, it slowly earned a poor reputation in Britain as a deceptive policy in Asia and was severely criticised in the US.<sup>39</sup> Eventually Anglo-Japanese Alliance was liquidated.

Reasons for the dislike of Anglo-Japanese Alliance in Britain have been presented in this section. This disenchantment of the British with Japan during World War One is believed to have contributed to the lack of British support for the Japanese racial equality proposal at the League of Nations.

### **1. Applicability Of Anglo-Japanese Alliance And Japan's Position:**

On 28 June 1914 the Crown Prince of Austria and his consort were assassinated at Sarajevo in the province of Bosnia that had just been incorporated into the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Subsequently the relations among the Powers rapidly deteriorated. On 31 July 1914 Germany moved its military along the Franco-German frontier, and hostilities between France and Germany erupted. As Germany declined to honour the neutrality of Belgium, Britain entered the fray and took sides with France and Russia, and announced a war on Germany on

4 August 1914. When Britain declared war on Germany, it envisaged naval encounter not only in Atlantic but also in the Pacific.<sup>40</sup> On the same day (4 August 1914) the Government of Japan announced that if Britain entered the war, Japan would take necessary measures in keeping with Anglo-Japanese Alliance. Nineteen days later on 23 August 1914, an Imperial Edict from Japan declared war on Germany.<sup>41</sup>

Germany's war was not restricted to Europe. In her leased territory of Kiaochow Bay and in East Asia, German fleet obstructed Japanese and Allied shipping, which threatened the peace in the Far East. Britain was concerned for the security of her colonies and her trade in the East. However, on 3 August 1914, Sir William Conyngham Greene, British Ambassador to Japan, called on Japan's Foreign Minister Baron Takaaki Kato and delivered a telegram received on the night of 2 August 1914, saying that Britain did not require any help from Japan.<sup>42</sup> Kato responded by saying that Japanese government would wait for the decision of British Government before deciding their approach to war in Europe. Kato added that it would be fortunate if there was no need to apply Anglo-Japanese Alliance. However, Kato declared, should it become necessary, Japanese Government at the request of British Government, would take the steps necessary.

The next morning (4 August 1914) Kato received a copy of a telegram from the British Ambassador that conveyed a change of mood by the British, and said:

‘...if the fighting should extend to the Far East, and an assault on Hong Kong and Wei-hai-wei were to occur, His Majesty's Government would rely on the support of the Imperial Government of Japan.’<sup>43,44</sup>

Later in the day when British Ambassador to Japan visited Foreign Minister Kato, Kato stated the decision of Japanese Government that if there were any acts of aggression like assault on Hong Kong or Wei-hai-wei, Anglo-Japanese Alliance would be applied instantly.<sup>45</sup> Kato also mentioned the readiness of Japanese war ships for action in applying the alliance to a profoundly thankful British Ambassador Greene. On the same day in London, British Foreign Secretary Grey expressed his deep gratitude to Japanese government for their magnanimous offer of help. Grey further stated that British government did not wish to embroil Japan in the present war because during Russo-Japanese War, Japan could have demanded British help under Anglo-Japanese Alliance, as France was aiding Russian fleet, but Japan did not do so. Inspired by this generosity, British government would endeavour not to embroil Japan in British trouble.

## **2. Britain's Request For Cooperation, And Japan Prepares For War:**

After initial hesitation Britain acknowledged that she could not combat German navy alone. On 5 August an internal British memorandum stated that British and German navies



were of similar strength in China seas and serious British trade could avoid serious harm only by taking Japanese help.<sup>46</sup> British Foreign Secretary Grey conferred with Winston Churchill as first lord of the Admiralty and with the first sea lord, and in the evening of 5 August 1914 Grey drafted a telegram seeking Japanese help.<sup>47</sup> On 6 August 1914 Grey forwarded a memorandum to Japanese Ambassador Inouye expressing British gratitude for Japanese assurances of assistance. On 7 August 1914 Ambassador Greene called on Foreign Minister Kato and requested Japanese government to help Britain hunt and destroy German armed merchant cruisers. Greene expressed that such an action would constitute a declaration of war with Germany.

Japan considered confronting German armed merchant cruisers in East Asia as an inadequate reason for launching war, and Japanese government wanted to say clearly in its declaration of war on Germany that 'peace in East Asia was imperilled as a result of German aggressive actions in that region, and that Japan was taking this action after close consultation with Britain'.<sup>48</sup> Japanese Foreign Minister sought a quick response from the British Government on 9 August 1914.

While Japan was unwilling to play a restricted part, Grey faced substantial pressure to persuade Japan to limit her action. China objected to the possible Japanese attack on Kiaochow; and Australia, New Zealand, the Dutch East Indies and the US did not like the idea of Japanese naval incursion into the South China seas and the South Pacific Islands.<sup>49</sup> On 9 August 1914 when Japanese Ambassador Inouye saw Grey, he requested the Japanese government not to initiate any attack without a formal British request. Grey, however, stated that if Japan and Germany fought a war, and Japan captured Kiaochow Bay and possessed it after the war, British government would endorse Japanese occupation.<sup>50</sup> On the same day (9 August 1914) British Ambassador Greene in Japan made the same proposal to Foreign Minister Kato.

On 10 August 1914 Japan informed Britain that the Imperial Government of Japan had no choice but to declare war on Germany.<sup>51</sup>

### **3. Japan's Declaration Of War On Germany:**

Britain responded on 11 August consenting to Japan's entry in war but requested Japan to restrict actions to the sea. Japan in her response of 13 August 1914 assured the British of restricted action but also stated that this condition could not be inserted into the declaration of war. Britain was powerless to prevent Japan from charting her own course of action.<sup>52</sup> However, the good relations between Japan and Britain suffered because Japan objected to Grey's suggestion and the ensuing correspondence ruffled Japanese feelings more than the issue of entering the war. In his last demands Grey used a paternal tone that Foreign

Minister Kato disapproved and wrote the ultimatum to Germany in a wording that Britain did not like. The incident showed the lack of confidence between the two allies.<sup>53</sup>

The British in the end agreed with the Japanese. On 15 August 1914 Japan sent an ultimatum to Germany asking her to eliminate all impediments to peace in the Far East and to instantly remove all German armed vessels from Japanese and Chinese waters and to hand over Kiaochow Bay to Japan by 15 September 1914.<sup>54</sup> Japan further demanded a response stating unconditional acceptance by noon of 23 August 1914. Germany did not respond by the dead line. So Japan, following the appropriate article of The Hague Convention sent notes to all the signatory Powers, advising them of the severance of diplomatic relations between Japan and Germany.

#### **4. Anglo-Japanese Campaign And Further Decline Of The Alliance:**

Japanese attack on German lease in China and German Pacific islands were essentially because of Anglo-Japanese Alliance without any particular hostilities towards the Germans. Yet, in August 1914 a grave crisis in Anglo-Japanese Alliance erupted. British invitation for Japanese help, at the commencement of World War One, yet their discouragement to Japan from entering the fray shocked Japan, and suspicions of the alliance surfaced. The first major dispute between the allies broke out and 'it created much bad blood between Britain and Japan'.<sup>55</sup>

Nish<sup>56</sup> argues that Japan entered the war to strengthen her hold in China and British response was vague. While Britain accepted the Japanese guarantee she nursed profound suspicions of Japan's eventual goals. Anglo-Japanese Alliance had plummeted to its lowest point and Britain endeavoured to prevent Japan from making any agreement with Germany. British suspicions were so intense that on 13 August Britain proposed that France and Russia be called upon for the Tsingtao invasion. This request offended Japan, particularly its army. Grey withdrew the request only a week later when threatened by a veto from Japan.

In the first combined military operations of the alliance thus far, the British troops, although small in number, functioned under Japanese command. The collaboration was unsatisfactory causing recriminations that lasted till the very end of World War One.<sup>57</sup>

A blockade of the entire coastline of Kiaochow Bay in Shantung was announced on 27 August 1914. Japan in due course, mobilised the Eighteenth Infantry Division whose advance units landed near Lungkou on the Gulf of Po Hai on 2 September 1914.<sup>58</sup> Japan also mobilised twenty-ninth cavalry brigade for immediate service in China.<sup>59</sup> Japanese troops attacked Tsingtao on 26 September 1914 under protection from Japanese and British fleet.<sup>60</sup>

A siege of Tsingtao and the fortified hills followed, and the Germans capitulated after a pounding by Japanese artillery and the ultimate attack in early November where British

troops also participated. The Japanese airforce reconnoitred and dropped bombs in the first aerial combat over Tsingtao. The battle was an uneven contest. 60,000 Japanese men attacked 4,000 Germans and the casualty lists showed: Japanese fatalities to be 415, British 13, and German 199, while the Japanese had 1,452 wounded, the British 61, and the Germans 294.<sup>61</sup> MacMillan<sup>62</sup> however, records that the cost to Japan of the attack on Germany, in China alone came to 2,000 Japanese lives and 50 million yen. In any case it was not an insignificant cost to Japan. Germans capitulated on 7 November 1914 and three days later, on 10 November German Governor Waldeck officially handed Tsingtao to Japanese Lieutenant-General Kamio.<sup>63</sup>

Relations between Japanese and British army soured during the course of the combined operations. The landing at Lungkou was tough and flooding impeded the progress of the troops particularly the wheeled vehicles. Although German opposition was poor, Japanese campaign was hindered by the British troops, for whom the Japanese provided food, horses, fodder and other facilities. Consequently there was tension between British and Japanese forces.<sup>64</sup> There were many instances where Japanese mistook British troops for Germans, and fired upon them and took them prisoners. The captain of the Sikh regiment was taken prisoner and maltreated.

Moreover the Japanese formed a poor opinion of the British soldiers, though not of the Sikhs (Indian troops). In the final phases of capturing of Tsingtao British troops were time and again ordered by Japanese commanders to march ahead along with the Japanese, but the British kept retreating. Later on an article by Oishi Masami in *Seiji to Shakai* observed that:

‘the English soldiers in the campaign against Tsingtao would not advance; they would only retreat, even when they were ordered to advance and struck on their backs by the rifle.’<sup>65</sup>

There were serious failures of communication between top brasses of the two countries, and the Japanese did not trust the British commanders. Moreover the relation between the commanders-in-chief, General Mitsuomi Kamio and Brigadier-general Barnardiston was not cordial. Tension between British and Japanese army plagued every level of the military.

However, naval co-operation between the two countries was mainly satisfactory. During the course of war Japanese fleet sailed south and captured German held islands of Jaluit, Yap, the Marshalls, the Marianas, and the East and West Carolines in the Pacific. The Japanese navy joined the British and pursued German men-of-war, convoyed troopships from British colonies to Europe. Moreover Japanese navy in European waters hunted German submarines, and in the Indian Ocean destroyed German merchant cruisers, thus making significant contributions to the eventual Allied victory.

## 5. Call For Expansion Of The Alliance:

Russia and France, before the commencement of World War One, had endeavoured to expand Anglo-Japanese Alliance by joining it. The elder *Genro* Inoue on 10 August 1914, had remarked that Anglo-Japanese Alliance was becoming cool, and he had supported the expansion of the alliance by the inclusion of Russia. Early in 1915, British Foreign Secretary Grey although admitted that the alliance was struggling, but was reluctant to admit two new members Russia and France, and refused its expansion. Japan also rejected the call for expansion. Motive behind calls for expansion of the alliance by Russia and France was the desire for Japanese aid. By September 1914, Britain realised that Japan's help was vital in the Indian Ocean and even beyond. Britain requested for deployment of a division of Japanese fleet in the Mediterranean, and two months later on 3 November 1914 Britain appealed to Japan for naval help for an expected entry to the Baltic. Japanese Foreign Minister Kato declined the requests, yet assured that Japanese government would reconsider its position if England were actually faced invasion.<sup>66</sup> On 15 November 1914, Britain again sought naval help from Japan. Japan chose to clarify her stance by saying that she would participate in pursuing the *Scharnhorst* and protecting shipping in the Pacific and Indian oceans but would not dispatch ships to the Mediterranean or the Dardanelles. Britain stopped requesting for Japanese naval help for a year.

Russia and France, however, were keen in Japan's military help in Europe. In the autumn of 1914, the three Entente powers made a joint appeal for Japanese troops for the western front that Japan rejected. Grey urged by his allies raised the issue privately on 6 November with the Japanese, which Japan again refused.<sup>67</sup> Many appeals to Japan's moral obligations under the alliance followed. Japan was repeatedly requested to send troops to the western front and later to the eastern front. Japan provided supplies to Russia to fight at the eastern front but always declined the requests to send troops. Japan forcefully contended that the scope of Anglo-Japanese Alliance did not extend to Europe and Japan was not obliged to dispatch forces to Europe. Britain and the alliance received no help from Japanese army during the war and that disappointed Britain, which became evident when the armistice was declared in November 1918.

In December 1914 when Britain gave up its requests to Japan, France repeated request for Japanese military help. France proposed that the powers would give, if necessary, 'such guarantees as Japan might reasonably demand in return for her help.'<sup>68</sup> Subsequently there was intense clandestine activities in London, Paris, Moscow and Tokyo to secure Japanese help.

Japan's single biggest plight in dealing with the western countries up to that point in time was racial discrimination encountered by Japanese people settled in foreign lands of British colonies and the US. Japan had time and again pointed out the issue of racial discrimination in order for its elimination. The Entente powers met in London in January 1915 'to discuss compensation that could be offered to Japan, whose main proposal was for the removal of racial discrimination against Japanese in British colonies.'<sup>69</sup> At the official level however, the proposal was quietly dropped. The entrenched racism against the Japanese in the western countries would continue unabated.

At this point in time, Britain and other European powers considered Japan as an unyielding and unhelpful ally, only interested to profit financially from the war. Such a perception created a negative image of Japan in Britain.

#### **6. Anglo-Japanese Secret Agreement of 1917:**

In 1917, World War One did not quite go the way Britain wanted. Britain sustained heavy losses to her merchant shipping as a result of German U-boat action, and the food shortages in Britain caused a large scale public protest and strike action in May 1917. In the summer of 1917 the French army collapsed and the Russian front failed. By December 1917 a massive campaign for peace became active in Britain. By the spring of 1917, Britain for months had failed to rule the sea. The situation in Britain was gloomy.

There were recent changes in government in both Britain and Japan. With the new government in Japan the British felt that Japan's role in the war could change. British Admiralty, shocked by massive losses British shipping sustained at German hands, initiated the move to canvass for help of the allies, Japan and the US.

Sir John Jellicoe, the first lord of the sea, since December 1916, felt that Britain's allies did not make enough contributions. Jellicoe expressed that Japan owes Britain a great deal and therefore Japan should patrol the south Pacific. Under the heading 'Japan as an ally' Jellicoe wrote:

'It can not be said that the attitude of Japan has been entirely satisfactory. It is true that in certain respects they are much handicapped owing to the antagonism between the US and Japan... Nevertheless apart from the selling of guns and ammunitions to the Russians and ourselves, Japan is not taking a full share in the war.'<sup>70</sup>

British Admiralty found it problematic to determine where and how to request Japanese help and forecast what reciprocal concessions Japan may demand. Finally the Admiralty determined that she required destroyers in the Mediterranean and light cruisers in the south Atlantic. The Admiralty through Foreign Office requested Japan for two of the four

light cruisers helping the allies at Singapore for transfer to the Cape of Good Hope to counter German raids, and for a fleet of destroyers to be based on Malta to counter German submarines. On 11 January 1917 Ambassador Greene conveyed the requests to the Japanese. On 26 January 1917 Japan's Foreign Minister Motono, in a meeting with Greene offered to extend Japanese naval help if 'Britain could meet certain of Japan's desires'<sup>71</sup>; that comprised the cession of the German islands in the South Pacific and the territorial rights in Shantung province in China. Greene conveyed the Japanese desires to his government. Before British government responded to the Japanese conditional offer, British Foreign Office began formulation of their counter-demand to be placed with Japan.

On 2 February 1917 Japan agreed to offer the required naval help, without waiting for Britain's response to Japan's reciprocal demands. Japan provided the *Tsushima* and *Niitaka*, for the Cape of Good Hope, and the *Akashi* and two fleets of destroyers for the Mediterranean. In so doing the Japanese had exceeded British expectations. In fact when war ended Britain invited Japan's Mediterranean fleet to offer thanks. In January 1919, to mark the felicitation, a special issue of the *Illustrated London News* was published that showed the Japanese sailors in the British capital in a fleet of hansom-cabs waving union Jacks and Hinomaru flags. British public paid tribute to the Japanese for their naval help.

On 10 February 1917, after receiving approval from Australia and New Zealand, Britain agreed with the Japanese demand. On 16 February 1917, British reply conveying British agreement and a British counter-demand was passed on to Japan that read:

'His Majesty's Government accede with pleasure to the request of the Japanese Government for an assurance that they will support Japan's claims in regard to disposal of Germany's rights in Shantung and possessions in Islands North of Equator on occasion of Peace Conference, it being understood that Japanese Government will, in eventual peace settlement, treat in same spirit Great Britain's claims to German Islands South of Equator.'<sup>72</sup>

On 21 February 1917, Japan informed Britain of her agreement with British request for rights to the Pacific islands south of the Equator. This agreement remained secret until in 1918 the Bolshevik leaders of Russia chose to reveal the clandestine treaty of the Tsarist government. Up to this point in Anglo-Japanese relations, Britain kept asking favours and Japan kept obliging. It remained so for the rest of the war. In January 1917, sympathisers in Japan had raised money to show their compassion for the war-ravaged nations of Europe. The organisers in their appeal had written:

‘Far removed as [Japan] is from the centre of conflict, [Japanese] people have not witnessed the bloody decimation of their country and the mountains of corpses that mark the battle fields of Europe.’<sup>73</sup>

Japanese people generously contributed to the fund and in six months two million yen were raised. In March 1917, the head of the *Yamashita* shipping company, donated a large consignment of premium quality marmalade valued at 1,500 British Pounds to British Embassy at Tokyo, to be dispatched to British troops. These gifts were genuine expressions of sympathy and generosity by Japanese people towards the British.

The other allies of Britain were desperate to obtain more Japanese help, so much so that they were willing to make any promises on paper. The invitation of a reciprocal demand from Japan was essentially to prevent the agreement appear too one-sided. By obtaining Japanese support for her cession of the south Pacific islands, Britain gained more benefits than France and Russia.<sup>74</sup> Despite generous and immediate Japanese support to the British, in Britain there were voices that remarked, that Japan gained considerably from the war at a low cost.

## **7. Japan’s Gains From World War One And British Disenchantment:**

Economic reasons like bilateral trade between Japan and Britain or even between Japan and the British Empire were never the primary motivators for Anglo-Japanese Alliance. In the second decade of the alliance it became obvious that Japan could not broaden her international commerce without impinging on British interests. In fact Japan and Britain competed in two main regions: China and India. While British exports to China stagnated between 1890 and 1913, the year before the war started, Japanese export during the same period of time to China increased thirteen times.<sup>75</sup> By 1914 Japan’s trade with India had also risen steeply. Japanese shipping line *Nihon Yusen Kaisha* enjoyed rights on Indian coast, where as British businesses did not enjoy similar privileges in Japan, and that annoyed the British. Moreover, the British suspected that N.Y.K. was subsidised by the Japanese government, a benefit British companies did not get. This suspicion suggested a bitter rivalry looming large.

Kaoru Inoue, the influential *Genro*, on 9 August 1914, welcomed the war in Europe as a god sent opportunity with the words, ‘the divine aid conferred on the new Taisho era for the achievement of Japan’s destiny’<sup>76</sup> and urged that Japan should seize this opportunity by joining Britain, France and Russia, against Germany. In the words of elder statesman, Aritomo Yamagata, Japanese watched the conflict in Europe, ‘like a fire on the far bank of the river.’<sup>77</sup> The Government of Japan when declaring war said ‘Japan must take the chance of a

millennium, to establish its rights and interests in Asia.<sup>78</sup> Critics of Japan in Britain argued that by combating Germany, Japan had opted to reap benefits at a minimal risk.<sup>79</sup>

*Cambridge History of Japan* records that First World War saved Japan from balance-of-payments problems<sup>80</sup>. Since the war began Japanese commerce prospered enormously. Many Japanese industries worked round the clock to satisfy the demand for war related materials. Japanese exports earnings rose from 526,581,000 yen in 1912 to 1,127,468,000 yen in 1916.<sup>81</sup> In China Japanese traders prospered immensely in the absence of European merchants. In the US, which had also enjoyed a surge in prosperity due to war, Japanese traders did well. European powers profited from Japanese merchandise, yet they were fearful that at the end of war they may not be able to win back the markets they had lost to Japan.

Japan profited from Allied orders for arms, ammunitions and other merchandise, and also because of diminished competition from European traders in domestic and Asian markets. Japan's foreign borrowings decreased substantially and she became an international creditor for the duration of war. Between 1914 and 1918, Japan's real gross national product increased by 40 per cent.<sup>82</sup> Japan's merchant navy doubled in size as Japanese exports to Britain and the US doubled, quadrupled to China and rose six times to Russia.<sup>83,84</sup> During the war, Japan obtained territories and other holdings at a very low cost.<sup>85</sup> In ship building Japan experienced significant growth. With trade generated revenue she amassed foreign exchange and gold, and became significantly wealthier.<sup>86</sup>

By the end of World War One, Japan ranked third in the list of world powers<sup>87</sup>. The economic as well as military power of Japan threatened Britain and the US,<sup>88</sup> so much so that in 1917 in a memorandum to the war cabinet British Foreign Secretary Arthur Balfour remarked that Britain would definitely 'defend the US if Japan attacked'.<sup>89</sup>

## **8. Japan's Unpopularity And Liquidation Of Anglo-Japanese Alliance:**

Japanese were content with their contribution to her ally Britain and the Entente powers. Japanese public viewed Japan's naval achievements in the war with pride, and Japan's newspapers reported her naval conquest in great detail. Japanese public however, were shocked when a revered writer Dr Inazo Nitobe in July 1918 wrote that Japanese contribution was so small and unsatisfactory that Japan might not enjoy a position of strength at the peace conference. At the same time strong criticism of British performance by the Japanese press adversely affected Anglo-Japanese relations during World War One.

In Britain during the war years there was a deep distrust of Japan. In 1916, British cruisers off Shanghai blockaded Japanese merchant vessels in order to search for Indian revolutionaries. This episode was an insult to Japan and demonstrated that the British had no confidence in the Japanese. Many documents demonstrate British suspicion that Japan was



either oblivious or self-serving in her actions during the war, despite Japan's significant contributions, particularly when she was so remote from the causes of war. However, the British Foreign Secretary Balfour in a letter to Lord Milner on 19 January 1918 wrote that Japanese contributions were not 'all that we had a right to expect.'<sup>90</sup>

Pro-German attitude of the Japanese Home Minister Goto and Premier Terauchi in 1918, and the pro-German lobby in Japanese press irritated Britain. Britain was also unhappy with Japan's tough negotiations before she made any new commitments to the war. The anti-alliance literature blamed the alliance and criticised the unhealthy state of Anglo-Japanese ties.

The alliance was criticised in both Britain and Japan. In Britain those attached to China, for sentimental as well as commercial reasons distrusted Japan, and were convinced that the alliance harmed Britain's future with China.<sup>91</sup> Dr Ernest Morrison, a revered correspondent in China until 1912 with *The Times*, based in Peking since 1897, and who had passionately advocated for Anglo-Japanese Alliance, became anti-Japanese from 1905, and wrote hostile articles against the alliance. The text of twenty-one Chinese demands, although covered up by *The Times* in 1915, was later revealed by the actions of *Manchester Guardian*, significantly harmed Japan's reputation in Britain and provided sympathisers of China with ammunition to complain. Many in Britain considered Japanese actions in China imperialistic.<sup>92</sup> Lancashire textile manufacturers, Labour movement, and all who listened to the Voice of America derided Anglo-Japanese Alliance. The negative effect of the alliance on Anglo-American ties was also a serious concern, because it was considered a reason for American suspicion.<sup>93</sup> These disappointments plummeted Anglo-Japanese Alliance to its nadir in Britain during the war years.<sup>94</sup>

Japanese government had planned a grand exhibition in Britain in 1912 to showcase the splendours of Japan to build a better public image of Japan. The grand exhibition however was postponed to 1917, and opened amidst huge publicity in the White City, London in May, with the British royal family and Prince Fushimi of Japan in attendance. The exhibition ran till October 1917. The relations between the two countries by this time had plummeted to such a nadir that the message of the exhibition in Britain 'was received without batting of an eye-lid.'<sup>95</sup> *The Times*, published an expensive and richly illustrated special supplement. Massive entertainments and lavish garden parties were arranged as a part of the grand exhibition. But it failed to arrest the sliding enthusiasm for the alliance waning since 1905. The belated public relation exercise, the grand exhibition, was generally considered to have failed and did not substantially increase trade. The grand exhibition was perhaps too late, although not too little, to arrest the sliding popularity of Japan in Britain. Many more

such public relations exercises much earlier in her engagement with Britain would have raised the profile of Japan. The issue of Japanese public relation exercise in Britain was forcefully argued by the London correspondent of Tokyo *Asahi* in a letter cabled to Tokyo and published in *Japan Times & Mail* of Sunday, 11 May 1919 under the caption Japan And Her Ally. The text of the letter is presented in Section One of Appendix I.

Due to the loud criticisms, Anglo-Japanese Alliance ultimately came up for review at Washington conference in 1921, and there Anglo-Japanese alliance was annulled and was absorbed in the Four Power Treaty of 13 December 1921. The process of the annulment of the alliance struck the Japanese as a vivid example of cold and calculating ‘British diplomatic expertise’<sup>96</sup>, and the alliance was terminated in August 1923, after more than twenty-one years of existence.

### **SECTION THREE:**

#### **Japan Australia Relation During World War One:**

Japan honoured its obligations under Anglo-Japanese Alliance effective since 1902 and fought along side Britain and its allies in World War One. As the hostilities commenced Britain also requested Japan to defend Australia and New Zealand. In response to British request, Japan despatched a number of ships and personnel from its Imperial Navy.<sup>97</sup> Despite suspicions and fears of Japan<sup>98</sup>, Australia accepted Japanese naval help. Speeches by Australian authorities always recognised Japanese contributions. Australian official history of the war records, ‘The most cordial relations prevailed between the visiting Japanese squadrons or ships and the naval authorities in Australia, and the Japanese admirals were supplied with all necessary information.’<sup>99</sup>

However Australia Japan relationship, the relationship of two formal allies, even during World War One when Japan was protecting Australia, was not entirely smooth and free from trouble<sup>100</sup> essentially because of fear of Japan and prejudices against the Japanese. Fear of Japan that constitutes the subject matter of a chapter later in the thesis, made Australian Prime Minister William Morris Hughes to mount a steadfast opposition to Racial Equality Bill presented by Japan at the League of Nations. Therefore it is essential to record the extent of help and protection offered by Japan to Australia during World War One to demonstrate the Japanese commitment to Anglo-Japanese Alliance. Presented below, in the first part of the section, are the discussions on instances of Japanese help and protection to Australia during World War One; and the second part discusses instances of Australian unfriendly, even hostile actions towards Japan during the same period of time.

#### **1. Convoying Of ANZAC Troops By Japanese Warships:**

When World War One broke out in August 1914, Australia had a small naval fleet. Her Dreadnought cruiser, four light cruisers, three destroyers and two submarines were utterly inadequate to protect and defend the vast island continent. On the other hand Japanese navy had ten times as many vessels, stationed in the north Pacific. Vastly superior Japanese navy in fact was a source of great concern in Australia. However, two months later, as a consequence of the Japanese agreement with the British to defend Australia, Australian cruiser *Sydney* (5,600 tons), built to counter Japanese attack on Australia, worked along side the vastly superior Japanese battle cruiser *Ibuki* (10,000 tons). In 1914 Japanese Imperial navy cruiser *Ibuki* and three other smaller cruisers (one British and two Australian that included *H.M.S. Sydney* and the *Melbourne*) escorted one of the biggest convoys in naval history of thirty-eight vessels that carried thirty thousand ANZAC (Australia and New Zealand Army Corps) troops with military hardware and 7,843 horses from Australia to Alexandria in Egypt. On 9 November the convoy sighted German cruiser *Emden* (3,600 tons) near the Cocos Group of Islands in the Indian Ocean.<sup>101</sup> Australian and Japanese cruisers cooperated and the *Sydney* sank *Emden* that had destroyed or seized 100,000 tons of shipping between Calcutta and New Guinea, in addition to attacking Madras and Penang Harbour. Congratulatory messages came from everywhere as the fleet sailed across the Indian Ocean, reaching Alexandria in December 1914.<sup>102</sup>

In March 1917 three Japanese cruisers and eight destroyers led Australian ships, carrying soldiers across the Indian Ocean. Japanese light cruisers *Izumo* and *Nisshin* escorted Australian shipping from Fremantle to Colombo between May to June 1917.<sup>103</sup>

## **2. Patrolling Of Australian Coastline By Japanese Warships:**

Japanese navy conducted a substantial part of patrolling Australian coastline and transported soldiers from New Zealand and Australia to Europe. Japanese naval activity in Australian waters was so intense that in 1914 Japanese navy proposed to station a liaison officer at Sydney. Japanese light cruisers *Chikuma* and *Yahagi* patrolled North Queensland coast, from December 1914 to January 1915. Japanese light cruisers *Aso* and *Soya* visited Rabaul and Fremantle between May to July of 1915.<sup>104</sup> In 1915, Japanese ships collaborated with Australian ships at the China station overseeing the Malay archipelago.

In 1916 Japanese light cruisers *Azuma* and *Iwate* called on Fremantle, Brisbane and Auckland. In the same year Britain again appealed to Japan to safeguard the sea-routes from Australia to Aden.<sup>105</sup> Japan intensified protection of Australia in 1917 in response to the outbreak of massive German submarine warfare. Between April to December 1917 Japanese light cruiser *Hirado* and her sister ship *Chikuma* were engaged to defend Australia. In March

1918 the *Yahagi* called on Fremantle, and between May to October patrolled the north-eastern coasts of Australia.

### **3. Instances Of Unfriendly Australian Attitude During The Alliance:**

Australia Japan alliance during World War One was not always smooth<sup>106</sup>, in fact the two countries 'were uneasy allies'.<sup>107</sup> Presented below are two instances of unfriendly, even hostile, Australian attitude towards their benefactor Japan during the early years of World War One.

#### **3.1. Australian Hostility At Fremantle Port:**

On 20 November 1917 Japanese warship the *Yahagi* engaged in protecting Australian waters, moved in to dock in Fremantle port. An Australian naval artillery post overseeing the port fired a shot at the *Yahagi* as it moved in. This incident occurred after Australian port authorities were duly informed of the *Yahagi*'s arrival, and as she came in at 6.30 a.m. In fact a pilot was already aboard the *Yahagi* to bring her in. Without any warning at 6.58 a.m. the shot was fired and missed the vessel.<sup>108</sup> The ship berthed without any further incident. After docking, Japanese Captain Miyaji Tamisaburo demanded an explanation from Captain Clare, the Australian officer-in-charge of the port. Only the next day, Captain Claire offered an explanation saying that the shot was meant to be just a warning to the *Yahagi* for not raising the customary code flag as she entered. Captain Miyaji protested and asserted that the *Miyagi* had replied the signal lamps correctly and had announced her presence by Morse codes. However, 'the official history is silent on the incident of 20 November 1917.'<sup>109</sup>

Captain Miyaji was unconvinced by the explanation offered by the Australian Captain Clare, and reported the incident to Admiral Oguri Kosaburo, commanding officer of the Indian and Western Pacific Ocean squadron. Admiral Oguri in turn consulted with Tokyo, and then advised Captain Miyaji not to discuss further with Captain Clare, but to pursue the matter directly with the Australian naval ministry in Melbourne. Captain Miyaji followed his orders, and consequently Australian Governor-General Sir Redmond Munro Ferguson travelled to Perth and met with the Captain Miyaji on 25 November and reassured that the shot was unintentional and offered his apologies with the wording, 'It was an unfortunate accident for which I apologize.'<sup>110</sup> The Australian Naval Board on 28 November offered a formal apology, and the incident was closed.

Although the matter was officially closed after no less a dignitary than the Australian Governor-General Sir Redmond Munro Ferguson travelled personally all the way to Perth and offered an unreserved apology to Japanese Captain Miyaji, it was a hostile action on the part of Australia towards an ally and a benefactor, Japan. This incident was perhaps symptomatic of the general mistrust and prejudice the general Australian public felt towards the Japanese.

### 3.2. The *Ibuki* Restrained By Australian Captain Of The *Melbourne*:

On 9 November 1914, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, Japanese battle cruiser *Ibuki* along side the Australian cruiser *Sydney* were shepherding one of the most gigantic convoys in naval history. The convoy came across German light cruiser *Emden*. Instantly the *Sydney* gave chase to engage the *Emden* in a combat. The *Ibuki*, was the mightiest battleship at the scene and obviously wanted to fight the *Emden*. The *Ibuki*, however, was not permitted to engage in combat by the leading ship *Melbourne*. The captain of the *Melbourne* instructed the *Ibuki* to take up the *Sydney*'s position and protect the flank.<sup>111</sup> During the hour long battle in which *Sydney* sank *Emden*, the *Ibuki*'s captain, Vice-Admiral Kato Kanji received no information on the encounter. Consequently *Ibuki*'s captain expressed his concern. This incident was a snub at a very high ranking naval officer of Japanese navy by an Australian officer for whatever his reasons were. But as the convoy proceeded safely across the Indian Ocean and reached its destination, the incident appeared to have been forgotten, as evidenced from lack of any records of further protests raised.

Distrust and fear of Japan compounded the awkward situation of being protected by the Asian rival, to counter whom Australia had commissioned her own navy. In Frei's<sup>112</sup> words:

'The Australian Prime Minister William Morris Hughes epitomised such suspicion in his observations from London, where he went in 1916 at the invitation of the British Government to observe first hand the Empire's plight. His letter of 21 April to Acting Australian Prime Minister George Pearce may have reversed what little goodwill might have sprouted between Japan and Australia in the war years'.

The text of the letter is as follows:

'My dear Pearce,

I hardly know how to begin to tell you the story of what is going on in England...all our fears - or conjectures – that Japan was and is most keenly interested in Australia are amply borne out by facts...Foreign Secretary Sir Edward Grey believes Japan will stand behind Britain – he admits however that there is a large and growing party in Japan who look askance at the alliance and with favour on Germany. It is to me quite clear that in the event of even a temporary reverse to the Allies, the Japanese Government might not be able – even if they so desired – to keep Japan behind Britain...

The position is aggravated ... by the fact that Britain has approached Japan with a view to obtaining naval (and, or, military) assistance – say in the Mediterranean – and that the Japanese Government, while ready enough to grant this, ask for some

evidence of Britain's friendliness towards her in order possibly to justify her action or placate the opposition...

I told Grey that Australia would fight to the last ditch rather than allow Japanese to enter Australia. Upon that point we were adamant...

My dear Pearce believe me things are *not* going well here...I feel very depressed and missing Australia and all of my colleagues and friends more than I can say.'<sup>113</sup>

#### End Notes:

1. Richard Storry, *Japan and the Decline of the West in Asia 1894-1943* (London: The MacMillan Press, 1979), 122.
2. *ibid.*, p.124.
3. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. II (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1978), 8.
4. Ian Hill Nish, *The Anglo-Japanese Alliance: The Diplomacy of Two Island Empires 1894-1907* (London: The Athlone Press, 1985), 377.
5. *ibid.*, p.7.
6. *ibid.*, p.8.
7. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. II (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1978), 29.
8. Captain M. D. Kennedy, *Some Aspects of Japan and Her Defence Forces* (London: Keegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., 1928), 31-47.
9. Paul Hibbert Clyde, *The Far East: A History of the Impact of the West on Eastern Asia*, 2nd ed. (New York: Prentice Hall, 1953), 304.
10. William G. Beasley, *The Modern History of Japan*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1991), p.169.
11. Ian Hill Nish, *The Anglo-Japanese Alliance: The Diplomacy of Two Island Empires 1894-1907* (London: The Athlone Press, 1985).
12. *ibid.*, p.12.
13. *ibid.*, p.12.
14. *ibid.*, p.12-13.
15. *ibid.*
16. *ibid.*, p.154.
17. *ibid.*, p.13.
18. *ibid.*, p.14.

19. William G. Beasley, *The Modern History of Japan*, 3rd ed. (Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1991), 169.
20. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. II (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1978), 29.
21. William G. Beasley, *The Modern History of Japan*, 3rd ed. (Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1991), 168.
22. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. II (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1978), 23.
23. *ibid.*, p.27.
24. Marius B. Jansen, ed., *The Cambridge History of Japan*, Vol. 5, The Nineteenth Century, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 774.
25. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. II (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1978), 27.
26. William G. Beasley, *The Modern History of Japan*, 3rd ed. (Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1991), 168.
27. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. II (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1978), 40.
28. William G. Beasley, *The Modern History of Japan*, 3rd ed. (Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1991), 169-170.
29. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. II (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1978), 65.
30. *ibid.*, p.401.
31. *ibid.*, p.402.
32. *ibid.*, p.402.
33. Ian Hill Nish, *The Anglo-Japanese Alliance: The Diplomacy of Two Island Empires 1894-1907* (London: The Athlone Press, 1985), 373.
34. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. II (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1978), 402.
35. *ibid.*, p.405.
36. *ibid.*, p.402.
37. Ian Hill Nish, *The Anglo-Japanese Alliance: The Diplomacy of Two Island Empires 1894-1907* (London: The Athlone Press, 1985), 377.
38. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. II (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1978), 489.

39. Ian Hill Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23* (London: The Athlone Press, 1972), 1.
40. *ibid.*, p.115.
41. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 27.
42. *ibid.*, p.39.
43. *ibid.*, p.38.
44. Ian Hill Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23* (London: The Athlone Press, 1972), 116.
45. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 38.
46. (FO 371/2016 [36648], note by Alston, 5 August 1914 in Ian Hill Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23* (London: The Athlone Press, 1972), 118.
47. Ian Hill Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23* (London: The Athlone Press, 1972), 118.
48. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 42.
49. Ian Hill Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23* (London: The Athlone Press, 1972), 120.
50. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 44.
51. *ibid.*, p.30.
52. *ibid.*, p.30.
53. Ian Hill Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23* (London: The Athlone Press, 1972), 125.
54. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 32.
55. Ian Hill Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23* (London: The Athlone Press, 1972), 132.
56. *ibid.*, p.133.
57. *ibid.*, p.132.
58. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 32.



59. Ian Hill Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23* (London: The Athlone Press, 1972), 126.
60. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 32.
61. Charles Burton Burdick, *The Japanese Seige of Tsingtau* (Connecticut: Hamden, 1976), 132.
62. Margaret MacMillan, *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempts to End War* (London: John Murray, 2001), 322.
63. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 32.
64. Ian Hill Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23* (London: The Athlone Press, 1972), 136.
65. *ibid.*, p.156.
66. *ibid.*, p.150.
67. *ibid.*, p.151.
68. *ibid.*, p.151.
69. *ibid.*, p.151.
70. *ibid.*, p.203.
71. *ibid.*, p.204.
72. FO 371/2950 [36133], 14 February 1917 in Ian Hill Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23* (London: The Athlone Press, 1972), 207.
73. Ian Hill Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23* (London: The Athlone Press, 1972), 196.
74. *ibid.*, p.211.
75. *ibid.*, p.10.
76. *ibid.*, p.128.
77. *ibid.*, p.255.
78. Margaret MacMillan, *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempts to End War* (London: John Murray, 2001), 321.
79. *ibid.*, p.321.
80. Peter Duus, ed., *The Cambridge History of Japan*, Vol. 6, The Twentieth Century, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 279.
81. Ian Hill Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23* (London: The Athlone Press, 1972), 196.

82. Chushichi Tsuzuki, *The Pursuit of Power in Modern Japan: 1825-1995* (Oxford University Press, 2000), 194.
83. Roy Watson Curry, *Woodrow Wilson and Far Eastern Policy, 1913-1921* (New York: Octagon Books, 1968), 197.
84. Margaret MacMillan, *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempts to End War* (London: John Murray, 2001), 321.
85. Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A Short History of the Far East* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1947), 515.
86. Richard Storry, *Japan and the Decline of the West in Asia 1894-1943* (London: The MacMillan Press, 1979).
87. Ian Hill Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23* (London: The Athlone Press, 1972), 261.
88. Margaret MacMillan, *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempts to End War* (London: John Murray, 2001), 321.
89. Ian Hill Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23* (London: The Athlone Press, 1972), 217.
90. *ibid.*, p.257.
91. Richard Storry, *Japan and the Decline of the West in Asia 1894-1943* (London: The MacMillan Press, 1979).
92. Ian Hill Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23* (London: The Athlone Press, 1972), 260.
93. Richard Storry, *Japan and the Decline of the West in Asia 1894-1943* (London: The MacMillan Press, 1979).
94. Ian Hill Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23* (London: The Athlone Press, 1972), 260.
95. *ibid.*, p.12.
96. Richard Storry, *Japan and the Decline of the West in Asia 1894-1943* (London: The MacMillan Press, 1979).
97. Misuzu Hanihara Chow, *Japan Literacy in Australia: A Changing Demand Over Eighty Years* (Ph.D. Thesis, Macquarie University, Sydney, 2001), 104-105.
98. Neville Kingsley Meaney, *Towards a New Vision: Australia & Japan: Through 100 Years* (Sydney: Kangaroo Press, 1999), 69.
99. Henry P. Frei, *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 92.

100. Neville Kingsley Meaney, *Towards a New Vision: Australia & Japan: Through 100 Years* (Sydney: Kangaroo Press, 1999), 69.
101. Henry P. Frei, *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 91.
102. Ian Turner, "1914-1919", in *A New History of Australia*, ed. Frank K. Crowley (Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1974), Reprinted 1980.
103. Henry P. Frei, *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991) 92.
104. *ibid.*, p.92.
105. *ibid.*, p.92.
106. *ibid.*, p.92.
107. Neville Kingsley Meaney, *Towards a New Vision: Australia & Japan: Through 100 Years* (Sydney: Kangaroo Press, 1999), 69.
108. Henry P. Frei, *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 92.
109. *ibid.*, p.92.
110. *ibid.*, p.93.
111. *ibid.*, p.91.
112. *ibid.*, p.93.
113. *ibid.*, p.93.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **FEAR OF JAPAN IN AUSTRALIA**

Australian Prime Minister William Morris Hughes most resolutely opposed the Racial Equality Bill presented by Japan at the League of Nations at Paris Peace Conference in 1919. Steadfast opposition mounted by Hughes provided the most convenient excuse to the opponents of the Japanese proposal to reject Racial Equality Bill. Hughes was a champion of White Australia Policy and he felt threatened by the prospect of racial equality clause being enshrined in the Covenant of the League of Nations, for he saw the Japanese bill a direct threat to the very foundation upon which Australia stood. Hughes was not alone in his fear of Japan. The country he led held widespread fear of Japan as well, and prejudices against the *Asiatics* were rife and institutionalised there. It is important to investigate and record the deep seated fear of Japan in Australia in order to explain the steadfast opposition of her leader to Racial Equality Bill at the conference.

Australia was officially born as a British colony on 22 January 1787 by a proclamation by King George III to the British parliament to relocate the prisoners in British jails. King George III's exact words were that 'a plan had been created to remove the inconvenience which arose from the crowded state of the gaols in the different parts of the kingdom'. A decision was made to set up a penal colony at Botany Bay in New South Wales discovered in 1770 by Captain James Cook.<sup>1</sup> In a vast country spread over 7.687 million square kilometres of land, despite the gold rush of 1851, in 1861 the non-aboriginal population of Australia stood at 1.2 million.<sup>2</sup> After a century of British settlement, Australia had a population of only 4 million.<sup>3</sup>

#### **1. Introduction Of Indentured Labour And Rise Of Racism:**

In the middle of the nineteenth century, to solve a serious shortage of labour, Australia started drawing workers from Asia Pacific in the form of, indentured labour, and invited Chinese immigrants 'to work the fields and tend the sheep.'<sup>4</sup> Then gold was discovered in Australia in 1851. The gold rushes produced a sudden rise in the supply of money and labour.<sup>5</sup> The number of Chinese immigrants also swelled and in Victoria alone their numbers increased from 2,300 in 1854 to 17,000 in 1855.<sup>6</sup>

About 40,000 Chinese lived in Victoria in 1859 and around 10,000 in New South Wales in 1861. Predominantly males, they excavated for gold in fields of poor yield or on abandoned plots, but any rise in unemployment or fall in mining yields raised the tension between the Chinese and Europeans. The Chinese were wrongfully blamed of wasting water; their religion was derided as pagan, their language and culture were taunted, and their hutments, without any proof, were slandered to be infested with diseases and rife with

sodomy. After 1854, there were many riots, and the worst were on Lambing Flat, New South Wales, in 1860 and 1861. The Europeans drove away the Chinese from this field, and when some of the Europeans were arrested, they staged an armed fight with the police.<sup>7</sup> In New South Wales, Sir Charles Cowper's liberal government enacted a legislation to bar the Chinese from some fields, and introduced a mandatory per capita hefty levy of 10 pounds to control their entry to the colony. Earlier between 1855 and 1858, Victoria and South Australia had restricted the entry of the Chinese, and Victoria levied a residence tax. The anti-Chinese moves were popular in Australian society.

