

78

3

情義第一課



腹之部
調音

記

(發信人)

大
臣

同

同

同

同

河

問

官

同

•

•

1

✓ 貴族院書記官長
 ✓ 衆議院書記官長
 ✓ 關東廳外事課長
 ✓ 參謀本部 (二部)
 ✓ 海軍軍令部 (二部)
 ✓ 陸軍省新聞班長
 ✓ 陸軍省調査班
 ✓ 鐵道省國際觀光局長

次官
 同
 情報部
 同
 同
 同
 同
 同

(以上)

0436

新聞論調送付先 (乙號)

(發信人) 情報部

男爵 松井慶四郎	子爵 石井菊次郎	男爵 林權助	公爵 近衛文麿	公爵 徳川家達	伯爵 伊東巳代治	子爵 金子堅太郎	伯爵 清浦奎吾	伯爵 山本權兵衛	伯爵 牧野伸顯	公爵 西園寺公望
麴町區下六番町五二	澁谷町青葉通一五	麻布區霞町二三	府下千駄ヶ谷三三〇	府下入新井新井宿二二一一	神奈川縣葉山町一七	芝區高輪臺町三二	芝區三田臺町一ノ五	芝區高輪臺町三二	府下入新井新井宿二二一一	神田區駿河臺南甲賀町五 (京都市上京區田中町清風莊)

0437

0439

L 0438

立 作太郎 同
 青木 節一 國際聯盟東京支局
 中野 正剛 青山原宿一九八
 永井 柳太郎 市外千駄ヶ谷町五〇七
 太平洋問題調査會(十部) 銀座西七ノ三 貿易會館
 國際聯盟協會 丸ノ内二ノ一二 十三號館
 滿鐵東京支社調査係(六部)
 半澤玉城 麴町區中六番町一四 外交時報社
 東京朝日新聞社編輯局長(二部) 麴町區有樂町三ノ一
 東京日日新聞社 同 (二部) 麴町區有樂町一ノ二
 時事新報社 同 (二部) 丸ノ内二ノ一八

0440

國民新聞社 同 (二部) 京橋區加賀町一ノ二
 報知新聞社 同 (二部) 麴町區有樂町一ノ一三
 中外商業新報社 同 (二部) 日本橋區北島町一
 都新聞社 同 (二部) 麴町區内幸町一ノ五
 日本新聞社 同 (二部) 麴町區有樂町二ノ四
 中央新聞社 同 (二部) 麴町區内山下町一ノ一
 讀賣新聞社 同 (二部) 京橋區西紺屋町一〇
 東京毎夕新聞社 同 (二部) 日本橋區松島町一ノ三〇
 東京夕刊新報社 同 (二部) 京橋區京橋三丁目一ノ七
 ジャパン、タイムズ社 同 (二部) 麴町區内幸町一ノ五
 東京毎日新聞社 同 (二部) 京橋區西三丁目

0441

二六新報社 同 (二部) 芝區芝口二ノ七
 萬朝報社 同 (二部) 京橋區銀座西二ノ三
 やまと新聞社 同 (二部) 芝區愛宕町二ノ三二
 大阪毎日新聞社 同 (二部) 大阪市北區堂島上二ノ三六
 大阪朝日新聞社 同 (二部) 大阪市北區中之島三ノ三

0442.

起密院附内録

九鬼隆一	市外大井町 五四四五
久保田 讓	小石川区金富町 三五
富井 政章	半込区市谷薬王寺 七一
石里忠恵	半込区揚場 一七
黒田長成	市外区福吉町 一
古市公威	市外澁谷町常盤松 一八
江木千之	半込区余丁町 三五
櫻井 錠二	本郷区駒込曙町 三

外務省

0443

荒井賢太郎	山形川区大塚仲町四一
河合 操	付下和国堀堀之内京四三
石原健三	市外下大塚七一
鎌田榮吉	市外目黒町下目黒五五五
鈴木貫太郎	市外築港町宮下一五七六
岡田良平	小石川区京町一二五
水町繁六	市外澁谷町神山五五
福田雅太郎	市外代々木山谷一七四

外務省

0444

研究会	麹町区三年町一
同成會	麹町区三年町一 幸俱樂部内
公成會	麹町区三年町一 昭和会館内
交友俱樂部	麹町区永田町二一一
同和会	麹町区三年町一 昭和会館内
大曜会	麹町区三年町一 霞山会館内

外務省

0445

11.1.0.21-4-1-1

情報部第一課長

昭和六年十月三十一日

滿洲事變ニ關スル改定新聞論調(三十一)

送付先別表ノ通り

情報部第一課



昭和六年拾月卅日 發送済

(0446)

記録付

30/10

新聞論調送付先(甲號)

(發信人)

内閣總理大臣

大臣

各省大臣(除宮内大臣)

同

關東長官

同

朝鮮總督

同

臺灣總督

同

樞密院議長

同

同 副議長

同

内閣書記官長

次官

法制局長官

同

樞密院書記官長

同

(0447)

