

The Washington Conference and East Asia, 1921–1922

Ryuji HATTORI

Abstract

This year marks the 100th anniversary of the Washington Conference, which was held from November 12, 1921 to February 6, 1922. In 2001, I attended an international conference, “Treaty-Bound: Japanese Politics and International Diplomacy, 1853–Present,” sponsored by the University of California, Berkeley. This paper was submitted at that conference. As for the international conference, see my work, *Kokusai Seijishi no Dōhyō: Jissenteki Nyūmon* [A guide to international political history: A practical introduction] (Hachioji: Chuo University Press, 2004).

Key Words

Washington Conference, East Asia, diplomacy

Contents

Introduction

1. The Road to the Washington Conference
2. The Root Principles and the Nine-Power Treaty
3. The Shandong Question and the Twenty-One Demands Question
4. The Siberian Question and the Chinese Eastern Railway Question

Conclusion

Introduction

Many scholars in the United States and Japan have related the East Asian international politics of the 1920s to the concept known as the “Washington System,” an international order depending on cooperative diplomacy among the U.S., Japan, and Britain, with China subordinate and the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR, 1918–1922) or the USSR (1922–1991) excluded.¹⁾ These scholars assume the starting point of the system to be the Washington Conference held from 1921 to 1922. Although there has been a wealth of studies on the Washington Conference, some questions still need to be addressed.

First, to what extent was the consensus among the three powers established, since that should have been the basis for cooperative diplomacy? In particular, did the U.S. government accept Japanese “special interests” in Manchuria? Or did U.S. East Asian policy compel Japan to change its “sphere-of-

influence diplomacy”? There has been no end to this debate. Sadao Asada said that the so-called Root Principles were the U.S.’s acceptance of Japanese special interests. In contrast, Thomas H. Buckley argued that there was no document that proved the U.S.’s acceptance of Japanese special interests.²⁾ Akira Iriye wrote, “It was only during the Washington Conference, meeting between November 1921, and February 1922, that the Japanese government became aware of the need to reconsider its fundamental assumptions concerning the conduct of foreign policy.”³⁾ In addition, scholars like Ian Nish were skeptical about the concept of the Washington System.⁴⁾ The disparities among these views are why it is necessary to reconsider the consensus between the three powers in the Washington Conference.

Second, what, if any, transitions took place in the U.S.’s East Asian policies during the period of the Washington Conference? Relatively few works have examined the Harding administration’s East Asian policies from within the administration or the relationship of those policies to those of the former Wilson administration. It is not widely known that there were serious disparities among U.S. policy-makers on the framework of East Asian policies during the conference. Specifically, the role of John Van Antwerp MacMurray, the chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs in the Department of State, has not been evaluated sufficiently.⁵⁾

Third, if the Chinese position was subordinate in the Washington System, why did the Beijing government accept such a position? This must be analyzed.⁶⁾ However, there have been few studies that fully used Chinese diplomatic documents.

Fourth, we must address the foreign policies toward the RSFSR. The RSFSR was not invited to attend the conference, and U.S.-Soviet diplomatic relations were not established until 1933; therefore, we can conclude that the RSFSR (and, later, the USSR) was excluded from the Washington System. The question, then, is why the powers could not agree about their foreign policy toward the RSFSR, despite having deliberated on an agenda that could have laid the foundations for diplomacy toward the RSFSR or the USSR.⁷⁾

In order to answer these questions, this paper surveys the argument among the U.S., Japan, and China before the conference; it then examines the reality of the “agreement” reached at the conference among the U.S., Britain, and Japan, focusing on “the Hughes amendment proposal,” which followed the Root Principles. Next, the paper discusses the role of MacMurray in the negotiations of the Shandong question, comparing the lines of U.S. Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes and Elihu Root, the U.S. plenipotentiary. After that, the paper scrutinizes U.S.-Japan-China negotiations on the Chinese Eastern Railway, which had a significant influence on countries’ respective foreign policies toward the RSFSR, and the failure of these negotiations. Chinese activities during the conference, providing insights from numerous Chinese diplomatic documents that have been made available. Finally, the conclusion of the papers offers a summary based on the analyses in section 1-4.