The Chinese harassed by these blatantly racist discriminatory rules organised mass meetings of protest and signed petitions. One such petition read:

‘We obey law, we make no noise, we have feelings like other men, we want to be brothers with Englishmen – why not let be so.’<sup>8</sup>

The liberal government emphasised that the Chinese were bonded labourers, ‘no better than slaves’<sup>9</sup> as they had signed contracts to serve the Chinese capitalists. The liberal government, just as racist as their electorate, backed anti-Chinese measures for electoral gains. The Australian diggers apprehensive of economic losses due to competition with the Chinese, were most openly racist. The status of the Chinese, however, as an inferior race was universal in Australia. There were other fears of the Chinese too. Governor Sir Charles Hotham (1854-5) was concerned for the security of Victoria, and Henry Parkes cautioned the public of the threat to British civilisation in Australia. Both these fears were forerunners of the concept of yellow peril that the Chinese would pour in to overrun entire Australia. By 1860 racialism in Australia was firmly established, and violent attacks on racial minorities were acknowledged facts. The Australians perceived the Chinese as ‘a more direct threat than the Aborigines to covert notions of British racial supremacy.’<sup>10</sup>

Queensland economy was controlled by large landowners and squatters. Many clashes, often violent, between European settlers and aborigines took place in Queensland, the worst being the 1861 massacre of 19 whites, followed by killing of 170 aborigines in the Midway Ranges. Despite such conflicts, demand for inexpensive coloured indentured labour grew. The landholders in the beginning depended on Indian labourers brought in by the government. In 1863, however, Captain Robert Towns started bringing in South Sea Islanders to work in the sugar-cane fields. In the next five years two thousand Islanders came to Australia as indentured labourers. Australians considered them racially inferior, and often treated them with cruelty.

In 1870s the South Australian government permitted *coolie* labour. The Chinese indentured labourers on a subsistence diet of rice and dried fish, and on a salary one-twelfth

of that paid to the Europeans, worked and made the mines profitable.<sup>11</sup> Despite the economic benefits reaped by the colonies due to the industrious Chinese labourers, the institutionalised racism that existed in the continent, led to the passage of the first Restriction Act on Chinese Immigration in 1888.

### **1.1. Introduction Of Japanese Labour:**

In the 1880s, to remedy the problems of unemployment caused by industrialisation, Government of Japan encouraged migration to Pacific Rim countries. A Department of Emigration in the Department of Foreign Affairs of Japan was set up in 1891. In 1893 the Japan Colonisation Association was created to encourage the idea that 'emigration is urgent and must be truly a national policy.'<sup>12</sup> Consequently Japanese businesses and shipping companies established emigration companies. These companies in 1890s hired the bulk of the Japanese indentured labourers sent to Canada, America, Hawaii and Australia. Japanese government soon afterwards enacted the Emigrants Protection Law to prevent its nationals from exploitation and ill-treatment. The law demanded all labour-hire companies to be registered, and made provision for overseeing the well being of the Japanese workers in foreign lands.<sup>13</sup>

In 1883, Japanese Foreign Ministry signed an indentured labour contract with Captain J.A. Miller of Australasian Pearl Company. The contract permitted recruiting thirty-seven Japanese to work the pearl-beds of Thursday Island off Queensland.<sup>14</sup> They joined their compatriots there at Darwin, hired from Japanese boarding houses in Hong Kong. These Japanese pearl divers prospered due to their industry and reliability. Consequently more such contracts ensued, and the Japanese community expanded. By 1893 the Japanese constituted the largest ethnic group in pearling industry at Thursday Island. On 2 April 1894, however, an alarmed Alexander Marks, Japan's Honorary Consul in Australia, cautioned the Japanese Vice Foreign Minister, Tadasu Hayashi, that the State of Queensland was feeling threatened by the large Japanese presence in Torres Strait. In fact Alexander Marks was voicing the fear of Japan in Queensland as early as in 1894.

Although the Japanese numbers were not high in Darwin, then under the administrative control of South Australia, it also started showing fears of the Japanese. In December 1894 only about thirty Japanese inhabited Darwin, and that included three ship masters. But this tiny number was seen as a threat, because of the fear that it might draw the larger Japanese presence at Thursday Island to expand its activities to Darwin. In fact such was the fear of Japanese that in autumn 1893 member for the Northern Territory, W. Griffiths, had introduced legislation into the South Australian Parliament to expand the Chinese Immigration Restriction Act of 1888 to apply to all *Asiatics*.

## 2. Sino-Japanese War And Fear Of Japan:

As Sino-Japanese war (1894-1895) raged, Brisbane and Adelaide received additional warnings of a rise in the number of Japanese on north Australian coast. On 3 March 1894, the Government Resident at Thursday Island, John Douglas, reported that presently seventy boats were owned and manned by the Japanese, from less than twenty boats two years earlier.<sup>15</sup> The Japanese ownership drew the serious attention of Queensland Parliament. On 25 April 1895, at Darwin, six white pearling-boat-owners wrote a petition to South Australian Parliament urging to give licences exclusively to whites. Only a week earlier victorious Japan had signed a peace treaty with vanquished China at Shimonoseki, and perhaps the Japanese victory had influenced the petitioners. Around the same time, Henry Willis, a free-trader from New South Wales, appealed to the Colonial Treasurer in the Legislative Assembly, requesting the government to consider immediate enactment of a law to prohibit Japanese immigration into New South Wales, like the legislation against the Chinese, in view of the Japanese victory in the Sino-Japanese war.

On 31 July 1895 W. Griffiths, in South Australian House of Assembly claimed that the rise in Japanese workers was causing great harm to the pearl industry of Northern Territory. The government initially refused his petition to control the Japanese, whose expertise was necessary to develop the industry. A canard detailing the advance of a fleet of Japanese boats from Thursday Island to Port Darwin, however, made the government, retract its stand. A similar rumour on 4 October 1895 prompted the South Australian Government to advise the Premier of Queensland to communicate to the Japanese on Thursday Island of the decision of no further issuance of pearling licences in the Northern Territory.<sup>16</sup>

Premier of South Australia, Charles Cameron Kingston (1850-1908), an architect of the Chinese Restriction Act of 1888 seized the opportunity provided by the earlier mentioned events. He had wanted to expand the Act to cover all *Asiatics*, but did not have the backing of his cabinet, and had faced opposition from the Government of New South Wales. At this point in time, when all colonies were discussing the issue of joining Anglo-Japanese Commercial Treaty, Kingston proposed an Intercolonial Conference to debate the two main issues facing Australia.<sup>17</sup> Premier of New South Wales, Sir George Houstoun Reid (1845-1918), agreed to hold the conference on 4 and 5 March 1896 in Sydney. The Conference unanimously decided to extend the Immigration Restriction Act to all coloured people. The decision, although appeared to have been taken for the preservation of racial purity of Australian population, was in fact motivated by the fear of Japan.<sup>18</sup>

In December 1894, British Minister at Tokyo, Le Poer Trench, cautioned Australia and Britain that a powerful Japanese navy could threaten not just Hong Kong and Singapore,

but also Australia and Canada. Major-General Sir Edward Thomas Hutton (1848-1923), commander of New South Wales military forces, in 1895 emphasised the need to give the defence of Australia top priority in view of the sudden rise of Japan as a first rate naval and military power.<sup>19</sup> Australia now faced a powerful Japan, whose navy had just transported, and was sustaining a 200,000 strong army in a tough military engagement. Such was the fear of Japan that in 1895, the central theme of Australia's annual defence exercise was countering Japanese ships on course to gaining entry to Sydney harbour. In a book *The Federal Defence of Australia*, published in 1897, the writer George Cathcart Craig revealed his research, with trepidation, of Japan's occupation of Formosa (now Taiwan), in another example of a demonstration of the fear of Japan then prevalent in Australia.

## **2.1 Other Factors That Compounded Fear Of Japan:**

Several factors unconnected to Japan's victory over China combined in the period 1893-1896 to encourage migration of Japanese into Australia. This hastened the issue of immigration control. In the early 1890s, the promotion of a frontier spirit by organisations like the Tokyo Geographical Society and the Colonisation Society was one such factor. Their writings encouraged the Japanese to follow frontiersmen who in 1870s had found fortune in the shell-beds of Australia. Japanese government reports, the likes of Kanjuro Watanabe's 1894-brief on Australia, with remarks on opportunities in fishery and sugar-cane industries, encouraged Japanese migration. In fact Japanese Vice Foreign Minister Masanao Hanihara, decades later remarked that the alluring offers by the Queensland sugar-cane farmers in 1890s was the main reason for a large migration of Japanese workers to Australia.<sup>20</sup> Hattori Toru's alluring narration of Thursday Island in a book, *A New Colony in the Southern Hemisphere*, written as a *how-to-build-a-colony* provided additional motivation to some other Japanese.

Another vital factor that urged Australian colonies to expand Immigration Restriction Act was British offer to join Anglo-Japanese Treaty of Commerce and Navigation. In December 1894, British government had forwarded copies of the treaty to Australia. Articles I and III of the treaty, most relevant to Australia, 'conferred the right of residing in the contracting parties' territories and the freedom of commerce and navigation between the subjects of the signatory powers.'<sup>21</sup> These passionately discussed topics were tied to the immigration restriction issue at the Intercolonial Conference at Sydney. The deadline to answer London by 25 August 1896 intensified the debate in Australia.

The above discussed factors made Australians view Japan, rather than China, as the main threat. The derogatory remarks against the Chinese were now directed against the Japanese. *The Straits Times* of 15 November 1895 is quoted below to strengthen the contention:



‘The new treaty between Britain and Japan now arouses close attention in Australia... The Japanese there stir up greater antipathy than the Chinese, and the Japanese are indeed looked upon as more dangerous from their highly insinuating ways and greater intellectual powers.

Japanese coolies stick together, save, and get on, until they settle on the soil and compete with Australian producers at such cheap rates that rivalry becomes almost impossible. But their immigration is only just beginning and the problem is how best to stop the evil at the outset. The new treaty terms between Britain and Japan facilitate Japanese immigration, but do not apply to the Australian colonies unless they intimate acceptance before a specific date. That date is drawing near... Trade advantages cannot countervail the accompanying disadvantages of cheap Japanese labour competition against the colonial working classes.’<sup>22</sup>

The article demonstrates the feelings that led to the rejection of the treaty by all the colonies in March 1896.

## **2.2. *Nan’yoo* And Fear Of Japan:**

Capture of Taiwan gave Japan her first base in the *nan’yoo* (south). Japan’s victory over China marked a turning point in Japanese notion of southward advance (*nanshin-ron*). During Meiji era, southward expansionists had encouraged commerce and expansion into that large yet ill-defined territory of the unexplored *nan’yoo*.<sup>23</sup> Russo-Japanese war further encouraged Japan’s southward advance. In 1910 Korea was annexed by Japan and Chinese Revolution started in 1911. Intense rivalry in Manchuria inflamed Japan’s situation as Britain, France, America, and Russia all competed for economic and strategic advantages in a region that Japan considered to be her domain of interest in the North. Japan’s numerous worries in North Asia stalled Japan’s march to the south. But Japan’s notion of southward march were very different from Australia’s fears of a Japanese invasion of her shores.

China was defeated by Japan, yet the Chinese traders dominated the *nan’yoo* and the Europeans still controlled the South Seas. The Japanese could not change this state of affairs, and so endeavoured to build their finances and economic development. The Japanese considered move into the South Seas by free trade and peaceful economic engagement.

Japan’s Prime Minister, Tsuyoshi Inukai, during Japanese expansionism in Manchuria, stated that after Russo-Japanese war of 1905, Japan should not advance North any more. Instead he announced that Japan should concentrate on South China and South East Asia; and focus on economic engagement in Vietnam, Thailand, Australia, the East Indies and the Philippines.<sup>24</sup> Australia, in Japanese estimation, had moved into the Polynesian *nan’yoo* that was way outside Japanese interests. Frei<sup>25</sup> in summing up the concept of *nan’yoo* and the ill-

founded fear of Japan in Australia has recorded, 'Australia really had no reason to be alarmed', yet Australia was terrified of Japan.

### **3. Immigration Restriction Act:**

Fear of Japanese, developed in Australia's northeast in the mid-1890s, spread from the pearling communities of Thursday Island to Darwin, and then to South Australia. There Charles Cameron Kingston found the opportunity in 1895 to urge an Intercolonial Conference to influence the doyen of the premiers Sir George Houstoun Reid, the need for a total exclusion of Asians. This was unanimously accepted at Sydney Intercolonial Conference in 1896. Then on, the fate of the immigration law rested with the New South Wales Government, which for political reasons, 'since neither Japanese nor Indians nor Afghanists threatened the social structure of that colony', pursued immigration restriction passionately.<sup>26</sup> New South Wales became a shining example for racial immigration legislation until the first constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia standardised the law for the entire nation.

Australia in the 1890s was protected by British navy, and immigration and defence were inter-related, while White Australia policy took shape as a national security policy. Protected by Britain's powerful navy, Australia did not have to raise its defence budget. Expansion of the Immigration Restriction Act to all coloured people effectively countered the Japanese threat.

The close relationship between defence and immigration is clear in the speeches of Sir Henry Parkes, popularly known as the Grand Old Man of Australian politics. Parkes was a passionate speaker for restricting Asian immigration, and for 'uniting the whole of the forces of Australia into one army.'<sup>27</sup> In the late 1880s and early 1890s Parkes warned that Chinese emigration to any part of Australasia must be restricted, because he did not wish to see an increase in the Chinese element. Further evidence of Parkes' fear of Asians is demonstrated when he stated:

'It will not be by the bombardment of one or our rich cities...but it will be stealthily, so far as movements of this kind can be made stealthily, effecting a lodgement in some thinly-peopled portion of the country, where it would take immense loss of life and immense loss of wealth to dislodge the invader.'<sup>28</sup>

Similar arguments by George Reid or Robert Homburg of South Australia, is seen in parliamentary debates following Intercolonial Conference of 1896. This time however it was no longer the Chinese, but the Japanese who were identified as the menace eager to establish themselves in remote parts of Australia. It was alleged that the Japanese settlements in Australia posed a defence threat that could lead to an intervention by a powerful Japan on behalf of its nationals settled in Australia. Therefore, it was argued that only the preventive

legislation of immigration restriction could avert the threat. In July 1897, George Reid in a debate in London emphasised the need for the exclusionist legislation to maintain international amity and to prevent the creation of a Japanese minority in Australia.

Australia contained the Japanese threat most effectively and diplomatically conceivable at the time. Simple expansion and modification of the Australian Immigration Restriction Act effectively countered the Japanese racial and strategic threat. A passage from Frei<sup>29</sup> is presented below to buttress the contention.

‘No guns were needed to keep out the Japanese or any other coloured peoples who might have threatened Australia. A piece of paper at the customs office served the purpose; any undesirable immigrant could be made to write out an often ridiculously phrased dictation of fifty words in English or any other language’.

#### **4. Fear Of Japanese In Queensland:**

The efficient exclusion system, discussed above, became law only in 1901. The decision by Australian colonies at the Sydney conference in 1896 did not carry royal assent, and did not reduce Asian immigration. Queensland, with the largest Japanese migration, abrogated the exclusion law only a few months later. The Japanese immigration issue in Queensland was quite complex. The sugar plantations and pearl-beds there had been drawing the largest number of Japanese in Australia. Consequently in Queensland, a strong complaint against Japanese immigration was launched by John Douglas, Governor Resident on Thursday Island and former premier of Queensland.<sup>30</sup> John Douglas represented Australian pearl masters who felt threatened by the rising number of Japanese masters of pearl luggers. But the then premier Hugh Nelson had close ties with the financiers and plantation owners who wanted large numbers of coloured migrants as cheap labourers. When Nelson became aware that a deal with the Japanese government would give Queensland commercial advantages while retaining the power to control the immigration of Japanese labourers, he abruptly dropped the Sydney decisions in the very month he was re-elected, in May 1896.

As yet there was no consensus among Australian colonies on the immigration issue. In Queensland, questions on how to manage immigration from Asia, particularly Japan, persisted. Even when the Premier attended Colonial Conference in London in 1897, Brisbane newspapers chastised the government for its failure to control Japanese immigration. Despite an agreement with Tokyo to control migration of labourers, Japanese numbers had increased from 2,225 in 1896 to 3,247 in 1898.<sup>31</sup> Government Resident John Douglas’s warnings, it was alleged, were ignored, and that Thursday Island ran the risk of becoming a Japanese colony. Quotations from Queensland newspapers are presented below to strengthen the contention. The *Brisbane Courier* in May 1897 reported:

‘Up to the late successful war with China his (the Japanese) presence in Australia was so occasional as to excite no alarm. The war has made a mighty difference ... They have leaped at one bound to an advanced place among nations, and they do not mean to hide their light under a bushel... the Hon. John Douglas declaring that there is every appearance of Thursday Island and the vicinity becoming a Japanese colony.’<sup>32</sup>

The *North Queensland Register* warned:

‘If the pearl-shelling industry remains open to the Japanese for another 3 years it will be theirs entirely, and Thursday Island, except for the intermittent support of passing steamers, will practically become an appanage of the Mikado... The diminutive alien in the pearl-shell industry, and in many others, notably domestic service, is invincible. He is sober, fairly intelligent, hard-working, and the proverbial aroma of an oiled rag keeps him in the pink of condition. The hard-working but heavy drinking, big eating white, the indolent aboriginal or the careless coloured men from Manilla, the South Seas, and the Malayan Peninsula, are helpless before the incoming tide of little yellow men, and unless something is done, and that quickly, the worst foreboding of the Hon. John Douglas will certainly be realised...

The economic alien is so patriotic that there is no room for European labourers... He ousts them all and imports per *Omi Maru* and other Japanese vessels, direct from his native country. Hitherto we have been assured the activity of the Japanese Empire since the war, would check the emigration of the pygmies to Australia, but Mr Douglas’ figures are too ominous to permit of that belief being entertained.’<sup>33</sup>

The issue of Japanese migration continued to be debated in Queensland parliament, even during Nelson’s absence. Acting Premier Sir Horace Tozer cautioned that John Douglas had sounded a warning to entire Australia. John Hamilton, Member of Parliament was more caustic of the Japanese presence on Thursday Island when he stated:

‘We are not afraid of them on account of their vices, but on account of their virtues. Take the pearl-shell business... More energetic men you cannot find. These men are the Scotchmen of the East, and some action should be taken to regulate them.’<sup>34</sup>

A Japanese consul based at Townsville in Queensland, after observing the political situation for one year, sensed the urgency to quell the widespread misgivings of the Japanese, and cabled the Japanese Foreign Minister Okuma Shigenobu requesting to impose a temporary ban on Japanese emigrants heading for pearl-shell diving at Thursday Island.<sup>35</sup>

Okuma instantly responded to his consul in Sydney announcing the suspension of immigration of Japanese to Thursday Island. The prompt Japanese self-restriction stopped Japanese immigration and it began to dwindle in Thursday Island.

### **5. Immigration Restriction Act Becomes White Australia Policy:**

Japanese immigration to Queensland, however, continued to rise, and other Australian colonies kept watching Queensland's arrangement with Japan. Later Queensland demanded passports, and prior job sanction from the Queensland Government for the Japanese immigrants. Japan protested and there followed 'disagreeable collisions'<sup>36</sup> and lengthy correspondence, as Queensland complained about Japanese labourers gaining entry with false documents claiming to be merchants. Eventually, in 1900, the government fixed an upper limit of no more than 3,247 Japanese to live in Queensland at any one time. Queensland also adopted to issue new pearling licences only to British subjects (1898), banned Asians from employing Aborigines, and gave subsidies only to those sugar factories whose workers were white. Consequently the Australian colonies keen on White Australia policy ignored Queensland's adherence to Anglo-Japanese treaty, and chose not to follow Queensland.

1897 Colonial Conference in London saw Australian premiers argue for the enactment of a White Australia policy, despite British unwillingness. The Colonial Secretary, Joseph Chamberlain's endeavours for a compromise only met with Australian intransigence. The debate saw the arguments shift from the *rights* of coloured people to entry in Australia, to the way to restrict Asian immigration. The shift allowed Japan to save face, but also concealed the nature of Immigration Restriction Bill, which became stricter than originally planned. Japanese Minister in London, in order to maintain Japan's self-esteem, urged the Marquis of Salisbury to compel Australian premiers adopt Natal formula that controlled immigration into British Natal in Africa by a dictation test.<sup>37</sup> Australians agreed to discuss the formula in their parliaments. On 7 October George Reid agreed, and Educational Immigration Restriction Bill replaced Coloured Restriction Bill in New South Wales in November. Although this new bill had a milder title, it was far worse, because it excluded all coloured people, even tourists, students, missionaries and merchants, who had been exempted earlier. The new bill effectively crystallised White Australia policy. It was adopted by all Australian colonies.

Australia's first Prime Minister, Edmund Barton, on 17 January 1901 declared White Australia Policy as the first plank in Australian Government's platform. All parties pledged adherence to this policy.

### **6. Passport Agreement With Japan:**

Anglo-Japanese Alliance, announced in February 1902, was generally received 'with marked expressions of approval'<sup>38</sup> in Australia. The alliance was perceived as a protection

against a Russian fleet from Vladivostok, a German fleet from the Chinese Sea, and as a safeguard to Australian trading in the Far East. Consequently in 1904, Australia's second Prime Minister, Alfred Deakin, relaxed the Immigration Restriction Act for Japanese nationals, essentially to gain commercial advantages in bilateral trade with Japan. The passport agreement that he concluded with Japan, allowed Japanese merchants, students and tourists unrestricted entry to Australia provided the purpose and duration of visits were specified in the passports. But further talks in 1905 between Deakin and Japan's Consul-General in Sydney, Mitsuo Iwasaki, collapsed as Australia refused to admit even limited numbers of Japanese labourers.

Despite some relaxation of Australia's immigration restriction for the Japanese, the condition of the Japanese living in Australia, did not improve much. In June 1904, a Japanese labour inspector travelling in Queensland was ordered by a train guard off the coach into the wagon reserved for coloured people.<sup>39</sup> Japan's consul at Townsville, Rinzaburo Tayui, was immediately informed and he lodged a stern complaint with the transport company and the government. The company offered an apology and promised to change its discriminatory conduct. Tayui also requested the Japanese Foreign Minister Komura Jutaro to demand an easy re-entry, offer of a Japanese language test, and permission for Japanese labourers to bring their families to Australia.

## **7. Russo-Japanese War And Intensification Of Fear Of Japan:**

Japan's victory over Russia in 1905, coincided with the British withdrawal of five battleships from the Pacific to the North Sea to strengthen defences against Germany. This British move created a panic in Australia, and Australian attitude towards Japan changed. With the British fleet withdrawn, Australia viewed Japan not only as a problem for migration but also as a military threat. Australia's Prime Minister Alfred Deakin expressed Australia's 'distrust of the Yellow Race in the North Pacific' and appealed to the United States for joining an '*entente cordiale* spreading among all white men who realise the Yellow Peril to Caucasian civilisation,'<sup>40</sup> and such was the fear of Japan in Australia that Deakin requested the US President Theodore Roosevelt to order America's Great White Fleet during its world tour of 1908 to call on Australia.

### **7.1. Australia Appeals For Extension Of Monroe Doctrine:**

The Australians knew the strain in US-Japan relations over the issue of discrimination the Japanese dwellers of California felt. So the Australians expected the Americans to support them against Japan. Consequently the fleet of sixteen American battleships was enthusiastically welcomed in Australia. More than a quarter of Australians greeted the American fleet in Sydney and Melbourne. One jingle-maker in a poem in the Melbourne *Age*

invited the Americans to support the Australians essentially on grounds of race. His poem is presented below to strengthen below:

‘Not heedless of your high descent,  
The grand old Anglo-Saxon race,  
To check with stern unflinching mace,  
The swarming, hungry Orient.’<sup>41</sup>

The New South Wales Minister for Education Mr Hogue gave a speech to the Country Press Association, inviting the American fleet to demonstrate the might of the white race to keep Australia white in the face of the Japanese threat. A portion of the speech reported in the *Daily Telegraph* of 19 August 1908, is presented below:

‘...the visit of the Fleet, which was one of great national importance – of world-wide importance...the voyage of the American Fleet was a demonstration to different nations to show what the white races might do if the occasion arose...Australia presented a magnificent field, a sort of paradise, to certain races – yellow races...Take it that [if] Japan got possession of a land like Australia, what wealth would be theirs, what ships they could build, what armies they could raise (hear, hear). It would then become probably a struggle for supremacy between the yellow and white races. It appeared to him that the purpose of the whole white race would be defensive, to keep Australia for the white race.’<sup>42</sup>

Commander of the Great White Fleet realised that Australia considered that only America could support Australia against Japan, and declared that the visit to the South Pacific had ‘established a curious sort of protectorate – a new Monroe Doctrine.’<sup>43</sup> In 1909, after the successful visit of the American fleet, Deakin invited the British to arrange with the US to expand the Monroe Doctrine to include Pacific-rim countries, underwritten by Britain, Holland, France, China and the United States. Deakin’s proposal was in fact an attempt to persuade the US and others to protect Australia against a Japanese threat. The agreement was proposed to serve all the countries except Japan and Germany. The exclusions made it obvious that the Australian suggestion was mainly directed against Japan or Japan allied with Germany. The British could not accept such a proposition that would insult her ally Japan and alienate Germany. The British, moreover, disapproved of the American demands under Monroe Doctrine, since the gist of the concept was to restrict American responsibilities inside Western Hemisphere. The Australian proposal withered away.

## **7.2 Australia Proposes Its Own Navy Against Japan :**

After Japan’s victory over Russia in 1905, Australian parliamentary debates heard Japan labelled as the aggressive and expansionist power posing a threat to Australia.

Australians argued for a well-planned bold defence to counter Japan. William Morris Hughes, the then Labor member for West Sydney, proposed ‘a bold and well-defined plan of Australian defence’<sup>44</sup>, when he advocated conscription in 1906. Prime Minister Alfred Deakin and Director of Naval Forces, Captain W.R. Cresswell, drew plans for an independent Australian navy. The Admiralty in London, however, chastised the plan labelling it imperfect and disproportionately expensive to the protection it afforded. Cresswell defended the plan as indispensable, arguing that it offered protection to a vulnerable Australia from a Japanese invasion. Australians were convinced of a Japanese invasion in view of the Japanese population problem. Japan in Australian view, needed room to expand, and therefore she was keen on acquiring Australia’s empty lands.

Alfred Deakin, who between 1903 to 1910 framed Australia’s defence and foreign policy, in an interview three weeks after Japan decimated the Baltic Fleet in the Battle of Tsushima, officially for the first time, identified Japan as the defence threat. He pointed that Australia ‘was now within striking distance of sixteen naval stations’<sup>45</sup>, including the strongest one, Yokohama. A former Deputy Prime Minister Allan McLean cautioned that Australians have been living in fool’s paradise, and they are only a short distance away from the mighty Japanese army and navy.

The 1905 renewal of Anglo-Japanese alliance that left the security arrangement of the Pacific to the Japanese aroused further suspicions of Japan in Australia. George C. Pearce, the Minister for Defence considered it unwise to trust the alliance as a guarantee because it came from Japan, a nation he branded aggressive. Pearce also announced that Japan was desirous of pushing out all round.<sup>46</sup> Pearce was convinced that Japan would engage in more conflicts to acquire free lands like Australia had, and therefore, Pearce urged Australians to establish their own reliable defence forces to fight Japan.

### **7.3. Voluntary Associations Spread Fear Of Japan:**

The year 1905 saw the fear of Japan in Australia reach a new height. Newly created voluntary associations in Australia endeavoured to rouse the spirit of military and racial defence, and they did that essentially by promoting the fear of Japan. The National Defence League, established with the patronage of politicians such as J.C. Watson, W. Hughes, A. Deakin and Thomas T. Ewing, belonging to both Labor and Liberal parties, through its first president, the chancellor of the University of Sydney, Sir Normand MacLaurin, on inauguration day in September, announced the imminence of a war. His exact words were:

‘We know not when the din of battle and clash of arms just ceased in the East, would be at our doors.’<sup>47</sup>



The journal of the National Defence League, the *Call*, identified Japan as the impending invader and stated that Japan is the possible, if not probable, enemy of the future.

Another association, the Immigration League, founded in 1905 with the patronage of Deakin and Watson, aimed at encouraging vigorous immigration from England, and the rest of Europe into Australia. Dr Richard Arthur, the League's first president, advocated an intensive migration programme to counter the rise of Japan and withdrawal of the British fleet. Dr Arthur called upon his fellow Australians to make any sacrifice to raise the population, and to acquire their own Australian Fleet. His statement, to support the argument is presented below:

‘The withdrawal of the British battleships from China has put a different complexion on affairs. Our ideal should be that twenty years hence we should find the Australians twenty millions strong...with 250,000 men trained to use the rifle.’<sup>48</sup>

#### **7.4. Voices of Reason Drown In Racist Frenzy:**

Senator Edward Pulsford was one of those rare few men who opposed the racist frenzy and spoke in support of Japan. Pulsford tabled a proposal of friendship between Japan and Australia in the Senate on 28 September 1905, and advocated a treaty to manage all issues of emigration and immigration. His pamphlet *The British Empire and the Relations of Asia and Australasia: Immigration Restrictions in Australasia*, read:

‘Japan, successful as she has been on the battlefield, is much more anxious to be recognised as the exponent of peace and civilisation, than of war and conquest... though originally Asiatic, the Japanese have stood apart in their islands for centuries...and are now no more Asiatic than they are European.’<sup>49</sup>

But Pearce castigated the pamphlet as a bigger disgrace than the Immigration Restriction Act, and decimated Pulsford's proposal during the debate.

E.H. Foxall, the private English secretary to the Japanese Consul-General in Sydney, was another such voice of reason. By 1907 he had become so disillusioned with the unfair treatment Japan was receiving in the Australian Press that he sought permission from the Japanese Foreign Minister, Viscount Hayashi, to contribute pro-Japanese articles under a pseudonym to the Australian press. Foxall offered to write articles, ‘exposing the unfairness of the journalistic methods adopted in the manufacture of racial prejudice, and severely criticising, in some cases, the individuals who adopt them.’<sup>50</sup> But these voices of reason were futile, and they drowned in the racist frenzy.

#### **8. The Shield Is Forged:**

The new security scenario of the Pacific in the aftermath of Japanese triumph over Russia in 1905, encouraged Australian notion of creating a regular army and a navy, as a

shield to fight and defeat any Japanese attack. Prime Minister Deakin, through three successive governments, since the first announcement in December 1907 until the final presentation of the defence plan to the Parliament in November/December 1909, championed the cause of this expensive shield.<sup>51</sup>

Deakin's Minister of Defence T.T. Ewing, a staunch supporter of the shield, often delivered lectures sprinkled with paranoia to promote his anti-Japanese views and the need to keep Australia white. A portion of one such speech is presented below:

'We passed an Immigration Restriction Act with one idea in view – to keep ...away...the silent invasion of these people...I refer to the yellow men to the north. We have virtually kicked these men off our doorstep; we have slammed the door of Australia right in their faces...I am dealing with the great battle of Armageddon, which has yet to be fought between the yellow and the white man...If a nation were to legislate that no Australian could land – if we were virtually turned out of a country – should we not seek the first opportunity for revenge?'<sup>52</sup>

In 1908, Ewing tabled Deakin's Defence Bill, as an instrument to keep Australia white and safe.

While Deakin was briefly out of power in 1908-1909, Labor party enthusiastically promoted the shield and in 1908 proposed an expansion of the navy to contain twenty-three destroyers at a cost of 2.3 million pounds. Senator G.F. Pearce, the Labor Defence Minister, exactly like his predecessor T.T. Ewing, cautioned the Australians of the grave danger they faced from the proximity of Japan. Such was his fear of Japan that he announced,

'We should not be safe until we have twenty million standing behind the guns.'<sup>53</sup>

In 1909, Deakin returned to power and his Defence Bill was primed for reintroduction to the Parliament. Deakin's new Defence Minister Joseph Cook on 21 September invited the Parliament to set up an Australian navy and to enact conscription to protect Australia from Japanese threat. The fear of Japan was very much in his mind when he cited:

'...the existence, far from our shores, of two or three million of the best trained troops in the world. They belong to a nation whose ideals are, in many respects as unlike our own as possible for them to be...Australia is the most vulnerable part of the British Empire. Half-a-dozen mighty kingdoms could find accommodation on this continent, and we are surrounded by nations hungering for room and breathing space...'<sup>54</sup>

Both Houses of the Parliament approved the bill that enacted conscription of males aged fourteen to twenty to create a first- and second-line of military of 66,000 men by 1915.<sup>55</sup>

The expansion of the navy was also approved, raising defence spending by more than 200 per cent. Australia requested the Admiralty in London to organise the building of the flagship, a 19,200 ton Dreadnought, H.M.A.S. Australia. The first batch of young men joined the camps in July 1912. Needless to say the shield was forged.

### **9. Rumours Of Japanese Espionage:**

In the prevailing environment of fear of Japan, canards of clandestine Japanese landings and of espionage by Japanese tourists, entertainers and pearl divers were rife, and were believed by Australians despite the lack of any evidence. Journal of the National Defence League, *The Call*, in 1907 published an article of an unlawful Japanese settlement secretly built in Northern Territory.<sup>56</sup> Two years later, in the year of the vote on the Australian Defence Bill, rumours of Japanese espionage were still circulating. The Australian press gave a lot of publicity to a report on four Japanese showmen who allegedly had been carrying out espionage in Northern Queensland in disguise. Defence Minister Pearce instantly supported the story drawing the indignation of Japan's first Consul-General in Australia Kisaburo Ueno in the *Australian Star*. Ueno had asked, 'Is not Japan an ally of Great Britain?...is it likely that Japan would be spying on a friendly and allied nation?'<sup>57</sup>

The *Sun* on 6 March 1911 in sensational headlines publicised canards that further crystallised the fear of Japan in Australia. The headlines and portions of the text, demonstrating paranoia of the hordes of the little brown men, published in a series of three instalments are presented below:

'Only 900 Miles Away! New Caledonia's Colony of Japanese.

Why They Are There! What They Are Doing!!

Spies in the Island. Japanese Who Wear Military Overcoats and Carry Arms.  
COULD TAKE THIS ISLAND TOMORROW.

Possible Naval Station and Coal Depot.'<sup>58</sup>

'If the Japanese already on the Island were to take into their hands to rise tomorrow, the people of New Caledonia could no more stop them than they could stop the sun rising... There are at least 2,000 Japanese known to be in New Caledonia today...At least 2,300 more will follow before long. The last shipment of 1,036 Japanese are working in the mines. Not coolie labourers, but intelligent and skilled. Nearly all fought in Japanese-Russo war. Many still wear military cloaks and carry revolvers...It is admitted that there are Japanese secret service spies in the island. [This] provides food for immediate thought and careful action on the part of the Commonwealth authorities if they desire to effectively prevent New Caledonia from becoming a Japanese colony, from which hordes of the little brown men may swoop

down upon Queensland any fine day...The Japanese brain is a curious product of latter-day education and of profit by example...He is a sphinx.’<sup>59</sup>

#### **10. Fear Of Japan In Australian Literature:**

The fear of Yellow Peril in addition to affecting the Australian press also figured in Australian novels, poems and plays. The *Bulletin* in its 14 January 1904 issue published a cartoon by Livingston Hopkins, announcing racial identification with Russia during the time of tension leading to Russo-Japanese war. The cartoon showed a black monkey (Japan) poised to strike an equally aggressive huge white bear (Russia) on a tree trunk, high above the ground where a little boy (Australia) stood watching the duo; and bore the title, *A Study in Black and White* and read:

‘I don’t see where any good is going to come for me which ever wins. But, anyhow, I reckon I vote for the white!’<sup>60</sup>

A cartoon by Norman Lindsay, entitled, *The Fight of the Shepherds*, published in *Bulletin* of 5 December 1912, showed Australia’s concern that the conflicts among the European powers might leave Australia at the mercy of Japan. Renowned Australian writer Henry Lawson, during Russo-Japanese war championed the cause of Russia for defending White Race. Lawson termed the war ‘the first round in the struggle of the East against the West, Of the fearful war of races’<sup>61</sup>; and in his poem *The Vanguard* he wrote,

‘It means all to young Australia – it means life or death to us,  
For the vanguard of the White Man is the vanguard of the Russ!’<sup>62</sup>

The *Lone Hand*, a monthly journal of large circulation that promoted conscription, and advocated Australia’s own navy, reflected the paranoia with the publication of articles with titles such as: *Our Pacific Ocean*, *A Japanese Pond*, *From the Oldest World: Japan’s Ju-jitsu Diplomacy*, *The Asiatic Menace: Japan the Gamester*, *The Asiatic Menace: The Awakening of the Dragon*. Stories featuring Japanese invasion of Australia were published in 1910 and 1911 bearing the captions *The Deliverer*, *Command of the Air*, and *First Blood*. F.R.C. Hopkin’s play *Reaping the Whirlwind*, shows a Japanese naval unit advance on Sydney in 1915. In this story the Japanese overcome every hurdle and the play ends theatrically with the words:

‘The Asiatics will enter this country without firing a shot! Oh! My God!’<sup>63</sup>

But the best known work, with a smattering of literary merit, was *The Commonwealth Crisis*, a book of some literary merit, serialised in the *Lone Hand* in 1908, and published as a book in 1909 bearing the title *The Australian Crisis*, amply demonstrated Australian paranoia of the times. The gist of the story, paraphrased from Frei<sup>64</sup> is as follows:

In 1912, the Japanese clandestinely reach the uninhabited shores of Northern Territory. When the Japanese are discovered, Japan offers an apology. Both Japan and Australia approach England for intervention, and Britain opts to support her ally Japan. British navy withdraws its warships, and blockades Australian ports forcing Northern Territory under direct Imperial control. A White Guard, assembled with recruits from Canada and the US to fight for Aryan Ideals, is defeated by the Japanese. The Japanese are then allowed to increase their numbers in Australia under nominal British control.

The story demonstrates Australia's profound suspicion of British-Japanese ties. The writer of the literary piece, C.H. Kirmess, alias Sir Frank Fox, was a journalist of the *Bulletin*, editor of the *Lone Hand*, and a friend of Prime Minister Deakin. Deakin was effusive in his praise of the literary piece.<sup>65</sup>

Japanese invasion of Australia formed the gist of Raymond Longford's 1913 film, *Australia Calls*. Randolph Bedford's 1908 play, *White Australia – or the Empty North*, expressed Australia's anxiety about the Yellow Peril and fear of Japan.<sup>66</sup>

#### **11. Fear Of Japan Influences Foreign Policy Analysis:**

Fear of Japan became the foundation for the formulation of Australian foreign policy.<sup>67</sup> The main focus of Australian defence was to counter a Japanese invasion of her shores. In 1913, the Australian Chief of the General Staff, Brigadier-General J.M. Gordon, after touring Papua and northern coastline of Australia, advised the Commonwealth Government that Australia's defence must concentrate on countering a Japanese attack on the Northern Territory and Queensland. Gordon presumed that if Britain were engaged in a war in Europe, Japan would be able 'to transport up to 50,000 troops to seize the whole of the northern shores of this country.'<sup>68</sup> E.L. Piesse, a widely respected military intelligence analyst, recommended the inclusion of more relevant mathematical studies, such as the distance of Tokyo from Darwin, and the time a vessel would take to cover this distance at 18 knots, and the consequences of severing all the telegraph links to Australia. Colonel J.G. Legge, the Australian representative on the Imperial General Staff at London in 1913 researched the precise nature of the Japanese threat. In one of his calculations the Japanese navy sailing at 12 knots an hour would cover 4316 naval miles, the distance from Yokohama to Sydney, in 14.5 days.<sup>69</sup>

Australia, ever suspicious of Anglo-Japanese Alliance, since its announcement by this time, was in open disagreement with Britain over the alliance. Australians did agree that the alliance restrained Japan but they did not consider it as an absolute deterrent to a Japanese invasion. The Australian Minister of Defence George Pearce, in 1911, on his way back from

Britain visited Japan and was impressed by the alertness and untiring energy of the Japanese people. Once in Australia Pearce announced that Australia's future would be determined by Japan 'than any group of European powers.'<sup>70</sup> The Australians believed that while Europe was over a month's journey away, Japan was only eight days away, and therefore Australia must be armed to counter Japanese invasion.

The fear of Japanese invasion rife in the press, literature and the government, affected even the best Australian foreign policy analysts making them blind to the strategic importance of Japan. On 17 March 1914, when Winston Churchill proposed Australian and New Zealand Dreadnoughts to strengthen British navy in European waters on the assumption that Australia was protected by Anglo-Japanese Alliance, Australians were astounded by Churchill's implied suggestion that the safety of the Pacific was guaranteed by an alliance with a country whose nationals they refused entry to their shores.<sup>71</sup>

Australian Prime Minister Joseph Cook declined Churchill's proposal, and openly complained. In fact his very words were, as presented below:

'the Pacific was being made safe and secure not by the might and majesty of the British fleet but by the Japanese treaty. (Being asked) To rely upon the Japanese treaty alone for the peace of the Pacific (raised) very serious questions (and created a) very serious situation (since they were) under treaty obligation with a nation whose people they might not admit to their shores.'<sup>72</sup>

Cook defiantly concluded that White Australia Policy must be defended at all costs.

The strongest response to Churchill's proposal came from Frederic Eggleston, a widely respected foreign policy analyst, well known for his sophisticated views based on sound analysis. Eggleston maintained that Japan could not be trusted at all because Anglo-Japanese Alliance did not deter Japan from demanding entry for its nationals to Australia. Eggleston's exact words are quoted below:

'there is nothing in the Anglo-Japanese treaty which prevents Japan from raising the question of making a demand upon England that Japanese subjects shall be admitted to Australia.'<sup>73</sup>

Eggleston's assertion that Churchill's assessment was wrong proved utterly incorrect. World War One continuously for four years tested Eggleston's erroneous assumptions that were founded on the prevailing knowledge of Australia that was obsessed with its whiteness and fear of Japan, and proved him utterly wrong. Eggleston's brilliance was a victim of his environment of irrational fear of Japan.

The Admiralty, however, showed a better understanding of international strategy. The menace of German navy was in fact best countered by Britain and her allies from the central

naval command in London, and Japan proved herself a loyal ally. Churchill's decision to leave the security of the Pacific to the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, and its 'strong continuing bonds of interest'<sup>74</sup>, proved correct. Australian fear of Japan proved unfounded; and the British view, that Australia was the safest part of the Empire proved correct.

## **12. Fear Of Japan Continues Despite Japanese Protections In World War One:**

Despite Japan's protection of Australia under Anglo-Japanese Alliance since the outbreak of World War One in 1914, Australian government made arrangements to counter the Japanese threat. In early 1915 Australian government approached British Ambassador in Tokyo and the New South Wales Trade Commissioner in Kobe to provide information on Japan's attitude towards Australia.<sup>75</sup> Australian intelligence services closely watched the Japanese people living in Australia to detect activities of espionage.

Since the very commencement of World War One, Australians feared that Japan might use the war as an excuse to further its ambitions in Asia and the Pacific.<sup>76</sup> Japan's efforts to convert China into a client state, her capture of the German North Pacific islands, and her demands on Australia to stick to Anglo-Japanese Commercial Treaty were seen in Australia as a systematic design to impose her authority. They saw Japan posing a serious threat to Australian interests, particularly to White Australia Policy.