✓ 貴族院書記官長
 ✓ 衆議院書記官長
 ✓ 關東廳外事課長
 ✓ 參謀本部 (二部)
 ✓ 海軍軍令部 (二部)
 ✓ 陸軍省新聞班長
 ✓ 陸軍省調査班
 ✓ 鐵道省國際觀光局長

次官
 同
 情報部
 同
 同
 同
 同
 同
 (以上)

(0448

新聞論調送付先 (乙號)
 ✓ 公爵 西園寺 公望
 ✓ 伯爵 牧野 伸顯
 ✓ 伯爵 山本 權兵衛
 ✓ 伯爵 清浦 奎吾
 ✓ 子爵 金子 堅太郎
 ✓ 伯爵 伊東 巳代治
 ✓ 公爵 德川 家達
 ✓ 公爵 近衛 文麿
 ✓ 男爵 林 權助
 ✓ 子爵 石井 菊次郎
 ✓ 男爵 松井 慶四郎
 (發信人) 情報部
 神田區駿河臺南甲賀町五
 (京都市上京區田中町清風莊)
 芝區三田臺町一ノ五
 芝區高輪臺町三二
 府下入新井新井宿二二一一
 神奈川縣葉山町一
 麴町區永田町一ノ一七
 府下千駄ヶ谷三三〇
 府下下落合四五
 麻布區霞町二三
 澁谷町青葉通一五
 麴町區下六番町五二

(0449

✓ 神 川 彦 松 同	✓ 高 柳 賢 三 同	✓ 横 田 喜 三 郎 同	✓ 蠟 山 政 道 東京帝大法學部	✓ 稻 原 勝 治 有樂町東京日日新聞社	✓ 關 口 泰 有樂町東京朝日新聞社	✓ 福 田 市 平 麴町内幸町ジャパン、タイムス社	✓ 熊 崎 良 芝區三田小山町一	✓ 森 格 政友會本部	✓ 山 道 幹 事 長 民政黨本部	✓ 浮 田 事 務 官 閑院宮家
-------------	-------------	---------------	-------------------	----------------------	--------------------	---------------------------	------------------	-------------	-------------------	------------------

0451

✓ 坂 本 俊 篤 牛込區市ヶ谷甲良三二	✓ 青 木 新 澁谷町松濤六〇	✓ 長 岡 春 一 四谷區花園町八八	✓ 田 中 都 吉 澁谷町金王一一	✓ 有 吉 明 芝區白金三光町二七三	✓ 犬 養 毅 四谷區南町八八	子爵 齋 藤 實 四谷仲町三ノ四四	男爵 阪 谷 芳 郎 小石川原町一二六	子爵 澁 澤 榮 一 府下瀧野川飛鳥山	✓ 内 田 定 槌 澁谷町南平臺一五	✓ 本 多 熊 太 郎 府下上目黒東山一〇八〇	✓ 壇 原 正 直 麻布區櫻田町一〇
----------------------	-----------------	--------------------	-------------------	--------------------	-----------------	-------------------	---------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-------------------------	--------------------

(0450

✓立 作太郎 同
 ✓青 木 節一 國際聯盟東京支局
 ✓中 野 正剛 青山原宿一九八
 ✓永 井 柳太郎 市外千駄ヶ谷町五〇七
 ✓太平洋問題調査會（十部） 銀座西七ノ三 貿易會館
 ✓國際聯盟協會 丸ノ内二ノ一二 十三號館
 ✓滿鐵東京支社調査係（六部）
 ✓半澤玉城 麴町區中六番町一四 外交時報社
 ✓東京朝日新聞社編輯局長（二部） 麴町區有樂町三ノ一
 ✓東京日日新聞社 同 （二部） 麴町區有樂町一ノ二
 ✓時事新報社 同 （二部） 丸ノ内二ノ一八

0452

✓國民新聞社 同 （二部） 京橋區加賀町一ノ二
 ✓報知新聞社 同 （二部） 麴町區有樂町一ノ一三
 ✓中外商業新報社 同 （二部） 日本橋區北島町一
 ✓都新聞社 同 （二部） 麴町區內幸町一ノ五
 ✓日本新聞社 同 （二部） 麴町區有樂町二ノ四
 ✓中央新聞社 同 （二部） 麴町區內山下町一ノ一
 ✓讀賣新聞社 同 （二部） 京橋區西紺屋町一〇
 ✓東京毎夕新聞社 同 （二部） 日本橋區松島町一ノ三〇
 ✓東京夕刊新報社 同 （二部） 京橋區京橋三丁目一ノ七
 ✓ジャパン、タイムス社 同 （二部） 麴町區內幸町一ノ五
 ✓東京毎日新聞社 同 （二部） 京橋區西三丁目

0453

二六新報社 同 (二部) 芝區芝口二ノ七
 萬朝報社 同 (二部) 京橋區銀座西二ノ三
 やまと新聞社 同 (二部) 芝區愛宕町二ノ三二
 大阪毎日新聞社 同 (二部) 大阪市北區堂島上二ノ三六
 大阪朝日新聞社 同 (二部) 大阪市北區中之島三ノ三