Australian Prime Minister Hughes feared that Japan would use Anglo-Japanese Alliance to gain entry for Japanese people and products into Australia; and Japan would join Germany if the war went badly for the Allies. His views reinforced the fear of Japan among Australian public, who were manipulated by a strictly censored and controlled media.<sup>77</sup> To make matters worse Australian politicians and media endorsed the views of the Prime Minister Hughes.<sup>78</sup>

Fear of Japan in Australia continued unabated during World War One, despite favourable assurances and reports on the Japanese from important Australian officials. Secretary of the External Affairs Department Atlee Hunt, held talks with the Japanese Consul General twice, first in June 1915 over a Japanese request for a Treaty of Commerce and Friendship, and in February 1916 in connection with the removal of the twelve-month limit on passports for Japanese merchants. Hunt reported the sincere tone of the talks, and advised to consider Japanese wishes to remove 'any very limited [immigration] restrictions.'<sup>79</sup> Hunt also supported his advice by arguing that during the fourteen years since the enactment of White Australia Policy, Japanese government never forced their labouring classes on Australia. Australia's emissary in Japan, J.B. Suttor, repeatedly expressed his views supporting Australian adherence to Anglo-Japanese Commercial Treaty, and advised to put an end to uncontrolled immigration with a gentleman's agreement, as Canada had achieved in

1906, 1911, and 1913. He also pleaded for a slight alteration of White Australia Policy to attract Japanese businesses to trade with Australia.

Such advice fell on deaf Australian ears prejudiced by irrational fear of Japan. The land flying the flag of White Australia was not about to abandon its prejudices against the yellow race from the north.

#### **End Notes:**

1. Alan G. L. Shaw, "1788 –1810"; in *A New History of Australia*, ed. Frank K. Crowley (Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1974), Reprinted 1980, 1.
2. Terry H. Irving, "1850-70" in *A New History of Australia*, ed. Frank K. Crowley (Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1974), Reprinted 1980, 139.
3. Henry P. Frei, *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 63.
4. *ibid.*, p.63.
5. Terry H. Irving, "1850-70" in *A New History of Australia*, ed. Frank K. Crowley (Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1974), Reprinted 1980, 138.
6. Henry P. Frei, *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 63.
7. Terry H. Irving, "1850-70" in *A New History of Australia*, ed. Frank K. Crowley (Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1974), Reprinted 1980, 151.
8. Geoffrey Serle, *The Golden Age: A History of the Colony of Victoria, 1851-1861* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1963), 330.
9. Terry H. Irving, "1850-70" in *A New History of Australia*, ed. Frank K. Crowley (Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1974), Reprinted 1980, 152.
10. *ibid.*, p.152
11. Gordon L. Buxton, "1870-90", in *A New History of Australia*, ed. Frank K. Crowley (Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1974), Reprinted 1980, 168.
12. Neville Kingsley Meaney, *Towards a New Vision: Australia & Japan: Through 100 Years* (Sydney: Kangaroo Press, 1999), 48.
13. *ibid.*, p.48.
14. Henry P. Frei, *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 74.
15. *ibid.*, p.75.
16. *ibid.*, p.76.
17. *ibid.*, p.76.



18. Neville Kingsley Meaney, *Towards a New Vision: Australia & Japan: Through 100 Years* (Sydney: Kangaroo Press, 1999), 58.
19. Henry P. Frei, *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 65.
20. *ibid.*, p.76.
21. *ibid.*, p.77.
22. *ibid.*, p.78.
23. *ibid.*, p.66.
24. *ibid.*, p.68.
25. *ibid.*, p.73.
26. *ibid.*, p.78.
27. *ibid.*, p.79.
28. *ibid.*, p.79.
29. *ibid.*, p.80.
30. *ibid.*, p.80.
31. *ibid.*, p.80.
32. *ibid.*, p.81.
33. *ibid.*, p.81.
34. *ibid.*, p.81.
35. *ibid.*, p.82.
36. *ibid.*, p.82.
37. *ibid.*, p.83.
38. *ibid.*, p.83.
39. *ibid.*, p.84.
40. Neville Kingsley Meaney, *Towards a New Vision: Australia & Japan: Through 100 Years* (Sydney: Kangaroo Press, 1999), 64.
41. *ibid.*, p.64.
42. *ibid.*, p.67.
43. *ibid.*, p.65.
44. Henry P. Frei, *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 67.
45. *ibid.*, p.85.
46. *ibid.*, p.85.
47. *ibid.*, p.85.

48. Richard Arthur, as cited in Henry P. Frei, *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 85.
49. Edward Pulsford, *The British Empire and the Relations of Asia and Australasia: Immigration Restriction in Australasia*, as cited in Henry P. Frei, *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 86.
50. Henry P. Frei, *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 86.
51. *ibid.*, p.86-87.
52. *ibid.*, p.87.
53. *ibid.*, p.88.
54. *ibid.*, p.88.
55. *ibid.*, p.88.
56. Neville Kingsley Meaney, *Towards a New Vision: Australia & Japan: Through 100 Years* (Sydney: Kangaroo Press, 1999), 66.
57. Henry P. Frei, *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 88.
58. *ibid.*, p.88.
59. *ibid.*, p.88.
60. Neville Kingsley Meaney, *Towards a New Vision: Australia & Japan: Through 100 Years* (Sydney: Kangaroo Press, 1999), 63.
61. *ibid.*, p.63.
62. *ibid.*, p.63.
63. Henry P. Frei, *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 89.
64. *ibid.*, p.89.
65. *ibid.*, p.89.
66. Neville Kingsley Meaney, *Towards a New Vision: Australia & Japan: Through 100 Years* (Sydney: Kangaroo Press, 1999), 65.
67. Misuzu Hanihara Chow, *Japan Literacy in Australia: A Changing Demand Over Eighty Years* (Ph.D. Thesis, Macquarie University, Sydney, 2001), 103.
68. Neville Kingsley Meaney, *Fears & Phobias: E.L. Piesse and the Problem of Japan* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, Occasional Papers Series, Number 1., 1996), 5.
69. *ibid.*, p.4.
70. Neville Kingsley Meaney, *Towards a New Vision: Australia & Japan: Through 100 Years* (Sydney: Kangaroo Press, 1999), 68.

71. Henry P. Frei, *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 89.
72. Neville Kingsley Meaney, *Towards a New Vision: Australia & Japan: Through 100 Years* (Sydney: Kangaroo Press, 1999), 68.
73. Henry P. Frei, *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 90.
74. *ibid.*, p.90
75. Neville Kingsley Meaney, *Fears & Phobias: E.L. Piesse and the Problem of Japan* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, Occasional Papers Series, Number 1., 1996), 7.
76. *ibid.*, p.7.
77. Henry P. Frei, *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 94.
78. Neville Kingsley Meaney, *Towards a New Vision: Australia & Japan: Through 100 Years* (Sydney: Kangaroo Press, 1999), 73.
79. Henry P. Frei, *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 94.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **WILLIAM MORRIS HUGHES**

The Prime Minister of Australia, William Morris Hughes steadfastly opposed Japan's Racial Equality Bill at Paris Peace Conference, because he perceived the bill as a direct threat to White Australia Policy. The previous chapter investigated and discussed the issue of fear of Japan in Australia. This chapter critically assesses the views of Hughes, and his political actions, particularly those immediately before, after and during Paris Peace Conference in order to understand why Hughes was so resolute in his opposition to Racial Equality Bill. Another crucial fact that emerges from the research presented in this chapter is that the only person who had some influence over Hughes was the British Prime Minister Lloyd George. This chapter, however, does not propose to present a summary of the life and times of Hughes, which form the subject matter of five books and two books of memoirs written by Hughes himself, the details of which are given in the Bibliography.

#### **1. Hughes, The Politician:**

William Morris Hughes, born on 25 September 1862 in London of Welsh parents, migrated to Queensland in 1884, at the age of 22. After spending the first two years in rural occupations, Hughes moved to Sydney, where he worked in a variety of miscellaneous occupations. In 1894, at the age of 32, Hughes was elected as the Labor member for Lang in the New South Wales Legislative Assembly. In October 1915, Hughes became the Prime Minister of Australia, replacing Andrew Fisher. During his first term as the Prime Minister, Hughes favoured conscription for overseas army service as a means of maintaining Australia's supply of troops to the war. Hughes' stance on conscription led to his expulsion from Labor Party in late 1916. Commissioned to form a new ministry, he carried on for 3 months as head of National Labor Party with the support of the Liberal opposition. His splinter Labor Party joined hands with the Liberals in 1917 to form Nationalist Party, which stayed in power by winning the general election held later that year. Hughes had no hesitation in breaking away from his own party or for that matter in taking help from his political opponents whenever it suited him. The actions of Hughes mentioned in the lines above, demonstrate a dimension of his character that could at best be summed up as opportunist.

Under the leadership of Hughes, Nationalist Party with the support of the recently formed Country Party won the 1922 general election. However the members of the Country Party firmly refused to accept Hughes as their leader. Hughes, well-known for his abrasive personality, 'had a dictatorial attitude towards his colleagues'<sup>1</sup>, and his lack of concern for the details of administration earned him many enemies. Consequently Hughes felt compelled to

resign. In 1923, Stanley Melbourne Bruce replaced Hughes as the Prime Minister of Australia. After his resignation from the leadership, in the 1920s, Hughes remained a constant critic of the Bruce-Page Government. Hughes's eventual overt opposition over the arbitration issue resulted in the collapse of the government in 1929, followed by three years of Labor rule under J.H. Scullin. Consequently Hughes was expelled from the Nationalist Party, the second expulsion of his political career.

Expelled from the Nationalist Party, Hughes endeavoured to create his own party, the Australian Party. His efforts did not meet with much success, so in 1931, Hughes joined a new non-Labor coalition formed under the leadership of J.A. Lyons called United Australia Party. During the 1930s and early years of World War Two, Hughes held powerful portfolios such as Health, External Affairs, Navy, and Attorney-General in Lyons and Menzies governments. Hughes also functioned as a member of the Advisory War Council between 1940 and 1945.

In September 1941, Arthur William Fadden's budget was defeated and John Joseph Curtin was sworn in as the Prime Minister. Hughes was elected Leader of United Australia Party over Robert Gordon Menzies, and fought the 1943 General Election as Deputy Leader of the Opposition. After the 1943 election Hughes stepped down as the leader. In April 1944 Hughes refused a United Australia Party directive asking him to resign membership of the Advisory War Council. Consequently he was expelled from the party, for the third time in his political career. Hughes was eighty-two years old at the time of expulsion, yet instead of gracefully retiring from politics he joined Liberal Party of Australia. He remained a representative of Liberal Party for North Sydney and later Bradfield until his death in 1952, at the age of 90.

## **2. Leadership Of Hughes During The Wars:**

During World War One, on the Western Front, Australia suffered more than 50,000 casualties. This large number of casualties made Lord Carson in England to remark that a steady supply of soldiers for the war must be maintained. The recruiting in Australia, however, steadily declined from 4,500 a month in early 1917 to 2,500 per month later in the year. The director-general of recruiting reported that the concern for general welfare became unimportant, and class and individual animosity ruled supreme. The problem grew more intense as the Australians began to feel the adverse effects of the war.<sup>2</sup> Many steps were taken to increase the recruitment but to little effect.

So on 7 November 1917, Prime Minister Hughes declared to conduct a referendum on conscription for overseas army service. He also announced that unless his government gained the right to conscript, he could not govern. Then in an attempt to secure a positive outcome,

his government excluded electorates of enemy origin from voting. Despite the best efforts of Hughes, majority Australians voted NO to conscription. The defeat made Hughes declare:

‘...it is not we who have failed, but the people of Australia. ...I can not forgive those [tens of thousands] of men who, grown fat on this war, pretended that they desired Australia to do her duty, and went on to the ballot box and voted against her doing it.’<sup>3</sup>

As mentioned in the previous section, so determined was Hughes in his support for conscription that he had defied his own political party, who in turn had expelled him from the party in 1916.

Hughes on many occasions visited the Australian forces on battlefields. In France, just before they successfully launched an attack on Hamel, Hughes visited the Australian soldiers and delivered a ‘stirring address’<sup>4</sup>. Hughes visited the troops again in France to congratulate them on the seizure of Peronne. Hughes was immensely popular with the Australian troops and was affectionately dubbed the Little Digger. After the conclusion of his overseas trip William Morris Hughes reached Melbourne on 30 August 1919. Hughes was received like a ‘victorious general with the laurels of a campaign upon him.’<sup>5</sup> He duly won the election, and formed his fourth government in four years.

During the Second World War, Hughes was made a member of the Advisory War Council between 1940 and 1945. In April 1944 United Australia Party, to which Hughes belonged, issued a directive asking him to resign the membership of the Advisory War Council. Hughes defied his own party again to stay with the War Council.

### **3. Hughes And White Australia Policy:**

Hughes was a champion and a defender of White Australia Policy. Many scholars have said so, and a few are quoted below to strengthen the contention. Meaney<sup>6</sup> commenting on Hughes at Paris Peace Conference has recorded, ‘for Hughes, White Australia, “the cornerstone of the national edifice” was at stake’. Turner<sup>7</sup> has stated that Hughes ‘objected to the Japanese demand for the inclusion of a racial equality clause in the Covenant of the League of Nations, on the ground that this might jeopardise the White Australia Policy...’. King<sup>8</sup> has mentioned that Hughes, as the head of the Australian delegation to Paris Peace Conference, saw Japan’s proposal as a demand in disguise to gain the right of immigration for Japanese in to Australia and a threat to White Australia Policy. Shimazu<sup>9</sup> has recorded that White Australia Policy was the mainstay of Australian life and there was ‘an inseparable link between this policy and Hughes’, a connection that can not be underestimated in view of the central role Hughes played in defeating racial equality proposal. Shimazu has further declared that ‘Hughes stood adamantly opposed’ to racial equality proposal ‘because the

perceived political benefit from opposition was much greater than the perceived cost of agreement'<sup>10</sup>. Hence Hughes's opposition to racial equality proposal was portrayed in Australia as a fight to defend White Australia Policy. More importantly, it was 'perceived by many as a *sine qua non* to Australia's national survival.'<sup>11</sup> 'Hughes's persistent opposition was a reflection of how important the protection of White Australia Policy, with its large anti-Japanese component, had become in Australian politics.'<sup>12</sup> Hughes's unshakable attachment to White Australia Policy was perhaps the single most important reason for his resolute determination to oppose the Japanese proposal. The forthcoming Australian general election, for which Hughes had to perform well at Paris by fighting for the defence of Australia, has been pointed out as another reason for Hughes for opposing the Japanese proposal. The second reason was in fact related to the first because it involved affirmation of his support for White Australia Policy, which was viewed in Australia as the main policy of national defence.

In 1918, Hughes, as the Prime Minister of Australia, visited Washington and London. With him, Hughes carried a document produced by The Naval Board on the security of Australia that had identified Japan as the threat, and precisely for that reason Hughes liked the document, and later on carried it with him to Paris Peace Conference in 1919. Meaney<sup>13</sup> has recorded that Hughes liked the document because it, 'spoke to his deepest convictions about Australia's vulnerability to an attack from Asia'. At Paris Peace Conference Australia's antagonism towards Japan intensified. This was essentially due to the attitude of Hughes, who, in Meaney's<sup>14</sup> words 'had proclaimed that Australians lived "almost within coo-ee of a thousand millions of coloured people" and had nailed "White Australia" to the top of the mast, was profoundly distrustful of Japan'.

Hughes, during his visit to the US in 1918, requested the Americans to help create an Australian Monroe Doctrine for the south Pacific, which was viewed by Japan as an effort to build an Anglo-Saxon pact against her. Hughes, in a letter to the Prime Minister of Britain Lloyd George, had opposed Japan's legitimate claims to the north Pacific islands on the grounds that they were important to the defence of Australia. Hughes wanted the islands to stay under British control and be administered by Australia essentially to keep the Japanese away. Hughes, however, due to the principled stand by Lloyd George determined to honour his commitment to Japan, was thwarted from securing the north Pacific islands. Then Hughes demanded the possession of the German islands in the south Pacific, which Japan had occupied. In the perception of Hughes the Pacific islands were ramparts which encompassed Australia like a fortress. The imagery of Hughes, 'namely that Australia was an isolated European outpost in danger of being enveloped and overrun by a threat from the north'<sup>15</sup> reflected the views of many of his compatriots. These examples of Hughes's utterances and

views demonstrate his deep distrust of the thousand millions of coloured people in the north that included the Japanese.

Hughes harboured deep suspicions and fears of the Japanese. Hughes trusted the anti-Japanese line of the writings of the earlier years of E.L. Piesse, when he was the Director of Military Intelligence from 1916 to 1919 and head of the, Pacific Branch of the Prime Minister's Department from 1919 to 1923. Piesse, prior to World War One feared Japan, and as Director of Military Intelligence reported on the chances of Japanese invasion that highly appealed to Hughes. Piesse, however, as a learned and reasonable man, disagreed with the notions of international relations based purely on race.<sup>16</sup> Encouraged by James Murdoch, the first lecturer in Japanese and first professor of Oriental Studies at Sydney University from 1917 to 1921, Piesse learnt Japanese and gathered all the appropriate materials for a sound analysis. As a result views of Piesse underwent drastic changes and Piesse was genuinely troubled by the fear and distrust Hughes showed towards the Japanese at Paris Peace Conference. Piesse urged a compromise with Japan.

Piesse utterly disbelieved the notion of an inevitable confrontation between the white and yellow races. Moreover he advised to modify White Australia Policy to soothe Japanese sensibilities. Hughes, however, remained unmoved in his staunch opposition to the Japanese. The moment Piesse's wise views conflicted with the anti-Japanese ideas of Hughes, Hughes started ignoring Piesse's advice. Piesse advocated 'Such an attitude as Mr. Hughes has taken, of emphasizing the difference between Japanese and Australians, and declaring that we shall not "budge one inch", will not do at all.'<sup>17</sup> Hughes not only disagreed entirely with the ideas of Piesse but also dismissed the advice of Piesse that there was 'probably little reason for applying discrimination based merely on race'<sup>18</sup> to the Japanese with one word 'rot'<sup>19</sup>. Hughes did not hesitate to sideline Piesse and Murdoch, the two most learned advisers on Japan of the era, because they proposed accommodation with the Japanese.

#### **4. Hughes At Paris Peace Conference:**

In view of the anti-Japanese ideas Hughes had, it is not surprising to note the single minded, relentless opposition he mounted to Racial Equality Bill proposed by Japan at Paris Peace Conference. Hughes primarily opposed the Japanese proposal because he saw it as a grave threat to White Australia Policy. His resolute opposition to racial equality proposal demonstrated his affirmation of White Australia Policy in a show of strength from Paris to advance his personal political cause for the forthcoming general election in Australia.<sup>20</sup> Hughes, 'through shrewd belligerence and a skilful use of his hearing aid, had had most of his own way'<sup>21</sup> at the conference.



Japanese delegates at Paris held a meeting with Hughes on 14 March 1919. After discussing the main issues Japanese delegates requested Hughes to read the Japanese proposal in order for both the parties to engage in further free and frank discussions. Thereafter Japanese delegates took leave, promising to meet with Hughes again. Since holding their talk with Hughes on 14 March 1919, Japanese delegates sought appointments many times to hold discussions with him. But Hughes avoided meeting with Japanese delegates on the pretext of either travel or illness<sup>22</sup>. Hughes was so determined to defend White Australia Policy that he chose to avoid meetings with the Japanese to discuss and sort out differences.

British plenipotentiary Robert Cecil, desirous of reaching an accommodation with the Japanese convened a meeting on 25 March 1919, at Canadian Prime Minister Sir Robert Borden's quarters, with the Prime Ministers of the British Empire that included the Australian Prime Minister Hughes. In the meeting Japanese delegates emphasised that their proposal was aimed at clarifying the principle of racial equality and it was unrelated to the issue of immigration. The Prime Ministers objected to the word equality and the Japanese strove to retain it. Canadian Prime Minister proposed a compromise, and that read, 'recognising the equality among the States and the principle of fair treatment to their nationals.'<sup>23</sup> Many agreed with the Canadian version, but only Hughes announced that as the representative of Australian public opinion, he had to absolutely oppose the Japanese proposal. A portion of Hughes' statement to support the claim is as follows:

'that, in short, what mattered with this proposal was not its wording but the underlying idea itself which ninety-five out of a hundred Australians rejected.'<sup>24</sup>

Hughes's hardline stand was designed to defend White Australia Policy, the law of the land of Australia, by choice. When other Prime Ministers urged him to make a compromise, Hughes defiantly announced that others were free to act the way they liked but he would stick to his principles and stormed off the meeting.

On 26 March 1919, General Smuts, Plenipotentiary of South Africa in a meeting with the Japanese delegates advised them to exercise caution in negotiating with Hughes. Smuts gave his reasons for saying so, and since they contain rather harsh words, his statement is cited as follows: 'Hughes was not only narrow-minded and unable to appreciate general international relations but was also by nature stubborn; and that if attempts to interfere were made carelessly, Hughes might become all the more defiant.'<sup>25</sup>

On 29 March 1919 General Smuts in a meeting with Baron Makino, mentioned that Hughes was so determined to oppose Japanese proposal that he had threatened to refuse to sign the Covenant of the League if the Japanese proposal were to be incorporated in the draft. So apprehensive was Hughes of the potential threat by Japanese proposal to White Australia

Policy that he used the ultimate weapon, the threat of boycotting the League of Nations. The Belgians and the Italians had set the precedence of boycotting the conference because of their failures to achieve their respective national political objectives, which were however, unrelated to the issue of racial equality.

Hughes with his policy of *Slap the Japs* publicly insisted that he would not deviate an inch from his position. Colonel Edward House, the most trusted aide to President Wilson of the USA, made an entry in his diary recording Hughes' sinister threat to foment racial tension to achieve his goal of obstructing the adoption of Racial Equality Bill. The exact words from his diary to support the claim are as follows:

‘Hughes insists that nothing shall go in, no matter how mild and inoffensive’ noting that ‘Hughes even threatened to appeal deliberately to racial prejudices and “raise a storm of protest not only in the Dominions but in the western part of the United States”<sup>26</sup>.’

Hughes both in secret conversation with the British delegation, and in a subsequent public announcement declared his absolute opposition to Racial Equality Bill.<sup>27</sup> His statement is as follows:

‘No matter how innocuous it may seem in form, it is certainly aimed at giving the League control of questions relating to immigration and nationalization, a matter which can not be surrendered by any State with such impairment of its sovereignty as to make it in effect a subject State.’<sup>28</sup>

Hughes refused to accept any of the compromises Colonel House had proposed. On one such attempt of compromise Hughes scribbled, ‘It may be all right. But sooner than agree to it I would walk into the Seine – or the Folies Bergeres – with my clothes off.’<sup>29</sup> One of the subordinates of Hughes from the Australian delegation in Paris was more direct and wrote, ‘No government could live for a day in Australia if it tampered with a White Australia’<sup>30</sup>, emphasising the vital importance of White Australia Policy that motivated Hughes to resolutely defend it to protect Australia from the fear of Japan.

In April 1919, Japanese delegate Makino met with Henry Wickham Steed, the Chief Editor of *The Times* of London, with the intention of influencing Hughes through that newspaper. Hughes instead of being influenced decided to leave Paris in case Japan's demand gained acceptance. On 11 April 1919, in a confidential meeting between the Japanese and the South African Prime Minister Botha, Botha remarked to Makino, ‘Hughes could not but be said to be crazy.’<sup>31</sup> Around 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> April 1919 the Japanese delegates sought an interview with Hughes once more in order to persuade him, but Hughes declined the request because of illness. The fact that he attended the Commission meeting on 11 April 1919, made it obvious that he had feigned illness to avoid meeting the Japanese.

## **5. Only Britain Could Have Restrained Hughes:**

Hughes in a letter to Balfour, in September 1918, warned Britain about Japanese activities in south Pacific islands by saying the Japanese ‘are everywhere and working assiduously. We too must work in like fashion or retire like my ancestors from the fat plains to the lean and rugged hills.’<sup>32</sup> Hughes wanted the south Pacific islands to stay under British or Australian control as a rampart to protect Australia. Earlier in August 1918 Hughes, at a meeting of the war cabinet with the prime ministers of British dominions, had protested that Australia had not been consulted over the Pacific islands in connection with Anglo-Japanese secret agreement of 1917, forcing the British Foreign Office to re-examine its position in preparation for discussion by the war cabinet in November. Moreover Hughes suggested reneging on the Anglo-Japanese secret agreement of 1917. Foreign Office, however, discovered that both Australia and New Zealand had been fully consulted and pledged by Britain over the secret agreement. So after the signing of the armistice, on 21 November 1918, the British Prime Minister Lloyd George raised the issue in the cabinet and ‘addressed Hughes with a celtic rhetoric’<sup>33</sup> and squashed his demands. A portion of Lloyd George’s speech relevant to the contention is quoted below:

‘It is clear that His Majesty’s Government can neither now, nor at the Peace Conference, go back on this official assurance without committing a breach of faith of which no Australian Government would wish them to be guilty. I am confident that you will not assist the enemies of the Empire by exposing before the nations in council a difference of opinion on a point with regard to which Britain has obviously no selfish interest, and the honour of the two great Australasian Dominions is no less pledged than that of the Mother Country. Let me further point out that if successful objection were made from a foreign quarter to Japan retaining possession of the German Pacific Islands North of the Equator, it would probably be on the plea of ‘no annexations’ and would equally apply to our retention of islands South of the Equator.’<sup>34</sup>

This is probably the only incident where Hughes was successfully restrained from his demands. The preceding argument demonstrates that British Prime Minister Lloyd George, as the chief executive of the British Empire, certainly had the authority over Hughes, a prime minister of a British colony. Lloyd George could have exercised his authority over Hughes had he been inclined to, or in other words, had the British supported Japan’s racial equality proposal.

Unfortunately Hughes influenced the final position of the British at Paris Peace Conference. In fact so convinced is Shimazu that the caption of Chapter Five of her book

reads, ‘Australia overwhelms the British Empire Delegation.’<sup>35</sup> The British did not see racial equality proposal as an important issue and conceded it to the Dominions as an issue related to immigration. This enabled Hughes to ‘bulldoze his way through negotiation’<sup>36</sup> because the proposal was not considered important enough either for Britain or the other Dominions. To make matters worse, the Japanese delegates failed to convince the British that Racial Equality Bill was not just an attempt to address the immigration issue, but it was an endeavour to champion a much broader principle.

#### **End Notes:**

1. Ian Turner, “1914-1919”, in *A New History of Australia*, ed. Frank K. Crowley (Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1974), Reprinted 1980, 353.
2. Ernest Scott, *Australia During the War* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1936), 398.
3. William M. Hughes as cited in, Ian Turner, “1914-1919”, in *A New History of Australia*, ed. Frank K. Crowley (Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1974), Reprinted 1980, 344.
4. John Monash, *The Australian Victories in France in 1918* (London, 1920), 55.
5. Ernest Scott, *Australia During the War* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1936), 818.
6. Neville Kingsley Meaney, *Towards a New Vision: Australia & Japan: Through 100 Years* (Sydney: Kangaroo Press, 1999), 72.
7. Ian Turner, “1914-1919”, in *A New History of Australia*, ed. Frank K. Crowley (Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1974, Reprinted 1980), p.351.
8. Peter King, *Japan and Australia: From Enmity to Enmeshment?* in *Australia and Asia*, eds. Mark McGillivray and Gary Smith (Oxford University Press, 1997).
9. Naoko Shimazu, *Japan, Race and Equality: The Racial Equality Proposal of 1919* (London: Routledge, 1998), 125.
10. *ibid.*, p.125.
11. *ibid.*, p.125.
12. *ibid.*, p.167.
13. Neville Kingsley Meaney, *Towards a New Vision: Australia & Japan: Through 100 Years* (Sydney: Kangaroo Press, 1999), 70.
14. *ibid.*, p.70.
15. *ibid.*, p.71.
16. *ibid.*, p.71.
17. “Secret report, Discrimination Against Asiatics: Notes For An Australian Policy”, 27th March 1919, *Edmund Leolin Piesse Papers* (882/2/119), (Canberra: National Library of Australia, Canberra, 1919) Para 14, p.11.

18. Neville Kingsley Meaney, *Towards a New Vision: Australia & Japan: Through 100 Years* (Sydney: Kangaroo Press, 1999), 73-74.
19. *ibid.*, p.73-74.
20. Naoko Shimazu, *Japan, Race and Equality: The Racial Equality Proposal of 1919* (London: Routledge, 1998), 135-136.
21. Ian Turner, "1914-1919", in Frank K. Crowley edited *A New History of Australia* (Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1974, Reprinted 1980), 351.
22. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.5-6 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
23. *ibid.*, p.7-8.
24. *ibid.*, p.7-8.
25. Matsui to Uchida, 30 March 1919, Doc 471-2, *Kokusai Renmei* (The League of Nations), *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol. 2, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
26. Charles Seymore, (ed.) *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, vol.4 (London: Ernest Benn Ltd. 1928), vol.4, 415.
27. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996), 95.
28. *ibid.*, p.95.
29. Margaret MacMillan, *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempts to End War* (London: John Murray, 2001), 328.
30. *ibid.*, p.328.
31. Matsui to Uchida, 15 April 1919, Doc 556, *Kokusai Renmei* (The League of Nations), *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol. 2, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
32. Ian Hill Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23* (London: The Athlone Press, 1972), 258-259.
33. *ibid.*, p.259.
34. British Foreign Office FO 371/3236[187840], Lloyd George to Hughes, 29 November 1918; CAB 23/8/505.
35. Naoko Shimazu, *Japan, Race and Equality: The Racial Equality Proposal of 1919* (London: Routledge, 1998), 117.
36. *ibid.*, p.135.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### JAPAN'S PROPOSAL AND DIPLOMACY AT PARIS

This chapter commences with an account of the elaborate preparation, including the proposal on racial equality, made by the Government of Japan for participation in Paris Peace Conference. The account is presented to demonstrate the sincerity of the Government of Japan, evidence of which is used to counter the theory that accused Japan and its delegation of sacrificing Racial Equality Bill for securing concessions on territorial rights in Shantung and in Pacific islands. A detailed description of intricate and intense diplomatic negotiations conducted by plenipotentiaries of Japan with representatives of other participating countries of Paris Peace Conference, in order to get Racial Equality Bill adopted by the League of Nations, forms the bulk of this chapter. Critical analyses of these descriptions are used to show the occasionally passionate but always genuine, yet eventually futile efforts, of the Japanese delegates to achieve the adoption of Racial Equality Bill.

This chapter also presents the convergence of the four key factors: resolute opposition to Racial Equality Bill from the Prime Minister of Australia determined to protect White Australia Policy; opposition by the British; lack of US support and Wilson's decision to overrule the wishes of the majority of the delegates; and sympathy of British dominions New Zealand, Canada and South Africa with Australia, to defeat the Japanese proposal. The chapter also demonstrates that the numerous changes made to the text of Racial Equality Bill by Japanese delegates made them appear pliable to representatives of other countries. This issue combined with weak presentation of their case by Japanese delegates, described in the chapter, harmed the position of Japan for securing the insertion of Racial Equality Bill in the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Bulk of the information on the intricate negotiations between Japanese diplomats and other parties during Paris Peace Conference, and descriptions of the proceedings of the events at the Conference, have been collected from a primary source, the Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan, presently lodged in the Diplomatic Record Office of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs at Tokyo. The three main documents that constitute this primary source are 1. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku*, October 1919, *Kokusai Renmei, Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai*, Vol. 3; 2. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Teppai Ni Kansuru Mondai, Taiheiyoo Mondai Kenkyuu Shiryou*, Vol.4, 20 Sept 1921, *Kokusai Renmei, Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai*, Vol. 3, 3. *Matsui to Uchida, Kokusai Renmei, Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai*, Vol. 2.

The facts from the diplomatic records have been supplemented by information from *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Volume II (Kajima 1978) sourced from NGB (*Nippon*

*Gaiko Bunsho*) volume *Pari Kowa Kaigi* (Summary of the Proceedings of the Paris Peace Conference), which is a reprint with a few omissions of the document entitled *Kowa Kaigi Keika Choso* by the Bureau of Political Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. As recorded earlier in the thesis of *The Diplomacy of Japan 1894-1922*, translated from *Nippon Gaiko Shi*, edited at Kajima Institute of International Peace, Tokyo, is the most authoritative source on the subject. Another primary source tapped for materials for this chapter are the various Japanese newspapers of 1919, microfilms of which are lodged in the National Diet Library of Japan, Tokyo.

The author was unable to collect any primary records from the Australian archives on the subject. The non-existence of ‘any records of either informal conversations or of formal meetings’ between the Australian Prime Minister Mr William Morris Hughes (or the Australian delegation) with the leaders and the delegations from other countries during the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, at the National Library of Australia where the Hughes Papers (MS 1538) are lodged, was confirmed in a letter No NLA 04/362 dated 25 March 2004, to the author from Mr Graeme Powell, Manuscript Librarian of Australian Collection and Reader Services of the National Library of Australia, Canberra.

Some information for writing this chapter have also been sourced from three most recently published books on the subject; the books are 1. *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, ed. 2<sup>nd</sup> 1996, written by Paul Lauren Gordon; 2. *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempt to End War*, 2001, written by Margaret MacMillan; and 3. *Japan, Race and Equality: The Racial Equality Proposal of 1919*, 1998, written by Naoko Shimazu.

Presented below are the historical facts and their interpretations that constitute the subject matter of the present chapter.

### **1. Preparation For Paris Peace Conference:**

World War One continued for four years and four months causing eight million deaths and twenty million injuries. In the aftermath of the war a peace conference was proposed and several venues such as Paris, Geneva and Brussels were suggested. With majority support, Paris was chosen as the site for hosting the conference<sup>1</sup> that commenced on 18 January 1919 and would continue till 28 April 1919.

Japan made elaborate preparations for participation at Paris Peace Conference. On 27 November 1918 the Government of Japan informally designated their plenipotentiaries to the conference. The appointments were informal because none of the other powers had yet formally made their appointments, and Japanese government chose to formalise the appointments at a later date. On the same day, 27 November 1918, Japan’s Foreign Minister

Yasuya Uchida informed Ambassador Sutemi Chinda in Britain and Ambassador Keishiro Matsui in France of their appointments as plenipotentiaries for the conference. The same communication also announced the appointments of Prince Saionji and Baron Makino as the other two plenipotentiaries. On 3 December 1918, Baron Makino and his twenty aides, who were officials from the Japanese Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Army and Navy, received their orders to proceed to Europe, and on 10 December 1914 they sailed from Yokohama to Europe via the US.<sup>2</sup> Prince Saionji could not leave immediately for reasons of health and was scheduled to join the Japanese team later. .

MacMillan commenting on the appointment of Saionji has erroneously recorded, ‘When Japan realised that Wilson, Lloyd George, Clemenceau and Orlando were leading their own delegations to Paris, its government hastily decided to send him, to compensate for not having sent their prime minister (whose political position was too shaky to risk the journey) or the foreign minister (who was sick). Saionji’s appointment was an indication that Japan took the conference seriously.’<sup>3</sup> MacMillan’s assertion gives the impression that initially Japan was not serious about Paris Peace Conference. It is worth pointing out that Prince Saionji was in fact appointed as early as on 27 November 1918, before any other countries had formally made their appointments of plenipotentiaries.<sup>4</sup>

Saionji, a liberal patrician, was an immensely influential figure in Japan, who had served as a diplomat, a foreign minister, in the 1900s as prime minister, and then in 1913 the Emperor of Japan had appointed him as the *genro* a term inadequately translated to mean elder statesman. As a *genro* venerable prince Saionji held enormous influence, particularly over the creation of new governments in Japan and its foreign policy. Moreover Saionji was a noted internationalist, convinced that a strong international order would help Japan prosper along side other countries. In appointing Saionji the Government of Japan had demonstrated a seriousness and a genuine desire for participating in the proceedings of Paris Peace Conference.

On 9 December 1918, Baron Makino received detailed instructions from Japanese Foreign Minister Uchida that contained explanations of Japanese position and Japanese proposals decided by Japanese Cabinet for presentations at Paris Peace Conference. The instructions were also explicit in their advice to ‘leave room for possible changes or deletions to be made as a result of the exchange of opinions with the Allied and Associated Powers before presenting them formally to the Peace Conference’ and ‘to follow always fair and moderate principles.’<sup>5</sup> Japanese government from the very beginning maintained a moderate, flexible and conciliatory approach in its proposals to Paris Peace Conference.



Baron Makino received specific instructions to deal with the fourteen points proposed by President Wilson of the US. On the point of the League of Nations Japanese government supported the ultimate objective of the League of Nations. The instructions also advised to argue for the elimination of discrimination based on race among nations, and to allow sufficient time to each member nation for a thorough study of the implementation of the League system<sup>6</sup>.

Baron Makino was advised to agree with some points proposed by President Wilson, raise objections to the others and to follow the general trend of the Conference on the rest. The Japanese plenipotentiary was also advised, 'to keep in step as far as possible with the Allied and Associated Powers, taking account of the general trend of the Conference.'<sup>7</sup>

## **2. Formal Appointments For The Peace Conference:**

On 13 January 1919, the Government of Japan formally appointed Prince Kimmochi Saionji as the chief plenipotentiary, and Baron Nobuaki Makino, Sutemi Chinda (Ambassador to Britain), Keishiro Matsui (Ambassador to France) and Hikokichi Ijuin (Ambassador to Italy) as plenipotentiaries to the Peace Conference.<sup>8</sup> Prince Saionji initially had turned down the appointment on grounds of poor health but accepted the offer, health permitting. So Baron Makino acted as the de facto chief of the Japanese delegation. Saionji arrived at Paris on March 2, 1919.

On 18 January 1919, the day Paris Peace Conference opened with the first Plenary Session of the Allied and the Associated Powers, Japanese government at their Cabinet meeting, decided the provisions of the Draft Treaty concerning the conditions of Peace in which Japan alone was interested, essentially ratifying the instructions issued to Baron Makino by Foreign Minister Uchida on 9 January 1919.

## **3. Strong Japanese Press And Public Opinion To Gain Racial Equality:**

In Japan the press was unanimous in its demand that Japanese delegation must insist on gaining racial equality. Quotations from leading Japanese newspapers are presented below to strengthen the contention. The *Hochi* declared that 'discrimination is humiliation and therefore an injustice to the people discriminated against'<sup>9</sup> and demanded that the Japanese delegates 'not fail to have the matter brought up' at the conference – 'and solved properly.'<sup>10</sup> The *Yorozu* announced that 'now is the time to fight against international racial discrimination.'<sup>11</sup> The *Asahi* announced, 'as to the terms of peace Japan should insist on the equal international treatment of all races...not only for Japan but for all the countries of Asia. No other question is so inseparably and materially interwoven with the permanency of the world's peace as that of unfair and unjust treatment of a large majority of the world's population.'<sup>12</sup> The *Asahi* advised that the Japanese objective should be to highlight 'the

wrong suffered by other races than the white'; and warned, 'if the discrimination wall is to remain standing, then President Wilson will have spoken of peace, justice and humanity in vain, and he would have proved after all only a hypocrite.'<sup>13</sup>

Japanese public confidence in the quality of their delegation was very high. Prince Kimmochi Saionji, the former Prime Minister of Japan and presently the *genro* as head of the Japanese delegation, assisted by highly respected Baron Nobuaki Makino, a former foreign minister, and Viscount Sutemi Chinda, His Imperial Majesty's ambassador at London were enthusiastically welcomed by the Japanese public. The Japanese public believed that the choice of men simply as 'ideal, unequalled in prestige, and highly qualified to achieve Japan's objectives.'<sup>14</sup>

Japanese considered the prospect of achieving their mission at Paris Peace Conference excellent.<sup>15</sup> The *Asahi* looked forward 'with great expectations' and declared, 'The country can not have a better set of men to represent it on so momentous an occasion as the great peace conclave, and it would expect that its success at the conference will be proportionately great.'<sup>16</sup> Some observers described the Japanese delegates as 'one of the most perfectly organised delegations in Paris.'<sup>17</sup>

Japanese delegates set sail 'amid banzais and deafening cheers',<sup>18</sup> from the Japanese public, who expected them to achieve great success. Lest the delegates forget their mission, *Asahi*, issued one last piece of advice to the Japanese delegation on the way to Paris, 'Above all our Peace Envoy must not forget to persuade the Conference to agree to the relinquishment of the principle of racial discrimination, which if allowed to exist would continue to be a menace to the future peace of the world. Fairness and equality must be secured for the coloured races who form 62 percent of the whole mankind.'<sup>19</sup>

#### **4. Proposal On Abolition Of Racial Discrimination:**

Japanese delegates proposed an amendment to the draft Covenant of the League of Nations to include 'the principle of according equal and just treatment to aliens belonging to member countries of the League of Nations regardless of their race or nationality', and to insert into the preamble to the Covenant, recognition 'of equality of all nations and the just treatment of every nationality.'<sup>20</sup> On arrival at Paris, Japanese delegates systematically endeavoured for the adoption of the principle of racial equality. Japanese delegates sensed that their best chances for success stood with the League of Nations Commission, an entity entrusted with the responsibility of creating a new organisation to encourage international reconciliation and its operating principles. Japanese delegates were also aware that Wilson attached considerable importance to this commission and to the drafting of the Covenant of the League.<sup>21</sup> Moreover, the Japanese knew that the new League could not exclude 'non-

white countries'<sup>22</sup>, and therefore the Japanese assumed that Japan had to be admitted to the League of Nations as a representative of the non-white world, and therefore again, the Japanese assumed the chances of their proposals to be accepted by the League to be excellent.

### **5. The US Politics Of Race And Wilson:**

US President Wilson faced domestic pressure to deal with Japan firmly<sup>23</sup>, because of strong anti-Japanese feeling among American public, who resented Japanese immigration to the US. Americans, like Australians and for that matter like people in the British dominions were fearful of being swamped by hordes of Oriental immigrants overwhelming white civilization. California felt so threatened that rules were drafted, that first made Japanese nationals lose the right to buy land, then prevented them from leasing land, and finally barred them from bringing their wives over to join them. In 1906 San Francisco School Board created segregated classes, lest Chinese and Japanese children overwhelm white children.<sup>24</sup> Before the advent of World War One in 1914, in the US, novels with themes of successful Japanese invasions were published. These books sold well in the west coast. When some Japanese fishermen applied for a lease on a bay in Mexico's Baja California, the Hearst press of the US known for its sensationalism, exaggerated it to be a plan by the Japanese government to construct a naval base. Hearst press successfully spread fear of *yellow peril*.<sup>25</sup> Similar scares circulated in Japan and the phrase *white peril* started appearing in Japanese press. *Our Next War*, a novel written by a retired officer of Japanese navy, had the theme of a Japanese attack on the US. In pre World War One years both the US and Japan feared each other.

Moreover Japanese had sold weapons to what Americans generally considered the wrong party in Mexico's bloody civil war,<sup>26</sup> creating a negative perception of Japan in the US, and to make matters worse in 1917, German foreign minister had asked Mexico to invite Japan to join an alliance against the US, in a case known as the 'Zimmerman telegram'<sup>27</sup>. This unusual attempt to persuade Japan to the side of Germany, quite unfairly, and for no fault of Japan, created a wrong impression of Japan in the US. Even during World War One when Japan fought on the side of the allies, Japanese nationals continued to be discriminated in the US.

A number of speeches Wilson had delivered had painted a picture of hope and prosperity for the future world, a portion of one such speech is quoted below:

'Only a peace between equals can last. Only a peace the very principle of which is equality and a common participation in a common benefit (can last). The right state of mind, the right feeling between nations, is as necessary for a lasting peace as is the just settlement of vexed questions of territory or of racial and national

allegiance. The equality of nations upon which peace must be founded, if it is to last, must be an equality of rights.’<sup>28</sup>

This message had impressed the Japanese very much, and despite their lack of confidence in the US they believed that Wilson could rise above American domestic politics and help the Japanese achieve their goals in racial equality issue.

But the Japanese did not know Wilson’s attitude to race. In fact several years earlier Wilson on the issue of Asian immigration had advocated for a policy of exclusion. The relevant portion of his speech is presented below:

‘I stand for the national policy of exclusion. We can not make a homogenous population out of a people who do not blend with the Caucasian race. Oriental coolieism will give us another race problem to solve and surely we have had our lesson.’<sup>29</sup>

In fact Wilson, was not particularly liberal on the issue of race, he was a southerner after all. Although Wilson ‘had appealed for black votes in his first campaign for the presidency, he had done little for blacks once he was in office.’<sup>30</sup> Wilson was the first to have introduced segregation into departments of the US federal government. When the black Americans lodged their protest with him, Wilson condescendingly had replied that segregation is not humiliation but a benefit, and should be so regarded. On numerous occasions Wilson, when approached by blacks to enact antilynching laws and to help fight discrimination, had done very little. The sheer number of blacks in the US forces during the World War One posed many domestic and international problems related to race, which Wilson, instead of solving, tried to evade. Blacks accused Wilson ‘of maintaining a lukewarm “aloofness” toward racial questions and of “cautious and calculated neglect”’.<sup>31</sup> Wilson even dispatched an emissary to France after World War One to stop the returning black soldiers from demanding equality in the US.