0454

把密院形田安

九鬼隆一	市外大井町五四五
久保田讓	少石川區金富町三五
富井政章	牛込區市谷藥王寺七一
石黒忠典	牛込區揚場一七
里田長成	市外區福吉町一
吉市公威	市外澁谷町常盤松一八
江木牛之	牛込區金町三五
櫻井鏡二	市外區駒込曙町三

0455

外務省

福田雅太郎	水町製袋六	長岡良平	鈴木實太郎	鏑田常吉	石井健三	河合操	甘花井賢吉郎
市外代々木山谷一七四	市外澁谷町神山五五	小石川区京町一三五	市外築港町宮下二五七六	市外国里町下目黒一五五五	市外下町崎所四一	府下和国堀堀之内京四三	子石川区大堤仲所四一

外務省

0456

火曜會	同和會	交友俱樂部	公正會	同成會	研究会
麹町区三年町一霞山金銀肉	麹町区三年町一昭和会銀肉	麹町区永田町二丁目一當地	麹町区三年町一昭和会館内	麹町区三年町一幸俱樂部内	麹町区三年町一

外務省

0457

文書課長		文書課發達		昭和六年拾月卅日		發送済	
主 管		情報部長		主 任		第一課長	
機 密		普通		昭和		昭和六年拾月卅日	
受 信		別表ノ力		發 信		情報部	
人 名		件名		名 込 綴		人 名	
		ウツド(ソド)ノ論文送付ノ件				情報部	
		在 上 海 美 字 號					
		裁ノ海海軍ノ要ニ関スルウツド(ソド)ノ論文					
		部					
		但シ海軍部ノ機密ナルモノナリ					
		中々ノ送付ノ件					
公 信		案		外 務		省	

新聞論調送付先(乙號)

(發信人) 情報部

- 公爵 西園寺 公望 神田區駿河臺南甲賀町五 (京都市上京區田中町清風莊)
- 伯爵 牧 野 伸 顯 芝區三田臺町一ノ五
- 伯爵 山 本 權兵衛 芝區高輪臺町三二
- 伯爵 清 浦 奎 吾 府下入新井新井宿二二一一
- 子爵 金 子 堅太郎 神奈川縣葉山町一
- 伯爵 伊 東 巳代治 麴町區永田町一ノ一七
- 公爵 德 川 家 達 府下千駄ヶ谷三三〇
- 公爵 近 衛 文 麿 府下千駄ヶ谷四五一
- 男爵 林 權 助 麻布區霞町二三
- 子爵 石 井 菊次郎 澁谷町青葉通一五
- 男爵 松 井 慶四郎 麴町區下六番町五二

0459

0458

30 117

✓ 神 川 彦 松 同	✓ 高 柳 賢 三 同	✓ 横 田 喜 三 郎 同	✓ 蠟 山 政 道 東京帝大法學部	✓ 稻 原 勝 治 有樂町東京日日新聞社	✓ 關 口 泰 有樂町東京朝日新聞社	✓ 福 田 市 平 麴町内幸町ジャパン、タイムス社	✓ 熊 崎 良 芝區三田小山町一	✓ 森 格 政友會本部	✓ 山 道 幹 事 長 民政黨本部	✓ 浮 田 事 務 官 閑院宮家
--------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--	----------------------------------	--------------------------	---	--

0461

✓ 坂 本 俊 篤 牛込區市ヶ谷甲良三二	✓ 青 木 新 澁谷町松濤六〇	✓ 長 岡 春 一 四谷區花園町八八	田 中 都 吉 澁谷町金玉一	✓ 有 吉 明 芝區白金三光町二七三	✓ 犬 養 毅 四谷區南町八八	子爵 ✓ 齋 藤 實 四谷仲町三ノ四四	男爵 ✓ 阪 谷 芳 郎 小石川原町一二六	子爵 ✓ 澁 澤 榮 一 府下瀧野川飛鳥山	✓ 内 田 定 槌 澁谷町南平臺一五	✓ 本 多 熊 太 郎 府下上目黒東山一〇八〇	✓ 埴 原 正 直 麻布區櫻田町一〇
---	---------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------	--	---	---	---------------------------------------	---	---------------------------------------

0460

✓立 作太郎 同
 ✓青 木 節 一 國際聯盟東京支局
 ✓中 野 正 剛 青山原宿一九八
 ✓永 井 柳太郎 市外千駄ヶ谷町五〇七
 ✓太平洋問題調査會(十部) 銀座西七ノ三 貿易會館
 ✓國際聯盟協會 丸ノ内二ノ一二 十三號館
 ✓滿鐵東京支社調査係(六部)
 ✓半澤玉城 麴町區中六番町一四 外交時報社
 ✓東京朝日新聞社編輯局長(二部) 麴町區有樂町三ノ一
 ✓東京日日新聞社 同 (二部) 麴町區有樂町一ノ二
 ✓時事新報社 同 (二部) 丸ノ内二ノ一八