## **6. Informal Talks With The United States And Britain:**

Japanese plenipotentiaries considered the US as the biggest potential obstacle, because of the long history of prejudices against the Japanese that existed in the US, in achieving their objective of getting the abolition of racial discrimination proposal approved. So the Japanese considered it necessary to reach a compromise with the plenipotentiaries of the US. They thought of achieving this by talking to Colonel Edward House, who was most trusted by Wilson. But as House was recuperating from an illness, Japanese plenipotentiary Chinda, paid a visit to the US Secretary of State Lansing on 26 January 1919. Chinda after explaining the Japanese position wished to find out the views of the US on Japanese proposal. Lansing appeared supportive but did not express his views on the subject. However during the

meeting Lansing mentioned that Wilson wished to meet Chinda and discuss the issue of the League of Nations with him. Wilson in an earlier meeting on January 22, 1919 had appreciatingly acknowledged Japan's acceptance of the Fourteen Points. His remarks and desire to meet with Chinda made Japanese delegation feel that Wilson perhaps intended a compromise on the subject.<sup>32</sup> This feeling encouraged the Japanese of the need for and advantage of conducting preliminary discussions with the US. However Wilson became very occupied thereafter and could not give an appointment for a meeting. So Makino and Chinda called on House on 2 February 1919.

Wilson's close friend and adviser House was encouraging and friendly, and he mentioned that 'he had always hated racial prejudice and would do his best to help'<sup>33</sup> the Japanese. Encouraged, Makino and Chinda explained in general terms the Japanese position. House, in stead of assuring support, showed hesitation. House 'stated that he, of course, personally deplored any prejudice of race and described it as "one of the serious causes of international trouble" and a problem that someday "should in some way be met".'<sup>34</sup> House advised caution and advised the Japanese to draft two versions: one stating what they wanted, and the other saying the minimum they would accept.<sup>35</sup> The Japanese found House sympathetic and that made them divulge the outline of their government's instructions on the subject.

In order to reach a compromise the Japanese on 4 February 1919, presented House, first Proposal A, out of the two proposals A and B they had prepared, for incorporation in the Covenant of the League of Nations. Proposal A in original English text read:

'The equality of the nations being a basic principle of the League of Nations, the High Contracting Parties agree that concerning the treatment and rights to be accorded to aliens in their territories, they will not discriminate, either in law or in fact, against any person or persons on account of his or their race or nationality.'<sup>36</sup>

Yet according to House, he 'discarded at once'<sup>37</sup> this proposal that championed the principle of racial equality in the world. Japanese plenipotentiaries eager to appease the US to reach a compromise immediately presented a diluted version, the Proposal B that in original English text read:

'The equality of nations being a basic principle of the League of Nations the High Contracting Parties agree that concerning the treatment of aliens in their territories, they will accord them, as far as it lies in their legitimate powers, equal treatment and rights, in law and in fact, without making any distinction on account of their race (or) and nationality.'<sup>38</sup>

House assured personal support to Proposal B and also assured Wilson's approval, and stated that, 'depending on Japan's desire, this might be presented to the Commission as the proposal of the President.'<sup>39</sup> Japanese delegation despite realising that this method of presentation, as the proposal of the US President, had its demerits, agreed with the suggestion of House.

On 5 February 1919, House informed Japanese plenipotentiaries that he had conferred with Wilson, who had amended the wording 'as far as it lies in their legitimate powers' of the Proposal B to 'as far as speedily and possible', and that the President had no objection to making Proposal B as his own by incorporating it in the Covenant of the League of the Nations.<sup>40</sup> Wilson's modification of the second proposal, from Japanese point of view, meant it was practically meaningless.<sup>41</sup> The Japanese had expected their proposal to be accepted from both pragmatism and principle point of view, so much so that a prominent voice in the Imperial Diet of Japan had announced that the world does not belong to the European alone, thereby implying that the Japanese proposal stood a good chance of adoption by the League. *The Japan Advertiser*, of 6 February 1919, of Japan, had expressed a view along a similar vein by saying that Japan and China have more people than all the other nations, thereby emphasising that Japan and China have to be admitted as members of the League; and until race discrimination, an indignity that Japanese and Chinese experienced, is abolished there can be no League of Nations. Yet the Japanese faced almost insurmountable objection right from the beginning in their negotiations at Paris Peace Conference.

House informed of another important development. House stated that the US had initiated preliminary negotiations with the British on the Japanese proposal, and the British unexpectedly stated considerable agreement.<sup>42</sup> But House also warned that the British agreement was an immediate reaction which the British might change after further deliberation. Once Japanese plenipotentiaries learnt of the British supportive response, they decided to abstain from direct negotiation with Britain awaiting Anglo-American talks. However, due to resistance by British Dominions, British opposition to Japanese proposal gradually surfaced. Therefore Japanese delegation consulted with House again and recognised the need of direct negotiations with the British. The Japanese in their earnest search for a compromise, further diluted their proposal<sup>43</sup> at their meetings with British plenipotentiaries Robert Cecil, who was also the chairman of the League of Nations Commission, and British Foreign Secretary Arthur Balfour. Balfour thought that the idea that all men are equal is interesting, but did not agree with it; and said 'You could scarcely say that a man in Central Africa was equal to a European.'<sup>44</sup> Balfour also had cautioned House that people, in the US and in the British Empire, viewed Japanese racial equality proposal as

the first step to dismantle controls on Japanese immigration. ‘He was aware of this, House replied, but Japan did have a problem with too many people. Perhaps, he (Balfour) added hopefully, they could all go to Siberia – or Brazil.’<sup>45</sup>

No wonder the British showed reservation. Although Cecil and Balfour assured to have understood the position of Japan, they did not agree with Japanese proposal on the pretext that the subject was a serious one and it was completely beyond their instructions. They also asserted that the race issue was irrelevant to the League of Nations and therefore ought not to be considered for inclusion in the Covenant.<sup>46</sup> Moreover, Cecil believed that such a grave issue ‘should not be decided by a majority vote.’<sup>47</sup>

## **7. Proposal To The League Of Nations:**

After informal talks with Britain and the US, Japanese delegates became convinced that the adoption of either of their proposals A or B would not be easy. At that time the first round of deliberations on the draft Covenant of the League was nearing conclusion.<sup>48</sup> Japanese delegation considered it was timely and necessary for the future to publicise Japan’s position on the subject. Accordingly the Japanese amended the draft, ‘which had been agreed with the President of the US, proposed at the League of Nations Commission held on 13 February 1919, to add their provision to the provision on the freedom of religion in Article 21 of the draft Covenant.’<sup>49</sup>

Japanese plenipotentiary Makino addressed the Commission to secure the passage of Japanese draft proposal. In English he stated, ‘the additional clause I am about to propose, I consider as coming appropriately under Article 21. It is not necessary to dwell on the fact that racial and religious animosities have constituted a fruitful source of trouble and warfare among different peoples throughout history, often leading to deplorable excesses. This article, as it stands, attempts to eliminate religious causes of strife from international relationship, and as the race question is also a standing difficulty which may become acute and dangerous at any moment in future, it is desirable that a provision should be made in this Covenant for the treatment of this subject. It would seem that matters of religion and race could well go together. I wish to add the clause:

“The equality of nations being a basic principle of the League of Nations, the High Contracting Parties agree to accord, as soon as possible, to all alien nationals of States members of the League, equal and just treatment in every respect, making no distinction, either in law or in fact, on account of their race or nationality.”<sup>50</sup>; directly after the end of the article as it stands. That race discrimination still exists in law and in fact, is undeniable and it is enough here simply to state the fact of its existence.’

Makino's speech on 13 February 1919, in the words of one observer 'struck fire at once.'<sup>51</sup> Makino's speech was 'a moving and liberal statement, but it made no difference'<sup>52</sup> to the delegates from the US, Britain, and the British Dominions.

On 13 February 1919, the day Makino delivered his above mentioned speech to the League of Nations Commission, Wilson was not present in the Commission as he was away attending the Five Great Powers Conference. British plenipotentiary Robert Cecil, who was the Chairman of the Commission, opposed the Japanese proposal, 'emphasising that this was an extremely difficult question affecting various quarters and, as it was subject to intense disputes, he wished to avoid having this provision incorporated in the Covenant of the League of Nations.'<sup>53</sup> Cecil said that this 'highly controversial matter was already causing problems within the British Empire delegation.'<sup>54</sup> Cecil suggested postponement of the debate on the subject to a future date.

Greek delegate Venizelos argued that the Japanese proposal was premature. He stated that the issue of racial discrimination should be expedited in view of the recent war. Since an immediate settlement would be difficult; and since the issue of religion was being included, a clause regarding race could not be denied. So he advised not to incorporate any provisions concerning either race or religion.<sup>55</sup> Belgian delegate Paul Hymans advised either to delete or to incorporate both religion and race, but the Japanese proposal deserved more consideration.<sup>56</sup> Paul Hymans later declared his opposition to the Japanese proposal.

Contrary to the voices of opposition from Britain, Greece and Belgium; the delegates of Brazil, Romania and Czechoslovakia declared their support for the Japanese proposal, arguing that it was proper to include a provision on racial equality. The delegate from France remarked that the two problems race and religion were related and he wished to delete both of them. The delegate from China supported Japan and stated that China was also interested in the subject of race.<sup>57</sup> The Chinese delegate reserved the right to speak on the subject later.

After Makino's speech on 13 Feb 1919, when House noticed that the tension in the Commission was intense and rising, House desirous of avoiding a head on clash, proposed to defer the debate.<sup>58,59</sup> At this point in time Cecil, the British plenipotentiary who was also the Chairman of the League of Nations Commission, invited the Commission to consider deletion of Article 21 all together. As the majority favoured deletion, the Japanese proposal failed to be adopted. That was, however, not the end of the road for the Japanese proposal. House stated that Wilson regarded the provision on religion important, and he was uncertain of Wilson's views on deletion and wished to confer with him. If Wilson insisted on reinstating the Article 21, House proposed to convene another Commission meeting.<sup>60</sup> If however Wilson approved the deletion, House proposed to convene the Plenary Session in the



afternoon of February 14, 1919 for Wilson to introduce the agreed proposal of the Commission.<sup>61</sup> The delay House proposed was achieved by temporarily withdrawing Wilson's favourite religious tolerance clause, to which the Japanese had attached their amendment. Other delegates accepted the proposal of House with the clear understanding that there would be more debate on the subject.<sup>62</sup>

After the meeting, however, at Wilson's behest, the Covenant was printed and circulated as it stood, purposefully omitting any reference to racial equality. Next day, on 14 February 1919, Wilson read the text at the Plenary Session, in a speech introducing the first revised draft of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and 'nothing at all appeared about race.'<sup>63</sup> Wilson had deleted the stipulations on religion and race.<sup>64</sup> The move to deceive the Japanese by avoiding an open debate on the race issue infuriated the Japanese delegates and their supporters. 'Controlling his anger but refusing to be silenced, Baron Makino announced' that Japan considered racial equality of fundamental importance to the world and therefore would submit the proposal again at the earliest opportunity.<sup>65</sup> Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan records the incident in more polite and moderate words by saying:

'So Makino expressed his felicitations on the draft Covenant of the League and at the same time reserved his position by adding that, at a later session, he would present a proposal, which he wished would be considered favourably.'<sup>66</sup>

That very evening of 14 Feb 1919, Wilson left Paris for Washington, partly to avoid the reaction that was bound to follow his action.<sup>67</sup>

#### **8. Racial Equality Issue Becomes Public And Japanese Efforts Outside The Conference:**

After the plenary session on 14 February 1919, racial equality issue proposed by Japan became public knowledge. All the delegates at Paris Peace Conference came to know about the Japanese proposal. The issue of discrimination aroused passions and affected the outcome of negotiations. In this emotion charged situation Makino gave an interview to the correspondent of the *New York Herald* to air his appeal to reach a fair resolution. A statement from Makino's interview is presented below:

'All people must be prepared to do a little hard thinking, and to have enough courage to part with many prejudices we have inherited from our ancestors, among which are racial prejudices.'<sup>68</sup>

This statement of Makino, universal in its appeal, contradicts the accusation of Shimazu<sup>69</sup> that Japanese proposal on racial equality was not a universal one.

In Japan, legislative and public meetings protested the 'badge of shame'<sup>70</sup> imposed by the white race against the coloured races of the world. Around the world private citizens who

strove to eliminate racial discrimination, spoke and wrote articles in many languages highlighting ‘the importance of human rights in international relations.’<sup>71</sup> Japan’s prominent newspaper *Asahi*, compared the Japanese mission at Paris Peace Conference with the British mission at the 1815 Congress of Vienna, where only the British despite strong opposition fought for humanity and justice by opposing the practice of slavery. A portion of the article from *Asahi* is presented below:

‘Now the question of racial discrimination occupies today precisely the position which that of slavery did then...Japan being the leading coloured Power, it falls on her to go forward to fight for the cause of two-thirds of the population of the world. Japan could not fight for a nobler cause...Japan must endeavour to make the Peace Conference leave behind a glorious record of putting an end to an inhuman and anti-civilisation practice as did the Vienna Conference a hundred years ago.’<sup>72</sup>

*Nichinichi* bluntly wrote, ‘The contention against racial discrimination must be insisted upon to the last.’<sup>73</sup>

Japanese delegates, anticipating futility in negotiations at Paris, also appealed directly to President Wilson, in their tireless effort to get racial equality proposal adopted by the League of Nations. Viscount Kikujiro Ishii, the Ambassador of Japan to the US, handed a memorandum to Wilson on the race issue, the day Wilson left Washington for returning to Paris Peace Conference. Ishii politely thanked Wilson for his ‘sympathy and support’, and cautioned Wilson that should the Japanese racial equality clause ‘fail of general recognition, the Japanese Government do not see how a perpetual friction and discontent among nations and races could possibly be eliminated.’<sup>74</sup> Ishii also informed Wilson that Japan viewed racial equality proposal as an issue of the first order and would not give up pursuing its goal.

Not content with the personal appeal on the race issue to Wilson, Ishii addressed the Japan Society in New York on 14 March 1919, to create public support and to put pressure on Wilson. Ishii highlighted ‘that a great war for international justice had just been fought with races fighting “side by side” and Ishii asked ‘Why should this question of race prejudice, of race discrimination, of race humiliation be left unremedied?’<sup>75</sup> Ishii mentioned that the injustice of inequality should be separated from the political issue of labour and immigration, because one resulted from economic factors where as the other involved sentiment, pride, and self-esteem. Ishii proclaimed that Japan would not use the principle of racial equality as a means of introducing more migrants into the US. Ishii’s pronouncements created immediate interest among statesmen and diplomats.

The *New York Times* of the following day, 15 March 1919, acknowledged the effect of Ishii’s actions with the following words:

‘not only the remarks of the Ambassador but also the earnestness with which he uttered his plea developed immediate interest among statesmen and diplomats.’<sup>76</sup> The paper also stated that Japan intended to make a definite stand on the race discrimination issue.

After Ishii’s speech Japanese residents of Hawaii sent telegrams to the US delegation advising to support the racial equality principle.<sup>77</sup> The *Asahi* in its editorial wrote:

‘Americans were “very sensitive of race problems” but must be reminded of their own Declaration of Independence, which contained “unmistakable guarantees of justice and equality to all mankind”.’<sup>78</sup>

Private petitioners in Japan joined and ‘explicitly warned the council at Paris that unless it abolished every racial hindrance and disqualification, “all conferences of peace, alliances, and leagues of nations can be build only on sand.”’<sup>79</sup>

### **9. Japan’s Expanded And Intensive Negotiations:**

The British resistance to the Japanese proposal originated from Prime Ministers of the British dominions. So Japanese delegation endeavoured to persuade the Prime Minister of Australia Hughes and the Prime Minister of Canada Sir Robert Borden to end their opposition to the Japanese proposal.<sup>80</sup> But Japanese delegation considered achieving its goal very difficult, so much so that it rated its chances of success only ten or twenty per cent. Japanese delegates, however, were determined, in case their attempts proved unsuccessful, to present their proposal again to clarify Japan’s position for the world to see.<sup>81</sup>

On 14 March 1919, Japanese plenipotentiaries Makino and Chinda called on Hughes and pleaded with him to change his stance. Makino and Chinda emphasised that the Japanese proposal was not intended to overturn the presently existing legislations, but aimed to clarify the principle of equal treatment. Practical issues of immigration, they stressed, could be resolved in future, by the concerned countries. In reply Hughes admitted that in principle nobody could object to the elimination of racial discrimination, but in practice it was an extremely difficult issue. Hughes expressed that he could not ignore his country’s public opinion; and he could not assure if the ‘wording of the Japanese proposal was acceptable to him without fully studying it.’<sup>82</sup>

Japanese delegates again highlighted that their demand was to clarify the compatibility of racial equality with the fundamental principles of the League of Nations and hoped that Australia would carefully study the proposal in view of the growing public opinion in Japan. Japanese delegates stated that their intention of submitting a proposal on racial equality shortly and they desired Australian support for it. The Japanese promised to take the opinion of Hughes in to account. Japanese delegates requested Hughes to study the proposal to enable

both sides to engage in free and frank discussions.<sup>83</sup> Thereupon Makino and Chinda took leave of Hughes, promising to meet again.

‘But Hughes took a non-committal attitude throughout.’<sup>84</sup> In Wilson’s absence from Paris from mid-February to mid-March, the British tried to resolve the issue through a compromise. ‘The French who had nothing at stake, watched with amusement.’<sup>85</sup>

Subsequently newspapers reported that the US was planning to present the draft of the Covenant of the League of Nations jointly with the draft of the preliminary Peace Treaty. At Wilson’s insistence France also appeared to support this method. Therefore Japanese plenipotentiaries Makino and Chinda held a meeting with House on March 18, 1919 and sought his views. House stated that simultaneous adoption of the two drafts was required to enforce the Treaty in future, so the US planned to present them together. House also mentioned that he would listen to the views of neutral countries on 19 March 1919 before presenting the original draft Covenant of the League of Nations to the Commission.<sup>86</sup> In response to further queries from Makino and Chinda, House mentioned that the draft Covenant of the League of Nations required minor modifications to clarify certain points but the fundamentals would remain unchanged.

The draft preliminary Peace Treaty was nearing completion and preparations for its delivery to the countries led by Germany was to be finished in the next two weeks. The Japanese delegates, therefore, asked House if the draft Covenant of the League of Nations would also be submitted around that time. House was vague on the subject and suggested that he would be presenting ‘it in good time’.<sup>87</sup> Japanese delegates drew his attention to the inflamed public opinion in Japan on the issue of racial equality. House expressed regret and advised that Japan should try to attain her objective when the League of Nations were to be established.<sup>88</sup>

Japanese delegates then tried to ascertain if President Wilson’s attitude on racial equality remained unchanged. House in a lighter vein answered that, as far as he knew, there was no change. An analysis of Houses’ responses made the Japanese delegates suspect that the US President might have changed his mind after his return to the US.<sup>89</sup> Japanese delegates realised that the draft Covenant of the League of Nations would be decided inside one week. Therefore, the Japanese submitted a modified proposal to remedy racial discrimination. But due to the sudden change, the Japanese delegates realised that the chances of getting their revised proposal accepted by the League of Nations Commission had diminished.

Japanese delegates, since holding their talk with Hughes on 14 March 1919, had sought many appointments to hold discussions with him. But Hughes seemed to have been avoiding Japanese delegation 'on the pretext of either travel or illness'.<sup>90</sup>

#### **10. Further Revisions To The Proposal:**

After realising that the chances of reaching an agreement were very slim, Makino and Chinda decided to make serious changes to the Japanese proposal. In view of the strong opposition they revised the amendment and the word, race, was avoided. An acrimonious debate in the Japanese delegation ensued when some members objected to the omission of the word race. One furious delegate said, 'It is absolutely meaningless. Stick to equality (of race) or no. Let us be honest with those who oppose us, even if they fear to be honest with us.'<sup>91</sup> The reasonableness of the milder amended version was considered by the Japanese delegates to guarantee approval.<sup>92</sup> The revised Proposal A, in original English text read:

'Equality of Nations being a basic principle of the League of Nations, the High Contracting Parties agree to endorse the principle of equal and just treatment to be accorded to all alien nationals of States members of the League.'<sup>93</sup>

On 21 March 1919, Japanese plenipotentiaries called on Australian Attorney General Sir Robert Garran and presented the Japanese contention and sought an appointment with Hughes for a discussion. On the same day Japanese plenipotentiaries Makino and Chinda met with House with the amended version where the word race did not figure at all. House, upon examining the text agreed to the Japanese proposal subject to the following two conditions:

1. Deletion of the word equality from the text,
2. Insertion of the Japanese proposal into the Preamble of the Covenant and not as an independent operative clause of the Covenant that would imply enforcement.<sup>94</sup>

House' advice spelt the emasculation of the Japanese proposal. The meeting with House concluded with the understanding that the British resistance must be eliminated before the presentation of the Japanese proposal.<sup>95</sup>

On 22 March 1919 Hughes through Robert Garran conveyed his disagreement by saying 'that he could not regrettably agree to that proposal, which though more general than the previous one, remained the same in substance'.<sup>96</sup>

In view of the opposition of the British and the US, Japanese delegates revised their proposal again to Proposal B. Japanese delegates proposed the inclusion of the wording 'recognising the principle that all the member nations of the League are equal' in the preamble of the Covenant.<sup>97</sup> On the same day, 22 March 1919, Japanese delegates met House and through him presented the revised new Proposal B to the US President and obtained his agreement.

On 23 March 1919, Makino and Chinda paid a visit to the British plenipotentiary Robert Cecil and appraised him of the negotiations with the US and Australia, and asked for British support for the new Japanese Proposal B. Cecil offered his personal support, but declined a definite reply because the issue 'was after all an Australian one.'<sup>98</sup> Cecil promised to discuss with delegates of the British Empire to reach an agreement to discuss further with the Japanese before the next Commission meeting.

On 24 March 1919, the Japanese delegates called on Cecil just before the League of Nations Commission opened. Cecil explained that Australian Prime Minister, and others, were absolutely opposed to the Japanese proposal. Cecil advised that only a compromise through discussions with the Australian Prime Minister and others might break the impasse.<sup>99</sup> The Japanese replied that they would be happy to talk and requested for further help from Cecil in arranging meetings.

### **11. Negotiations With Prime Ministers Of The British Empire:**

British plenipotentiary Cecil organised a meeting on 25 March 1919, at Canadian Prime Minister Borden's quarters with Prime Ministers of the British Empire for reaching an accommodation with the Japanese. The meeting was attended by Japanese plenipotentiaries Makino and Chinda; Prime Ministers of Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Newfoundland; General Smuts of South Africa, and Cecil. At the meeting that lasted two hours, the Japanese emphasised that their proposal was intended to clarify the principle of equality and was unrelated to the issue of immigration.<sup>100</sup> Japanese delegates mentioned the strong public opinion in Japan over the issue of racial equality and sought to obtain agreement. The Prime Ministers and others, however, emphasised that they understood Japanese stance, but since the application of the Japanese proposal could not be restricted to the Japanese but could also be applied to the Chinese and the Indians made its acceptance difficult unless the word equality was altered.

Japanese delegates strove to retain the word equality because this very word encapsulated the essence of the Japanese proposal and its deletion would destroy the proposal. Canadian Prime Minister Borden suggested a compromise. His words were: 'recognising the equality among the States and the principle of fair treatment to their nationals.'<sup>101</sup> Many of the Prime Ministers agreed, but only Hughes maintained his opposition and stormed out of the meeting. The other Prime Ministers were very offended, but they saw the necessity to persuade Hughes and begged the Japanese to allow them some more time.

The meeting ended without a concrete conclusion. The Prime Ministers of the British Empire believed that Hughes' attitude was motivated by the approaching general election in Australia. Prime Minister Massey of New Zealand also faced an election and sided with

Hughes. The forthcoming election in Australia provided a good opportunity to Hughes to raise his profile as the protector of Australia by defending White Australia Policy which was the policy of national defence. Thus the outcome of the Japanese proposal solely depended on Hughes.<sup>102</sup>

At one point, in sheer anger and frustration, Makino at a press conference declared that if Japan lost on racial equality issue, it might refuse to join the League of Nations. 'We are not too proud to fight but we are too proud to accept a place of admitted inferiority in dealing with one or more of the associated nations,' Makino said, and added, 'We want nothing but simple justice.'<sup>103</sup> This threat, although did not secure the adoption of Racial Equality Bill by the League of Nations, did contribute to the eventual success of securing the other two items of the Japanese agenda.

## **12. Negotiations To Obtain The Support Of Australian Prime Minister:**

On 26 March 1919, Japanese delegates called on the plenipotentiary of South Africa General Smuts and expressed their willingness to substitute the word 'state' by 'nation' in the earlier mentioned compromise proposal.<sup>104</sup> Japanese delegates also sought Smuts' view on seeking British Prime Minister's help for securing the support of Australian Prime Minister. Smuts replied that Hughes as a Peace Conference delegate did not represent Britain, so he would not be influenced by the British Prime Minister. Smuts advised caution in negotiating with Hughes. Therefore the Japanese delegates decided to rely solely on Smuts and Massey to persuade Hughes, in the process perhaps committing a strategic mistake.

On 27 March 1919 Japanese delegates called on House and appraised him of the negotiations with the Prime Ministers.<sup>105</sup> House stated no objection to the new Japanese proposal and mentioned that Hughes had often clashed with President Wilson, and suspected that Hughes's present defiant attitude could be due to his opposition to Wilson.

On 29 March 1919, Smuts informed Makino that he met with Hughes and persuaded him to support the Japanese proposal. Hughes in turn had stated that he was not opposed to Japan as such but was afraid of the Chinese who might demand immigration in to Australia and therefore would not drop his resistance to racial equality proposal. Hughes had emphasised that if the Japanese proposal were to be enshrined in the draft Covenant of the League he would oppose it at the Plenary Session, and would raise the immigration issue. Hughes had declared that should it be adopted, he would decline to sign the Covenant. Smuts further mentioned that Massey was not personally opposed to racial equality proposal and had endeavoured to persuade Hughes, but Massey had to support Hughes due to the forthcoming election in New Zealand.

Smuts was regretful of his futile efforts and mentioned that the British had no option but to resist the Japanese proposal in support of Empire Prime Ministers. Smuts cautioned that attempts to enshrine the proposal in the Covenant of the League would fail.<sup>106</sup> Smuts' final advice was that Japan may have to think stipulating equal opportunity in the conditions of trade presently under consideration at the Economic Commission. Makino thanked Smuts and regretted that Japan was still facing unreasonable and resolute resistance from Hughes despite making the utmost compromises. Makino also warned that the details of the negotiations and the impasse due to the actions of Hughes alone would become public, and that would further inflame Japanese people. At that moment House joined the talks and after gathering from Smuts the nature of the discussion stated that if Hughes interrupted the discussions on the Covenant of the League by invoking the immigration issue at the Plenary Session, a serious problem would arise in the United States that would force Wilson to resist the Japanese proposal. Makino deplored the impasse despite the efforts of Smuts and House and stated that Japan would never change her position and he would seize every opportunity to achieve his Government's demand.

On 30 March 1919, Makino and Chinda called on Smuts and stated that the Japanese delegation had carefully considered the idea of holding a convention, but discarded it because of the 'legitimacy and the moderate nature of their proposal' and inflamed public opinion in Japan.<sup>107</sup> Japanese delegates stated that many organisations in Japan were holding innumerable meetings, and public opinion was getting more vocal, demanding that Japan should boycott the League of Nations unless the proposal on racial equality was adopted. Smuts suggested to find a new approach to break the impasse. Smuts reiterated his suggestion of holding a general convention on a purely mutual basis. Japanese delegates, however, declined the convention as a replacement for their racial equality proposal because such an approach was offered many times by the US in connection with regulating Japanese immigration, but had been rejected by Japan because, although it claimed mutuality and appeared fair but, it totally ignored the reality. The Japanese delegates cited House that the only way to deal with the impasse, was to adopt racial equality proposal at the Commission and ignore Hughes at the Plenary Session. The Japanese delegates urged Smuts to support their cause.

Smuts, however, remarked that Hughes was determined to demonstrate an absolute opposition at the Commission resolved not to sign the Covenant and incite public opinion, and that might inflame opposition in the US creating a difficult situation that the US wants to prevent by all means. Smuts also added that the British Government would feel most pain at the criticism that they forgot the enormous war sacrifices of Australia if they were to ignore



Australian position. Thus Smuts elaborately explained the problems of taking a forceful approach as suggested by the Japanese, and finally ended the meeting with the remark, 'some way out might be found.'<sup>108</sup>

On 31 March 1919, Japanese delegates called on House and apprised him of their discussions with Smuts and sought the support of the US. House was angry to learn that the negotiations had reached such an impasse and announced that 'should the British take a determined attitude' (to support the Japanese proposal) 'the US would not hesitate to go along with them.'<sup>109</sup> House also added that should the people of Japan misunderstand the US over the issue of racial equality, regrettably future relations between the two countries might suffer.

In the afternoon of the same day (31 March 1919) Smuts invited the Japanese delegates to visit him. Smuts stated that he had proposed Hughes an amendment where immigration and naturalisation laws are mentioned as examples of domestic affairs in concordance with the ruling that the Executive Commission should not make recommendations on purely domestic affairs, of the meetings of the League of Nations Commissions on the 24<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> of March. Hughes had replied to consider and had shown some appreciation.<sup>110</sup> Japanese delegates declared that such issues should be determined by the League of Nations in the future, but at this point, they were totally against stating such examples. Japanese delegates explained the Japan-US immigration issue and the history of deletion of the last paragraph of Article II of the old US-Japan treaty of Commerce and Navigation; and requested Smuts to withdraw the said amended proposal immediately.

Borden and Smuts shuttled between Hughes and the Japanese delegates; and arranged for Makino and Chinda to meet Hughes. The Japanese considered Hughes a 'peasant' and Hughes complained of them 'beslobbering me with genuflexions and obsequious deference'<sup>111</sup>; and the deadlock continued.

Smuts suddenly departed on a tour of Hungary. On 3 April 1919, Makino and Chinda called on the British Prime Minister and explained at length the history, negotiations and development of the Japanese proposal. Japanese plenipotentiaries sought his good offices to persuade Hughes and break the impasse. The British Prime Minister expressed his agreement with Japanese view and 'promised to do his best after consulting with Canadian Prime Minister Borden and South African Prime Minister Botha'.<sup>112</sup>

Japanese delegates subsequently spoke directly with Botha and Borden as well as with Smuts, who had come back to France, but their efforts to persuade Hughes were futile. Makino also spoke with Henry Wickham Steed, the chief editor of *The Times* of London, in an attempt to persuade Hughes through the influence of that newspaper. Hughes, however,

decided to leave 'Paris in case Japan's demand should be accepted.'<sup>113</sup> Obviously reaching a compromise appeared hopeless.

The League of Nations Commission moved steadily and the discussions on the draft Covenant were to be concluded at the meeting on 11 April 1919. So the Japanese decided to present their racial equality proposal regardless of the views of Hughes. Japanese delegates none the less requested for one more meeting with Hughes to persuade him, but he declined the request because of illness.<sup>114</sup> But he attended the Commission meeting on 11 April 1919 making it obvious that he had avoided meeting the Japanese purposefully.

### **13. Presentation Of The Proposal At The League Of Nations Commission:**

In the evening of 11 April 1919, in the final session of the League of Nations Commission, the article-by-article study of the draft Covenant was concluded. The moment a discussion on the preamble commenced, to clarify its position the Japanese delegation proposed to include the phrase 'by the endorsement of the principle of equality of nations and just treatment of their nationals'<sup>115</sup> in the Covenant.

The 11<sup>th</sup> of April 1919 'was indeed a day of battle.'<sup>116</sup> Wilson chaired the final session of the League of Nations Commission that continued up to one o'clock in the morning. Wilson had just concluded a tough battle to preserve the *status quo* of Monroe Doctrine with a special reservation clause that nothing in the Covenant would affect its validity. The US delegates had been very adamant over this issue, and House had warned 'to ride over' any opposition, declaring that 'they could go to Hell seven thousand feet deep' because the clause 'was going to be put through the way it was.'<sup>117</sup> The French had resisted the special privilege Americans had sought, but the US motion had passed with Japanese support. So the Japanese expected a similar support from the Americans for their racial equality proposal. Moreover the Japanese had fixed their positions on 'the burning question.'<sup>118</sup>

In a hostile atmosphere and predetermined stands Makino rose to deliver his speech. Cecil had British instructions to support the British colonies and to vote against Japan.<sup>119</sup> Hughes 'continued to harangue' and declared that 'he remained unalterably opposed to the proposal in any form'.<sup>120</sup>

Makino as in previous occasions 'calmly but firmly renewed the Japanese plea for racial equality.'<sup>121</sup> A portion of Makino's speech<sup>122</sup> relevant to the thesis is presented as follows: 'I have already had occasion to bring up this subject before the committee, but it was in another form and with a different meaning. The subject is a matter of such great moment and concern for a considerable part of mankind and especially to the nation I represent, that I deem it my duty to present it again for your consideration...

This League is intended to be a world instrument for enforcing righteousness and defeating force. It is to be the highest Court of Justice... It is an attempt to regulate the conduct of nations and peoples towards one another according to a higher moral standard than has obtained in the past, and to administer fairer justice throughout the world. These ideas have touched the inmost human soul and have quickened the common feelings of different peoples scattered over the five continents. It has given birth to hopes and aspirations, and strengthened the sense of legitimate claims they consider as their due...

In close connection with the grievances of the oppressed nationalities, there exist the wrongs of racial discrimination, which was, and is, the subject of deep resentment on the part of a large portion of human race. The feeling of being slighted has long been a standing grievance with certain peoples. And the announcement of the principle of justice for peoples and nationalities as the basis of the future international relationship has so heightened their legitimate aspirations, that they consider it their right that this wrong should be redressed...

Believing these conditions to be indispensable, I think it only reasonable that the principle of equality of nations and the just treatment of their nationals should be laid down as a fundamental basis of future relations in this world organisation. If this reasonable and just claim is now denied, it will, in the eyes of those peoples with reason to be keenly interested, have the significance of a reflection on their quality and status. Their faith in the justice and righteousness, which are to be the guiding spirit of the Covenant, may be shaken...

It is not intended that the amendment should encroach on the internal affairs of any nation. It simply sets forth a guiding principle for future international intercourse. The work of carrying out this principle comes within the indisputable competence of the proper authorities. This amendment does not fully meet our wishes, but it is an attempt to conciliate the viewpoints of different peoples, the result arrived at after a thorough and mature consideration of various aspects and realities of present international relations.<sup>123</sup>

After delivering his speech Makino sat down before a stunned audience. The 'presentation was admirably done and it seemed to me that they had the support of the entire room'<sup>124</sup>, recorded an unidentified member of the US delegation, according to David Hunter Miller. Others described Makino's speech as 'cogent' and 'impressive', 'dignified', 'strong', 'admirable', and 'most embarrassing' to those who opposed the Japanese position<sup>125</sup>. Lauren<sup>126</sup> records 'By all accounts, Makino presented a most persuasive and moving

performance'. MacMillan<sup>127</sup> has recorded, 'Makino and Chinda both spoke moderately and calmly. They made a very good impression.'

#### **14. Discussion On The Proposal:**

After the shock dissipated and 'other possible speakers had deferred or fled', Robert Cecil speaking for the British Empire delivered a 'pathetic speech' with 'a deliberate evasion of the issue.'<sup>128</sup> Cecil declared his personal agreement with racial equality proposal but opposed the amendment by saying 'that it appeared entirely meaningless to include such a phrase.'<sup>129</sup> Cecil argued that the issue of immigration was an entirely internal matter, and if the principle of equality among nations were to be enshrined in the Covenant, provisions regarding the feminine issue, would also have to be included, referring to the previous day's meeting that had listened to the aspirations of the women's rights movement. Cecil contended that racial equality issue should be deferred till the League of Nations is well established, and he argued that if racial equality clause was adopted it would 'open the doors to an immense controversy and to an intrusion into the domestic legislation of the states.'<sup>130</sup> Cecil finally pointed out that Japan already is one of the five great Powers, so the treatment of Japanese nationals was not a problematic issue as far as the League was concerned.<sup>131</sup> After finishing his speech, Cecil 'sat silent with eyes fixed on the table, and took no part in the subsequent debate.'<sup>132</sup>

Chinda instantly responded to the objections raised by Cecil 'in the strongest possible language yet used by Japan on the issue.'<sup>133</sup> Chinda stated that the modified amendment pleaded only for a formal recognition of the principle of equality of nations and the just treatment of their nationals. Endorsement of this amendment would 'signify that all the members of the League should be treated with equality and justice'; rejection however, would indicate 'that the equality of members of the League is not recognised'.<sup>134</sup>

Thereafter US President Wilson called upon the other delegates to express their opinions. Prime Minister Vittorio Orlando of Italy voiced his support for racial equality. Equality was an issue that should not have been raised, he said, but once raised, the amendment must be adopted.<sup>135</sup> Orlando also stated that racial equality proposal represented the ideal towards which they were proceeding and such a proposal must be adopted.<sup>136</sup>

Senator Leon Bourgeois of France urged adoption of racial equality proposal, and contended that the proposal is impossible to reject because it contained 'an indisputable principle of justice.'<sup>137</sup> Bourgeois also announced his total agreement with Orlando. Larnaud of France expressed his agreement and stated that the new Japanese proposal emphasised a principle without asking for its immediate enforcement. Venizelos of Greece made an elaborate statement saying that on the previous occasion on 13 February 1919, he had argued

for the exclusion of the proposals on religion and race, and consequently the original Japanese proposal that posed difficulties all over the world had failed, but the present proposal, represented the principle of equality among nations, without imposing any special obligation, and therefore must be supported.<sup>138</sup> Statements of strong support came from the representative of China Wellington Koo, and the Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia.<sup>139</sup> A majority of the members appeared poised to vote for the racial equality proposal, and the clause appeared set for approval by the Commission.

Domowsky of Poland stated his support for the Japanese proposal, but opposed its insertion in the preamble because he believed it ran counter to the structure of the Covenant. Makino refuted the assertions of Domowsky by saying that 'the preamble embodied the general spirit of the League and did not envisage the provision of each article'.<sup>140</sup> Finally Wilson who was the chairman of the session intervened and stated that this issue, should be deliberated calmly and advised against argument over it at the Plenary Session.

#### **15. Vote On The Proposal:**

Wilson, as the chairman of the session, chose to act. Wilson's ploy to hide and place the blame on others had failed. House had just handed a note to Wilson warning bluntly 'The trouble is that if this Commission should pass it, it would surely raise the race issue throughout the world'<sup>141</sup>; and 'Wilson took the hint,'<sup>142</sup>, for Wilson knew any reference to racial equality will alienate west coast politicians whose support he needed in the US Congress to pass the bill regarding the formation of the League. Wilson appealed to the Japanese to retract their amendment, and advised that 'it was a mistake to make too much fuss about racial prejudice that would only stir up flames that would eventually hurt the League.'<sup>143</sup>

Then Wilson, with conciliatory words tried to avoid the issue. Some sentences spoken by Wilson are presented below:

'Gentlemen, it seems to me that it is wisest that we should be perfectly candid with one another in a matter of deep importance like this'. National differences and racial prejudices would be forced as much as possible into the background but at this juncture in history, 'the burning flames of prejudice' surely would 'flare out in the public view.'<sup>144</sup>

Wilson declared that the principle of the equality of nations was already an implicit, fundamental feature of the League, and it was not necessary to state it explicitly in the preamble of the Covenant and thus cause controversy. Wilson concluded with the conciliatory words:

‘I offer these suggestions with the utmost friendship, as I need not assure my Japanese colleagues, and with a view to the eventual discussion of these articles’<sup>145</sup>, which did not conceal his desire of not giving in to the Japanese demand on racial equality.

The Japanese delegates, however, were not swayed ‘by these assurances of friendship’ and ‘promises of eventual discussion’; and Makino invited a vote on the Japanese proposal.<sup>146</sup> This very action of the Japanese plenipotentiary Makino, upright and defiant, determined to prove the majority support of the commission for racial equality proposal in order to get racial equality proposal passed, counters the theory that Japan deliberately sacrificed racial equality proposal to achieve the other two goals in the agenda.

Wilson desperately wanted to avoid a vote on the subject, but Japanese demand for a vote forced him to give in. Wilson ‘therefore reluctantly and nervously called for a vote.’<sup>147</sup> Out of the sixteen members in attendance, excluding the chairman, eleven members raised their hands in favour, that included the two French delegates, two Italian delegates, and one delegate each from Greece, China, Serbia, Portugal, Czechoslovakia and the two Japanese delegates. Five delegates, one each from Britain, the United States, Poland, Brazil and Romania, voted against the proposal.<sup>148</sup> The final tally confirmed Wilson’s worst fears, for the result showed a clear majority favoured the Japanese proposal.<sup>149</sup>

#### **16. Rejection Of The Proposal:**

Confronted with a majority support for the Japanese proposal, ‘Wilson with the dexterity he had no doubt learned as a university president’,<sup>150</sup> suddenly announced from the chair that the amendment had failed. Wilson stated that the amendment could not be adopted because it had failed to secure the unanimous approval of the commission. This proclamation stunned the delegates, for they knew that on two other previous occasions, both of which mattered a great deal to Wilson, the unanimity rule had not been used at all.<sup>151</sup> These two issues were Monroe Doctrine qualification and location of the League. This very ruling by President Wilson was the last salvo that destroyed the Japanese proposal on racial equality, despite the untiring efforts of Japanese delegates.

The French legal expert instantly drew the attention of the commission, now in a pandemonium, to the two decisions, one on Monroe Doctrine qualification and the other on the location of the League, which were decided by majority rather than unanimous support. The French delegate stated that a majority had voted for the Japanese amendment, so it stands passed.<sup>152</sup> Makino also drew the attention of Wilson to the cases where the Commission had decided by majority vote, and not by unanimity. Some others pointed out that Geneva, the venue for the new League of Nations, was decided by a majority vote.<sup>153</sup>

Wilson acknowledged that the majority had voted for the Japanese proposal, but stated that on this specific issue there were too serious objections to enshrine it in the Covenant. ‘I am obliged to say’, he concluded, ‘that it is not adopted.’<sup>154</sup> Wilson clarified that for the adoption of such an important resolution unanimous agreement, or at least no opposition is necessary.<sup>155</sup>

Wilson wished to end the debate on the subject and move on speedily, but Makino stopped him.<sup>156</sup> Makino declared that Japan is convinced of the legitimacy of her demand and therefore he would raise this issue whenever the opportunity came. Makino also expressed his desire to get the statements of the debate, and the results of the vote recorded in the minutes of the Commission.<sup>157</sup> Lauren<sup>158</sup> has recorded:

Makino ‘in great disappointment, stated that the Japanese delegation wanted the transcripts of this meeting to clearly indicate that a majority vote had been secured – “for the record”.’<sup>159</sup>

Chairman Wilson agreed.

The demand by Japanese delegates for the adoption of their proposal on the evening of 11 April 1919 was generally recognised to be moderate. In preliminary negotiations the US delegate had stated that, if the US had the support of the British on racial equality proposal, political debates back home in the US, could be avoided and had made this a criterion for supporting the Japanese. Moreover the US delegate had previously agreed in principle to the Japanese proposal. British plenipotentiary Cecil himself had assiduously endeavoured to reach a compromise. It was obvious from the attitude of Wilson, House and Cecil at the meeting that Britain and the US were in an extremely difficult situation of having to offer their resistance to racial equality proposal, while inwardly recognising the Japanese view.<sup>160</sup> The single biggest obstruction that derailed the acceptance of the Japanese proposal, to include the principle of racial equality in the preamble of the Covenant of the League of Nations, was the Prime Minister of Australia William Morris Hughes.

### **17. Japanese Preparation For The Plenary Session:**

After Japan’s proposal was rejected at the final session of the League of Nations Commission on the evening of 11 April 1919, Japan had to choose between making a presentation of the proposal at the Plenary Session and inviting a vote, or merely to declare her position while reserving its proposal for a future occasion. But as long as Britain and the US remained opposed, the Japanese proposal stood absolutely no chance of adoption, even if a vote was arranged at the Plenary Session. Moreover the smaller countries, who had supported Japan on 11 April 1919, could change their positions at the Plenary Session, because of the strong opposition from Britain and the US and vote against Japan. Japanese

delegates, therefore, feared the possibility of an adverse result, with a very small number of countries supporting it, in case of a vote at the Plenary Session.<sup>161</sup> Furthermore, if Japan were to request for a vote, there was no alternative because of the proposal's past history, but to request the vote on the proposal to include a phrase in the preamble. The idea to include a phrase in the preamble was unsatisfactory to the Japanese as this had been reached after making maximum concessions for arriving at a compromise. The Japanese delegates thought it more appropriate to reiterate the original proposal, and merely clarify Japan's intentions to secure Japan's future position.