0462

✓國民新聞社 同 (二部) 京橋區加賀町一ノ二
 ✓報知新聞社 同 (二部) 麴町區有樂町一ノ一三
 ✓中外商業新報社 同 (二部) 日本橋區北島町一
 ✓都新聞社 同 (二部) 麴町區内幸町一ノ五
 ✓日本新聞社 同 (二部) 麴町區有樂町二ノ四
 ✓中央新聞社 同 (二部) 麴町區内山下町一ノ一
 ✓讀賣新聞社 同 (二部) 京橋區西紺屋町一〇
 ✓東京毎夕新聞社 同 (二部) 日本橋區松島町一ノ三〇
 ✓東京夕刊新報社 同 (二部) 京橋區京橋三丁目一ノ七
 ✓ジャパン、タイムス社 同 (二部) 麴町區内幸町一ノ五
 ✓東京毎日新聞社 同 (二部) 京橋區西三丁目

0463

- ✓二六新報社 同 (二部) 芝區芝口二ノ七
- ✓萬朝報社 同 (二部) 京橋區銀座西二ノ三
- ✓やまと新聞社 同 (二部) 芝區愛宕町二ノ三二
- ✓大阪毎日新聞社 同 (二部) 大阪市北區堂島上二ノ三六
- ✓大阪朝日新聞社 同 (二部) 大阪市北區中之島三ノ三

0464

✓九鬼隆一	市外大井町 五四四五
✓久保田 讓	小石川 金富三五
✓富井政幸	牛込区市谷 榎木五七
✓石黒忠恵	牛込区揚場町 一七
✓黒田長成	赤坂区福吉町 一
✓吉市公威	市外港谷 常盤 一八
✓江木千之	牛込区余丁町 三五
✓櫻井錠二	本郷区駒込 曙 三

外務省

0465

花井賢太郎	小石川三太塚仲所四一
河合操	府下和田堀堀、内原四三
石原健三	市外下大崎七一
錦田策吉	市外目黒下目黒五五五
鈴木貫太郎	市外巢鴨宮下一五七六
岡田良平	小石川三太原一二五
水町製沙衣六	市外澁谷神山五五
福田雅太郎	市外代々木山荘一七四

外務省

0466

研究会	麹町区三年町一
同成会	麹町区三年町一、幸俱樂部
公成会	昭和公司
交友倶楽部	麹町区永町二一一
同和会	麹町区三年町一、昭和公司
火曜会	昭和公司

外務省

0467

第二課長

文書課長 公信案

文書課發送 昭和六年拾月卅日發送済 淨書 (校原稿) (淨書)

主 情報部長 主 第二課長 (起草昭和六年十月三十一日)

附 情報部長 附 第二課長

受 信 在 別表ノ用

件 名 アドヴァンサー 説書 送付 件

名 込 綴

人 名 信 報 部

シヤパン、アドヴァンサー 説書 十月二十七日新裁 説書 部 (但し 杉村三使一拾部) 中 杉村三使二送付

公 信 案

外 務 省

3.2

0468

30 52

附屬物同封 (原議用紙甲)ナ

(總數二四三)

0469

0470

(昭和六年二月五日現在)

in that hope, for men in the opposition are quite different when they assume the responsibilities of office, and the important factor of inflamed public opinion in China may make it impossible for even those who see this problem in its proper aspects to be reasonable. The other hope is that the issues involved may become more clearly to the forefront before the Council of the League reconvenes, and this is not only possible but probable, provided always that no more "incidents" will be permitted to occur in the meantime so as to distract public attention from the real issues involved.

Japan at this late date is now making a statement which Mr. Yoshizawa should have made before the last days of the Council's session, which brings out Baron Shidehara's five points which have been referred to so frequently.

It would be most unfortunate if the League's decision should strengthen the hands of the military faction in Japan, and yet this is not impossible, but only for the time being. And it would be equally unfortunate if the same cause should weaken

the

0472

the confidence of the people of Japan in the justice of the leading Western nations, especially at this time when the world is sincerely striving for a reduction in armaments to ease their financial burdens during a period of worldwide economic depression.

We are confident that Japan has no territorial aspirations in Manchuria, but we do know, and the world should know, that Japan will stand firm in her determination not to yield her vested interests in Manchuria, which involve not only the investment of large sums of money and represent the enterprise of the people of Japan, but which have been acquired at the cost of two wars and the sacrifice of lives.

0471

treaties extracted from the Indians under duress. And it has been so since the beginning of history. It is true that the world is striving at this time to prevent war but world disarmament is not yet an accomplished fact. It is hardly conceivable that Lord Cecil was quoted correctly when he said "Japan's treaty rights had no connection with the security of Japanese nationals in Manchuria."

It is also difficult to conceive that even such an authority as Mr. Briand would make a statement, as reported in all press despatches, in which he said "that although agreement seemed very near it was apparent that evacuation and protection of Japanese nationals could be regulated in a very few days."

While much of the fault can be placed on Mr. Yoshizawa yet much of it has been due to the protracted delays which occurred in Tokyo. That was not the fault of the Cabinet, and certainly not of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, but in times of emergency or a national crisis it is apparent that the Japanese government cannot act quickly, for at such times a dual, or even a multiple, form of government exists

0474

exists and it is difficult to draft statements which require the approval of the head of different departments and with probably conflicting viewpoints.

If members of the Council of the League of Nations were not conversant with the Manchurian situation, and they certainly showed that they were not, how much less informed is the man on the street. It is unfortunate that the vote of 13 to 1 against Japan may probably be taken, unreasoningly and subconsciously, by the public the world over as an indictment of Japan's position because of the very complexities of the Manchurian problem which the average man abroad does not understand.

Japan by not bringing the sanctities of treaty rights to the attention of the Council in its early stages unfortunately permitted the Chinese contention of evacuation of troops prior to negotiations to become the principal consideration before the Council.

Notwithstanding that a good cause has been distorted and misrepresented, there exists the basis of two hopes, one that the coming government at Nanking may take a more reasonable position. We do not know at this moment how much confidence can be reposed

in

0473

quote from press reports, Mr. Yoshizawa disclaimed knowledge of these press reports which were substantially correct. When questioned on this subject Mr. Yoshizawa is reported to have replied that regarding the question of sanctity of treaties, there must be some misunderstanding, as he did not telegraph to his Government in this sense, and that he regretted the Reuter message and would telegraph to the Japanese Government in this connection.

And in the reports from Geneva we read Lord Cecil as saying:

"If it were a question of treaties, Japan could always submit them to the League Court, of which a Japanese, Mr. Mineichiro Adachi, is president. Hence, Japan was assured of justice. But it could not demand that this be a subject for direct Sino-Japanese negotiations before evacuation. The League could always express an opinion that all valid treaties should be respected, but the question of Japan's treaty rights had no connection with the security of Japanese nationals in Manchuria."

Such

0476

Such an argument, if it is correctly reported, should have been promptly demolished, and it should not have required either a trained diplomat or an authority on international law to do so. Japan does not dispute the validity of the treaty of 1915 any more than France disputes the validity of the treaty of Versailles, nor had Japan asked for any interpretation of the treaty. That kind of an argument might appropriately have been addressed to the Chinese delegate, whose government has refused to recognize the treaty of 1915, but not to the Japanese.

The Sino-Japanese treaty of 1915 is certainly as valid as the treaty of Versailles. It could reasonably be asked if a treaty which was obtained as a threat of war is a more formidable manner of duress than a treaty which was extracted after a protracted war from a vanquished foe. Practically every treaty of importance in the world has been obtained under duress. The very foundations and the boundary lines of some of the member states of the League were created through the treaty of Versailles. The very foundation of the United States of America was based on a treaty obtained through the war of independence. And the very existence of the American colonies was based on

treaties

0475

the League Covenant is brief and we quote it in full, as follows:

The High Contracting Parties, In order to promote international co-operation and to achieve international^{al} peace and security

by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war,

by the prescription of open, just and honorable relations between nations,

by the firm establishment of understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among governments, and by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another,

Agree to this Covenant of the League of Nations.

What happened? China got the leap when the story was attracting the widest attention throughout the world and many days passed before the Japanese government could agree on a statement and issue it. And in that statement not a word was said about the sanctity of treaty rights. In the meantime China had appealed

in

0478

in characteristically platitudinous generalities to the League and world opinion for support as the aggrieved party.

Japan should have had no fear to bring this fundamental issue to the forefront at the opening of the Council's sessions. As it transpired, however, no references were made to treaty rights until the last days of the meeting, the reports of which make pitiable reading. Mr. Yoshizawa even at that late date, when asked to explain what was meant by "fundamental principles" is reported to have said, that the Japanese Government had certain established ideas on what it meant by fundamental principles which he could not communicate to the Council without authorization from Tokyo. This despite the fact that it is now known that he had explicit instructions from his government to make Baron Shidehara's five points known and to stand on them. Instead of making the issue on the sanctity of treaty rights, Mr. Yoshizawa beclouded the main issue involved, surrounded it with mystery, which in turn created suspicion of Japan's motives.

Japan, as a matter of fact, had nothing to hide and yet the delegates were forced to resort to and

0477

quote

request of Yuan Shih-kai, then president of the Republic of China. But that is now past history. It does not enter into any consideration of the validity of the treaty.

Japan should have stated her case clearly at the very outset, and stated it in the broadest, simplest and briefest terms possible, so that the world at large could have readily grasped and understood the issues involved. On these points Japan could have with justice maintained her stand and would have been supported. At that particular time the terms could have been framed in three points, sketched briefly to the following effect: That the actions taken were defensive; that Japan had no territorial aspirations and would maintain the integrity of China; and that Japan insists upon the maintenance of the sanctity of treaty rights and other commitments. This would have covered not only all treaty rights but all agreements made between Japan and China, not only as regards the railroad in Manchuria but other agreements concluded between China and Japan which have been consistently ignored. Any good lawyer would advise his client to state his case in the broadest terms. A good patent lawyer would always advise one to obtain,

if

0480

if possible, a basic patent rather than one which is specific. By attempting to be specific or too definite in detail one often limits his own case. It would have strengthened Japan's position, for in demanding that China recognize the sanctity of treaties and other commitments Japan would have been asking only that which any other nation would have demanded under similar circumstances and would have been only asking what is the least which is expected of any sovereign State, and, furthermore, it would have brought the real issue clearly to the forefront.