#### **18. Declaration Of The Japanese Plenipotentiary:**

On 28 April 1919, at the fifth Plenary Session of the Conference, after Wilson's report on the draft Covenant of the League of Nations, agreed upon at the Commission, Japanese plenipotentiary Makino made a statement. A portion of Makino's statement<sup>162</sup> relevant to the thesis is presented as follows:

‘I had first on the 13<sup>th</sup> (of) February an opportunity of submitting to the Commission of the League of Nations our amendment to the Covenant, embodying the principle of equal and just treatment to be accorded to all aliens who happen to be the nationals of the States which are deemed advanced enough and fully qualified to become Members of the League, making no distinction on account of race or nationality.

On that occasion I called the attention of the Commission to the fact that the race question being a standing grievance, which might become acute and dangerous at any moment, it was desirous that a provision dealing with the subject should be made in this Covenant...

Further, I made it unmistakably clear that, the question being of a very delicate and complicated nature, involving the play of a deep human passion, the immediate realisation of the ideal equality was not proposed, but that the clause presented, enunciated the principle only, and left the actual working of it in the hands of the different governments concerned, that, in other words, the clause was intended as an invitation to the Governments and peoples concerned to examine the question more closely and seriously, and to devise in a fair and accommodating spirit means to meet it.

Attention was also called to the fact that the League being, as it were, a world organisation of insurance against war; that in cases of aggression nations suitably placed must be prepared to defend the territorial integrity and political independence of a fellow-member;...



On the next day, that is, on the 14<sup>th</sup> (of) February, when the draft Covenant was reported at a Plenary Session of the Conference without the insertion of our amendment, I had the privilege of expressing our wholehearted sympathy and readiness to contribute our utmost to any and every attempt to found and secure an enduring peace of the world. At the same time I made a reservation that we would again submit our proposal for the consideration of the Conference at an early opportunity...

Now that it has been decided by the Commission that our amendment, even in its modified form, would not be included in the draft Covenant, I feel constrained to revert to our original proposal and to avail myself of this occasion to declare clearly our position in regard to this matter.

The principle which we desire to see acted upon in the future relationship between nations was set forth in our original amendment as follows:-

“The equality of nations being a basic principle of the League of Nations, the High Contracting Parties agree to accord, as soon as possible, to all alien nationals of States Members (sic) of the League equal and just treatment in every respect, making no distinction either in law or in fact, on account of their race or nationality”.

In closing, I feel it my duty to declare clearly on this occasion that the Japanese Government and people feel poignant regret at the failure of the Commission to approve of their just demand for laying down a principle aiming at the adjustment of this long-standing grievance, a demand that is based upon a deep-rooted national conviction. They will continue in their insistence for the adoption of this principle by the League in future’.

Japanese plenipotentiary Makino had the entire text of his speech recorded in the minutes.<sup>163</sup>

## **19. Failure Of Racial Equality Bill And Fulfilment Of Other Demands:**

Despite the sincere endeavours by Japanese plenipotentiaries, as demonstrated in the earlier pages, Japanese proposal on racial equality was not adopted by the League of Nations. Tireless negotiations by the Japanese plenipotentiaries, particularly the efforts of their de facto chief Baron Makino, and his rare yet occasional expressions of frustrations including the outburst of a threat of refusal to join the League of Nations prove that he was not using Racial Equality Bill as a bargaining tool to achieve the other two items of the Japanese agenda. Japanese plenipotentiaries were genuine in their efforts in getting Racial Equality Bill passed.

Japanese delegates however were able to use the defeat of their proposal on racial

equality, to their advantage by pointing out that unless they got the other two demands in their list of three fulfilled, they may not sign the rest of the covenant. Wilson's very words mentioned towards the end of April are quoted below:

‘The Japanese told me with all oriental courtesy that if we didn't take their side on this article of the treaty, they could not sign the rest.’<sup>164</sup>

This subtle threat worried the other powers and the conference was reluctant to see another defection. The Italians had already defected and the Belgians were about to do so. Wilson desperate to save the League of Nations yet unwilling to adopt racial equality proposal, gave in to the Japanese demand in China.<sup>165</sup>

Japan might have converted defeat into a semi victory, but Japan did not premeditate such a strategy of sacrificing Racial Equality Bill for fulfilling the other demands in her agenda. The author would like to concur with Shimazu<sup>166</sup> that the ‘bargaining chip theory was a way of discrediting the Japanese claim to Shantung’ and has no ‘credibility’.

#### **End Notes:**

1. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 343.
2. *ibid.*, p.343.
3. Margaret MacMillan, *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempt to End War* (London: John Murray Ltd., 2001), 316.
4. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 343.
5. *ibid.*, p.344.
6. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Teppai Ni Kansuru Mondai* (The Issue of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), *Taiheiyoo Mondai Kenkyuu Shiryoo*, (Research Materials on Pacific Issues), Vol.4, 20 Sept 1921, p.1, *Kokusai Renmei* (The League of Nations), *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol. 3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
7. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 345.
8. *ibid.*, p.351.
9. *Hochi*, as cited in “Racial Discrimination,” *Japan Times & Mail*, 3 December 1918.
10. *Hochi*, as cited in “Mission's Importance Cannot Well Be Surpassed,” *Japan Times & Mail*, 11 December 1918.
11. *Yorozu*, as cited in “What are Japan's Peace Terms,” *Japan Times & Mail*, 29 December 1918.

12. *Asahi* as cited in "Parting Word to Peace Delegates," *Japan Times & Mail*, 11 December 1918.
13. *Asahi* as cited in "Racial Discrimination Question To End," *Japan Times & Mail*, 31 January 1919.
14. *Nichinichi*, *Hochi*, *Yomiuri* and *Jigi* in *Japan Times & Mail*, 29 and 30 November 1918.
15. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996), 87.
16. *Asahi* as cited in "Hearty Approbation," *Japan Times & Mail*, 30 November 1918.
17. Patrick Gallagher, *America's Aims and Asia's Aspirations* (New York: Century, 1920), 232.
18. "Saionji Sails Amid Banzais," *Japan Times & Mail*, 15 January 1919.
19. *Asahi* as cited in "What Japan Should Demand At Paris," *Japan Times & Mail*, 15 January 1919.
20. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 360.
21. David Hunter Miller, *My Diary At the Conference of Paris*, 21 vols. (New York: Privately printed, 1924), vol. 3, 455, doc.no.211.
22. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996), 88.
23. Margaret MacMillan, *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempt to End War* (London: John Murray Ltd., 2001), 324.
24. *ibid.*, p.325.
25. *ibid.*, p.323.
26. *ibid.*, p.324.
27. Roy Watson Curry, *Woodrow Wilson and Far Eastern Policy, 1913-1921*. (New York: Octagon Books, 1968), 131-2.
28. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996), 87.
29. Roger Daniels, *The Politics of Prejudice*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), 55.
30. Arthur S. Link, *Wilson: The New Freedom*, 2 vols. (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1956), 243-54.
31. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996), 90.

32. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 395.
33. *House Diary*, Edward Mandel House Papers, Yale University Library, New Haven, 4.2.19.
34. Charles Seymour, (ed.) *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, vol.4 (London: Ernest Benn Ltd. 1928), vol.4, 310.
35. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996), 89.
36. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.2 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
37. Charles Seymour, (ed.) *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, vol.4 (London: Ernest Benn Ltd. 1928), vol.4, 310.
38. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.2 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
39. *ibid.*, p.2.
40. *ibid.*, p.2.
41. Charles Seymour, (ed.) *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, vol.4 (London: Ernest Benn Ltd. 1928), entry of 6 February 1919.
42. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.2-3 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
43. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 397.
44. Margaret MacMillan, *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempt to End War* (London: John Murray Ltd., 2001), 326.
45. *Lothian (Philip Kerr) Papers*, Scottish Record Office, Edinburgh, pp. 37-40, notes dictated on Monday, 10 February, 1919; David Hunter Miller, *The Drafting of the Covenant*, 2 vols. (New York: Putnam, 1928), vol.1, 183-4; Stephen Bonsal, *Unfinished Business* (London: Michael Joseph Ltd., 1944), 33.

46. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.2-3 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
47. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Teppai Ni Kansuru Mondai* (The Issue of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), *Taiheiyoo Mondai Kenkyuu Shiryoo*, (Research Materials on Pacific Issues), Vol.4, 20 Sept 1921, p.2, *Kokusai Renmei* (The League of Nations), *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol. 3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
48. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 397.
49. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.3 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
50. *ibid.*, p.3.
51. Ray Stannard Baker, *Woodrow Wilson and World Settlement*, 3 vols. (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1923), vol.2, 235.
52. Margaret MacMillan, *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempt to End War* (London: John Murray Ltd., 2001), 327.
53. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.3-4 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
54. Margaret MacMillan, *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempt to End War* (London: John Murray Ltd., 2001), 327.
55. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Teppai Ni Kansuru Mondai* (The Issue of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), *Taiheiyoo Mondai Kenkyuu Shiryoo*, (Research Materials on Pacific Issues), Vol.4, 20 Sept 1921, p.4, in *Kokusai Renmei* (The League of Nations), *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol. 3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
56. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.3-4 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.

57. *ibid.*, p.4.
58. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996), 93.
59. Margaret MacMillan, *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempt to End War* (London: John Murray Ltd., 2001).
60. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.4 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
61. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Teppai Ni Kansuru Mondai* (The Issue of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), *Taiheiyoo Mondai Kenkyuu Shiryou*, (Research Materials on Pacific Issues), Vol.4, 20 Sept 1921, p.5, in *Kokusai Renmei* (The League of Nations), *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol. 3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
62. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996), 93.
63. Patrick Gallagher, *America's Aims and Asia's Aspirations* (New York: Century, 1920), 94 & 322.
64. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 401.
65. Conference de la Paix, 1919-1920, *Recueil des actes de la Conference*, "Secret", Partie 3, Seances plenieres de la Conference (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1922), 60.
66. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.4 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
67. Conference de la Paix, 1919-1920, *Recueil des actes de la Conference*, "Secret", Partie 3, Seances plenieres de la Conference (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1922), 60.
68. "Time to Give Up Race Prejudice, Japanese View," *New York Herald*, 17 February 1919.
69. Naoko Shimazu, *Japan, Race and Equality: The Racial Equality Proposal of 1919* (London: Routledge, 1998).
70. Patrick Gallagher, *America's Aims and Asia's Aspirations* (New York: Century, 1920), 323.

71. Le Japon et le probleme des races by Saito Man, located at the Hoover Institution, Stanford, California in Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996), 93.
72. *Asahi* as cited in "Japan's Great Mission," *Japan Times & Mail*, 13 March 1919.
73. *Nichinichi* as cited in "Must Stick to Racial Discrimination Question," *Japan Times & Mail*, 15 March 1919.
74. Breckinridge Long to Wilson, 4 March 1919, 8, No.22, p.11626, Woodrow Wilson Papers, Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Washington, D.C.
75. "Ishii Looks To End of Race Prejudice," *New York Times*, 15 March 1919.
76. "Ishii's Plea Stirs Western Senators," *New York Times*, 16 March 1919.
77. David Hunter Miller, *My Diary At the Conference of Paris*, 21 vols. (New York: Privately printed, 1924), vol.17, 254.
78. *Asahi*, as cited in "The Racial Question at Versailles," *Japan Times & Mail*, 30 March 1919.
79. United States, American Mission to Negotiate Peace, Supreme Headquarters Records, "Bulletins", Bulletin No.121 (mimeographed), located at the Hoover Institution.
80. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.5 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
81. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 401.
82. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.5 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
83. *ibid.*, p.5.
84. NGB: Vol. *Pari Kowa Kaigi* (Paris Peace Conference), p.343 in Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980).
85. *Clemenceau Papers*, Ministere de la Defense, Archives d'Armee de Terre, Chateau de Vincennes, Paris, 6N74, Societe des Nations, letter of 18.4.19.
86. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 402.
87. *ibid.*, p.403.

88. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.5-6 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
89. *ibid.*, p.6.
90. *ibid.*, p.6.
91. Patrick Gallagher, 1920 *America's Aims and Asia's Aspirations* (New York: Century, 1920), 236.
92. "Japan's New Proposal Probably Accepted," *Japan Times & Mail*, 2 April 1919.
93. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.6 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
94. *ibid.*, p.6.
95. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 404.
96. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.6 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
97. *ibid.*, p.6.
98. *ibid.*, p.6-7.
99. *ibid.*, p.7.
100. *ibid.*, p.7.
101. *ibid.*, p 7-8.
102. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), 406.
103. Japan, Delegation to Paris Peace Conference, Documents Distributed to the Public, 'Interview du Baron Makino, 2 avril 1919 (mimeographed) located at the Hoover Institution; and "Japan May Bolt World League," *San Francisco Chronicle*, 3 April 1919.
104. Matsui to Uchida, 30 March 1919, Doc 471-2, *Kokusai Renmei* (The League of Nations), *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol. 2, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
105. *ibid.*, Doc 471-2.
106. *ibid.*, Doc 471-3.



107. Matsui to Uchida, 2 April 1919, Doc 488, *Kokusai Renmei* (The League of Nations), *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol. 2, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
108. *ibid.*, Doc 488, Doc 488-2.
109. *ibid.*, Doc 488-2.
110. *ibid.*, Doc 488-2.
111. Margaret MacMillan, *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempt to End War* (London: John Murray Ltd., 2001), 328.
112. Matsui to Uchida, 15 April 1919, Doc 556, *Kokusai Renmei* (The League of Nations), *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol. 2, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
113. *ibid.*, Doc 556.
114. *ibid.*, Doc 556.
115. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.12 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
116. Stephen Bonsal, *Unfinished Business* (London: Michael Joseph Ltd., 1944), 192.
117. David Hunter Miller, *My Diary At the Conference of Paris*, 21 vols. (New York: Privately printed, 1924), vol.1, 242.
118. Emile Joseph Dillon, *The Inside Story of the Peace Conference* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1920), 493; 'so filled with explosives' Stephen Bonsal, *Unfinished Business* (London: Michael Joseph Ltd., 1944), 169.
119. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996), 97.
120. "Australia Remains Unalterably Opposed," *Japan Times & Mail*, 3 April 1919.
121. David Hunter Miller, *My Diary At the Conference of Paris*, 21 vols. (New York: Privately printed, 1924), vol.1, 245.
122. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.20-22 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
123. *ibid.*, p.20-22.
124. David Hunter Miller, *My Diary At the Conference of Paris*, 21 vols. (New York: Privately printed, 1924), vol.1, 245.

125. Emile Joseph Dillon, *The Inside Story of the Peace Conference* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1920), 494.
126. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996), 98.
127. Margaret MacMillan, *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempt to End War* (London: John Murray Ltd., 2001), 329.
128. Paul Birdsall, *Versailles Twenty Years After* (New York: Reyal & Hitchcock, 1941), 98.
129. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.12 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
130. Conference de la Paix, 1919-1920, *Recueil des actes de la Conference*, 'Secret', Partie 4, Commission de la Societe des nations (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1922), 174.
131. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.12 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
132. David Hunter Miller, *The Drafting of the Covenant*, 2 vols. (New York: Putnam, 1928), vol.1, 461.
133. Russell H. Fifield, *Woodrow Wilson and the Far East: The Diplomacy of the Shantung Question* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1952), 166.
134. Conference de la Paix, 1919-1920, *Recueil des actes de la Conference*, 'Secret', Partie 4, Commission de la Societe des nations (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1922), 175.
135. *ibid.*
136. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Teppai Ni Kansuru Mondai* (The Issue of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), *Taiheiyoo Mondai Kenkyuu Shiryoo*, (Research Materials on Pacific Issues), Vol.4, 20 Sept 1921, p.14-15, in *Kokusai Renmei* (The League of Nations), *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol. 3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
137. Conference de la Paix, 1919-1920, *Recueil des actes de la Conference*, 'Secret', Partie 4, Commission de la Societe des nations (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1922), p.175-76.
138. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Teppai Ni Kansuru Mondai* (The Issue of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), *Taiheiyoo Mondai Kenkyuu Shiryoo*, (Research Materials on Pacific Issues), Vol.4, 20 Sept 1921, p.14-15, in *Kokusai Renmei* (The League of Nations), *Jinshu Sabetsu*

*Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol. 3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.

139. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996); Margaret MacMillan, *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempt to End War* (London: John Murray Ltd., 2001), 99.

140. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Teppai Ni Kansuru Mondai* (The Issue of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), *Taiheiyoo Mondai Kenkyuu Shiryoo*, (Research Materials on Pacific Issues), Vol.4, 20 Sept 1921, p.15, in *Kokusai Renmei* (The League of Nations), *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol. 3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.

141. David Hunter Miller, *My Diary At the Conference of Paris*, 21 vols. (New York: Privately printed, 1924), vol.8, 268a Document No. 767.

142. Paul Birdsall, *Versailles Twenty Years After* (New York: Reyal & Hitchcock, 1941), 99.

143. David Hunter Miller, *The Drafting of the Covenant*, 2 vols. (New York: Putnam, 1928), vol.1, 461-6.

144. Document No 773, 'Notes by Clancy' in David Hunter Miller, *My Diary At the Conference of Paris*, 21 vols. (New York: Privately printed, 1924), vol.8, 277-78.

145. *ibid.*

146. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996), 99.

147. Conference de la Paix, 1919-1920, *Recueil des actes de la Conference*, 'Secret', Partie 4, Commission de la Societe des nations (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1922), 176.

148. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.13-14 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.

149. Conference de la Paix, 1919-1920, *Recueil des actes de la Conference*, 'Secret', Partie 4, Commission de la Societe des nations (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1922), p.176.

150. David Hunter Miller, *The Drafting of the Covenant*, 2 vols. (New York: Putnam, 1928), vol.1, 461-6.

151. Charles Seymour, (ed.) *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, 4 vols, (London: Ernest Benn Ltd. 1928), vol.4, 428.

152. Conference de la Paix, 1919-1920, *Recueil des actes de la Conference*, 'Secret', Partie 4, Commission de la Societe des nations (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1922), p.177.

153. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Teppai Ni Kansuru Mondai* (The Issue of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), *Taiheiyoo Mondai Kenkyuu Shiryoo*, (Research Materials on Pacific Issues), Vol.4, 20 Sept 1921, p.16, in *Kokusai Renmei* (The League of Nations), *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol. 3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
154. Document No. 773, in David Hunter Miller, *My Diary At the Conference of Paris*, 21 vols. (New York: Privately printed, 1924), vol.8, 279.
155. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Teppai Ni Kansuru Mondai* (The Issue of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), *Taiheiyoo Mondai Kenkyuu Shiryoo*, (Research Materials on Pacific Issues), Vol.4, 20 Sept 1921, p.15-16, in *Kokusai Renmei* (The League of Nations), *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol. 3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
156. Conference de la Paix, 1919-1920, *Recueil des actes de la Conference*, 'Secret', Partie 4, Commission de la Societe des nations (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1922), p.177.
157. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Teppai Ni Kansuru Mondai* (The Issue of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), *Taiheiyoo Mondai Kenkyuu Shiryoo*, (Research Materials on Pacific Issues), Vol.4, 20 Sept 1921, p.16, in *Kokusai Renmei* (The League of Nations), *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol. 3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
158. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996).
159. Conference de la Paix, 1919-1920, *Recueil des actes de la Conference*, 'Secret', Partie 4, Commission de la Societe des nations (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1922), 177.
160. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Teppai Ni Kansuru Mondai* (The Issue of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), *Taiheiyoo Mondai Kenkyuu Shiryoo*, (Research Materials on Pacific Issues), Vol.4, 20 Sept 1921, p.16, in *Kokusai Renmei* (The League of Nations), *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol. 3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
161. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.14-15 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
162. *ibid.*, p.15.
163. *ibid.*, p.15.

164. Paul Mantoux, *Paris Peace Conference 1919: Proceedings of the Council of Four-March 24 – April 18*, (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1964), vol.1, 314.
165. Margaret MacMillan, *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempt to End War* (London: John Murray Ltd., 2001), 330.
166. Naoko Shimazu, *Japan, Race and Equality: The Racial Equality Proposal of 1919* (London: Routledge, 1998), 146-147.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **REASONS FOR REJECTION: A DISCUSSION**

Despite their tireless efforts, obvious from the endless rounds of diplomatic negotiations, Racial Equality Bill proposed by Japan was rejected at the Paris Peace Conference. The shocking result, since the very hour of the rejection on 11 April 1919, has inspired many commentaries and has remained a debatable issue. After a careful examination of the published and unpublished evidences from a range of sources, this chapter presents a critical analysis of the reasons for rejection. The research presented in this thesis reveals that a number of factors combined to defeat the adoption of Racial Equality Bill by the League of Nations. The four key factors that came together to defeat the Japanese proposal could be listed as: a) resolute opposition to Racial Equality Bill from the Prime Minister of Australia determined to protect White Australia Policy; b) opposition by the British; c) lack of US support; and d) sympathy of British dominions New Zealand, Canada and South Africa with Australia.

Hughes's resolute opposition provided the convenient excuse to Britain and the US to join hands with Australia to defeat the Japanese proposal. The Japanese delegates at the conference appeared pliable with their numerous changes to the text of racial equality proposal and that harmed their cause. The Japanese delegates committed some tactical mistakes in negotiations and made some diplomatic errors. Despite passionate speeches containing words of reason, they generally made a poor presentation of their case essentially due to poor language and communication skills. The above listed facts also demonstrated the inexperience of the Japanese in international diplomacy, and that harmed their position. Moreover the prejudices against the Japanese are also considered to have harmed the Japanese cause at the conference. The single most important factor that contributed to the rejection of the Japanese proposal was the resolute opposition offered by Hughes, which is discussed in detail in Chapter Three, and therefore is not repeated here. A discussion of the other major factors for rejection is presented below.

#### **1. Prejudices Against The Japanese:**

The issue of entrenched prejudices against the Japanese is considered to have had a bearing on the rejection of the Japanese bill at Paris. Lauren,<sup>1</sup> MacMillan,<sup>2</sup> Meaney,<sup>3</sup> Iriye,<sup>4</sup> Curry,<sup>5</sup> and Frei<sup>6</sup> have discussed the issue of prejudices against the Japanese, but have not emphasised this aspect as an influential one for the rejection of the Japanese bill. Other important researchers Kajima,<sup>7</sup> Storry,<sup>8</sup> Nish,<sup>9,10</sup> Tsuzuki,<sup>11</sup> and Shimazu<sup>12</sup> are essentially silent on the issue of prejudice as an influence on the rejection of the Japanese proposal. A discussion on the issue of prejudices the Japanese faced, particularly so at Paris, perpetrated

by the delegates of other nations at the conference; and an argument that prejudices might have harmed the Japanese position leading to the rejection of the Japanese bill, is given here.

Initial Japanese contacts with Europe and the US for education and modernisation happened at a time when the concept of ‘scientific racism’ was thriving in the natural and social sciences in the west that inspired even eminent academics there to contend that ‘racial inferiority’ of the Japanese could be verified ‘empirically’.<sup>13</sup> In the years before and during World War One, racial discrimination reached new intensity. During the war the Japanese were portrayed by allies as well as their adversaries as ‘threatening, scheming, slant-eyed, racially inferior creatures, constituting the most dangerous element of the yellow peril.’<sup>14</sup> Western analysts proclaimed that the world would be safer if only the Japanese would ‘stay in their place’ – ‘one in which they do not greatly intensify and so embitter the struggle for existence of the white man.’<sup>15</sup>

During Paris Peace Conference Britain circulated her legal arguments to the representatives of other nations demonstrating ‘why different states and races could not be considered equal’.<sup>16</sup> In England publications emphasising the racial stereotypes of superficial differences with statements like, ‘the Japanese are five feet high, brown in colour, they have swivel-shaped eyes, and they eat raw fish’ kept appearing.<sup>17</sup>

In addition to the prejudices against the Japanese, severe immigration controls, humiliation and the mistreatment of the Japanese strained Japan’s diplomatic relations with the US, Canada and Australia.<sup>18</sup> Antagonism between Japanese and Americans reached its peak during World War One.<sup>19</sup> Persistent and vociferous Japanese demands to eliminate racial discrimination hardened American antagonism. Japanese Premier Shigenobu Okuma’s speech castigating the racial mistreatment of the coloured people by the whites; and the premier’s declaration that Japan ‘plans to gain equality’, and ‘inferiority must end’, received a lot of negative publicity.<sup>20</sup>

In 1919, at Paris Peace Conference, Japan still was a new nation in the world arena. Westerners interacting with Japan relied on their stereotypical images of the enigmatic East. The Great Powers ignored or treated the Japanese delegates as some sort of a joke in the Supreme Council<sup>21</sup>. They gave Japan five delegates to the Peace Conference, just like themselves, but ignored Japan, when the Council of Four was established to speed up the proceedings, and Japan was excluded.

Snide and hurtful racist remarks against the Japanese, was by no means confined to the ignorant masses of the US and the British dominions. Such remarks came even from the top most echelons of these countries. During the course of Paris Peace Conference, French President Clemenceau in an audible remark to his foreign minister during a meeting said, ‘To

think that there are blonde women in the world; and we stay closed up here with these Japanese, who are so ugly.’<sup>22</sup> Delegates from western countries joked among themselves ‘about how similar they (the Japanese delegates) looked’; the Americans called the Japanese delegates, Baron Makino and Viscount Chinda, the ‘two Mikados’.<sup>23</sup> Even Colonel House, who the Japanese delegates trusted and considered friendly, was not very complimentary when he recorded Baron Makino and Viscount Chinda as ‘silent, unemotional, watchful.’<sup>24</sup>

A British diplomat at Paris Peace Conference, Harold Nicholson observed that any statement on racial equality as proposed by Japan in the Covenant of the League, ‘implied the equality of the yellow man with the white man’, and this in turn, ‘might even imply the terrific theory of the equality of the white man with the black.’<sup>25</sup> If this happened, in Nicholson’s words, ‘no American senate would ever dream of ratifying any Covenant which enshrined so dangerous a principle’, consequently Wilson ‘found himself in a grave difficulty.’<sup>26</sup>

Delegates from New Zealand, Australia and Britain carried feelings of racial inferiority, distinction and exclusion towards the Japanese as the Americans had. William Massey, the Prime Minister of New Zealand, had conducted an election campaign on a promise ‘to keep the country clear of coloured and undesirable immigrants.’<sup>27</sup> To remind Massey of his responsibilities of keeping New Zealand White, *Otago Witness*, on 23 April 1919, would write ‘though the American Declaration of Independence begins by asserting all men are born equal in the sight of God, it makes no mention of niggers and Japanese.’<sup>28</sup>

Hughes and the country he led, Australia, where prejudice and fear of Japan was rife, have been the subject matter of two important chapters of this thesis. None the less it is worth recording here that Hughes had ‘refused to compromise with Asians in diplomatic negotiations, and unashamedly proclaimed his belief in white superiority.’<sup>29</sup> Hughes expressed fear of ‘the advance guard of the great army of coloured men’ and believed ‘Our chief plank is, of course, a White Australia. There’s no compromise about that. The industrious coloured brother has to go – and remain away!’<sup>30</sup>

On issues of race the official attitude of the British was no different. Robert Cecil representing the British Empire stated that as regards to *any* clause on racial equality by Japan, ‘the British would not agree to it at all, probably not in any form.’<sup>31</sup> Cecil’s colleague, Foreign Secretary Arthur Balfour justified the British attitude in a discussion with House, recorded by a member of the US delegation, as given below:

‘Colonel House handed me a pencil memorandum which he showed to Mr. Balfour, commencing with the proposition taken from the Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal. Mr. Balfour said this was an eighteenth



century proposition which he did not believe was true. He believed it was true in certain sense that all men of a particular nation were created equal, but not that a man in Central Africa was created equal to a European.’<sup>32</sup>

During the course of Paris Peace Conference Japan’s ambassador to the US, Ishii gave a speech in an attempt to persuade the US delegates to support Japan’s Racial Equality Bill. Ishii’s highly publicised speech drew an instant response from the US senators in the Capitol, who expressed that a clause on racial equality in the Covenant of the League of Nations could threaten the race based US legislation on ‘Asian immigration in the West and black segregation in the South.’<sup>33</sup> California legislature launched a campaign to prevent Wilson from supporting the Japanese bill. Senator J.D. Phelan declared that ‘equal rights can not be accorded to Oriental peoples without imperilling our own national existence and destroying western civilisation.’<sup>34</sup> San Francisco Board of Supervisors sent a resolution to Washington and Paris strongly endorsing the views of Senator Phelan.

The prejudicial attitudes held by these countries who Japan considered close allies, confused the Japanese. Public opinion in Japan became inflamed demanding racial equality. A public meeting in Tokyo arranged by thirty-seven different organisations was convened to urge the Japanese delegates at Paris to gain racial equality. The organisations created the Association for the Equality of Races and passed a resolution, as given below:

‘if racial discrimination is allowed to remain, all the alliances and treaties will only be castles of sand, and the general peace of the world will not be secured.’<sup>35</sup>

To avoid such an eventuality, the resolution announced:

‘the Japanese nation should do its utmost to see that discriminatory treatment based on racial difference, which has hitherto prevailed in international relations, be removed by the Peace Conference.’<sup>36</sup>

When Japan raised the race issue at Paris Peace Conference, people desperate to eliminate racial discrimination in the world and desirous of a powerful ally found one in Japan.<sup>37</sup>

The above presented discussion demonstrates the prejudices towards the Japanese that existed in Europe, the US and the British colonies. These prejudices are considered to have harmed the Japanese cause leading to the rejection of the Japanese proposal at Paris Peace Conference.

## **2. British Reluctance To Support Japan:**

The British delegation, not only as the representatives of Britain but also as the spokespersons for the British Empire that controlled the British dominions of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and South Africa, was perhaps the single most influential delegation of

Paris Peace Conference. Moreover British plenipotentiary Cecil also officiated as the Chairman of the League of Nations Commission. The British maintained that racial equality proposal was an issue of Japanese migration to British Dominions and the US. Therefore the British considered it to be a domestic issue for the British Dominions and the US, and did not attach much importance to it for debate and discussion in an international forum like the League of Nations. Failure of the Japanese delegates to convince the British that racial equality proposal was not just an immigration issue did not help the Japanese cause.

Japanese government did not make any substantial efforts during World War One years to arrest the sliding image of Japan in Britain. Japan did conduct a grand exhibition in Britain in 1917, originally planned to open in 1912 and delayed by five years that failed to influence the British, because Anglo-Japanese relations had already sunk to their lowest point. During the conference or in the preparatory stages for the conference Japanese government did not carry out any public relations exercises in Britain to rouse the public opinion in favour of their proposal on racial equality. With the benefit of hindsight perhaps a strong British public opinion in favour of the Japanese proposal would have swayed British government to support Japanese Racial Equality Bill. In fact as recorded earlier, on 31 March 1919 House had said that if the British supported the racial equality proposal the US would join them.

After the rejection of Japanese proposal on racial equality at the League of Nations, London correspondent of the Tokyo *Asahi*, cabled his paper a remarkable review of the existing relations between Britain and Japan published in The *Japan Times & Mail* of Sunday, May 11, 1919, where he appealed to Japan in general, and to her government and diplomats in particular to undertake a substantial propaganda work in Britain to rouse British public opinion in favour of Japan. The text of the letter is presented in the Appendix.

### **3. Wilson's Ruling And Lack Of US Support:**

President Wilson's ruling on the evening of 11 April 1919 to reject Japanese proposal on racial equality was a significant factor, perhaps like the proverbial last nail in the coffin, for the rejection of the Japanese proposal.

During the course of the debate on racial equality proposal on the evening of 11 April 1919 Colonel House slipped a note to Wilson that bluntly warned that race issue all over the world would be inflamed if the Japanese proposal were to be passed, and Wilson took the hint. Shimazu<sup>38</sup> however, is not convinced of the influence of House on Wilson, because of personal disagreements between the two, and she argues that Wilson had his own reasons for rejecting the proposal on racial equality.<sup>39</sup> The League of Nations was a politically ambitious goal for President Wilson. The League meant everything to him and it embodied his vision to establish a new international order. Moreover, Wilson tended to evaluate issues from the

perspective of advancing his personal agenda. After Wilson's religious freedom article was rejected in February 1919, particularly by the British, because the racial equality amendment was linked to it, Wilson did not want to see the momentum to establish the Commission halt so early over the racial equality proposal, which was not sufficiently important to annoy Britain. Wilson knew the need to court British support to achieve his ultimate goal of creating the League, because he was convinced that only with an Anglo-Saxon consensus he could establish the new world order to be dominated by the Anglo-Saxons. A quotation to strengthen the argument is presented below:

‘We, Anglo-Saxons, have our peculiar contribution to make towards the good of humanity in accordance with our special talents. The League of Nations will, I confidently hope, be dominated by us Anglo-Saxons; it will be for the unquestionable benefit of the world. The discharge of our duties in the maintenance of peace and as a just mediatory in international disputes will rebound to our lasting prestige. But it is of paramount importance that we Anglo-Saxons succeed in keeping in step with one another.’<sup>40</sup>

The contents of House's note and Wilson taking the hint, and ultimately Wilson making a ruling, could never have been designed as a part of the Japanese strategy by Japanese government or the Japanese delegates accused by some critics of sacrificing Racial Equality Bill to secure other items in the agenda for Paris Peace Conference. Instead of focusing on the motivations of President Wilson for the ruling of 11 April 1919, the nature of the ruling that failed the Japanese proposal is emphasised here.

Initially House was supportive of racial equality proposal, but he changed his attitude around mid-March 1919 when he noted the intensity of Hughes's opposition as a result of which the British would never accept the proposal. House was perhaps very influenced by the intense British opposition to the Japanese proposal.<sup>41</sup>

Hughes so intensely and persistently opposed the racial equality proposal that delegates in Paris took Hughes's threat of disrupting the peace conference if necessary, seriously. Even Wilson could not ignore the resolute resistance offered by Hughes that significantly affected the British position on racial equality proposal. Wilson did not want to offend and alienate Britain, ‘whose commitment to the League was essential to its success’<sup>42</sup> over a proposal like racial equality, which he considered disposable, and Wilson was perhaps indifferent about Racial Equality Bill.

Americans were determined to insert their special reservation clause in the Covenant of the League of Nations Commission to protect the validity of their Monroe Doctrine. The French strongly opposed the privilege the Americans wished. On 11 April 1919 with the

support of Japanese delegates the Americans had their special privilege adopted at the League of Nations Commission. Having supported Monroe Doctrine, the Japanese perhaps assumed that the Americans would return the favour by supporting Racial Equality Bill, the debate for which followed immediately after, but the Americans never reciprocated.

#### **4. Role of British Dominions:**

Britain found it difficult to ignore the views of her colonies, for the significant support they had provided to her war efforts.<sup>43</sup> Out of the total male populations, 19.35 per cent of New Zealanders, 13.48 per cent of Canadians, 13.43 per cent of Australians, and 11.12 percent of South Africans served in the war. India made the largest contribution bigger than the combined efforts of all the other colonies, providing one million men and 146 million British pounds. The British colonies therefore in a way earned their right to play an active part in Paris Peace Conference.<sup>44</sup>

During the conference Prime Ministers of the British Dominions of Canada, South Africa and New Zealand initially appeared sympathetic to the Japanese proposal. Prime Ministers and plenipotentiaries of South Africa and Canada mediated between the Japanese and the Australians in an attempt to reach a compromise. But none of the Dominions openly sided with Japan to oppose the Prime Minister of Australia, Hughes. In fact the Prime Minister of New Zealand who was also facing a general election back home in New Zealand openly sided with Hughes to oppose racial equality proposal by the Japanese.

#### **5. Tactical Mistake By The Japanese In Negotiations At Paris Peace Conference:**

Presented below is a discussion on tactical mistakes committed by Japanese plenipotentiaries at Paris Peace Conference that undermined the position of Japan. The two mistakes discussed below are, Japanese reliance on the US, and enormous delay in opening negotiations with the British.

##### **5.1. Japanese Reliance On The US:**

As discussed in detail under the caption 'Informal Talks With The United States And Britain' of Chapter Four, the Japanese delegates, in the very early stages of Paris Peace Conference, considered the US as the single biggest obstacle in achieving their goal. Therefore on 26 January 1919, only a week after the commencement of the conference on 18 January 1919, Japanese plenipotentiary Chinda called on the US Secretary of State Lansing, who appeared supportive of the Japanese proposal. Favourable comments from the US President in a meeting on January 22, 1919, and his desire to meet with Japanese plenipotentiary Chinda had further encouraged the Japanese delegation. On 2 February 1919 when Japanese plenipotentiaries called on House, the most trusted aide to the US President, House appeared sympathetic. Following further negotiations on 4 February 1919, Colonel

House expressed his personal support to the diluted version, Proposal B out of the two proposals A and B the Japanese had prepared for incorporation in the Covenant of the League of Nations, and assured the support of President Wilson. On 5 February 1919, House informed Japanese delegates of his discussion with Wilson, who had amended the wording 'as far as it lies in their legitimate powers' of the Proposal B to 'as far as speedily and possible.'<sup>45</sup> House also added that the US had initiated preliminary negotiations with the British on the Japanese proposal, and the British expressed agreement.

Once the Japanese delegates learnt of the British supportive response they decided not to negotiate directly with Britain awaiting Anglo-American talks. This was a tactical mistake on the part of the Japanese diplomats. The lack of simultaneous parallel negotiations with the British, while negotiating with the US, particularly when the presentation of the proposal on racial equality at the League of Nations was less than a week away, on 13 February 1919, was a significant tactical mistake committed by the Japanese. Japanese delegates realised the need to negotiate with the British only when they learnt of the gradual emergence of the British opposition to the Japanese proposal.

Lauren<sup>46</sup> states that 'the key still rested with the Americans, British and Australians'; thereby arguing that for a successful outcome for the Japanese proposal, leading to its adoption by the League of Nations, all the three parties, the Americans, British and Australians were important. The Japanese, however, turned increasingly to the US delegation after being frustrated in their negotiations with the Australians and the British. According to House's former secretary Stephen Bonsal, the Japanese delegates called on the Americans 'almost every day.'<sup>47</sup> But 'each time the colonel (House) was kind but firmly refused to make any concessions at all.'<sup>48</sup> Makino and Chinda after their deadlock with Hughes appealed to House repeatedly for help but they were looking in the wrong direction. House was not willing to support a proposal castigated in the United States. Privately, House was delighted that the British were made to resist the Japanese proposal. House had remarked, "It has taken considerable finesse to lift the load from our shoulders and place it upon the British, but happily, it has been done".<sup>49</sup>

Wilson worried about public opinion in the US, began suspecting the Japanese. On one occasion Wilson had remarked that 'he had trusted them before, in fact they had broken their agreement about Siberia,'<sup>50</sup> thereby meaning that he did not trust the Japanese any more. The Japanese efforts for securing the passage of their proposal by negotiations with the US was genuine but unfortunately misdirected.

## **5.2. A Significant Delay In Opening Negotiations With The British:**

Japanese delegates met with British plenipotentiaries Robert Cecil and Arthur Balfour to reach a compromise with the British. In the meetings the Japanese earnestly sought to find a compromise by further toning down their proposal. The Japanese made the very first direct contact with the British delegates between 6 February 1919 to 12 February 1919, almost full three weeks after the commencement of Paris Peace Conference on 18 January 1919. This was an enormous delay. In the subsequent meetings the British refused to agree to the Japanese proposal. The British delegates obviously had already made up their mind not to support the Japanese.

On 13 February 1919 at the League of Nations Commission, Japanese delegates proposed to add their provision on racial equality that had been amended and agreed to by the US President, to the provision on the freedom of religion in Article 21. President Wilson was absent from the League of Nations session of 13 February and was busy attending the Five Great Powers Conference. British plenipotentiary Robert Cecil, who was also the Chairman of the Commission, opposed the Japanese proposal. Cecil wished to avoid this provision incorporated in the Covenant of the League of Nations.

In the ensuing debate the delegates of Brazil, Romania, Czechoslovakia, France and China spoke in favour of the Japanese proposal. Only Greece and Belgium supported the British in their opposition to the Japanese. At this juncture Robert Cecil, faced with the prospect of a majority support for the Japanese proposal, proposed deletion of Article 21 all together. Majority of the delegates present in the session favoured deletion and consequently the Japanese proposal failed to be adopted. Support of the British delegates would have ensured the adoption of the Japanese proposal on 13 February 1919, at a fairly early stage of the conference.

## **6. Errors In Diplomacy By The Japanese:**

During Paris Peace Conference, despite their best efforts, Japanese delegates committed some diplomatic blunders that weakened their position. Compromises and consequent revisions to the text of racial equality proposal at least on nine occasions, and postponements, by Japanese delegates constituted serious diplomatic blunders. A discussion of the contention is presented below. On one occasion Japanese plenipotentiary Makino delivered an inappropriately worded speech that sounded imperialistic and prejudicial, making the Japanese demand on racial equality appear hypocritical, the account of which is also presented below.

### **6.1. Compromises And Postponements By The Japanese Delegates:**

Japanese delegates during the conference, from the very beginning, kept altering the text of their racial equality proposal in gestures of compromise to pacify opposition, many

times, at least on nine occasions, during their formal as well as informal meetings of negotiations. In keeping with the directives from Japanese government to cooperate with the allies, and perhaps more so in keeping with the traditional Japanese values of amity and harmony, they maintained a spirit of compromise from the outset and drafted two versions of racial equality proposal termed Proposal A and Proposal B. A discussion is presented below to demonstrate that the series of compromises the Japanese made during the conference, steadily weakened their position, giving the impression to the experienced participants like Britain and the US, that the Japanese are pliable. It is also believed that the Japanese compromises made Australian Prime Minister Hughes, who emerged as the single biggest resolute opposition to the Japanese proposal, believe that the Japanese could be pressurised to change their position. The instances of Japanese compromises to strengthen the contentions are presented below.

**a) Compromises After Discussions With The US:**

Japanese delegates after their very first informal discussions on 2 February 1919 with Colonel House of the US felt encouraged to negotiate further. On 4 February 1919 during the follow up negotiations with House the Japanese presented Proposal A. House flatly rejected Proposal A. Japanese delegates in a spirit of compromise instantly presented the diluted version Proposal B. House expressed his personal support to Proposal B but the instant compromise offered by the Japanese damaged their position. Moreover House mentioned that President Wilson would also agree with the draft and the draft could be presented to the Commission as the proposal of the President. Japanese delegates agreed with the suggestion of House and asked for the help of his good offices. Such instant acquiescence, a sign of inexperience and naïveté, or even weakness, was perhaps interpreted so.

The next day on 5 February 1919 House informed Japanese delegates that Wilson himself had amended the wording, as far as it lies in their legitimate powers, of the Proposal B to, as far as speedily possible. Japanese delegates probably buoyed by the feeling that they were making progress in getting their proposal adopted by the Commission again instantly acquiesced. The compromise by the Japanese could only have further weakened their position because their act fuelled the perception that the Japanese were pliable.

After informal talks with the US and Britain the Japanese became aware of the opposition to their proposal by the British. At that time the end of the first round of discussions on the draft Covenant of the League was approaching at the League of Nations Commission. Japanese delegation believed that it was timely and very necessary for the future to make public, Japan's opinion on the subject. So the Japanese delegates further diluted the text of the draft and proposed it to the League of Nations on 13 February 1919. In

a deft diplomatic move the Chairman Robert Cecil who was also the British plenipotentiary eliminated the Japanese proposal from the agenda.

**b) Revisions After Discussion With Australia:**

On 14 March 1919, Japanese plenipotentiaries Makino and Chinda called on Australian Prime Minister Hughes, who had emerged as the single biggest obstacle, and pleaded with him. Hughes did not yield. Japanese delegates also learnt that unless drastic changes were made to their proposal, there was no hope of obtaining agreement. So between 15<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> of March 1919, the Japanese further revised their Proposal A and discussed it with House on 21 March 1919. House agreed to the Japanese proposal subject to two conditions. As a result on the very next day, the 22<sup>nd</sup> of March 1919, the Japanese delegates revised their proposal further to Proposal B, making it the sixth revision.

**c) Revision After Discussions With Prime Ministers Of The British Dominions:**

British delegate Cecil arranged for a meeting of Japanese delegates with Prime Ministers of the British dominions on 25<sup>th</sup> March 1919 at the temporary residence of the Canadian Prime Minister Robert Borden in order to reach an agreement. At the meeting the Japanese delegates took their Proposal B as the basis and explained that the Japanese proposal was intended merely to clarify the principle of racial equality. Prime Ministers of the British dominions objected to the word equal and the Japanese strove to retain it. Following intensive discussions Borden suggested a compromise and the Japanese accepted Borden's amendment. Many of the Prime Ministers agreed to this proposal in a spirit of compromise with the exception of Hughes, who after declaring his staunch opposition stormed out.

**d) More Japanese Postponements And Compromises:**

On 10 April 1919 meeting of the Commission on the League of Nations, Japanese delegates informed that they would be introducing their amendment the next day. 'They had put it off so often, said House's son-in-law Gordon Auchincloss, that it had become something of a joke.'<sup>51</sup>

Japanese proposal to include the phrase - by the endorsement of the principle of equality of nations and just treatment of their nationals - at the final session of the League of Nations Commission on the evening of 11 April 1919, was the eighth compromised version. Japanese plenipotentiary Makino in a passionate appeal to the Commission introduced this eighth revision, which was not adopted by the League of Nations Commission.

After Japan's proposal was rejected on the evening of 11 April 1919, Japan prepared for the Plenary Session. In order to secure Japan's future position by clarifying her stand, Japanese delegates thought it more appropriate to repeat the original proposal. So on 28 April 1919, at the fifth Plenary Session of the Conference, Japanese plenipotentiary made a



statement essentially reverting to the very first draft of their proposal, making it the ninth change.

## **6.2. An Inappropriately Worded Speech By The Japanese:**

On 27 January 1919, only a week after Paris Peace Conference commenced, Japanese delegate Makino read a statement to the Supreme Council where referring to the Pacific islanders, he said, ‘were a primitive people who could only benefit from Japan’s protection and benevolence.’<sup>52</sup> The choice of words were foolish and gave the impression that the Japanese plenipotentiary was just as imperialistic and perhaps as racially prejudiced as the delegates from other participating countries who opposed the proposal on racial equality, making the Japanese demand on racial equality appear hypocritical.

No wonder the Japanese had ‘at best, lukewarm support’<sup>53</sup> from the fellow delegates at Paris.

## **7. Weak Presentation And Extreme Modesty:**

On the evening of 11 April 1919, at the final session of the League of Nations Commission Makino made a passionate appeal in a speech delivered in English for adoption of the Japanese proposal on racial equality. Makino’s speeches contained wise words. But throughout the entire duration of Paris Peace Conference Japanese delegates in their negotiations were too polite, too gentle and too modest. Moreover, Japanese delegates at the conference demonstrated rather weak language and communication skills that weakened their position. A discussion of their weak language and communication skills, and their extreme modesty and lack of firmness, is presented below.

### **7.1. Weak Language And Communication Skills:**

Many of the Japanese delegates at Paris Peace Conference spoke only rudimentary English or French. Makino’s English was not very good and Chinda’s English was somewhat better.<sup>54</sup> In one committee meeting, when the chairman asked the Japanese member whether he voted Aye or Nay, he replied ‘Yes’.<sup>55</sup> Because of weak language skills perhaps, Japanese delegates on the various bodies of the conference maintained a silence and that was misconstrued by the delegates of other western countries, who felt that Japanese delegates played ‘mainly a watching part’<sup>56</sup> in the proceedings. At one point House is reported to have said, ‘The Jap’s never speak.’<sup>57</sup> Wilson’s press officer, Baker, wrote, the Japanese ‘were the one-price traders of the Conference, they possessed the genius – perhaps the oriental genius – of knowing how to wait.’<sup>58</sup>

### **7.2. Extreme Modesty And Lack Of Firmness:**

The Japanese delegates were too cultured and polite and did not know how to counter Hughes, who, ‘through shrewd belligerence and a skilful use of his hearing aid, had had most

of his own way’<sup>59</sup> at Paris Peace Conference. Japanese delegates ‘in Paris – old Prince Saionji Kimmochi and the genteel Makino Nobuaki – were, alas, no match for the cantankerous Hughes and his biting oratory.’<sup>60</sup>

Extreme modesty shown by Japanese delegates irritated many of their fellow countrymen. In sheer exasperation Marquis Shigenobu Ookuma, a prominent Japanese, aired his views in *Kokumin* of Sunday, 6 April 1919. Under a bold heading ‘Rather Leave The League Of Nations’, a portion of his views read, ‘...but our delegates just showed their virtue of modesty pointlessly with lots of prudence. If modesty goes beyond the limit, it becomes obsequious and cowardly’.

### **8. Inexperienced Diplomacy:**

Failure of racial equality proposal presented by Japan at the League of Nations during Paris Peace Conference for adoption by the League of Nations remains an unfortunate indelible fact. Since the day of the rejection of racial equality proposal on 11 April 1919, right unto the present times, many scholars believe that Japanese inexperience in international diplomacy harmed their own cause. The numerous articles published in Japanese newspapers in the immediate aftermath of the rejection, blaming Japanese diplomacy, have been presented under two subheadings: Criticism of Japan and Japanese delegates, and Criticism of, and call to leave, the League of Nations, in the Appendix under the section Comments From The Japanese Press.

There were many instances where Japanese newspapers criticised the Japanese delegates with statements such as:

‘...lack of ability and tact shown by Japan’s delegates...’<sup>61</sup>;

‘...the rejection of the proposal means diplomatic failure...(and)... is decidedly a disgrace to the country, no matter in what beautiful terms it may be explained’<sup>62</sup>;

‘...This defeat may in part at least be due to the incompetence of our peace delegates...’<sup>63</sup>.

The *Yamato* in the *Japan Times & Mail* of April 18, 1919 said:

‘...all the steps taken by the present Government under Mr. Hara vis-à-vis the Peace conference have been one whole stretch of failures...and concession after concession all in vain was another. Among other blunders of a more serious nature...are the mistakes made in the choice of men representing the country...and their undexterous movements...’

The *Yamato* in the *Japan Times & Mail* of April 27, 1919 again declared:

‘...there must be no more concession on Japan’s part at the Peace Conference...No more yielding, not even by an inch...’cried the paper.

*Kokumin* recorded in the *Japan Times & Mail* of May 6, 1919 regretted the lack of firmness shown by the Japanese delegates with the following statement:

‘that the Government and its delegates had not shown ... firmness and zeal in pushing the anti-discrimination proposal...’

The author contends that the Japanese delegates at Paris, inexperienced in international diplomacy did weaken their position, but the reasons for rejection of racial equality proposal were extrinsic, as discussed at length in the earlier chapters. An elaboration to demonstrate where Japanese diplomacy went wrong is presented below.

### **8.1. Japan’s Absolute Trust In Anglo-Japanese Alliance:**

Japan had immense faith in her ally Britain since the first signing of Anglo-Japanese Alliance on 30 January 1902, currently on its seventeenth year at the time of Paris Peace Conference. Perhaps on the basis of the presumed strength of the alliance Japan instructed its delegates to the conference to maintain close contact with the representatives of Britain and other allies.

From British point of view Japan was not the first country of choice for signing an alliance. Only after Britain failed to reach agreements with Russia and Germany, Britain considered Japan for an alliance. The British being far more experienced in international affairs treated the alliance as an agreement to safeguard British interests. Britain’s primary aim in Asia was protection of her Empire in India, and secondarily its commercial interests in China. Therefore Britain also envisaged Anglo-Japanese Alliance as a means to rein in Japan so that Japan would not be able to join hands with Russia and threaten British interests in India and China. Even on one occasion in April 1904 British King Edward VII when talking with the Russian minister Izvolskii at Copenhagen had said that the aim of Anglo-Japanese Alliance was to contain Japan.

Japan, inexperienced in international diplomacy, did not have any inkling of the complexities of British diplomacy. Japan by placing absolute trust in Anglo-Japanese Alliance, took British support for granted and committed a grave strategic blunder in negotiations during the conference.

#### **End Notes:**

1. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996).
2. Margaret MacMillan, *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempt to End War* (London: John Murray Ltd., 2001).
3. Neville Kingsley Meaney, *Towards a New Vision: Australia & Japan: Through 100 Years* (Sydney: Kangaroo Press, 1999).

4. Akira Iriye, *Pacific Estrangement* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1972).
5. Roy Watson Curry, *Woodrow Wilson and Far Eastern Policy, 1913-1921* (New York: Octagon Books, 1968).
6. Henry P. Frei, *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991).
7. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980).
8. Richard Storry, *Japan and the Decline of the West in Asia 1894-1943* (London: The MacMillan Press, 1979).
9. Ian Hill Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23* (London: The Athlone Press, 1972).
10. Ian Hill Nish, *The Anglo-Japanese Alliance: The Diplomacy of Two Island Empires 1894-1907* (London: The Athlone Press, 1985).
11. Chushichi Tsuzuki, *The Pursuit of Power in Modern Japan: 1825-1995* (Oxford University Press, 2000).
12. Naoko Shimazu, *Japan, Race and Equality: The Racial Equality Proposal of 1919* (London: Routledge, 1998).
13. Akira Iriye, *Pacific Estrangement* (Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press, 1972), 126-50.
14. Deutsche Wacht in Kiautschau, *Simplicissimus* 19 Jahrgang, Nr.27, 6 October 1914.
15. Robert E. Park, in Introduction to Jesse F. Steiner, *The Japanese Invasion* (Chicago: McClurg, 1917), p.xiv.
16. The Doctrine of the Legal Equality of States, Document No. 575, in David Hunter Miller, *My Diary At the Conference of Paris*, 21 vols. (New York: Privately printed, 1924), vol.7, 84-85.
17. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, Second Edition, (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996), p.94.
18. *ibid.*, p.85.
19. Akira Iriye, *Across the Pacific: An Inner History of American-East Asian Relations* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, 1967), 131.
20. US Congress, *Congressional Record*, Ist Session, 64th Congress, vol.53, pt.1, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1916), 754-55.
21. Margaret MacMillan, *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempt to End War* (London: John Murray Ltd., 2001), 315.

22. Marescotti L. Aldrovandi, *Guerra diplomatica: recordi e frammenti di diario* (Milan, 1936), 337.
23. Roy Watson Curry, *Woodrow Wilson and Far Eastern Policy, 1913-1921* (New York: Octagon Books, 1968), 251.
24. Charles Seymour, ed. *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, vol.4 (London: Ernest Benn Ltd. 1928), vol.4, 304.
25. Harold Nicolson, *Peacemaking 1919* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd. 1943), 145.
26. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996), 90.
27. *Handbook for Candidates*, as cited in Peter S. O'Connor, "Keeping New Zealand White, 1908-1920," *New Zealand Journal of History* 2 (1968), pp.41-65.
28. "The Week: Racial Equality," *Otago Witness*, 23 April 1919.
29. Britain, PRO/FO, 371/6684, Memorandum entitled 'Racial Discrimination and Immigration, 10 October 1921, Confidential, F4212/223/23, p.10.
30. Lawrence F. Fitzhardinge, *William Morris Hughes: A Political Biography* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1964), 116 & 136.
31. David Hunter Miller, *My Diary At the Conference of Paris*. 21 vols. (New York: Privately printed, 1924), entry of 8 February 1919, Vol.1, 114.
32. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996), 90.
33. "Ishii's Plea Stirs Western Senators," *New York Times*, 16 March 1919.
34. "Land Law Must Be More Drastic," *Sacramento Union*, 1 April 1919.
35. As cited in Britain, PRO/FO, 371/3817, Despatch No. 55 from Conyngham Greene (Tokyo) to Curzon (London), 6 February 1919.
36. As cited in Britain, PRO/FO, 371/6684, Memorandum entitled 'Racial Discrimination and Immigration, 10 October 1921, Confidential, F4212/223/23, p.17.
37. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996), 85.
38. Naoko Shimazu, *Japan, Race and Equality: The Racial Equality Proposal of 1919* (London: Routledge, 1998), 155.
39. *ibid.*, p.156.
40. *ibid.*, p.155.
41. *ibid.*, p.139.
42. *ibid.*, p.155-157.

43. Naoko Shimazu, *Japan, Race and Equality: The Racial Equality Proposal of 1919* (London: Routledge, 1998), 122.
44. *ibid.*, p.122.
45. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, p.1-2 in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
46. Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996), 94.
47. Stephen Bonsal, *Unfinished Business* (London: Michael Joseph Ltd., 1944), 154.
48. Charles Seymour, ed. *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, vol.4 (London: Ernest Benn Ltd. 1928), vol. 4, 413-15.
49. *House Diary*, Edward Mandel House Papers, Yale University Library, New Haven, 13.2.19.
50. David Hunter Miller, *My Diary At the Conference of Paris*, 21 vols. (New York: Privately printed, 1924), vol.1, 100.
51. *Auchincloss Diary*, Gordon Auchincloss Papers, Yale University Library, New Haven, 10.4.19.
52. Papers Relating to the *Foreign Relations of the United States: The Paris Peace Conference 1919*, vol.3, 739-40.
53. Margaret MacMillan, *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempt to End War* (London: John Murray Ltd., 2001), 328.
54. Ian Hill Nish, *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23* (London: The Athlone Press, 1972), 267.
55. Charles Seymour, ed. *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, vol.4 (London: Ernest Benn Ltd. 1928), vol.4, 177-8
56. Harold Vazeille William Temperley, ed. *A History of the Peace Conference of Paris*, vol. 1, (London: Henry Frowde and Hodder & Stoughton, 1924), 259.
57. Charles Seymour, ed. *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, vol.4 (London: Ernest Benn Ltd. 1928) vol. 4, 309.
58. Ray Stannard Baker, *Woodrow Wilson and World Settlement*, 3 vols. (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1923), vol. 1, 73.

59. Ian Turner, "1914-1919", in *A New History of Australia* ed. Frank K. Crowley (Melbourne: William Heinemann, Melbourne, 1974, Reprinted 1980), 351.
60. Henry P. Frei, *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 101.
61. *Hochi* in *Japan Times & Mail*, April 16, 1919.
62. *Kokumin* in *Japan Times & Mail*, April 16, 1919.
63. *Asahi* in *Japan Times & Mail*, April 18, 1919.

## CONCLUSION

A critical examination of the issues and events related to the presentation and eventual rejection of Japanese proposal on racial equality at Paris Peace Conference is the crux of the thesis. In the process the thesis has demonstrated the delicate nature of behind the scenes diplomatic negotiations and manoeuvres between Japanese delegates and representatives of other participating countries during the conference. Japanese delegates through their negotiations endeavoured to include the principle of according equal and just treatment to aliens belonging to member countries of the League of Nations regardless of their race or nationality as an amendment to the draft Covenant of the League of Nations. They also proposed to insert a passage recognising equality of all nations and just treatment of every nationality into the preamble to the Covenant. Japanese efforts however proved unsuccessful and the proposal on racial equality was rejected by the League of Nations. Investigations into the reasons for rejection of racial equality proposal, that constitute the Principal Question of the research, have been addressed at great length in this thesis. Presented below is a discussion on the conclusions drawn.

### **1. A Combination Of Factors Defeated Racial Equality Proposal:**

The central contention of the thesis is that racial equality proposal was not rejected because of any one particular reason. A number of major factors combined to defeat the Japanese proposal on racial equality at Paris Peace Conference. Among the major factors some were perhaps more important than others, none the less, all the major factors contributed to the combined effect that defeated racial equality proposal. A discussion of major factors in an ascending order of importance is presented below.

The least important, among the major factors, was the lack of support for the Japanese proposal by the British dominions of New Zealand, Canada and South Africa. The author believes so, because this factor on its own did not carry much weight. But this factor was important because it lent support to the Prime Minister of Australia William Morris Hughes. Although South African plenipotentiaries and the Prime Minister of Canada tried to break the impasse in negotiations between the Japanese delegation and Hughes, who had adopted an uncompromising attitude, the Canadians and the South Africans did not firmly oppose Hughes. The Prime Minister of New Zealand, because of domestic politics in New Zealand and the forthcoming general election there, in fact openly sided with Hughes in opposing racial equality proposal.

Lack of US support for racial equality proposal, and Wilson's ruling against the Japanese, was a key factor for the rejection of the Japanese proposal on racial equality at the conference. Wilson in the early stages of the conference was not averse to the proposal on



racial equality. But once he noticed resolute opposition to the proposal by Australian Prime Minister Hughes, and the lack of support for the proposal from the British, he hesitated to support the Japanese proposal. Wilson was keen on establishing the League of Nations, and to make it successful to create a new international order, which he hoped would be dominated by the Anglo-Saxons. Wilson needed the British to create his world order, and so he did not want to upset the British. Wilson might also have been swayed by the US domestic politics where he needed the support of the US senators, some of whom were opposed to racial equality proposal, to get the League of Nations approved in the US Senate. So when Wilson faced the prospect of a win for the Japanese proposal at the League of Nations Commission meeting of 11 April 1919, he rejected racial equality proposal on grounds of lack of unanimity.

Lack of British support for racial equality proposal was a very significant factor for the rejection of the Japanese proposal at the Peace Conference. In the very early stages of the conference, like the Americans the British were not averse to the Japanese proposal on racial equality. But soon afterwards due to the resolute opposition of Hughes the British opposed Japanese proposal. To make matters worse Prime Ministers of the other British Dominions of New Zealand, Canada and South Africa, either sided with Hughes or did not openly oppose him. British Dominions had made significant contributions to the just concluded Great War with man power and funds; and the British did not want to disappoint their leaders. Moreover the British treated the Japanese proposal on racial equality more as an issue of Japanese migration to Anglo-Saxon dominated countries and hence considered it as an internal matter for the Dominions and chose not to intervene. Such an attitude from the British encouraged Hughes even more to oppose the Japanese proposal. It is believed that only the British had some influence on Hughes. British influence was demonstrated when the British Prime Minister Lloyd George had restrained Hughes in November 1918 barely a month before the commencement of Paris Peace Conference from renegeing on the promises made to the Japanese in Anglo-Japanese secret agreement over the cession of German held islands in the Pacific. Moreover had the British supported racial equality proposal the US would most definitely have followed suit. But unfortunately for the Japanese the British chose not to support racial equality proposal, making it a significant factor for the rejection of Japanese proposal.

Resolute opposition by the Prime Minister of Australia Hughes to racial equality proposal was the single most crucial factor that significantly contributed to the rejection of the Japanese proposal at Paris Peace Conference. Hughes was a champion of White Australia Policy and had proclaimed not to concede *even an inch* to the Japanese. Hughes saw racial

equality proposal as a grave threat to White Australia Policy that formed the very foundation on which his country stood. Moreover in a few months time Hughes faced a general election in Australia and he used the Peace Conference as a stage for showing his strength by affirming his strong support for White Australia Policy that was the policy frame work for the national defence of Australia. By vehemently opposing racial equality proposal he reaffirmed his credentials as the protector of Australia and its foundation, White Australia Policy. Hughes's strong and persistent attack on racial equality proposal, and his threats to reignite race issues all over the world intimidated even the Americans. In the absence of any restraint from the British, the only party who could have restrained Hughes, Hughes forced his way to achieving his goal, and that was defeating racial equality proposal.

Since 11 April 1919, the day the Japanese proposal on racial equality was rejected at the League of Nations Commission, some critics, often vociferous, have argued that the defeat was a deliberate Japanese ploy of sacrificing the racial equality proposal to secure the other items in the Japanese agenda. The author has demonstrated that this theory is incorrect. The Japanese did not deliberately sacrifice their proposal. The Japanese plenipotentiaries endeavoured to secure the adoption of the racial equality proposal but failed.

Another accusation that has been levelled against the Japanese delegation at Paris Peace Conference, and the Japanese government of the time, is that racial equality proposal did not champion a universal principle because the Japanese themselves racially discriminated against the Chinese and the Koreans. Moreover, the accusers believe, therefore, Japanese demand for racial equality was not genuine, and hence it failed at the League of Nations Commission in 1919. Japanese discrimination against the ethnic Chinese and the ethnic Koreans is an undeniable historical fact, just as the discrimination the Japanese people suffered in British colonies and the US. It is correct that the Japanese delegates advanced the racial equality proposal essentially because of the serious discrimination the Japanese people suffered in British colonies and the US, but the Japanese demand for racial equality at the conference was most definitely genuine.

The Japanese people, particularly the ethnic Japanese settled in British colonies and the US, and the new migrant workers from Japan arriving in the above mentioned countries, suffered from a range of humiliating discriminations, based purely on grounds of race. The racial discrimination the Japanese faced was not just an emotional issue, it affected and adversely governed their livelihoods and their very existence. The prejudiced rules controlled and restricted immigration. There were often horrendous stereotyping and on occasions malicious gross exaggeration of some ethnic traits of the Japanese in the above mentioned countries. The perpetrators of such prejudices were not confined to any narrow sections of

the society, rather prejudices were rampant and the perpetrators belonged to every walk of life, including academics, literature, policy making, politics and government. Entrenched prejudices against the Japanese harmed Japan at Paris Peace Conference.

## **2. Inexperience In International Diplomacy:**

Japanese diplomats at Paris Peace Conference made genuine efforts at negotiations for the adoption of racial equality proposal at the League of Nations. However, Japanese diplomats, however, committed many strategic and tactical mistakes at Paris. Inexperienced in international diplomacy, Japanese delegation at the conference and Japanese government of the time, perhaps did not comprehend the simple yet complex facts of international relations. In international relations there are no permanent friends and no permanent enemies. The only enduring fact is that nations have interests. When the interests coincide, nations become friends and when there is a conflict of interest, the once friendly nations become enemies. Even more importantly two nations at any given point in time could be friends over a certain issue and enemies over another. The Japanese had immense faith in their ally Britain to whom Japan was bound by Anglo-Japanese Alliance since 1902. But the Japanese either did not realise or did not pay attention to, or both, the fact that since the commencement of the second decade of Anglo-Japanese Alliance there was a perceptible decline in the alliance. The decline, during the World War One years, 1914 to 1918, became very steep, that led to the eventual cancellation of the treaty; but Japan did not do anything substantial by way of promoting Japan in Britain to arrest the decline. During the war years, there were even instances of hostilities between the two allies, Britain and Japan. Yet, despite the undercurrents of distrust and unfriendliness, Japanese government and Japanese delegates at Paris Peace Conference placed their absolute trust on their ally Britain, to their own detriment.

During the conference Japanese delegates demonstrated rather weak communication and language skills, and that made delegates from the major countries like the US, Britain and France develop a poor opinion of the Japanese communication abilities. The negotiation skills of Japanese delegates lacked finesse, and that made matters worse. Japanese delegates made numerous changes, at least on nine occasions, to the text of racial equality proposal in a spirit of compromise. But these changes created a perception among the delegates from other countries that the Japanese were weak, pliable and too willing to compromise. Even Japanese critics of the Japanese delegates pointed out that extreme modesty exhibited by Japanese delegates at the conference damaged the Japanese cause.

At the conference Japanese delegates failed to combat Hughes and also failed to garner the British support. It is believed that Hughes could have been influenced only by the British. For the Japanese British support was absolutely crucial firstly because the British

could have restrained Hughes, and secondly the British could have influenced Wilson who wanted British support to create the League of Nations. Yet the Japanese did not engage in any worthwhile propaganda exercise in Britain to improve their image in Britain that was seriously dented during World War One.

The inexperience in diplomacy shown by the Japanese delegates at Paris Peace Conference weakened the position of Japan in negotiations for the adoption of Racial Equality Bill by the League of Nations. But this inexperienced Japanese diplomacy in itself did not constitute a major factor for the rejection of racial equality proposal. As discussed in the previous section the reasons for rejection of the Japanese proposal were extrinsic.

### **3. Pernicious White Australia Policy:**

Could White Australia Policy be blamed for the rejection of racial equality proposal, the answer is a most definite yes. Preservation of White Australia Policy to safeguard Australia from the threat of Japanese as well as other *Asiatics* was the single biggest motivation for the Australian Prime Minister Hughes to resolutely oppose racial equality proposal. So it is obvious that the tentacles of the pernicious White Australia Policy did not stay confined to Australia, the land of its origin, and stretched way beyond, in to Paris Peace Conference and the League of Nations to destroy racial equality proposal.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### 1. References In English:

#### 1.1 Articles and Books:

1. Ambrosius, Lloyd E. *Woodrow Wilson and the American Diplomatic Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
2. Baker, Ray Stannard. *Woodrow Wilson and World Settlement*, 3 vols. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1923.
3. Barkan, Elazar. *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States between the World Wars*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
4. Bean, Charles Edwin Woodrow. *The Official History of Australia in the War of 1914-1918: The Story of ANZAC From the Outbreak of War to the End of the First Phase of the Gallipoli Campaign, May 4, 1915*, Vol. 1. Brisbane: University of Queensland Press, 1981, 1st. ed. 1921.
5. Beasley, William G. *The Modern History of Japan*, 3rd ed. Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1991.
6. Birdsall, Paul. *Versailles Twenty Years After*. New York: Reyal & Hitchcock, 1941.
7. Stephen, Bonsal. *Unfinished Business*. London: Michael Joseph Ltd., 1944.
8. Borden, Henry. Ed. *Robert Laird Borden: His Memoirs*, vol 2. London: Macmillan, 1938.
9. Borrie, Wilfred David. *Immigration, Australia's Problems and Prospects*. London: Angus & Robertson, 1949.
10. Browne, Frank C. *They Called Him Billy*. Sydney: Peter Huston, 1946.
11. Burdick, Charles Burton. *The Japanese Seige of Tsingtau*. Connecticut: Hamden, 1976.
12. Buxton, Gordon L. "1870-90." In *A New History of Australia* ed. Frank K. Crowley. Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1974, Reprinted 1980.
13. Campbell, David A. S. "A Foreign Policy for Australia." In *Australia's Foreign Policy*, ed. Walter G.K. Duncan, 163-210. Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1938.
14. Cecil, Lord Robert. *A Great Experiment*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1941.
15. Chow, Misuzu Hanihara. *Japan Literacy in Australia: A Changing Demand Over Eighty Years*. Ph.D. Thesis, Macquarie University, Sydney, 2001.
16. Clark, Manning. *A Short History of Australia*. London: Heinemann, 1977, 1st. ed. 1963.
17. Clyde, Paul Hibbert. *The Far East: A History of the Impact of the West on Eastern Asia*, 2nd ed. New York: Prentice Hall, 1953.

18. Connors, Leslie. *The Emperor's Adviser: Saionji Kimmochi and Pre-war Japanese Politics*. London: Croom Helm, 1987.
19. Conroy, Hilary. *The Japanese Frontier in Hawaii, 1868-1898*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1953.
20. Craig, George Cathcart. *The Federal Defence of Australia*. Sydney: George Robertson & Co., 1897.
21. Crawford, John G. "Australia as a Pacific Power." In *Australia's Foreign Policy*, ed. Walter G.K. Duncan, 69-121. Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1938.
22. Crawford, John G., and Saburo Okita, *Australia, Japan and Western Pacific Economic Relations*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1976.
23. Curry, Roy Watson. *Woodrow Wilson and Far Eastern Policy, 1913-1921*. New York: Octagon Books, 1968.
24. Daniels, Roger. *The Politics of Prejudice: The Anti-Japanese Movement in California and the Struggle for Japanese Exclusion*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962.
25. \_\_\_\_\_. *Asian America: Chinese and Japanese in the United States since 1850*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1988.
26. Daniels, Roger, and Harry Kitano, *American Racism: Exploration of the Nature of Prejudice*. Engelwood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1970.
27. Dignan, Donald. "Australia and British Relations with Japan, 1914-21." *Australia Outlook* 21, 1967, 135-150.
28. Dillon, Emile Joseph. *The Inside Story of the Peace Conference*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1920.
29. Dingman, Roger. *Power in the Pacific: The Origins of Naval Arms Limitation, 1914-22*. Chicago, 1976.
30. Dower, John W. *War Without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War*. London: Faber and Faber, 1986.
31. Egerton, George W. *Great Britain and the Creation of the League of Nations: Strategy, Politics, and International Organisation, 1914-1919*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978.
32. Ferguson, Ted. *A White Man's Country: An Exercise in Canadian Prejudice*. Toronto: Double Day, 1975.
33. Fifield, Russell H. *Woodrow Wilson and the Far East: The Diplomacy of the Shantung Question*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1952.

34. Fitzhardinge, Lawrence F. *William Morris Hughes: A Political Biography*, Vol. I and Vol. II. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1964, 1977.
35. Fitzpatrick, Brian, and Rowan J. Cahill, *The Seamen's Union of Australia, 1872-1972*. Sydney: Seamen's Union of Australia, 1981.
36. Floto, Inga. *Colonel House in Paris: A Study of American Policy at the Paris Peace Conference, 1919*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.
37. Foley, Hamilton. Compiled by, *Woodrow Wilson's Case for the League of Nations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1923.
38. Frei, Henry P. *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991.
39. Gallagher, Patrick. *America's Aims and Asia's Aspirations*. New York: Century, 1920.
40. Garran, Robert. *Prosper the Commonwealth*. London: Angus & Robertson, 1958.
41. George, Alexander L. and Juliette L. George, *Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House: A Personality Study*. New York: Dover Publications, 1964.
42. Greenwood, Gordon and Charles, Grimshaw. Eds. *Documents on Australian International Affairs 1901-1918*. Canberra: Australian Institute of International Affairs, 1977.
43. Hankey, Lord Maurice. *The Supreme Control: At the Paris Peace Conference 1919*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1963.
44. House, Edward Mandel, and Charles, Seymour, eds. *What Really Happened at Paris: The Story of the Peace Conference, 1918-1919*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1921.
45. Hughes, Colin A., *Mr. Prime Minister: Australian Prime Ministers, 1901-1972*, (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1976).
46. Hughes, William Morris. *The Splendid Adventure: A Review of Empire Relations within and without the Commonwealth of Britannic Nations*. London: Ernest Benn Ltd., 1929.
47. \_\_\_\_\_. *Australia and War To-day: The Price of Freedom*. Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1935.
48. \_\_\_\_\_. *Crusts and Crusades; Tales of Bygone Days*. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1947.
49. \_\_\_\_\_. *Policies and Potentates*. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1950.
50. Huttenback, Robert A. *Racism and Empire: White Settlers and Coloured Immigrants in the British Self-Governing Colonies*. London: Cornell University Press, 1976.
51. Ichihashi, Yamato. *Japanese in the United States: A Critical Study of the Problems of the Japanese Immigrants and their Children*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1932.

52. Ichioka, Yuji. *The Issei: The World of the First Generation Japanese Immigrants, 1885-1924*. New York: The Free Press, 1988.
53. Irving, Terry H. "1850-70." In *A New History of Australia*, ed. Frank K. Crowley, 124-64. Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1974, Reprinted 1980.
54. Iriye, Akira. *Across the Pacific: An Inner History of American-East Asian Relations*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, 1967.
55. \_\_\_\_\_. *Pacific Estrangement: Japanese and American Expansion, 1897-1911*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1972.
56. \_\_\_\_\_. "Wartime Japanese Planning for Post-War Asia." In *Anglo-Japanese Alienation 1919-1952*, ed. Ian Nish, 177-97. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
57. Ishii, Kikujiro. *Diplomatic Commentaries*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1936.
58. Ito, Kazuo. *Issei*. Seattle: Japan Publications, 1973.
59. Iwao, Seiichi. Ed. *Biographical Dictionary of Japanese History*. Tokyo: Kodansha International, 1978.
60. Johanson, David. "History of White Australia Policy." In *Immigration: Control or Colour Bar?: The Background to 'White Australia' and a proposal for change*, The Immigration Reform Group, ed. Kenneth Rivett. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1962.
61. Jose, Arthur W. *Official History of Australia in the War of 1914-18: The Royal Australian Navy*, Vol. 9. Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1937.
62. Kajima, Morinosuke. *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. II. Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1978.
63. \_\_\_\_\_. *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III. Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980.
64. Kennedy, Captain M. D. *Some Aspects of Japan and Her Defence Forces*. London: Keegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., 1928.
65. King, Peter. "Japan and Australia: From Enmity to Enmeshment?" In *Australia and Asia*, eds. McGillivray, Mark and Gary, Smith. Oxford University Press, 1997.
66. Knock, Thomas J. *To End All Wars: Woodrow Wilson and the Quest for a New World Order*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
67. Lansing, Robert. *The Peace Negotiations: A Personal Narrative*. London: Constable and Company Ltd., 1921.
68. \_\_\_\_\_. *The Big Four and Others of the Peace Conference*. London: Hutchinson, 1922.



69. Latourette, Kenneth Scott. *A Short History of the Far East*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1947.
70. Lauren, Paul Gordon. *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*, 2nd ed. Boulder: Westview Press, 1996.
71. Link, Arthur S. *Wilson: The New Freedom*, 2 vols. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1956.
72. Lloyd, George David. *War Memoirs*, vols 4 and 5. London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 1934.
73. Lodge, Henry Cabot. *The Senate and the League of Nations*. London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.
74. Lowe, Cedric J., and Michael L. Dockrill, *The Mirage of Power: British Foreign Policy, 1902-22*. 3 Vols. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972.
75. Lowe, Peter C. *Great Britain and Japan, 1911-15: A Study of British Far Eastern Policy*. London: Macmillan, 1969.
76. Macmahon, Ball W. *Australia and Japan: Documents and Readings in Australian History*. Melbourne: Thomas Nelson, 1969.
77. MacMillan, Margaret. *Peacemakers: The Paris Conference of 1919 and Its Attempts to End War*. London: John Murray, 2001.
78. Mayer, Arno J. *Politics and Diplomacy of Peacemaking: Containment and Counterrevolution at Versailles, 1918-1919*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1968.
79. Meaney, Neville Kingsley. *The Search for Security in the Pacific, 1901-14*. Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1976.
80. \_\_\_\_\_. "The Yellow Peril and the Australian Crisis: The Japanese Phase in the History of the Australian Foreign Policy. 1905-41." In *Kokusai Seiji* (International Relations) Vol. 2, 1981.
81. \_\_\_\_\_. *Australia and the World: A Documentary History from the 1870s to the 1970s*. Brisbane: Longman, 1985.
82. \_\_\_\_\_. *Fears & Phobias: E.L. Piesse and the Problem of Japan*. Canberra: National Library of Australia, Occasional Papers Series, Number 1, 1996.
83. \_\_\_\_\_. "Australia's Changing Perception of Asia." In *The Japan Foundation Papers*, No.2. Sydney: The Japan Cultural Centre, 1997.
84. \_\_\_\_\_. *Towards a New Vision: Australia & Japan: Through 100 Years*. Sydney: Kangaroo Press, 1999.
85. Miller, David Hunter. *My Diary At the Conference of Paris*, 21 vols. New York: Privately printed, 1924.

86. \_\_\_\_\_. *The Drafting of the Covenant*, 2 vols. New York: Putnam, 1928.
87. Monash, John. *The Australian Victories in France in 1918*. London, 1920.
88. Murdoch, James. *History of Japan*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1926.
89. Nicolson, Harold. *Peacemaking 1919*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd. 1943.
90. Nish, Ian Hill. *Alliance in Decline: A Study in Anglo-Japanese Relations 1908-23*. London: The Athlone Press, 1972.
91. \_\_\_\_\_. *Japanese Foreign Policy, 1869-1942*. London, 1977.
92. \_\_\_\_\_. *The Anglo-Japanese Alliance: The Diplomacy of Two Island Empires 1894-1907*. London: The Athlone Press, 1966, Reprinted 1985.
93. Peattie, Mark R. "The Nanyo: Japan in the South Pacific, 1885-1945." In *The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895-1945*, eds. Myers, Ramon H. and Mark R. Peattie, 172-210. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
94. \_\_\_\_\_. *Nan'yo: The Rise and Fall of the Japanese in Micronesia 1885-1945*. Honolulu: Hawaii University Press, 1987.
95. Piesse, Edmund Leolin. "Japan and Australia." In *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 4, (1926): 475-88.
96. \_\_\_\_\_. *Japan and the Defence of Australia*. Melbourne: Robertson & Mullens, 1935.
97. Rivett, Kenneth. Ed. *Immigration: Control or Colour Bar?: The Background to 'White Australia' and a proposal for change*. The Immigration Reform Group, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1962.
98. Rivett, Kenneth. "The Immigration Reform Movement.", In *The Abolition of the White Australia Policy: The Immigration Reform Movement Revisited*, Australia-Asia Papers no. 65, Centre for the Study of Australia-Asia Relations, ed. Nancy Viviani. Brisbane: Griffith University, 1992.
99. Roosevelt, Eleanor. *India and the Awakening East*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953.
100. Royama, Masamichi. *Foreign Policy of Japan: 1914-1939*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1973.
101. Scott, Ernest. *The Official History of Australia in the War of 1914-1918: Australia During the War*, Vol.11. Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1936.
102. Serle, Geoffrey. *The Golden Age: A History of the Colony of Victoria, 1851-1861*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1963.
103. Seymour, Charles. Ed. *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, vol.4. London: Ernest Benn Ltd. 1928.

104. Shaw, Alan G.L. "1788 –1810." In *A New History of Australia*, ed. Frank K. Crowley, 1-44. Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1974, Reprinted 1980.
105. Shepherd, Jack. *Australia's Interests and Policies in the Far East*. New York: Institute of Pacific Relations Inquiry Series, 1939.
106. Shimazu, Naoko. *Japan, Race and Equality: The Racial Equality Proposal of 1919*. London: Routledge, 1998.
107. Shimizu, Hajime. "Nanshin-ron: Its Turning Point in World War I." *Developing Economies*, Vol.25, (1987), 386-420.
108. Shotwell, James T. *At the Paris Peace Conference*. New York Macmillan, 1937.
109. Sissons, David C. S. *Attitudes to Japan and Defence 1890 –1923*. M.A. Thesis, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, 1956.
110. \_\_\_\_\_. "The Immigration Question in Australian Diplomatic Relations with Japan, 1875-1919." In History Section 26/821, *Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science*, (1971).
111. \_\_\_\_\_. "Japanese in Australia from 1871 to 1946, in Study of Immigration." No. 10, JICA (Japan International Cooperation Agency), (1974), 27-54.
112. \_\_\_\_\_. "Manchester v. Japan: The Imperial Background of the Australian Trade Diversion Dispute with Japan, 1936." *Australian Outlook*, Vol. 30, (1976), 480-502.
113. \_\_\_\_\_. "Karayuki-San: Japanese Prostitutes in Australia, 1887-1916.", 2 parts. *Historical Studies*, Vol. 17, Nos 68 and 69, (1977), 323-41 and 474-88.
114. \_\_\_\_\_. "The Early Japanese Influence on the Northern Territory", *NT Newsletter*, Nov., Dec., 1977, Jan. 1978, pp. 15-21, 16-21, 13-16. 1977.
115. \_\_\_\_\_. "The Japanese in the Australian Pearling Industry." *Queensland Heritage*, Vol. 3, 1979.
116. Sladen, Douglas Brooke Wheelton. *From Boundary Rider to Prime Minister*. London: Hutchinson, 1916.
117. Sprigg, Stanhope W. *W.M. Hughes, the Strong man of Australia*. London: Arthur Pearson, 1916.
118. Steiner, Jesse F. *The Japanese Invasion*. Chicago: McClurg, 1917.
119. Stoddard, T. Lothrop. *The Rising Tide of Colour Against White World Supremacy*. New York: Scribner's, 1921.
120. Storry, Richard. *A History of Modern Japan*. London: Penguin, 1960.
121. \_\_\_\_\_. *Japan and the Decline of the West in Asia 1894-1943*. London: The MacMillan Press, 1979.

122. Takeda, Isami. *Australia-Japan Relations in the Era of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 1896-1911*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Sydney, Sydney, 1984.
123. Takegoshi, Yosaburo. *The Story of the Wako: Japanese Pioneers in the Southern Region*, tr. Hideo Watanabe. Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1940.
124. Takeuchi, Tatsuji. *War and Diplomacy in the Japanese Empire*. Tokyo: Tuttle, 1935.
125. Taylor, Alan John Percivale. *English History, 1914-1945*. Oxford University Press, 1965.
126. Temperley, Harold Vazeille William. Ed. *A History of the Peace Conference of Paris*. London: Henry Frowde and Hodder & Stoughton, 1924.
127. Tillman, Seth P. *Anglo-American Relations at the Peace Conference of 1919*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.
128. Tsuzuki, Chushichi. *The Pursuit of Power in Modern Japan: 1825-1995*. Oxford University Press, 2000.
129. Turner, Ian. "1914-1919." In *A New History of Australia*, ed. Frank K. Crowley, 312-56. Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1974, Reprinted 1980.
130. Walworth, Arthur. *Wilson and his Peacemakers: American Diplomacy at the Paris Peace Conference, 1919*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1986.
131. Whyte, Farmer W. *William Morris Hughes; His Life and Times*. Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1957.
132. Willard, Myra. *History of the White Australia Policy to 1920*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1923, reprinted 1974.

## **1.2 Documents From National Archives Of Australia:**

1. *Documents April 1919-Sept. 1920 K-R*, A2219, External Relations Volume 11.
2. *Eastern questions [2cm]*, A3934, SC12/6.
3. *War Peace Conference – Paris 1919 Protocols*, A981, War P 10 Part 1.
4. *Far Eastern Affairs Brazil, China, India, Japan [4.5cm]*, A2219, External Relations Volume 2 B Ton.
5. *Senator Millen's mission to London and Geneva and Piesse's briefs*, A3932, SC42.
- a. *[Personal Papers of Prime Minister Cook][Transcript of Versailles Peace Conference Session 'Communication of the Preliminaries of Peace to the German Delegates', 7 May 1919; Chapter 11: The Paris Peace Conference and the Founding of the League of Nations' (circa 1976, author unknown)*, M3609, 4.
6. *Cuttings Compiled Oct. 1918 to April 1919 J-W[7cm]*, A2219, External Relations Vol. 6.
7. *Chapter 47 – The Peace Conference and the Treaty of Versailles*, A5954, 1283/10.

8. *League of Nations, and International treaty engagements*, A3932, SC104.
9. *Reports etc of visits of the Director of the Pacific Branch*, A3932, SC229.
10. *Far East – Enquiries by Major E L Piesse*, A6661, 1402.
11. *Cuttings compiled: Oct. 1918 to April 1919 A-J*, A2219, External Relations Vol. 5.

### **1.3 Documents From National Library Of Australia:**

1. Latham, J.G., Letter: Latham to Piesse, 21 February 1919, Piesse Papers, NLA, MS882/5/8.
2. Murdoch, J., Letter: Murdoch to McRae, 6 December 1918, Kagoshima, Japan: Piesse Papers, NLA, MS882/5/5.
3. \_\_\_\_\_. Letter: Murdoch to MacRae, 22 December 1918, Tokyo: Japan: Piesse Papers, NLA, MS882/5/6.
4. \_\_\_\_\_. Letter: Murdoch to Piesse, 14 March 1919, Sydney: Piesse Papers, NLA, MS882/5/10.
5. \_\_\_\_\_. Letter: Murdoch to Piesse, 10 April 1919, Mosman Bay: Piesse Papers, NLA, MS882/5/13-14.
6. \_\_\_\_\_. Letter: Murdoch to Piesse, 22 April 1919, Old Cremorne: Piesse Papers, NLA, MS882/5/15.
7. \_\_\_\_\_. Letter: Murdoch to Piesse, 24 April 1919, Cremorne: Piesse Papers, NLA, MS882/5/16.
8. \_\_\_\_\_. Letter: Murdoch to Piesse, Cremorne: Piesse Papers, NLA, MS882/5/17.
9. \_\_\_\_\_. Letter: Murdoch to Piesse, 26 April 1919, Cremorne: Piesse Papers, NLA, MS882/5/18.
10. Piesse, E.L., Letter: Piesse to Murdoch, 2 May 1919, Melbourne: Piesse Papers, NLA, MS882/5/22.
11. \_\_\_\_\_. Copy of letter: Piesse to Latham, 7 May 1919, Melbourne: Piesse Papers, NLA, MS882/5/25.
12. *Australia and Japan: Conversation at the Gaimusho with Mr. Shimidzu*, 24 and 25 December 1919, Piesse Papers, NLA, MS882/5/41-52.
13. *Conversation at the Japanese Foreign Office*, 17 March 1920, Piesse Papers, NLA, MS882/5/58-65.
14. *Racial Equality – The Japanese Amendment to the Covenant of the League of Nations: Notes of Proceedings in the Commission of the League of Nations*, 10<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 13 February 1919 and 15<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 17 April 1919, Piesse Papers, NLA, MS882/4/59-69.

15. *Japan and Racial Equality: Extract from speech of Viscount Ishii at First Assembly of the League of Nations on 30<sup>th</sup> November 1920*, 30 November 1920, Piesse Papers, NLA, MS882/4/81.
16. *Discrimination against Asiatics – Notes for an Australian Policy*, 27 March 1919, Piesse Papers, NLA, MS882/2/118-131.