China undoubtedly would have countered by demanding the evacuation of the Japanese troops prior to negotiations. Even had Japan compromised on this point China would still have refused, for the very foundation of China's foreign policy, not only as far as Japan is concerned but in her relations with other countries, is based on her denial to recognize her treaty commitments. The shoe would have pinched on the other foot. Had the issue been brought out in the open at the outset Japan would have had the support of the Council of the League, for the League itself is based on the sanctity of treaties. The preamble to

the

0479

Editorial of The Japan Advertiser,

October 27, 1931.

Japan's Treaty Rights

The action of the Council of the League of Nations would be inexplicable in retrospect except the explanation is that Japan presented a good case badly, and that is putting it mildly. In the last session of the Council Mr. Yoshizawa's studied avoidance of any insistence upon the respect for the sanctity of treaty rights is incomprehensible. Instead he surrounded the term "fundamental principles" and "security" with a sense of mystery which was absolutely unjustifiable under any circumstances.

To those who have followed Sino-Japanese relations during the past decades it was evident from the outset that the crux of the entire situation was the validity of the treaty of 1915 which China has consistently refused to recognize, on the plea that it was obtained under duress - an ultimatum. As a matter of fact, the ultimatum presented to China at that time was at the

request

0481

公
信
案

(原議用紙甲)才

(淨書)

附屬書通

(序)

發信人
劉表

人名

件名「アドラー・タイ・ズー」論説送付

名 込 綴

「^アジャパン、アドヴァンタイザー」^リ残すは三十七日計裁

詩說音部

但乙
夫謀部。軍令部。二部

御參考

止
分
二
送
付
了

外務省

39

第一卷

(發信人)

大
臣

同

同

同

同

同

同

官

同

聞

0483

(0482

30 53

30/10

卷之四

公
信
案

外務

文書課長代

公信堂

(原議用紙甲)十

0485

30

54
3013

貴族院書記官長
衆議院書記官長
關東廳外事課長
參謀本部（二部）
海軍軍令部（二部）
陸軍省新聞班長
陸軍省調查班
鐵道省國際觀光局長

同	同	同	同	同	情	同	次
					報		
					部		官

(以上)

0484

新聞論調送付先(乙號)

(發信人) 情報部

公爵 西園寺 公望

神田區駿河臺南中賀町五
小京都市上京區田中町清風莊

伯爵 牧野 伸顯

芝區三田臺町一ノ五

伯爵 山本 權兵衛

芝區高輪臺町三三

伯爵 清浦 奎吾

府下入新井新井宿二二二

子爵 金子 堅太郎

神奈川縣葉山町一色

伯爵 伊東 已代治

麴町區永田町一ノ一七

公爵 德川 家達

府下千駄ヶ谷三三〇

公爵 近衛 文麿

府下下落合四五
三の四ヶ一ニ一シ

男爵 林 權助

麻布區霞町二三

子爵 石井 菊次郎

澁谷町青葉通一五

男爵 松井 慶四郎

麴町區下六番町五二

✓ 塙 原 正直

麻布區櫻田町一〇

✓ 本 多 熊太郎

府下上目黒東山一〇八〇

✓ 内 田 定槌

澁谷町南平臺一五

子爵 澁 澤 榮一

府下瀧野川飛鳥山

男爵 阪 谷 芳郎

小石川原町一二六

子爵 齋 藤 實

四谷仲町三ノ四四

✓ 犬 養 毅

四谷區南町八八

✓ 有 吉 明

芝區白金三光町二七三

田 中 都 吉

澁谷町金王一一

✓ 長 岡 春 一

四谷區花園町八八

✓ 青 木 新

澁谷町松濤六〇

✓ 坂 本 俊 篤

牛込區市ヶ谷甲良三二

0487

0486

神	高	横	磯	稻	關	福	熊	森	山	浮
川	柳	田	山	原	口	田	崎		道	田
彦	賢	喜	政	勝	泰	市	良	格	幹	事
松	三	三	道	治		平			事	務
同	同	同	東京帝大法學部	有樂町東京日日新聞社	有樂町東京朝日新聞社	麴町内幸町ジャパン、タイムス社	芝區三田小山町一	政友會本部	民政黨本部	閑院宮家

0488

立	青	中	永	太平洋問題調査會(十部)	國際聯盟協會	滿鐵東京支社調査係(六部)	半澤玉城	東京朝日新聞社編輯局長(二部)	東京日日新聞社	時事新報社
作太郎	木節一	野正剛	井柳太郎	銀座西七ノ三 貿易會館	丸ノ内二ノ一二 十三號館		麴町區中六番町一四 外交時報社	麴町區有樂町三ノ一	同	同
同	國際聯盟東京支局	青山原宿一九八	市外千駄ヶ谷町五〇七					麴町區有樂町一ノ二	(二部) 丸ノ内二ノ一八	(二部) 丸ノ内二ノ一八