## 2. References From Published Sources In Japanese:

1. Banno, Junji. *Meiji: Shisoo no jitsuzoo (A true picture of the ideas of the Meiji era)*. Tokyo: Soobunsha, 1977.
2. \_\_\_\_\_. *Taishoo seihen: 1900nen taisei no hookai (Political change in Taisho period: Breakdown of the political system of 1900)*. Tokyo: Mineruba, 1982.
3. \_\_\_\_\_. *Kindai Nippon no gaikoo to seiji (Japanese diplomacy and politics in the modern era)*. Tokyo: Kenbun shuppan, 1985.
4. Fujimura, Michio. *Nisshin sensoo: Higashi ajia kindaishi no tenkanten (The Sino-Japanese war: A turning point in the modern history of East Asia)*. Tokyo: Iwanami shinsho, 1973.
5. Fukuzawa, Yukichi. *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshuu (The complete works of Fukuzawa Yukichi)*, vol.10. Tokyo: Iwanami, 1959-60.
6. Hosoya, Chihiro. *Makino Shinken to berusaiyu kaigi (Makino Shinken and Paris Peace Conference)*, *Chuuoo kooron*, (1965), vol. 80, no.5, 363-9.
7. Hattori, Tooru. *Nihon no Nan'yoo (Japan's South Seas)*. Tokyo: Nan'yoodoo, 1888.
8. \_\_\_\_\_. *Nan'yoosaku (Policy toward the South)*. Tokyo: Muraoka Genba, 1891.
9. \_\_\_\_\_. *Nankyuu no shin shokumin (A new colony in the southern hemisphere)*. Tokyo: Hakubunsha, 1894.
10. Ikei, Masaru. "Pari heiwa kaigi to jinshu sabetsu teppai mondai (Paris Peace Conference and Abolition of Racial Discrimination)." *Kokusai seiji (International Politics)*, (1962), vol.23, 44-58.
11. \_\_\_\_\_. "Uchida Yasuya – shoodo gaikoo e no kisei (Uchida Yasuya – Paths to impulse democracy)." *Kokusai seiji (International Politics)*, (1976), vol. 56, 1-21.
12. Inada, Shunosuke. *Jinshu mondai (Race issues)*. Tokyo: Yuurinkaku, 1915.
13. Inukai, Tsuyoshi. *Kokuboo oyobi gaikoo (Japan's defence and diplomacy)*. Tokyo: Dai Nippon Seinen Kyookai, 1914.
14. Irie, Toraji. *Meiji nanshin shikoo (A short history of southward expansion in the Meiji Era)*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1943.
15. Iriye, Akira. *Nihon no gaikoo: Meiji ishin kaa gendai made (Japanese diplomacy: From the Meiji restoration to the present day)*. Tokyo: Chuuoo kooronsha, 1966.

16. Ishii, Kikujiro. "*Daisensoo gaikoo no issetsu* (An instance in the diplomacy of the Great War)." *Gaikoo jihoo* (Diplomatic review), No.551, (1928), 24-30.
17. \_\_\_\_\_. *Gaikoo Yoroku (Diplomatic Commentaries)*. Tokyo: Iwanami, 1930.
18. Kaigun Gunreibu, (Navy General Staff). *Taishoo yonen oyobi itaru kyuu nen kaigun senshi* (*The naval war history from 1915 to 1920*), vol. 2, (1924).
19. Kayahara, Kazan. "*Nihon kokumin o jisatsu seshimuru mono wa Ei-Bei de aru* (England and America are driving the Japanese people toward suicide)." *Dai san teikoku* (The third empire), No.53. (October 1915), 4-9.
20. Kikuchi, Takenori. *Hakushaku Chinda Sutemi den (Life of Count Chinda Sutemi)*. Tokyo: Kyooomeikaku, 1938.
21. Koizumi, Sakutaroo. *Saionji Kinmochi Jiden (Biography of Prince Kinmochi Saionji)*. Tokyo: Koodansha, 1949.
22. Konoe, Fumimaro. *Seidanroku (Record of political talks)*. Tokyo: Chikura shoboo, 1936.
23. Makino, Nobuaki. *Shootoo Kandan (Reminiscences told at his Shootoo Residence)*. Tokyo: Soogensha, 1940.
24. \_\_\_\_\_. *Kaikoroku (Reminiscences)*, 2 vols. Tokyo: Chuuoo kooronsha, 1978.
25. Mamiya, Kunio. "*Okuma Shigenobu to jinshu sabetsu teppai mondai* (Okuma Shigenobu and Abolition of Racial Discrimination)." *Waseda daigakushi kiyoo* (History Bulletin of Waseda University), (1989), vol. 22, 213-37.
26. Matsumura, Masayoshi. "*Kookaron to nichiro sensoo* (Yellow peril and the Russo-Japanese war)." *Kokusai seiji* (International politics), (1982), vol. 71, 38-53.
27. Mishima, Kazuo. *Gooshuu oyobi Indo (Australia and India)*. Tokyo: Mainichi Shimbunsha, 1891.
28. \_\_\_\_\_. *Gooshuu oyobi Indo tanken shi (Record of an expedition to Australia and India)*. Tokyo: Nihon Kooen Kyookai, 1891, Reprint 1943.
29. Nakanishi, Hiroshi. "*Kanoe Fumimaro 'Eibei hon'i no heiwashugi o haisu' rombun no haikei* (The Background of Kanoe Fumimaro's Paper 'Discard British and the US Proposed Rules for Peace')." *Hoogaku ronsoo* (Discussion on Japanese Studies), (1993), vol. 132, 225-58.
30. Nakano, Seigoo. *Koowa kaigi o mokuageki shite (After I saw Paris Peace Conference)*. Tokyo: Toohoo jironsha, 1919.
31. Narita, Katsushiroo. *Nichigoo Tsuushoo Gaikooshi (The Diplomacy and Trade History between Japan and Australia)*. Tokyo: Shinpyooron, 1971.

32. *Nooshoomushoo Shoomukyoku* (Office for trade and agriculture). “1911 nen ni okeru Nichigoo booeki no gaikyoo (Outline of Japanese-Australian trade in 1911).” *Shoomushuusan*, No.11. (1913).
33. Okuma, Shigenobu. *Jinshu mondai (Race issues)*. Tokyo: Waseda daigaku shuppan, 1919.
34. Onuma, Yasuaki. “Haruka naru jinshu byoodoo no risoo (A Far Away Ideal Racial Equality).” In *Kokusaihoo (International Law)*, *Kokusai rengoo to Nihon (The League of Nations and Japan)*, ed. Yasuaki Onuma. Tokyo: Koobundoo, 1987.
35. *Osaka Shoosen Kabushiki Kaisha* (Osaka shipping company). *Gooshuu jijoo (Condition of Australia)*, (1913).
36. Saitoo, Takashi. “Pari koowa kaigi to nihon (Paris Peace Conference and Japan).” *Kokusai seiji (International politics)*, (1958), vol.6, 105-17.
37. Saitoo, Naotake. *Kaiko hachijuunen (Reminiscences of the past eighty years)*. Tokyo: Jiji Tsuushinsha, 1963.
38. *Seisan Choosakai* (Investigation committee on products and industry) *Nooshoomushoo (Ministry for Agriculture & Commerce)*. *Gooshuu oyobi Nyuushiirando shisatsu fukumeisho (Inspection report on Australia and New Zealand)*, (1911).
39. Shimizu, Hajime. “Taishoo shoki ni okeru ‘Nanshin-ron’ no ichikoosatsu: sono Ajia shugiteki henyoo o megutte (A study of the ‘southward advance’ in the early Taisho period: its changes under the impact of Asianism).” *Ajia kenkyuu (Research on Asia)*, Ajia Seikei Gakkai, Vol.30. No.1, (1983).
40. Shimomura, Hironori. *Nippon Gaikoo Hiroku (Secret Stories of Japanese Diplomacy)*. Tokyo: Asahi Shimbunsha, 1934.
41. Shinobu, Seizaburoo. *Nihon gaikooshi 1853-1972 (History of Japanese diplomacy 1853-1972)*. Tokyo: Mainichi shimbunsha, 1974.
42. Shirani, Yasushi. *Gooshuu jijoo (Conditions in Australia)*. Tokyo: Ritsumeikan Shuppanbu, July 1942.
43. Shiroyanagi, Shuuko. *Saionji Kimmochi den (Life of Saionji Kimmochi)*. Tokyo: Nippon hyooronsha, 1929.
44. Sukanuma, Teifu. “Shin Nippon no zunan no yume (Dream of New Japan’s expansion to southern lands).” *Dai Nippon shoogyoo shi (Commercial History of Japan)*, 635-92. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, Reprinted September 1940.
45. Sugimori, Yootaroo. *Kokusai gaikooroku (Record of International diplomacy)*. Tokyo: Chuuoo kooronsha, 1933.



46. Takamura, Naosuke. “*Tenkanki to shitenno daiichiji taisen to Nippon* (Juncture of World War One and Japan).” *Koozanihon rekishi* (Course of Japanese history), part 3, vol. 9. Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppankai, 1985.
47. Tanaka, Yoshijuuroo. *Gooshuu shisatsu fukumeisho* (*Inspection report on Australia*). Tokyo: Nooshoomushoo Sanrinkyoku, 1913.
48. Tokutomi, Iichiro. Ed. *Kooshaku Yamagata Aritomo den* (*Life of Marquis Yamagata Aritomo*), vol. 3. Tokyo: Yamagata Aritomo Kookinen jigyookai, 1933.
49. Tsuchiya, Gensaku. *Gooshuu* (*Nanpoo tairiku*) *oyobi Shinseiran* (*Choohakuun*) (*Australia [the southern country] and New Zealand [the long white cloud country]*). Tokyo: Ashahi Shinbunsha, 1916.
50. Tokugawa, Mitsukuni. *Dai Nihon shi* (*A comprehensive history of Japan*), Vol.5. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Koobunkan, 1911.
51. Tsurumi, Yuusuke. *Nan'yoo yuuki* (*Travel sketches of the South Seas*). Tokyo: Dai Nihon Yuubenkai Koodansha, 1917.
52. Uchida, Yasuya. *Denki hensai iinkai* (*Compilation committee of the biography of Uchida Yasuya*), ed., Uchida Yasuya. Tokyo: Kajima kenkyuujou shuppankai, 1969.
53. Umino, Yoshiroo. *Kindai Nihon Gaikooshi Soosho Dai Rokkan: Kokusairenmei to Nihon* (*The Diplomatic History of Modern Japanese Vols.6: The League of Nations and Japan*). Tokyo: Harashoboo, 1972.
54. Unno, Yoshiroo. “*Pari koowa kaigi to gaimushoo* (Paris Peace Conference and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs).” *Rekishi kyooiku* (History education), 1967, vol.15, no.1, 46-53.
55. \_\_\_\_\_. *Kokusai remmei to nihon* (*The League of Nations and Japan*). Tokyo: Hara shoboo, 1972.
56. Watanabe, Kunjuuroo. *Gooshuu tanken hookokusho* (*Report on the exploration of Australia*). Tokyo: Gaimushoo Tsuushookyoku, 1894.
57. Yamamoto, Teijiroo. “*Nan'yoo shisatsu dan* (An informal inspection report on the South Seas).” *Seiyuukai*, 25 September 1918.
58. Yanaihara, Tadao. “*Taiheiyo no heiwa to Eikoku* (England and peace in the Pacific).” *Kaizoo*, (July 1937), 2-16.
59. Yano, Tooru. *Nanshin no keifu* (*Genealogy of southward advance*). Tokyo: Chuuoo Shinsho, 1975.
60. \_\_\_\_\_. “*Taishoo ki 'nanshin-ron' no tokushitsu* (Japanese views on the southward advance during the Taishoo period).” *Toonanjia Kenkyuu*, Vol.16. No.1, (1978), 5-31.

61. \_\_\_\_\_. *Nihon no Nan'yoo shikan (Japanese historical view of the South Seas)*. Tokyo: Chuuo Shinsho, 1979.
62. Yokohama Shookin Ginkoo Toodoriseki Choosabu. *Gooshuu keizai mondai (Australia's economic problems)*, No.132. August 1942.

### **3. References From Unpublished Sources In Japanese:**

1. *Gooshuu ni oite honpoo imin tokoo seigen ikken (On overseas immigration restriction of Japanese in Australia)*. File 3.8.2.33, Vols. 1-8.
2. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Taiguu Teppai Mondai Sookatsu Hookoku* (Summary of the Report of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), October 1919, in *Kokusai Renmai* (The League of Nations): *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol.3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
3. *Jinshuteki Sabetsu Teppai Ni Kansuru Mondai* (The Issue of Abolition of Racial Discrimination), *Taiheiyoo Mondai Kenkyuu Shiryoo*, (Research Materials on Pacific Issues), Vol.4, 20 Sept 1921, *Kokusai Renmei* (The League of Nations), *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol. 3, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
4. *Kaigunsho* (Navy Ministry), *Kaigun daijin kanboo kiroku (Record office)*. *Ibuki senji niso (The war-logbook of the Ibuki)*.
5. Matsui to Uchida, *Kokusai Renmei* (The League of Nations), *Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai* (Abolition of Racial Discrimination), Vol. 2, Diplomatic Records of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Japan.
6. *Nihon Gaikoo Bunsho* (abbreviated in this volume as NGB) (*Japanese Diplomatic Documents*). Vols. 28-45 (from Meiji 28<sup>th</sup> to Meiji 45<sup>th</sup> Year). 1895-1912.
7. *Nihon Gaikoo Bunsho* (cited in this Volume as NGB) (*Japanese Diplomatic Documents*). Vols. Taishoo Sannen (1914) to Taishoo Juunen (1921).
8. *Nihon Gaikoo Bunsho* (cited in this Volume as NGB) (*Japanese Diplomatic Documents*). Vols. Pari Koowa Kaigi Keikagaiyoo (Records of the Paris Peace Conference).
9. *Nihon Gaikoo Nmnpuyoo narabini Shuyoo Busho* (Chronology of Japan's Diplomacy and Important Documents).

### **4. Articles In Newspapers:**

#### **4.1 Japan Times & Mail:**

1. "Conference With President Wilson Most Satisfactory." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 1 January 1919, p.1.
2. "Conference Will Last 3 Months." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 9 January 1919, p.1.

3. "Saionji Departs." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 12 January 1919, p.1.
4. "Ijuin Is Japan's Fifth Delegate." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 12 January 1919, p.1.
5. "Great Plenary Congress Not Before End of 1919." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 12 January 1919, p.1.
6. "Japanese Press Comment: Bon Voyage to Marquis Saionji." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 12 January 1919, p.2.
7. "Clemenceau Will Present League Proposal-British Dominions at Peace Table." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 14 January 1919, p.1.
8. "Smuts' Ideas Are Eulogized." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 15 January 1919, p.1.
9. "Food The Solution of Peace Says Wilson." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 16 January 1919, p.1.
10. "Each Nation Only One Vote at Conference." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 17 January 1919, p.1.
11. "The President His Own Premier- Allies Consider Aid to Poles Indispensable." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 18 January 1919, p.1.
12. "Poincare Opens Peace Conference." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 22 January 1919, p.1. and 4.
13. "Program of Conference Laid Down by President Wilson" Says Clemenceau." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 23 January 1919, p.1.
14. "Why Are Hara And Uchida Dumb on League of Nations! Ask Tokyo Papers." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 23 January 1919, p.4.
15. "No Intervention by Allies in Russia." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 25 January 1919, p.1.
16. "Japan Buddhists to Peace Conference." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 25 January 1919, p.1. and 4.
17. "Japanese Press Comment: Racial Discrimination Question to End." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 31 January 1919, p.2.
18. "Japanese Press Comment: League May Prove an Organ of Oppression." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 31 January 1919, p.2.
19. "Japanese Press Comment: Useless to Join League." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 31 January 1919, p.2.
20. "Australia Is Firm on Islands Question." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 4 February 1919, p.1.
21. "Japan May Accept But Australia Obdurate." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 5 February 1919, p.1. and 4.

22. "Nothing Yet Decided on Says Hara." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 5 February 1919, p.1.
23. "Japanese Press Comment: Administration of German Colonies." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 5 February 1919, p.2.
24. "Japanese Press Comment: Premier Hughes Called an Aggressionist." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 5 February 1919, p.2.
25. "Japanese Press Comment: Australian Contention Is All Nonsense." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 5 February 1919, p.2.
26. "Japanese Press Comment: Are The Peace Delegates Idle?" *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 5 February 1919, p.2.
27. "Japanese Press Comment: Where Is Japan's Yamato-Damashii?" *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 5 February 1919, p.2.
28. "Abolition Racial Discrimination Is The New Catchword." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 5 February 1919, p.4.
29. "Plan for League of Nations Published." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 16 February 1919, p.1.
30. "Full Text of League of Nations' Covenant." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 18 February 1919, p.1 and 2.
31. "Discrimination - Protest from Japan Dropped." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 18 February 1919, p.1.
32. "This Is Our Government of Friendship." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 18 February 1919, p.1 and 4.
33. "Makino States Japan's Position." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 19 February 1919, p.1 and 4.
34. "President Wilson Explains League." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 5 March 1919, p.1.
35. "I Will Not Come Back 'Till Its Over, Over There'." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 8 March 1919, p.1.
36. "3 Big Questions Still Remaining." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 9 March 1919, p.1.
37. Hashiguchi, Jihei. "So-Called Racial Discriminations And The League of Nations." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 13 March 1919, p.4.
38. "Paris Conference Is The Peoples' Servants." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 14 March 1919, p.1.
39. "Duty And Honor Directed Japan." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 14 March 1919, p.1.

40. "Peace Treaty Draft Adopted in The Main." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 22 March 1919, p.1.
41. "No Change in Plans for Treaty." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 23 March 1919, p.1.
42. "Anti-Racial Discrimination Meeting." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 23 March 1919, p.1.
43. "Japan Asks for Equal Treatment." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 25 March 1919, p.1.
44. "Another Anti-Racial Discrimination Meeting." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 25 March 1919, p.1.
45. "Japanese Press Comment: The League And Peace Treaty." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 25 March 1919, p.2.
46. "Japanese Press Comment: Peace Conference Still Talking." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 25 March 1919, p.2.
47. "Japanese Press Comment: League Must Not Be Rushed Through." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 25 March 1919, p.2.
48. "Britain Disapproves Japan's Proposal." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 27 March 1919, p.1.
49. "League Has Japan's Full Approval." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 27 March 1919, p.1.
50. "Ishii Predicts Japan-Russo-German Group And Another War If Japan Leaves League." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 27 March 1919, p.1.
51. "Japan And America Offer Amendments." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 28 March 1919, p.1.
52. "Gompers Makes Pointed Remarks." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 28 March 1919, p.1.
53. "League Not Causing Delay Says Wilson." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 29 March 1919, p.1.
54. "Japan Doesn't Raise Immigration Problem." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 30 March 1919, p.1.
55. "Japan's Last Effort on Racial Discrimination." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 1 April 1919, p.1.
56. "Japanese Press Comment: Omission of Racial Question an Oversight." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 1 April 1919, p.2.
57. "Japanese Press Comment: Japan Threatened with Isolation." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 1 April 1919, p.2.

58. "Japan's New Proposal Probably Accepted." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 2 April 1919, p.1.
59. "Australia Remains Unalterably Opposed." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 3 April 1919, p.1.
60. "Allies Lift The Adriatic Blockade." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 5 April 1919, p.1.
61. "New York Papers Favor Japan." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 5 April 1919, p.1.
62. "Epitome of Ishii's Speech." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 5 April 1919, p.1.
63. "Wilson May Convoke Congress in May." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 6 April 1919, p.1 and 4.
64. "Japanese Press Comment: New York World Praises Japan." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 6 April 1919, p.2.
65. "Wilson Much Better- Disarmament Vital, Says Lloyd George." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 8 April 1919, p.1 and 4.
66. "Ishii Will Pay Visit to Tokyo." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 8 April 1919, p.1.
67. "Japanese Press Comment: Peace Congress Full of Self-Contradictions." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 8 April 1919, p.2.
68. "President Improves –Peace by Easter." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 9 April 1919, p.1.
69. "Japanese Press Comment: Japan Denies Equality to Her Own People." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 9 April 1919, p.2.
70. "Indemnity Amount to Be Left Undecided." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 10 April 1919, p.1.
71. "Only a Question of Misunderstanding." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 10 April 1919, p.1.
72. "More Anti-Japanese Agitation in California." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 10 April 1919, p.1.
73. "Japanese Press Comment: The American Amendment to The League." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 10 April 1919, p.2.
74. "Have Not Japan's Delegates Finished Their Work in Paris?" *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 10 April 1919, p.4.
75. "Anti-Japanese Bill on California Senate." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 11 April 1919, p.4.
76. "Monroe Doctrine Amendment Adopted." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 15 April 1919, p.1.
77. "Anti-Japanese Bill Withdrawn." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 15 April 1919, p.1.

78. "Makino Talks to Australia." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 15 April 1919, p.4.
79. "Amended Form of League Covenant." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 16 April 1919, p.1 and 4.
80. "America Attacked." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 15 April 1919, p.2.
81. "Text of Ishii's Famous Speech." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 17 April 1919, p.4.
82. "Sarre a New State But Coal France's Forever –Rhine Demilitarised." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 18 April 1919, p.1.
83. "Japanese Press Comment: The League's Amended Covenant." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 18 April 1919, p.2.
84. "Japanese Press Comment: League Like Wrapping Explosive in a Wet Rag." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 18 April 1919, p.2.
85. "Japan And Racial Equality." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 19 April 1919, p.2.
86. "Japanese Press Comment: What Rejection of Racial Equality Means." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 20 April 1919, p.2.
87. "Japanese Press Comment: Racial Equality Bill Defeated by Anglo-Saxons." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 20 April 1919, p.2.
88. "Japanese Press Comment: Causes for Japan's Failure." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 20 April 1919, p.2.
89. "Japanese Press Comment: Peace Conference Delays." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 23 April 1919, p.2.
90. "Japanese Press Comment: Unrest in Japan Feared." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 23 April 1919, p.2.
91. "Japanese Press Comment: The "Yamato" Dislikes Peace." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 24 April 1919, p.2.
92. "Japanese Press Comment: The Government Will Be Held Responsible." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 24 April 1919, p.2.
93. "Hughes Suppresses Race Equality, Reciprocity." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 25 April 1919, p.1.
94. "Tsingtau Problem May Make Japan Withdraw." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 26 April 1919, p.1.
95. "Japanese Press Comment: Anglo-Saxons Want to Dominate The World." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 26 April 1919, p.2.
96. "Japanese Press Comment: Japan's Failure at Peace Conference." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 26 April 1919, p.2.

97. "Italy Quits Conference Despite The President's Eloquent Appeal." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 27 April 1919, p.1 and 4.
98. "Japanese Press Comment: What Japan Must Do." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 27 April 1919, p.2.
99. "Japanese Press Comment: Italy's attitude at The Peace Conference." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 27 April 1919, p.2.
100. "Japanese Press Comment: The "Yorozu" Tries to Be a Prophet." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 27 April 1919, p.2.
101. "Australia Solid Behind Hughes." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 27 April 1919, p.4.
102. "China Problems Engage Conference." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 29 April 1919, p.1 and 4.
103. "Japanese Press Comment: Peace Conference Too Anglo-Saxon." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 29 April 1919, p.2.
104. "Japanese Press Comment: Italy's Action Encourages Japan." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 29 April 1919, p.2.
105. "Propagandists Pass Racial Resolution." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 29 April 1919, p. 2.
106. "League Covenant's New Features." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 30 April 1919, p.1.
107. "Japanese Press Comment: Japan's Position Different from Italy's." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 30 April 1919, p.2.
108. "Japanese Press Comment: Italy's Action Praised." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 30 April 1919, p.2.
109. "Japanese Press Comment: Covenant a Challenge, Says *Kokumin*." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 30 April 1919, p.2.
110. "Full Text of New Covenant." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 1 May 1919, p.1 and 4.
111. "Japanese Press Comment: The *Hochi* Trying to Sow Discord." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 1 May 1919, p.2.
112. "Hughes Would Now Be Gazing at The Moon from a German Internment Camp, If...." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 1 May 1919, p.4.
113. "Covenant Adopted Unchanged Kiao-Chau Dispute Settled." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 2 May 1919, p.1.
114. "The League of Nations." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 2 May 1919, p.2.
115. "Japanese Press Comment: Japan in The Same Boat as Italy." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 2 May 1919, p.2.



116. "Japanese Press Comment: The Revised Covenant Still Imperfect." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 4 May 1919, p.2.
117. "Japanese Press Comment: Japan's Success a Triumph of Reason." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 6 May 1919, p.2.
118. "Japanese Press Comment: *Nichinichi* Expects Wilson to Bow to Japan." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 6 May 1919, p.2.
119. "Japanese Press Comment: Racial Equality Left Out." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 6 May 1919, p.2.
120. "The Greatest Peace Treaty Ever Made." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 9 May 1919, p.1 and 4.
121. "Fuller Summary of Peace Treaty." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 11 May 1919, p.1.
122. "Japan And Her Ally." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 11 May 1919, p.2.
123. "Germany's Plan to Dominate The World." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 11 May 1919, p.4.
124. "Correspondence: The Changed Policy towards Japan in England." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 13 May 1919, p.1.
125. "Conclusion of Treaty Summary." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 13 May 1919, p.1.
126. "Treaty of Peace." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 13 May 1919, p.2.
127. "China Will Not Sign The Treaty." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 14 May 1919, p.1.
128. "Japanese Press Comment: Peace Treaty Will Drawn Up." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 14 May 1919, p.2.
129. "Japanese Press Comment: Sympathies at The Conference." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 16 May 1919, p.2.
130. "Paris Appreciates Japan's Delegates." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 27 May 1919, p.2.
131. "Expect Treaty to Be Signed June 10." *Japan Times & Mail* (Tokyo). 30 May 1919, p.1.

#### **4.2 Tokyo Asahi Shimbun:**

1. "Doku Shokuminchi No Shobun (Dealing with the colonies of Germany)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 30 January 1919, p.3.
2. "Nihon Yookyuu Teido (Japan requested the Marshall and the Caroline Islands)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 31 January 1919, p.3.
3. "Sekidoo o Genkai (The equator is the limit)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 31 January 1919, p.3.

4. "Iwayuru Taiheiyoo Mondai (Pacific issues)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 2 February 1919, p.3.
5. "GooShuu Hantai Tsuuden (Telegram from Australia saying disapproval)". *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 2 February 1919, p.3.
6. "Gooshuu Seifu no Seimei (The statement of Australian Government)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 3 February 1919, p.2.
7. "Gooshuu no Chika ni Hairan (Pacific islands will be in the Australian administration)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 3 February 1919, p.2.
8. "Raianshi Hantai Seimei (Mr. Ryan opposes Japan's administration of Pacific islands)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 3 February 1919, p.2.
9. "Goo Nyuu Ryooshushoo Genmei Kaihi (Prime Ministers of Australia and New Zealand avoid saying about German colonies)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 3 February 1919, p.2.
10. "Gooshuu Shushoo Kaerimite Iwaku (Australian Prime Minister looked back and said)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 4 February 1919, p.3.
11. "Gooshuu Shushoo Joohosu (Prime Minister of Australia declined his claim)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 5 February 1919, p.3.
12. "Hyuuzushi Shakuzentarazu (Mr. Hughes is not happy with the result)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 5 February 1919, p.3.
13. "Gooshuu Seifu Shushoo o Homu (Australian Government supports Prime Minister Mr. Hughes)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 6 February 1919, p.3.
14. "Sabetsu Teppai Mondai (Racial equality issue)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 22 February 1919, p.2.
15. "Jinshu Mondai Horyuu (Reservation of racial issue)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 23 February 1919, p.3.
16. "Gooshuushi no Nihon Iminron (Japanese immigration issue in Australian newspaper)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 1 March 1919, p.4.
17. "Sabetsu Teppai Mondai (Racial equality issue)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 6 March 1919, p.4.
18. "Gooshi no Iminron (Immigration issue in an Australian newspaper)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 7 March 1919, p.4.
19. "Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai (Abolition of racial discrimination)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 11 March 1919, p.3.
20. "Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai to Teikoku (Abolition of racial discrimination and Japan)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 14 March 1919, p.3.

21. "Ozakishi too Soobetsu (A farewell to Mr. Ozaki and others)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 14 March 1919, p.4.
22. "Jinshu Sabetsu Hantai Doryoku (Making an effort to oppose the abolition of racial discrimination)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 15 March 1919, p.3.
23. "Saionjikoo Genmei (Statement of Marquis Saionji)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 15 March 1919, p.3.
24. "Jinshu Sabetsu Teppaian Hooki (Giving up the Racial Equality Bill)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 15 March 1919, p.3.
25. "Gooshi Nihon Taido Hihyoo (Australian newspaper criticizes Japanese attitude)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 16 March 1919, p.3.
26. "Jinshu Mondai no Shinhooshin (New policy of racial issue)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 17 March 1919, p.2.
27. "Taiheiyoo Mondai (The issue of Pacific)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 17 March 1919, p.2.
28. "Ishii Taishi Enzetsu (Ambassador Ishii of the United States made a speech)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 19 March 1919, p.3.
29. "Ishii Taishi Enzyutsu Shushi (The gist of Ambassador Ishii's speech)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 19 March 1919, p.4.
30. "Ishii Taishi Enzetsu Hankyoo (Responses to Ambassador Ishii's speech)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 21 March 1919, p.4.
31. "Nihon no Sabetsu Teppai (Abolition of racial discrimination in Japanese law)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 23 March 1919, p.2.
32. "Jinshu Sabetsu Mondai (The issue of racial discrimination)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 23 March 1919, p.2.
33. "Renmei Kiyaku Soonyuu (Inserting rules of the League of Nations to preliminary articles of Paris Peace Conference)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 24 March 1919, p.2.
34. "Nichibei Iin Seshoo (Negotiation between Japanese and American delegates)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 24 March 1919, p.2.
35. "Jinshuan Saitei Yokoku (An advance announcement of re-proposing Racial Equality Bill)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 24 March 1919, p.2.
36. "Jinshu Musabetsu Tappai Hantai (Objection against abolition of racial discrimination)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 24 March 1919, p.2.
37. "Jinshu Byoodoo Shugi (Racial equality principle)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 24 March 1919, p.2.

38. "Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai Taikai (The second meeting for abolition of racial discrimination)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 24 March 1919, p.2.
39. "Makinodan Seimei (Statement of Baron Makino)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 25 March 1919, p.3.
40. "Nihon Teigi Naiyoo (Contents of Japanese proposal)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 25 March 1919, p.3.
41. "Koowakaigi no Gaikooshin (Diplomacy in Paris Peace Conference)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 27 March 1919, p.3.
42. "Eikokuin Hantai (British delegate opposes)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 27 March 1919, p.3.
43. "Uchida Gaisoo Enzetsu (Mr. Uchida, Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs, made a speech)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 27 March 1919, p.3.
44. "Jinshu Byoodoo Teian (Proposal for racial equality)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 28 March 1919, p.2.
45. "Jinshu Syuuseian Teigi (Proposal for the amendment for racial equality)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 28 March 1919, p.2.
46. "Eishokuminchi Daihyoo Hantai (Representatives from British colonies oppose Japanese Racial Equality Bill)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 28 March 1919, p.2.
47. "Jinshu Byoodoo Taiguu Teian (Proposal for racial equal treatment)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 28 March 1919, p.2.
48. "Jinshuan Unmei (Destiny for Racial Equality Bill)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 28 March 1919, p.2.
49. "Renmei Shingi Kaisei (Careful discussion on drafts of the League of Nations has been completed)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 29 March 1919, p.2.
50. "Jinshu Byoodooan no Teishutsu (Proposal for the bill of racial equality)." *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo). 29 March 1919, p.3.

## APPENDIX

### COMMENTS FROM THE JAPANESE PRESS

After the Japanese proposal was defeated, Japan still had a choice of presenting the proposal to the Plenary Session and to invite a vote, due in a few weeks. The choice gave a glimmer of hope to the Japanese, perhaps all was not lost yet, or so some sections of the Japanese press and public thought. The comments on and the analysis of the events of Paris Peace Conference as reported in Japanese press, since the rejection of the Japanese proposal are presented below. Japanese press comments agree with the contention that determined opposition from Australian Prime Minister Hughes provided a convenient excuse to Britain and the US to join hands with Australia to defeat the Japanese proposal. Japanese press comments reported that the weak presentation of their case by Japanese delegates, who appeared pliable with their numerous changes to the text of Racial Equality Bill, harmed their cause. Japanese press comments also reported that inexperienced diplomacy on the part of Japan weakened her position. Lack of efforts by the Japanese to systematically cultivate the British support during World War One years, and failure to effectively counter Hughes during Paris Peace Conference, harmed their position. Bulk of the information presented here are sourced from articles published in *Japan Times & Mail*. It must be noted that *Japan Times & Mail*, published English translations of important news items and editorial views of a range of other Japanese language newspapers such as, *Kokumin*, *Asahi*, *Hochi*, *Yorozu*, *Nichinichi*, *Jiji*, and *Yamato*, published from Japan. *Japan Times & Mail* also reported British, French, American and Australian views, gathered from articles published in a number of foreign newspapers such as: the Australian newspaper *The Sydney Sun*; British newspapers, *Morning Post*, *Daily Chronicle*, and *Daily Mail*; and French newspapers, *Le Martin*, *Le temps*, and *La Victoire*. The views of the newspapers in Australia, Britain, America and France as reported in the Japanese press have also been presented.

Most of the news articles surveyed are since the rejection of the Japanese proposal on 11 April 1919 to 30 May 1919, after which the coverage on Paris Peace Conference in Japanese press, dwindled. However there is one exception, an article published in *Kokumin* on 6<sup>th</sup> April 1919, which is very critical of Japanese delegates, and which offered a piece of advice on future course of action for Japan, expressed by Marquis Shigenobu Okuma, a prominent Japanese of national stature. The above mentioned newspaper articles quoted are often in their entirety and are such materials from primary authentic sources in such detail, have not been presented in any of the books published on the subject of Japanese proposal on racial equality, and have never been published in any form in Australia. A brief discussion on

the reports and analysis during the period in survey, from the various countries starting with Japan, followed by Australia, the US, Britain and France is presented below.

Forty articles related to Paris Peace Conference, offering reports and analysis from Japan, appeared in *Japan Times & Mail*. Criticism of Wilson and the US, criticism of Hughes, and criticism of Britain, and criticism of the West in general, formed the single biggest category of articles, numbering fourteen. Ten articles criticised the League of Nations and urged Japan to leave the League. Five articles reported shock and disappointment that prevailed in Japan, six articles were critical of Japan and Japanese delegates, and four articles praised Japan and Japanese delegates. One large and significantly important article, particularly so to this research, urged Japan to rouse public opinion in Britain.

Three articles recorded views emanating from Australia. Apprehension that Australia-Japan bilateral relations may suffer on account of the resolute opposition by Hughes to the Japanese proposal at the League of Nations is the theme of the first article. Australian press, however, also reported that Australia was solidly behind Hughes, and Hughes's newly proposed motion to keep immigration out, constitute the other two articles.

Only two news items recorded views emanating from the US. The first article mentions the sympathy of the US press with Japan, and the second states protest by coloured people of America against the rejection of the Japanese bill.

Only two news items recorded views emanating from Britain. One article praises the abilities of Japanese delegates, and the other shows disappointment at the rejection of the Japanese bill.

Four news items recorded views emanating from France. One article is critical of Wilson, another is full of praise for Japanese delegates, and two others express sympathy with the Japanese.

The Appendix contains five sections.

#### **SECTION ONE:**

##### **Report And Analysis From Japan:**

Section One: Report And Analysis From Japan, is the main section of this appendix. In this section reports and analysis of views emanating from Japan have been presented. The newspaper articles presented in this section, based on their themes, have been grouped into nine categories; the captions of which are:

1. Shock and disappointment in Japan
2. Japan must rouse public opinion in Britain
3. Criticism of Japan and Japanese delegates
4. Praise of Japan and Japanese delegates

5. Criticism of the West
6. Criticism of Hughes
7. Criticism of Wilson and the US
8. Criticism of Britain
9. Criticism of, and call to leave, the League of Nations

### **Shock And Disappointment In Japan:**

Articles showing shock and disappointment in Japan are presented below.

#### **1. Shock In Japan:**

‘The *Kokumin* regrets to realize its unfavourable forecast about the issue of the racial discrimination abolition proposal which has turned out to be right in view of the latest advices from Europe reporting the decision of the peace conference in Paris. The rejection of the proposal means the diplomatic failure and decadence of Oriental nations in the international arena in future.

The treatment accorded to the Japanese delegates at the peace conference in Paris has entirely disproved and betrayed Japan’s confidence that through the European war she has raised herself to the rank of the great powers of the world. In other words, Japan has been precipitated headlong into a deep ravine from the top of a towering precipice.

What attitude will China, Siberia and other Asiatic nations take towards Japan after she has committed such a diplomatic failure and blunder? questions the paper. The rejection of the racial discrimination proposal is decidedly a disgrace to the country, no matter in what beautiful terms it may be explained.

The country which has occupied the foremost position in the Orient, being admitted as the leader of all Oriental nations, has been kicked out of her exalted position and pushed back into the rank of secondary powers, and that by her own allies, giving a pretext for contempt and mockery to the weaker and smaller nations.

Does the government, that must be fully aware of the true aspect of this awkward situation, believe that it can silence the nation with its wonted excuse, viz., insufficient national strength?’<sup>1</sup>

#### **2. Results Of The Vote:**

‘*Kokusai-Havas*

Paris, April 13,- A prolonged sitting of the League of Nations commission discussed the racial equality question but reached no definite decision. The Japanese delegates raised an amendment demanding that an addition should be made to the preamble of the Covenant by which all states which are members of the League should not only maintain frank and loyal relations but should also recognise the equality of nations.

Of seventeen votes eleven were in favour of the amendment, the minority voters insisting on their reservations which they intend to develop at the next plenary sitting of the commission and to obtain a final decision.<sup>2</sup>

### **3. A Snub To Japan:**

‘The failure of Japan’s demand for racial equality to secure the unanimous support of the League of Nations Commission has proved to have caused the sorest disappointment here.

At first, general expectation was centred on the removal of racial discrimination suffered by Japanese emigrants abroad. It was generally thought that the demand for abolition of racial discrimination, if separated from the question of Japanese emigration, would become practically valueless when judged from the standpoint of Japanese interests abroad.

When it was made known that it would not concern that question; the stalwart thinkers and jingoists became disgusted and began to blame the Government for weakness and incompetency.

The moderate thinkers felt, however, that the emigration question set aside, the demand for racial equality being reduced to a purely academic principle it could confidently be expected to be accepted by the League of Nations Commission. Even this expectation has not been fulfilled.

The national disappointment may now be considered to verge on disaffection. There is no doubt that the Government will be made the target of violent attacks, and that the various bodies of the opposition to the Government will make the most of the occasion thus afforded for an anti-government campaign throughout the whole country.

When such campaigns are started, it is the fear of the moderate and sober-minded thinkers that sensation-mongers and popularity-seekers will be afforded the finest opportunity for instigating and stirring up anti-whites prejudices. A dangerous weapon thus be considered to have been placed in their hands.

A most careful and comprehensive survey of the feelings of typical and leading thinkers shows that they learn of the fact with the profoundest regret. All agree in feeling that rejection of a demand formally made by a nation is tantamount to a snub and humiliation.

There are some whose opinions deserve attention who feel that if Japan’s formal demand has failed to accomplish its direct object, it has served the purpose, otherwise unattainable, of unearthing and placing on record a hitherto unexpressed but real truth concerning the question and the attitude of Whites versus the Non-whites.

A historic and august congress of the representative white peoples has now formally refused to admit and accept the principle of equality of the non-white people with themselves.



It is sincerely to be lamented that this action of the League of Nations Commission will most probably result in erecting a perpetual barrier against a harmonious commingling of the races toward which the world tendency has been thought to have been moving.

The action of the commission resulting in the failure of Japan's demand for racial equality to be formally accepted by the Peace Conference is flagrantly, at variance with the declared aim and purpose of the League of Nations.

Instead of removing anything likely to prove a cause of international discord, a seed must now be considered to have been sown by the rejection of Japan's demand that will grow into a permanent division of the world into two groups of peoples irreconcilable in their respective aspirations.

The population of the white people in different quarters of the world is calculated at seven hundred millions, while the non-whites number eleven hundred millions. The fact that these two groups are now sharply divided on account of the white people formally refusing to admit the other races on a footing of equality can only tend to accentuate racial prejudices which will far from realize President Wilson's ideal of a lasting peace of the world.

Japan's admission into the group of the Five Great Powers must be considered to be merely accidental and only for the political convenience of the allies. Her present situation is exactly that of a Negro preacher asked to speak in a church because of his oratorical power. To speak from the pulpit is by no means to be identified with an admission of equality from a racial standpoint on the part of the white congregation. It is well for Japan to remember this point.

It is only by sheer dint of her power and civilization that she is entitled to receive treatment on a footing of equality by those of the white race.

The only solution of the question therefore of sustaining Japan's prestige, accidental as it is, must be sought in preparedness to cope with international situations as they may develop from time to time.

The preacher's "peace on earth and good will toward men" must be considered to be still very, very distant in spite of the strenuous exertions of the august body of the Peace Delegates now assembled at Paris.'<sup>3</sup>

#### **4. Spirit Of Unrest In Japan:**

'The *Jiji* notices that the spirit of unrest is filling the mind of the nation as the effect which the war has produced on the world's politics and economics, and considers this a problem which statesmen and leaders of thought should approach with the utmost care.

This feeling of uneasiness comes first from the delay which is deterring the progress of the Peace Conference and the secrecy which enshrouds its proceedings.

Then the rush of waves of thought radiating from Paris is having a result of filling the country with inconsistencies, democracy being preached, for instance, side by side with very old fashioned caste ideas, so that the people do not know where to look for the guiding post.

Likewise in economics, also, the course of events is very erratic, except that everybody is one in feeling the pressure of hardships of living.

In any case there is every indication that the labour element of this country will not rest content where it is, and says the paper all these circumstances call for the greatest caution in guiding the populace'.<sup>4</sup>

### **5. Japan Is Disgraced:**

'A lecture meeting promoted by younger members of the Kenseikai to attack the foreign policy of the government was held at the Y.M.C.A. Hall in Kanda Tuesday evening. The Hall was packed with people before the meeting opened. Following the opening speech of Mr. Yamaji, M.P., Mr. H. Takahashi said, 'Japan is disgraced in connection with the question of the South Sea islands, racial equality, and disposal of Tsingtau.'

Mr. T. Yamada stirred up the audience by saying "Premier Hughes of Australia is now insulting us but if Japan had not joined the war he would now be looking up at the pale moon from an internment camp in Germany."

Mr. Miki, M.P. in the course of a vigorous speech said, "what mean America's naval preparations at Guam island? What is the real motive of Uncle Sam trying to part us from the Marshal islands?"

Mr. Suzuki, M.P. shouted "show the will of the Japanese nation to the world by reorganising the government." Mr. Kawasaki, M.P. encouraged emigration, saying "Korea in danger, we must build a foundation by sending a large number of Japanese there."

Mr. S. Takagi, M.P. said, "where is justice and humanity in the lynching of colored men in America and the cruel treatment of the Indians by the British government? The League of Nations is to shut up Japan in a small room and force her down."

Mr J. Tanaka made a hot speech about Americans and Britishers in Japan saying that they are "watching the faces of the Japanese."<sup>5</sup>

### **Japan Must Rouse Public Opinion In Britain:**

An article urging Japan to rouse public opinion in Britain is presented below.

#### **1. Japan Must Rouse Public Opinion In Britain:**

'The London correspondent of the Tokyo *Asahi* has cabled to his paper the following remarkable review of present day relations between Britain and Japan:

It would not be untimely to review the relations of Japan with her ally. To speak the truth, the English attitude toward Japan is one of thorough indifference-and how indifferent

the English are can be shown by the fact that the sailors of the Japanese Mediterranean fleet were received more cordially at the French, Spanish and Italian ports than at the English ports visited, while the English treated the Brazilian sailors more affectionately than they did the Japanese.

It is a great disappointment for those who have revisited here after four years to see the enormous change in English feeling. Your correspondent has endeavoured carefully to survey and analyze the causes underlying this. A summary of the findings is:

First, Japan's indifferent attitude and help toward the Allies while profiting more than any other nation during the war:

Secondly, the pro-German, militaristic tendencies in Japan during recent years;

Third, Japan's aggressive policy towards China;

Fourth, the semi-commercial rivalry during the war.

Your correspondent does not desire to say that Japan has been wrong in these. That is not his view; but he believes that these elements have reflected upon the English mind and have served to foster an antipathy towards Japan.

Since your correspondent came here last January, he has not noticed a passage in any of the papers referring to the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, while none of the politicians has ever mentioned the necessity of keeping up this alliance, the period of which will be terminated within a few years.

Even the racial question, although unopposed, elicited no editorial support.

On the other hand it is no exaggeration to say that not a single day has passed without a certain section of the press, the Liberal and Labor organs, containing some sharp criticism and attack against and attack upon Japan, with a strong bias. Samples of these have already been cabled to you. Such labor (sic) leaders as Henderson are as much Japanophobe as is Hughes.

Your correspondent has met many Englishmen who seem to have small interests in politics generally but who ask about Japan's policies toward China and Russia, mentioning frequently the Twenty-one Demands. Every Japanese merchant resident here agrees that he feels the keen sense of the English commercial rivalry. It is true that some Japanese goods appeared on the market here during the war, though the total amount was trifling, and it is laughable for a great nation to show alarm at this when Japan is importing tens of millions worth of goods from England and the total sum of Japanese trade has only reached that held by England a century ago at the time of Napoleon's downfall.

Nevertheless the British are keen about this and the Manchester and Glasgow press is printing daily warnings against Japanese competition, with the prejudice against Japan increasing.

Today there is very scanty news reaching here from Japan, which is smothered up in the unproportionately immense volume passing through other channels, most of them being propaganda.

What Japan has done passes without explanation or apology and no doubt the common masses, especially of the younger generation, who are seeing only one sided views, unconsciously misunderstand Japan's position and are becoming anti-Japanese.

Your correspondent regards the present situation as intolerable and not to be lightly passed over. Unless something is done to offset the anti-Japanese feeling incalculable wrong will be done to Japan's cause, because the politicians in democratic countries like France, England and America do not lead but only follow the masses of the common people. Rightly or wrongly, the influence of this misunderstanding is already clear at Paris, where the Japanese delegation has been placed in an isolated, if not a humiliating position, struggling vainly for our cause under these circumstances.

I cannot therefore but argue an abstention in Japan from chauvinistic tendencies and emphasise the urgent necessity for the establishment of some propaganda work, an immense weapon which heretofore has been neglected to our expense. The Chinese are carrying on their propaganda work well, perhaps with Japanese money which they have borrowed and which they are using to damage us. We should simply and candidly explain what we are doing, what we intend to do and what we are asking for, making these explanations not to the governments but to the people.

In other words, we should send more cables for publication abroad. Whatever progressive movements may be carried on at home, which ought to ameliorate the anti-Japanese feeling, are entirely worthless for this so long as they pass unnoticed abroad.'<sup>6</sup>

### **Criticism Of Japan And Japanese Delegates:**

Articles showing criticism of Japan and Japanese delegates are presented below.

#### **1. Rather Leave The League of Nations:**

'Even though other problems are not solved, Racial Equality Bill should be settled on this occasion. If it not solved during Paris Peace Conference, we should decide the peace conditions toward Germany quickly and can leave behind the issue related to the League of Nations. However, for the sake of Japan, we should carry out our original intention of racial equality if it may be withheld for the time being. For Japan, there is no other issue more important and urgent than this.

At Paris Peace Conference where delegates from many countries discuss important issues, we should carry out our intention of racial equality for our future benefit, but our delegates just showed their virtue of modesty pointlessly with lots of prudence. If modesty goes beyond the limit, it becomes obsequious and cowardly. Marquis Saionji was born of a noble family and won a lot of popularity but he had already retired. He was like that even inside Japan, there was no doubt that he could do nothing substantial outside Japan. When he was a minister in Germany, he spent most of his time in Paris although he had to be in Berlin. Therefore, sometime he could not reply immediately after he got telegrams from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan. He was almost dismissed.

Baron Makino is not very active either. Compared to Chinese delegates aged around forty to fifty, all our delegates are old. The world is changing and there is an opportunity for Japan to grow significantly. Britain, France and Italy sent their Foreign Ministers to participate in the Conference and American president himself joined it. At least our Foreign Minister himself should go and start discussing issues actively and ambitiously.

Again Japan should carry out our original intention of racial equality for our future benefit if we have to withhold it for a while. Moreover, in case it is rejected, we must be ready not to join the League of Nations without hesitation. I reckon that European Powers try to kill human beings politically and morally in order to avoid actual killing.

People of Japan should make an effort of pursuing our original intention to the end.’<sup>7</sup>

## **2. Japan Government Blamed:**

‘The failures of our peace delegates at Paris are indeed regrettable; but, says the *Kokumin*, it does not seem fair to hold them alone responsible for the diplomatic defeats.

The paper would censure in the first place the Foreign Office, then the Diplomatic Advisory Board and finally the Ministry itself.

It finds fault in the fact that whereas all the great Entente Powers are represented at the Peace Conference by statesmen in power in their country Japan alone has sent there only professional diplomats, at least not a statesman in the Government of the day.

Then the Diplomatic Advisory Board has failed to include a man like Viscount Kato, and last of all the Government knows no zeal of work but to promote the interest of the *Seiyukai*.

In these circumstances, says the paper, Japan cannot but be expected to fail at the great Peace Conference.’<sup>8</sup>

## **3. Criticism Of The Japanese Delegates:**

‘Despite the alleged remark of Premier Hara, that adverse criticisms made here on Japanese delegates are having effects unfavourable to this country at Paris, the *Yorozu* asserts

that messages from Paris still continue to tell stories that can by no means be favourable to the delegates.

However, the paper takes comfort in a way by pointing out that not even President Wilson, Premier Lloyd George or Premier Clemenceau, can truly be said to represent their countries, they all having strong hostile forces facing them at home.

One thing against the Japanese delegates is however that they cannot be said to identify themselves with democracy as the others are its living exponents.

One does not know what Marquis Saionji is really for at Paris, the whole thing being in the hands of Baron Makino, who happens to be a statesman of the old school given to secret diplomacy and oligarchic statecraft.

In short the paper holds that the Government must ultimately be held responsible for the failures of the peace delegates.’<sup>9</sup>

#### **4. Japan Delegates A Dismal Failure:**

‘In view of persistent attacks on the Government for what is regarded as its diplomatic failure, the Kokumin is surprised at the turn of affairs, which is even taken by some presaging its fall before long, especially as it has been in existence only for some months.

None the less it is true that our delegates at Paris have been a dismal failure, and the country cannot help feeling deeply deplored to see them, harassed and dazed by a nondescript agency known as Chinese delegates whose status and qualifications are enshrouded in mystery.

However it is not Japan alone which is not satisfied with the Peace Conference, the noise of discontent growing louder and louder in England, America and other countries.

However that may be, it cannot be denied that all our delegates efforts have ended in failure, and the Imperial Government and the Diplomatic Advisory Board must, says the paper, be held responsible for this.’<sup>10</sup>

#### **5. Japan Delegates Advised To Redouble Efforts:**

‘As for questions in which Japan is concerned, some of the great western Powers do not show much interest in them, except that their nationals residing in the Far East are devising endless schemes to prejudice Japan’s claims.

In these circumstances, it would be imperative, the paper urges, that our delegates collect and adduce fresh evidence and materials and make redoubled endeavours to convince the Conference of the justice and indispensability of Japan’s contentions in regard to Shantung and South Sea Islands questions.’<sup>11</sup>

#### **6. Japan Was Not Firm:**

‘While the Government and people here were engrossed with the Shantung question, the Peace Conference, says the *Kokumin*, calmly and coolly passed the revised convention for the League of Nations containing not a word about racial equality.

The paper regrets that the Government and its delegates had not shown the same firmness and zeal in pushing the anti-discrimination proposal as they have done in regard to the Shantung question.

The paper regards it as a consolation that the noblest of humanitarian principles was enunciated for the first time by Japan, with a promise that she shall continue to propose it until it is finally adopted.’<sup>12</sup>

### **Praise Of Japan And Japanese Delegates:**

Articles showing praise of Japan and Japanese delegates are presented below.

#### **1. Japan Amendment Lacks General Approval:**

*‘Kokusai American News Service*

Paris, April 12.- The following authoritative statement was made here to-day concerning the meeting of the league of nations (sic) committee of yesterday:

“At a meeting of the league of nations (sic) commission on Friday, April 11<sup>th</sup>, the Japanese delegation proposed an amendment to the preamble of the covenant, as follows: to be inserted after the words ‘by the prescription of open, just and honourable relations between nations’, an additional clause to read: ‘By the endorsement of the principle of equality of nations and the just treatment of their nationals’.”

The amendment was admirably presented by Baron Makino. In the course of his speech he emphasized the great desire of the Japanese government and of the Japanese people that such a principle be recognised in the covenant. His argument was supported with great force by Viscount Chinda.

A discussion followed in which practically all of the members of the commission participated. The decision was marked by breadth of thought, free and sympathetic exchange of opinion, and a complete appreciation by the members of the commission of the difficulties which lay in the way of either accepting or rejecting amendment.

The commission was impressed by the justice of the Japanese claim, and by the spirit in which it was presented. Mention was frequently made in the course of the decision of the fact that the covenant provided for the representation of Japan on the executive council as one of the five great powers, and that a rejection of the proposed amendment could not, therefore, be construed as diminishing the prestige of Japan.

Various members of the commission, however, felt that they could not vote for its special inclusion in the covenant. Therefore, the commission was reluctantly unable to give to the amendment that unanimous approval which is necessary for its approval.’<sup>13</sup>

## **2. Japan’s Position Enhanced:**

*‘Kokusai Peace Service*

Paris, April 20. – The majority of the delegates accept China’s claim for exemption from the obligations of the treaty of 1915, under the plea of compulsion.

The majority vote given to Japan’s rejected amendment, coupled with what is generally regarded as discriminatory treatment by President Wilson has served greatly to enhance the Japanese position at the conference.

Many delegates, including Mr. Hughes, openly denounce the “unfair treatment” of the amendment, which in the form in which it was presented greatly enhanced the value of the constitution of the League. It merely enunciated a splendid broad principle, which the Japanese delegates courageously upheld, not because they could thereby better their prestige. That is already established by their position at the conference.

The friends of Lord Robert Cecil, who is now in London, say that he did not oppose the Japanese amendment. He did not record his vote.’<sup>14</sup>

## **3. Recognition For Japanese Delegates:**

*‘A Kokusai News Agency telegram dated Paris May 15 says:*

Delayed cables from Tokyo indicate that there has been considerable agitation there against the delegates representing Japan at Paris. This is creating the worst possible impression and is scarcely comprehensible here, where it is generally conceded that the Japanese delegates have demonstrated remarkable diplomatic abilities. Their attitude and methods throughout the conference have reflected the highest credit on Japan and have been marked by an entire absence of the blatant jingoism displayed in the attempts which have been made in Japan to inflame the people against their delegates, against President Wilson and against America and Britain.

The friends of Japan are surprised and pained at the attitude reflected in these reports, which speak of a clamour for a larger recognition of “Japan’s contributions and sacrifices in the war”. The facts are that the Japanese delegates have received marked recognition throughout the conference. They have obtained the fullest satisfaction of their essential claims and added enormously to the prestige of Japan. Even the French and Italian newspapers are expressing contempt for those Japanese elements which are “endeavouring to attract attention and are sacrificing the reputation of their country by making an unseemly and insensate hubbub”.’<sup>15</sup>



#### **4. Praise For Japan:**

‘A *Kokusai* telegram dated London, May 15, says:

The Japanese delegation to the Brussels International Parliamentary Conference was entertained at luncheon in the House of Commons by the government and the parliamentary commercial committee.

The healths of King George and the Emperor of Japan were drunk.

Mr. Cecil Harmsworth, Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, proposing the toast to the guests, dwelt on the cordial relations between Britain and Japan in the past, which had borne fruitful results. He laid emphasis on the Japanese naval services in war time in destroying German bases, in convoying Australian troops and in anti-submarine services in the Mediterranean. Japan’s growing commercial prosperity, he said, was the subject of our admiration, not enmity.’<sup>16</sup>

#### **Criticism Of The West:**

Articles showing criticism of the West are presented below.

##### **1. Humanity And Justice Not Respected In The West:**

‘A careful perusal of the League of Nations covenant convinces the “*Asahi*” that in its amended form the pact has become an instrument of considerably reduced power as compared with its original form, besides America gaining much in its stand, while Japan’s diplomacy proves a failure.

As for Japan, even such a concession as separating the immigration question from the racial equality proposal has not saved her from an abject failure.

This defeat may in part at least be due to the incompetence of our peace delegates, but none the less the paper cannot but be made keenly conscious of the fact that European and American conscience is paralysed, and except for some political purposes humanity and justice are not understood or respected by the so called civilised west.

As it is, however, the equality contention is a noble one and is in the interest of a majority of mankind, and the paper hopes the Imperial Government will not relax to the last its effort to avail itself of every opportunity to push the cause.’<sup>17</sup>

##### **2. Only The US and Britain Gain:**

‘The *Yorozu* is under the same impression as the *Asahi* in regard to the weakening of the covenant of the League of Nations in its amended form.

In this connection the paper cites a saying by some one that the League covenant is very much like wrapping explosives in a wet rag.

Hence it is a mistake to suppose that the League will put an end to war in the world. What it will effect is that through it England and America increases (sic) their allies.

The paper is very dubious of the reliability of the League for real justice and for its power to suppress international trouble as for instance in the case of Bolshevism.

In any case it holds that Japan could not commit a more egregious mistake than to believe that by belonging to the League she would be made perfectly secure in her existence. It also doubts the League's power to minister justice in the coming economic war.'<sup>18</sup>

### **3. Disbelief Of The West:**

'While the nation's attention is centred on the racial equality proposal many are downcast with disappointment at its hopeless prospect, being, at the same time, inclined to disbelieve that the western Powers would so inconsistently go back on their words by rejecting it.

So saying, the *Yorozu* declares that should Great Britain and America continue to the last to oppose the proposal, it would be tantamount to their confessing two falsehoods to the world. For the proposal is nothing more than putting in practice a Christian teaching.

Its rejection will make a mockery of President Wilson's contentions for humanity. Then the Anglo-American opposition to racial equality will result in furnishing Germany with a pretext for reviving her militarism.

As to the suggestion that Japan should refuse to join the League of Nations in case the equality proposal is finally rejected, the paper thinks there is no need for such a step. An honest nation like Japan must always expect a tendency to be isolated.

The journal is rather concerned with the future of England and America which are being carried too far by their materialistic interests alone in neglect to their moral enhancement, whereas Japan with her just contentions has nothing to fear from the future.'<sup>19</sup>

### **4. Audacity Of The Anglo-Americans:**

'The *Kokumin* observes that France, Italy, China, Greece and a few others were, it is said, on the side supporting the racial equality bill at the Peace Conference, and forming a majority in its favour, and its defeat is mainly ascribable to England and America, whose opposition broke unanimity causing it, thus, to be thrown out.

The paper cannot help being struck with the courage and boldness of Anglo-American delegates who dared to cause the stigma attaching to their countries of defying humanity in the most outrageous manner to go down in history.

They have dared to invite the ill feeling of 1,000,000,000 coloured people, and have made their countries the living exponents of a way to destroy the League of Nations.

The paper wishes to know whether they realise the grave responsibility they have brought on the shoulders of their countries.'<sup>20</sup>

### **5. Anglo-Saxons Want To Dominate The World:**

‘The *Nichinichi* is under an impression that whatever the future of the League of Nations Covenant, it is dead in its spirit. At the same time it notices in the covenant something that tells of Anglo-Saxon domination in defiance of racial equality.

The paper regrets that an instrument of absolute peace which it should be, should be made a medium for provoking racial hatred and jealousy that lead to friction and hostilities.

The paper gives the following reasons for thinking so. First, the racial equality proposal was defeated owing to the prejudices of America, England, Canada and Australia, while the Peace Conference gave formal recognition to Monroism, which is subversive of the idea of the League of Nations.

Second, President Wilson, as Anglo-Saxon chairman, acted unfairly in deciding against a majority on the racial question. The paper asks, do the Anglo-Saxons imagine that this sort of thing will not displease and excite the indignation of races other than the white?

Then the paper sees every reason that the Anglo-Saxons will continue to struggle to maintain their dominant position, whatever alliances there may appear among the white races.

There is a fear of Asiatics and other coloured races being turned more and more into a prey for the Anglo-Saxons. In these circumstances the paper would call for the awakening of Asiatics, especially the Chinese to stop their internal feuds.

The whites, the Anglo-Saxons, says the paper, aim at bringing under their exclusive control the wealth of the world and at the subjugation of all other races. The paper cannot suppress its anger.’<sup>21</sup>

#### **6. Allies Claims A Pretension:**

‘Premier Hughes’ self-exoneration of his responsibility for opposing the racial equality principle, which he put forth in his latest interview with newspaper representatives at Paris, lays bare, says the *Yorozu*, the low and ugly state of his mind.

However that may be the general reason why the principle is opposed is the fear on the part of white people that it may be made a stepping stone to free immigration or their desire to shut out and subjugate all other races but their own.

But how the rejection of the principle is resented by the peoples interested in its recognition may be seen in what is taking place in Egypt and India.

The paper is convinced that the majority of mankind will yet have occasion to make President Wilson regret his mistake in the unfair decision he made in adopting the minority opinion in rejecting the principle.

The Allies had claimed that they were fighting for freedom, justice and humanity, but now it has been proved to have been a mere pretension and that their liberty, justice and humanity are all insincere.

But the world will not forever remain deceived, and it is Japan's mission, says the journal, to help the whites to avert the retribution which is coming to them to punish their perfidy.<sup>22</sup>

### **7. Distrust Of England And America:**

'The *Yorozu* is rather desperate and says that robbing Japan of Tsingtao is pre-concluded understanding between England and America.

...

It is foolish, says the paper, to keep on arguing honestly, when England and America have begun to disclose their real intentions.

To keep company with them will only be to drag Japan into deeper and deeper abyss from which she may never be able to get out.

Japan, says the journal, should wash her feet off the Peace Conference before it gets dark.<sup>23</sup>

### **8. World Sees The Rejection:**

'The principles of justice, equality and humanity are very good, and theoretically there should be no objection to their being applied to China; but the world has seen in the rejection of racial equality, the unreliability of these principles as professed by some of the Powers.

Rather than run the risk of losing the position secured by the hard efforts of half a century the paper would insist on the Government taking the present opportunity to endeavour to have the Powers recognise Japan's special interests in the Far East.<sup>24</sup>

### **Criticism Of Hughes:**

Articles showing criticism of Hughes are presented below.

#### **1. England Embarrassed By Hughes:**

'*Kokusai* is informed by persons closest to President Wilson and Colonel House that both favour the Japanese amendment, but that Japan's prestige and standing will not be affected by the rejection of the amendment; on the contrary Japan's world position is vastly increased by the recognition accorded to her throughout the convention, whereas England was greatly embarrassed by Mr. Hughes who, up to the last moment, refused to recede from the position that any recognition of Japan's equality would be a menace to the idea of a "White Australia".

Mr. Hughes position was represented before the commission by Lord Robert Cecil, who made a speech strongly opposing the amendment.<sup>25</sup>

#### **2. Hughes Hopes Japan And Australia To Remain Friends:**

'*Kokusai Peace Service*

Paris, April 16 (Delayed transmission). Mr Hughes, the Australian Premier, interviewed by *Kokusai*, vigorously asserted that the rumours that he was responsible for the refusal to insert the Japanese amendment were circulated in Paris by parties who desired to stir up trouble between Japan and Australia.

He said that Australia was not represented at the meeting of the commission at which the majority vote approved the amendment. He said he understood that some six or seven among the seventeen members either voted against the amendment or did not record their votes.

Mr Hughes paid the highest tribute to Japan as a nation and to the Japanese delegates attending the convention.

He justifies his opposition upon the grounds of the differences in industrial conditions in Australia and Japan but hopes the two countries will continue to live on terms of mutual high regard.’<sup>26</sup>

### **Criticism Of Wilson And The US:**

Articles showing criticism of Wilson and the US are presented below.

#### **1. America Criticised:**

‘The slow progress of the Paris conference and the gloomy prospects of the fate of the racial discrimination abolition proposal furnish the topic for comment in most Japanese papers:

The *Hochi* is inclined to...

Surmising the decision of the committee to be such the paper is anxious to know the fate of the racial discrimination abolition proposal, which together with the Monroe doctrine formed the Gordian knot of the League of Nations question.

Taking this for granted the paper questions what compensation the Japanese peace delegates have secured in exchange for the recognition of the Monroe doctrine. To say nothing of the racial discrimination abolition proposal, the result of which will be made known very shortly, the paper questions whether the Japanese delegates strongly insisted on a Monroe doctrine for the Orient, which they ought to have insisted on by all means from the very beginning.

The report that an interview was held between President Wilson and Baron Makino on the very day of the committee meeting affords some slight hope, but the paper feels rather anxious in view of the unenviable lack of ability and tact shown by Japan’s delegates in the past.’<sup>27</sup>

#### **2. Wilson Looked Down On Japan:**

‘The *Hochi* is given to a curious view that allured by President Wilson’s doctrine of self-determination, the races large and small are all in a state of commotion, thereby threatening to plunge the whole world into seething anarchy.

That is not the only fault the paper finds with President Wilson. It accuses him of domination and presumptuousness in general, and of slighting and looking down on the Japanese delegates, in particular, as in his attitude toward the racial equality, the south sea islands and the Shantung questions.

That he should be able to prevail over the Japanese delegates may mean the latter’s incompetence. At the same time it also means a power he derives from Anglo-American combine, which hates to see Japan in the ascendant.

The paper thinks the country is now face to face with a situation which is very much like that which was experienced when Germany, Russia, and France united to bring pressure to bear on it after the Chino-Japanese war.

The time has come, it says, when the Japanese nation must make up their mind to take the matter into their hands as they did at the time of the triple interference.’<sup>28</sup>

### **3. Wilson’s Unfair Ruling:**

‘It may not be denied that Premier Hughes of Australia was chiefly responsible for the defeat of Japanese proposal of racial equality.

But, says the “*Nichinichi*”, had President Wilson being as arduous in their support as he was in upholding the Monroe doctrine, the Japanese delegates would have been successful in carrying their points.

Instead the President allowed himself to be made a tool of anti-Japanese agitators in America. The paper regrets very much that there is a great gulf between his words and deeds.

Indeed, had it not been for the President’s unfair ruling, the Conference would have accepted the Japanese proposal, which secured a majority of votes.

The paper hopes Mr. Wilson will yet awake to his own inconsistencies, and hasten to give recognition to the contention of others which are based on reason and justice.’<sup>29</sup>

### **Criticism Of Britain:**

An article showing criticism of Britain is presented below.

#### **1. British Siding With Hughes:**

‘Premier Hughes of Australia now denies the responsibility for the exclusion: also Lord Robert Cecil who made speeches against it. Their friends say that while Hughes and Cecil shared the views of the minority, they now congratulate the Japanese delegates upon the decided victory shown by the substantial and most complimentary support of the majority.

They asserted that they are not responsible for the pronouncement being excluded from the draft. Others and Americans say that President Wilson acted as a supporter. Weighty British opinion is siding with Hughes who doggedly represented the determined opposition of Australia.<sup>30</sup>

### **Criticism Of, And Call To Leave, The League Of Nations:**

Ten articles showing criticism of the League of Nations, and also urging Japan to leave the League, are presented below.

#### **1. Japan Advised To Leave The League:**

‘The *Yamato* says all the steps taken by the present Government under Mr. Hara vis-à-vis the Peace Conference have been one whole stretch of failures. The separation of free immigration from racial equality was one error, and concession after concession all in vain was another.

Among other blunders of a more serious nature, as the paper puts it, are the mistakes made in the choice of men representing the country, the discord of the delegates amongst themselves and their undexterous movements, giving chance to the Chinese delegates to go back on Japan, etc.

To remedy the situation and to avoid further disaster the paper insists on the advisability of the Empire leaving the League of Nations, which does not lay its foundation on the equality of races.

Severance from the League will mean of course the isolation of the Empire; but the paper is not afraid of isolation by peoples who have no respect for justice and equality. Justice and humanity being on the Japanese side will win for her millions upon millions of friends from the majority of mankind.

Nor is the paper troubled with the thought that England and America will bring pressure to bear on Japan if she leaves the League, its complacent reason being that any state which would organise a league in disregard of the equality principle will sooner or later become victims of Bolshevism and will turn into a labour governed community, which will have no time to bother itself with international problems.

The journal goes to the extent of saying that Japan should rather be a colleague of Germany than remain a member of the League, which forces an arrangement by which this Empire may take no defensive measures on the South Sea islands despite America’s strengthening of armaments on Guam and the Philippines by denying the latter their independence, so as to be the master of the Pacific.

The *Yamato* ends by declaring that effeminacy and cowardice of the present Government and the Diplomatic Advisory Board represents by no means the national thought.’<sup>31</sup>

## **2. Japan Must Not Make Concessions:**

‘According to a high official of the Government, Japan may be obliged to withdraw from the League of Nations in case the proposals of Japan regarding the disposal of Shantung are disapproved at the Peace Conference.

It is stated that the government has already sent telegraphic instructions to the Japanese delegates in Paris not to make any concessions in dealing with this question.’<sup>32</sup>

## **3. Japan Considers Withdrawal:**

‘Paris, April 21.- The Four Power Conference has, over the telephone, informed the Japanese Commissioners that the discussion on the Tsingtao question will be postponed until the 23<sup>rd</sup> instant. Viscount Chinda called on President Wilson on the 21<sup>st</sup> instant but the later refrained from making any responsible statement in regard to the question.

The Japanese Commissioners are uneasy. It is reported that should Japan’s demands regarding Tsingtao be rejected she will withdraw from the Peace Conference.-*Nichinichi*.’<sup>33</sup>

## **4. No More Concessions:**

‘The *Yamato* holds that there must be no more concession on Japan’s part at the Peace Conference, and she must be resolutely firm with her claims with regard to the Pacific islands north of the equator, Siberia and German concessions in China.

No more yielding, not even by an inch, cries the paper.’<sup>34</sup>

## **5. Call For Boycott:**

‘England, France and the United States will derive satisfaction, thinks the *Yorozu*, from the Peace Conference, but not the rest, which like Italy are very much disgruntled.

The Anglo-American delegates are endeavouring to decide the great world questions too much in a way to suit the convenience and interests of their own countries.

They started with defending justice, liberty, and humanity; then they went back on these principles on the pretext of avoiding interference with the independence and sovereignty of different states.

But when it suits them, they would themselves insist on intervening in the domestic affairs of other countries. The paper fails to see any fair justification for such Anglo-American attitude.

Japan must resist this sort of thing at all cost. President Wilson rejected a majority vote in the case of racial equality question but accepted it in the interest of Monroe doctrine.



The *Yorozu* considers it intolerable to let the world be controlled by such Anglo-American arbitrariness and perfidy. It demands that our delegates immediately betake themselves home from Paris.<sup>35</sup>

#### **6. Japan Advised To Quit:**

‘The *Kokumin* also calls for the prompt quitting of Paris by our delegates or rather for the withdrawal of Japan from the Peace Conference.

It derives a great deal of encouragement from Italy, the stirring action of whose delegates seems to have strongly stimulated the Government and people of Japan.

Yielding on racial equality proposal, Japan must not concede an inch on the Tsingtao question. Japan should now go hand in hand with Italy, helping each other in pushing their respective contentions.

Can the Italian withdrawal be a mere empty threat? The paper implies that it shows great determination on the part of Italy and that Japan also should act with great determination.<sup>36</sup>

#### **7. Japan Should Not Join The League:**

‘A meeting of propagandists advocating the abolition of racial discrimination was held on Thursday at the Imperial hotel. ...

The meeting passed the following resolution: Resolved, that the Japanese nation should not become a member of the league of nations if it does not recognize the abolition of racial discrimination.<sup>37</sup>

#### **8. League No Panacea:**

‘The after-war world agitation continues and is growing worse, says the *Kokumin*, because there are Powers who would make most of the present opportunity to promote their selfish interests.

On the other hand the Bolshevik baccili are threatening to carry everything before them, so that in their mind, England, France and Italy are afraid of their invasion.

The League of Nations, in these circumstances will be no effective panacea, thinks the paper, especially as its covenant is a challenge to 1,000,000,000 coloured people.<sup>38</sup>

#### **9. Covenant Wordy But Poor In Substance:**

‘The sudden acceleration of business which has marked the recent progress of the work of the Peace Conference, while satisfactory in itself, occasions certain fears to the *Kokumin*. The paper is, in short, afraid of haste making waste or leading to blunders.

The League of Nations Covenant in its revised form is, for instance, decidedly an improvement on its original draft, but as a diplomatic document it is full of holes, the results of careless compilation, being full of words but comparatively poor in substance, which,

according to interpretations, may be made almost meaningless, or an instrument of despotic arbitrariness, besides running counter to the constitutions of most countries.’<sup>39</sup>

#### **10. Nothing To Rejoice:**

‘The *Yorozu* sees nothing especially to rejoice over in the peace to come, because it is a peace that depends upon the League of Nations, which is not founded on the principle of equality of races, besides the League benefiting only two or three Powers while the rest are filled with dissatisfaction.

As to the settlement of Shantung question, the paper is particularly pleased because it spells the triumph of reason, which is on Japan’s side, - this triumph being especially precious at a conference which dares to put a new dress on justice and humanity.’<sup>40</sup>

### **SECTION TWO:**

#### **Report From Australia:**

In Section Two: Report From Australia, reports and analysis of views emanating from Australia as reported in Japanese press have been presented. The articles are presented below.

##### **1. Australia-Japan Relation May Suffer:**

‘Sydney, April 12.-In response to a telephone call from Baron Makino, a Japanese Peace Commissioner in Paris, the Paris correspondent of the Sydney Sun visited the Baron at the latter’s Hotel (sic) on the morning of the 7<sup>th</sup> instant, when the Baron, who seemed in a depressed mood, expressed the fear that future relations between Australia and Japan may assume a dangerous character because of the fact that public opinion in Japan in regard to the racial discrimination question is very strong.

He appeared to regret that owing to the opposition raised by Australia the Japanese demand for equal treatment with the white race could be shelved at the Peace Conference. He said with the exception of Australia the Japanese demand is being accepted by all other countries.

The correspondent stated that the fact that Japan had been admitted as a member of the Five Powers at the Paris Conference went to show that her position is generally recognised by other Powers on a basis of equality.

To this, Baron Makino replied that there was a difference between national equality and individual equality. Japan demands the recognition of individual equality.

He then pointed out that the League of Nations Covenant provides, among other things, that no countries in the Union must interfere with the domestic affairs and legislation of a State. The contention advanced by Australia that should the Japanese demand be accepted the immigration question may be said to be placed under the authority of the League

of Nations was irrelevant, he said. Japan only demands that a few words recognizing the same treatment for the coloured races as the white shall be inserted in the Covenant.

The correspondent suggested that if there is time Australia and Japan might conclude a second Gentlemen's Agreement.

Baron Makino diplomatically remained silent, but hoped that the Australians and Japanese would exchange visits and inaugurate more Consulates than before so as to establish a fuller understanding between the two countries.

The Baron asked the correspondent not to publish some further statements he made regarding the racial question.-*Nichinichi*.<sup>41</sup>

## **2. Hughes Motions To Keep Immigration Out:**

'Sydney, April 21.- The Paris correspondent of the *Sydney Sun* reports that Baron Makino is now endeavouring to settle the Japanese demand before the revised League of Nations Covenant is submitted to a final conference of International Commissioners.

Mr. Hughes, Premier of Australia, has stated that he has already introduced a motion to recognize the racial equality principle in the League of Nations Covenant, coupled with a clause to the effect that questions relating to immigration, naturalization and labour shall be placed outside the jurisdiction of the League of Nations. But this motion was rejected by the Japanese Commissioners.

The correspondent asked the Japanese Commissioners why they rejected the motion, but they refrained from making any explanation.

Mr. Hughes actually introduced the above motion, but it appears that the Japanese Commissioners were not satisfied. In other words, Mr. Hughes now recognizes the equality of all races, but at the same time demands reciprocal treatment on the part of all nations; Japan, however, dissents. It is, therefore, in the face of this proposition that the Japanese Commissioners are trying to appease public resentment in Japan. At the present juncture, it is alleged, Mr. Hughes would not accept any fresh Japanese proposal without consent of the Melbourne Government. – *Nichinichi*.<sup>42</sup>

## **3. Australia Solid Behind Hughes:**

Mr. McKay, chief editor and general manager of the *Sydney Sun* who is visiting the country to acquaint himself with the public opinion of Japan arrived at Kobe on the 24<sup>th</sup>.

He is reported to have said that the opposition of Premier Hughes to the abolition of racial discrimination amendment proposed by Japan is unavoidable as it is the public opinion throughout Australia having the labouring classes at its back.

The "Sun" is an evening paper and its circulation is said to be more than 400,000.<sup>43</sup>

## **SECTION THREE:**

### **Report From The US:**

In Section Three: Report From The US, reports and analysis of views emanating from the US, as reported in Japanese press have been presented. The articles are presented below.

#### **1. US Press Sympathises With Japan:**

‘...The opposition to the League of Nations has begun to wane in consequence of the inclusion of the Monroe Doctrine in the League of Nations covenant.

The American press sympathises with Japan’s failure in the racial inequality abolition proposal.’<sup>44</sup>

#### **2. ‘Coloured People Of America’ protest:**

‘Paris, May 20.-Every delegate to the peace conference has received a copy of the protest of the coloured people of America against the non-insertion of a clause in the peace treaty obliging each nation of the Allies to grant equal civil rights to its own citizens.’<sup>45</sup>

### **SECTION FOUR:**

#### **Report From Britain:**

In Section Four: Report From Britain, reports and analysis of views emanating from Britain as reported in Japanese press have been presented. The articles are presented below.

#### **1. Commission Impressed By Japanese Delegates:**

‘The *Daily Mail* says American headquarters issued a statement saying: “The Commission were impressed by the justice of the Japanese claim and the spirit in which it was presented by Baron Makino and supported by Viscount Chinda but the Commission were unable to come to the unanimous approval which is necessary for its adoption”.’<sup>46</sup>

#### **2. Without Racial Equality, Covenant Incomplete:**

‘A London message to Tokyo says London papers of April 29<sup>th</sup> unanimously commented on the revised League of Nations Covenant, but Northcliffe papers alone unreservedly support it. Liberal journals generally welcome it, but point out the League of Nations Covenant without recognising racial equality is incomplete.

The *Morning Post* is bitterly against the League, saying the League cannot dispel the cause for international rivalry. But other papers admit the League forms a turning point in world politics, and concede it is President Wilson’s victory. Some papers object to the continuation of the Monroe Doctrine, simultaneously with the rejection of Japan’s racial amendment. The *Daily Chronicle* points out the rejection of the Japanese contention testifies to America’s hypocrisy. The *Times* supports the Japanese Amendment which has been deferred to the League’s decision, and suggests the best means for the realisation of her object is to improve and accelerate her industrial and social conditions. It also notes Great Britain and America are parents of the League, and it embodies many Anglo-American traditions.’<sup>47</sup>

## **SECTION FIVE:**

### **Report From France:**

In Section Five: Report From France, reports and analysis of views emanating from France as reported in Japanese press have been presented. The articles are presented below.

#### **1. Wilson's Ruling Criticised:**

*'Kokusai Peace Service*

Paris, April 14 (Delayed in transmission).- Interviewed regarding Japan's proposal to insert a recognition of the principle of the equality of nations into the Covenant of the League, Mr. Orlando, who heartily supported Baron Makino, said emphatically: "There is no room for discussion. Japan's position is unassailable."

Mr. Stephane Lauzanne, in *Le Martin*, severely criticises the rejection of the amendment providing for equal treatment of the members of the League, notwithstanding the fact that it received a substantial majority. He points out that the selection of Geneva instead of Brussels as the seat of the League was based upon a similar majority, but it was accepted. The writer sarcastically points out that President Wilson supported the Geneva decision and accepted the majority, but disapproved of the recognition of equality and demanded unanimity in this case.<sup>48</sup>

#### **2. Tribute To Japanese Delegates:**

*'Le Martin* pays a tribute to Baron Makino and Viscount Chinda for their dignified persistence in advocating the principle of equality, which was earnestly supported by France and Italy and opposed by America.

Other newspapers point out that while the refusal to accept the ruling of the majority will generally be regarded as unjust, the position of Japan to reintroduce the amendment will not be impaired because Japan is already a member of the Executive Council of the League of Nations.<sup>49</sup>

#### **3. French Public Opinion Supports Japan:**

'There is almost an unanimous expression of public opinion in all circles in Paris against the action of the commission denying the rights to the majority which is regarded as extremely unfortunate, especially embarrassing for the Japanese delegates who, while actually carried the point with honour and credit, are denied the fruits by the action of her traditional allies and friends. Meanwhile, the Japanese delegates decline to comment on the question before the matter is brought up for the final discussion at the Plenary Conference.

An ingenious effort is being made at certain quarters to create the impression that Japan is responsible for the absence of the clause providing for freedom of religions but well-informed people point out that the Constitution of Japan contains religious liberty clause.

The fact is that the clause ensuring the freedom of religion for which the Jews are especially anxious was excluded by the action of President Wilson during the earlier stage of the commission.<sup>50</sup>

#### **4. French Sympathise With Japan:**

The comments of the Paris press on the Covenant of the League of Nations adopted at the fifth preliminary Plenary Session on 28 April 1919, were generally pessimistic. 'In particular they regretted that the important amendment proposed (the Japanese proposal), which would have really contributed to world peace, was not adopted and expressed general misgivings about the adopted text of the League Covenant. *La Victoire*, in particular, commented that it was regrettable that, despite an article about the Monroe Doctrine of the United States of America being added to the League Covenant, the Japanese amendment requesting equal treatment had been rejected. *Le Temps*, in expressing profound sympathy with the Japanese demand, commented in a very round-about way that it did not doubt that some day a solution which would have to respect the legitimate demand of Japan would be arrived at.'<sup>51</sup>

#### **End Notes:**

1. "Kokumin's Gloomy Forebodings," *Japan Times & Mail*, 16 April 1919, p.2.
2. "17 to 11 Favored Japan's Amendment in Sarre A New State But Coal France's Forever--Rhine Demilitarised", *Japan Times & Mail*, 18 April 1919, p.1.
3. "Japan and Racial Equality," *Japan Times & Mail*, 19 April 1919, p.2.
4. "Unrest In Japan Feared," *Japan Times & Mail*, 23 April 1919, p.2.
5. "Hughes Would Now Be Gazing At The Moon From A German Internment Camp, If...", *Japan Times & Mail*, 1 May 1919, p.3.
6. "Japan And Her Ally in Japanese Press Comment," *Japan Times & Mail*, 11 May 1919, p.2.
7. Marquis Shigenobu Ookuma, "If Japanese Proposal For Racial Equality Is Rejected, in Rather Leave The League Of Nations," *Kokumin*, 6 April 1919, p.2.
8. "Causes For Japan's Failure," *Japan Times & Mail*, 20 April 1919, p.2.
9. "The Government Will Be Held Responsible," *Japan Times & Mail*, 24 April 1919, p.2.
10. "Japan's Failure At Peace Conference in Japanese Press Comment," *Japan Times & Mail*, 26 April 1919, p.2.
11. "What Japan Must Do," *Japan Times & Mail*, 27 April 1919, p.2.
12. "Racial Equality Left Out," *Japan Times & Mail*, 6 May 1919, p.2.

13. "Japan Amendment Lacks General Approval in Monroe Doctrine Amendment Adopted – Covenant Will Specifically Provide Doctrine Not Affected – Japan's Amendment Lacks Unanimous Approval," *Japan Times & Mail*, 26 April 1919, p.1.
14. "Sympathies At The Conference," *Japan Times & Mail*, 16 May 1919, p.2.
15. "Paris Appreciates Japan's Delegates," *Japan Times & Mail*, 27 May 1919, p.2.
16. "Diet Delegates Welcomed In London," *Japan Times & Mail*, 27 May 1919, p.2.
17. "The League's Amended Covenant," *Japan Times & Mail*, 18 April 1919, p.2.
18. "League Like Wrapping Explosives In A Wet Rag," *Japan Times & Mail*, 18 April 1919, p.2.
19. "What Rejection Of Racial Equality Means," *Japan Times & Mail*, 20 April 1919, p.2.
20. "Racial Equality Bill Defeated By Anglo-Saxons," *Japan Times & Mail*, 20 April 1919, p.2.
21. "Anglo-Saxons Want To Dominate The World," *Japan Times & Mail*, 26 April 1919, p.2.
22. "The *Yorozu* Tries To Be A Prophet," *Japan Times & Mail*, 27 April 27, 1919, p.2.
23. "The *Yorozu* Distrusts England And America," *Japan Times & Mail*, 30 April 1919, p.2.
24. "Wants Powers To Recognise Japan's Position," *Japan Times & Mail*, 6 May 1919, p.2.
25. "England Greatly Embarrassed," *Japan Times & Mail*, 29 April 1919, p.3.
26. "Hughes Says He Didn't in Covenant Adopted Unchanged Kiao-Chau Dispute Settled," *Japan Times & Mail*, 2 May 1919, p.1.
27. "America Attacked," *Japan Times & Mail*, 16 April 1919, p.2.
28. "The *Hochi* Trying To Sow Discord," *Japan Times & Mail*, 1 May 1919, p.2.
29. "The *Nichinichi* Expects Wilson To Bow To Japan," *Japan Times & Mail*, 6 May 1919, p.2.
30. "Hughes Denies Responsibility In Racial Question in Covenant Adopted Unchanged Kiao-Chau Dispute Settled," *Japan Times & Mail*, 2 May 1919, p.1.
31. "The *Yamato* Dislikes Peace," *Japan Times & Mail*, 24 April 1919, p.2.
32. "Tsingtau Problem May Make Japan Withdraw – Persistent Rumors That She Will Leave League If Proposals Are Not Accepted," *Japan Times & Mail*, 26 April 1919, p.1.
33. "Japanese Delegates Uneasy in Tsingtau Problem May Make Japan Withdraw – Persistent Rumors That She Will Leave League If Proposals Are Not Accepted," *Japan Times & Mail*, 26 April 1919, p.1.
34. "No More Concessions On Japan's Part," *Japan Times & Mail*, 27 April 27, 1919, p.2.
35. "Peace Conference Too Anglo-Saxon," *Japan Times & Mail*, 29 April 1919, p.2.
36. "Italy's Action Encourages Japan," *Japan Times & Mail*, 29 April 1919, p.2.
37. "Propagandists Pass Racial Resolution," *Japan Times & Mail*, 29 April 1919, p.2.

38. "Covenant A Challenge Says *Kokumin*," *Japan Times & Mail*, 30 April 1919, p.2.
39. "The Revised Covenant Still Imperfect," *Japan Times & Mail*, 4 May 1919, p.2.
40. "Japan's Success A Triumph Of Reason," *Japan Times & Mail*, 6 May 1919, p.2.
41. "Makino Talks To Australians – Fears Future Relations May Assume Dangerous Character Over Racial Question," *Japan Times & Mail*, 15 April 1919, p.3.
42. "Hughes Proposes Race Equality, Reciprocity – Japan Disagrees With Australian Counter Amendment – Still Trying To Get Own Proposal Accepted," *Japan Times & Mail*, 25 April 25, 1919, p.1.
43. "Australia Solid Behind Hughes," *Japan Times & Mail*, 27 April 27, 1919, p.3.
44. "Opposition In U.S. To League Is Waning Sympathy With Japan, in Sarre A New State But Coal France's Forever---Rhine Demilitarised," *Japan Times & Mail*, 18 April 1919, p.1.
45. "Coloured People In America For Equal Rights, in Expect Treaty To Be Signed June 10," *Japan Times & Mail*, 30 May 1919, p.1.
46. "A Tribute To Japanese Delegates," *Japan Times & Mail*, 29 April 1919, p.3.
47. "Wilson's Victory Conceded," *Japan Times & Mail*, 16 May 1919, p.2.
48. "Orlando Backs Racial Equality," *Japan Times & Mail*, 29 April 1919, p.3.
49. "A Tribute To Japanese Delegates," *Japan Times & Mail*, 29 April 1919, p.3.
50. "Public Opinion In Paris Favours Japan, in Covenant Adopted Unchanged Kiao-Chau Dispute Settled," *Japan Times & Mail*, 2 May 1919, p.1.
51. Morinosuke Kajima, *The Diplomacy of Japan: 1894-1922*, Vol. III (Tokyo: Kajima Institute of International Peace, 1980), p.418.