0489

国民新聞社 同 (二部) 京橋區加賀町一ノ二
 報知新聞社 同 (二部) 麴町區有樂町一ノ一三
 中外商業新報社 同 (二部) 日本橋區北島町一
 都新聞社 同 (二部) 麴町區内幸町一ノ五
 日本新聞社 同 (二部) 麴町區有樂町二ノ四
 中央新聞社 同 (二部) 麴町區内山下町一ノ一
 讀賣新聞社 同 (二部) 京橋區西紺屋町一〇
 東京毎夕新聞社 同 (二部) 日本橋區松島町一ノ三〇
 東京夕刊新報社 同 (二部) 京橋區京橋三丁目一ノ七
 ジャパン、タイムス社 同 (二部) 麴町區内幸町一ノ五
 東京毎日新聞社 同 (二部) 京橋區西三丁目

(0490

二六新報社 同 (二部) 芝區芝口二ノ七
 萬朝報社 同 (二部) 京橋區銀座西二ノ三
 やまと新聞社 同 (二部) 芝區愛宕町二ノ三二
 大阪毎日新聞社 同 (二部) 大阪市北區堂島上二ノ三六
 大阪朝日新聞社 同 (二部) 大阪市北區中之島三ノ三

(0491

✓ 逓 信 省	✓ 商 工 省	✓ 農 林 省	✓ 文 部 省	✓ 司 法 省	✓ 海 軍 省	✓ 陸 軍 省	✓ 大 藏 省	✓ 内 務 省	宮 内 省	内 閣
									✓ 拓 殖 省	✓ 鐵 道 省

外務省

0495

戊

- ✓ 貴族院書記官長
- ✓ 衆議院書記官長
- ✓ 關東廳外事課長
- ✓ 參謀本部 (二部)
- ✓ 海軍軍令部 (二部)
- ✓ 陸軍省新聞班長
- ✓ 陸軍省調査班
- ✓ 鐵道省國際觀光局長

(以上)

次官
同
情報部
同
同
同
同
同

0494

文書課長		文書課發達		昭和六年十二月貳日		發送濟		淨書		正校(原稿)		(原議用紙甲)ナ	
主 情報部長		主 第一課長		(起草)		昭和六年十月		淨書		(原稿)		(原議用紙甲)ナ	
受 信		車外		別表ノ五		昭和六年拾月卅日附		附屬書		135		通	
人名		姓名		名 込 綴		人名		信 服 部					
件名		ウツドヘッド		論文送付ノ件									
在 上海英字紙		イウニング		ポスト		ナ片ニヤ							
新 報ノ海		海軍		ニ関スル		ウツドヘッド		論文					
之 部		中		今		所		追		送		付ス	
外 務 省		但		杉		杉		杉		杉		杉	

3.2

0496 30 118

號
(總數一四三)

在英大使館	在倫敦總領事館	在米大使館	在シカゴ領事館	在カルカタ總領事館
在佛大使館	在漢堡總領事館	在ブラジル大使館	在晚香坡領事館	在マニラ總領事館
在獨大使館	在リッゲンブルク領事館	在カナダ公使館	在オタワ領事館	在ダヴァオ分館
在伊大使館	在アンヅェルス領事館	在キューバ公使館	在ハバナ領事館	在バタヴィア總領事館
在伊大使館	在里昂領事館	在メキシコ公使館	在バタヴィア領事館	在シドニー總領事館
在土大使館	在馬耳塞領事館	在ベルー公使館	在バナマ領事館	在西貢領事館
在瑞西公使館	在未蘭領事館	在チリ公使館	在マサトラン領事館	在盤谷領事館
在西公使館	在オランダ公使館	在アルゼンティン公使館	在リマ領事館	在蘭貢領事館
在蘭公使館	在オランダ公使館	在ホノルル總領事館	在バウルー領事館	在孟買領事館
在瑞典公使館	在オランダ公使館	在紐育總領事館	在バウルー領事館	在スラバヤ領事館
在ラトヴィア公使館	在オランダ公使館	在メキシコ總領事館	在バウルー領事館	在マダガスカル領事館
在ポーランド公使館	在オランダ公使館	在サンパウロ總領事館	在バウルー領事館	在マダガスカル領事館
在オーストリア公使館	在オランダ公使館	在サンパウロ總領事館	在バウルー領事館	在マダガスカル領事館
在埃公使館	在オランダ公使館	在サンパウロ總領事館	在バウルー領事館	在マダガスカル領事館
在ルーマニア公使館	在オランダ公使館	在サンパウロ總領事館	在バウルー領事館	在マダガスカル領事館
在希臘公使館	在オランダ公使館	在サンパウロ總領事館	在バウルー領事館	在マダガスカル領事館
在リスボン出張所	在オランダ公使館	在サンパウロ總領事館	在バウルー領事館	在マダガスカル領事館
在フィンランド出張所	在オランダ公使館	在サンパウロ總領事館	在バウルー領事館	在マダガスカル領事館

[illegible]

(昭和六年二月五日現在)

impression in China that Japan's Treaty rights were a matter to which it was indifferent.

A diplomatic defeat of Japan, such as this would be, would be equivalent to condoning treaty violations, and encouraging the Chinese in the belief that no matter how vital the interests attacked, no Power was entitled to resist. The position of all foreign interests in this country would thenceforth become intolerable.

Japan's Suspicions

It is not surprising that Japan views outside interference with grave suspicion. Was she not jockeyed out of the possession of the Liaotung Peninsula in 1895 by the intervention of Russia, France and Germany, the firstnamed of which took possession thereof three years later.

At Versailles, and again at Washington her position in Manchuria was vigorously assailed, and Baron Shidehara found it necessary to state that "if it should once be recognized that rights solemnly granted by treaty may be revoked at any time on the ground that they were conceded against the spontaneous will of the grantor, an exceedingly dangerous precedent will be established, with far-reaching consequences upon the stability of the existing international relations in Asia, in Europe, and elsewhere."

Under

0500

Under foreign pressure Japan withdrew the more objectionable of the Twenty-One Demands, and restored the Shantung Railway and the Leased Territory to China. . . . But as regards Manchuria, she has consistently maintained that she will brook no interference with her interests.

Her mistake has been her failure to notify the League of the precise causes and objects of her recent action. And it is to this omission that the League should now address itself, if it really seeks to end the present deadlock.

0499

members "to subject it (i.e. Japan) to the severance of all trade or financial relations, and the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant breaking State," or "to recommend to the several Governments concerned what effective military, naval or air force the Members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League."

When Facts Fail

The plain truth of the matter is that both the League Covenant and the Kellogg Pact must break down unless the spirit as well as the letter of these instruments be scrupulously observed by all Parties. Neither document was ever intended to allow a country such as China to play ducks and drakes with her Treaty obligations, and to add provocation to Powers with substantial interests in this country.

If the League is to fulfil its functions as an organization for preventing war, or recourse to force, it must exact from its members a recognition of the sanctity of Treaty obligations previous to a state of affairs arising that leaves no alternative solution.

The Japanese up to the present, have shown singular ineptitude in the presentation of their case for action
in

0502

in Manchuria. But every student of affairs in the Far East is aware that Japan, more than any other country, has suffered from Treaty violations and other forms of provocation at the hands of the Chinese.

There were indications weeks before she took action that her patience was becoming exhausted. And now that she has definitely committed herself to the maintenance of her rights by force - which she asserts is not equivalent to war - a solution can only be found by insisting that China, as well as Japan, shall fulfil her Treaty obligations.

The Japanese will not withdraw their troops until they are satisfied that their nationals will be adequately protected. China cannot, at the moment, give any assurance worth the paper it is written upon, to that effect. The Japanese are determined that their Treaty rights shall be respected.

No hint has as yet been given that China will fulfil this requirement.

A Disservice To Foreigners

The League would be doing a singular disservice to foreign interests in China were it - assuming that it has the means to do so - to insist only upon the withdrawal of the Japanese forces, and to create the
impression

0501

to confiscate the Chinese Eastern Railway, Russia brushed aside all protests based upon this instrument, invaded Northern Manchuria, and dictated her own terms by direct negotiations with the Manchurian authorities.

In spite of the Kellogg Pact, and its obligations, foreign opinion was not, on the whole, unfavorable to Russia!

"The arbitrary procedure in connection with the Chinese Eastern indicates that in their desire to oust foreigners the Chinese are little disposed to live up to formal obligations entered into in good faith and with open eyes by previous Governments in China," wrote the New York Times.

"The Chinese by their high-handed action on the Chinese Eastern Railway, have given a warning to all the other Powers that the present Chinese rulers will recognize no agreement that is not supported by force," said the Manchester Guardian. "They have provided an excellent argument for the postponement, even by the friendliest foreign Power, of any change in the existing system of extraterritoriality."

A Puzzle For Japan

It must, then, be somewhat puzzling to Japanese statesmen to find that when their Government takes action, as a result of cumulative provocation, for the protection

0504 of

of railway and economic rights in Manchuria, which are even more vital to Japan than the Chinese Eastern Railway was to Soviet Russia, not only is the Kellogg Pact invoked, not only is a non-Member of the League of Nations invited to participate in the deliberations of the Council, but that the European Press even discusses the possibility of applying Article XVI of the League Covenant, an Article which provides that if any Member of the League has resort to war in disregard of its covenants, "it shall ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other Members of the League"

No-one for a moment imagines that America or the Great European Powers will dream of applying this article in the present dispute. They have all had too much experience of the provocativeness and procrastination of the Chinese Government to feel that military or naval intervention in support of China, against Japan, is worth the bones of a single American or European grenadier!

While they will continue to exert what peaceful pressure may be possible to bring about a pacific settlement of Sino-Japanese issues, the League Council will certainly not be guilty of the folly of instructing its

members

0503