1. The Road to the Washington Conference

From July to September 1921, the Harding administration proposed an international conference to Britain, France, Japan, China, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, and Portugal.⁸⁾ What surprised Japan was that the U.S. government raised as agenda the Far Eastern question and the Pacific question as well as naval arms limitations. Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs Yasuya Uchida telegraphed Japanese

Ambassador to the U.S. Kijūrō Shidehara, on July 13: "I am afraid that foreign powers could intervene Japanese foreign policy toward China and Siberia."⁹⁾ Japanese Prime Minister Takashi Hara told Eichi Shibusawa and Kentarō Kaneko, "Some people are really worried about the conference and insist that this autumn will be a time of tribulations."¹⁰⁾ Kensuke Horinouchi, the director of the Second Division of the American and European Bureau in the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, recollected that "the U.S.'s proposal of 'the Far Eastern question and the Pacific question' caused serious domestic controversy. We were worried that Japan would be terribly criticized in the indicted seat because U.S. public opinion was blaming Japan for her firm policy toward China, symbolized by 'the Twenty-One Demands.'"¹¹⁾

On July 22 the Hara cabinet decided that "established facts and questions between the two countries should not be entrusted to joint discussion within the powers," and "questions such as the Shandong question should naturally be excluded." At the same time, they conceded, "it would be acceptable to discuss general principles such as the mutual respect of territory, the open door, and equal opportunity; rather, it is desirable to propose these principles from our side."¹²⁾ In other words, the Hara cabinet maintained that while its basic policy was in agreement with certain U.S. diplomatic principles, it intended to preserve Japanese vested interests by excluding, to the utmost, discussions of such concrete problems as the Shandong question.

The Hara cabinet had been attempting to resolve the Shandong question since January 1920, but the Beijing government had refused to negotiate. After repeated questions from Shidehara since the end of June 1921, Hughes suggested to Chinese Minister to the U.S. Sao-Ke Alfred Sze that the Chinese government begin negotiations before the Washington Conference was held.¹³⁾ Sze told Hughes on August 11, "if the United States would act as intermediary and could secure a satisfactory proposition from Japan, it would be very helpful." However, Hughes was not expert enough to present an acceptable compromise.¹⁴⁾

The Beijing government's plan was to entrust the Shandong question to the Washington Conference; they were counting on diplomatic support from the U.S. and Britain. The Second Canton government, headed by President Sun Yat-sen, however, criticized the Beijing government's declaration that it would participate in the Washington Conference. Sun Yat-sen attacked the Beijing government's President Hsu Shih-chang, saying that he was "not permitted morally or legally to voice his opinion on the Chinese question and does not have the right to dispatch the Chinese delegation," on the grounds that he was premier when the Chinese government negotiated the Twenty-One Demands.¹⁵⁾

There was no guarantee that the Shandong question would be discussed multilaterally in the Washington Conference, as the Beijing government expected. In fact, a draft submitted by the Harding administration in the middle of September did not refer to the Shandong question. What was remarkable about the draft was that it did mention the Chinese Eastern Railway, which was being managed mainly by Japan and the U.S.¹⁶⁾ When Hughes showed the draft to Shidehara on September 8, he told him, "We must act as trustees of Russian property until a legitimate government is formed in Russia."¹⁷⁾

Along with this proposal, the U.S. government negotiated with Japan to strengthen the control of the Chinese Eastern Railway before the Washington Conference. The State Department's intention was to heighten the attribution of the Technical Board of the Chinese Eastern Railway, which was under the

influence of U.S. President of the Inter-Allied Technical Board John F. Stevens, and to retain the management system even after the withdrawal of the Japanese troops, which alone had remained in Siberia.¹⁸⁾ However, fearing that U.S. influence would expand in northern Manchuria, the Hara cabinet was against the U.S. proposal under the pretext that it could infringe the sovereignty of China and the RSFSR.¹⁹⁾ Therefore, the Chinese Eastern Railway question as well as the Shandong question was not resolved before the Washington Conference.

Meanwhile, the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, led by Vice-Minister Masanao Hanihara, Director-General of the Treaties and Conventions Bureau Tadao Yamakawa, Director-General of the Asian Bureau Kenkichi Yoshizawa, and Director-General of the American and European Bureau Tsuneo Matsudaira, was preparing for the conference, conferring with the War Ministry and the Navy Ministry.²⁰⁾

The Hara cabinet summed up its instructions on October 13, saying that the priority should not be given to the Far Eastern and the Pacific questions because “the primary objective of the conference is the naval arms limitations question.” In other words, the delegation was not to discuss the abolition of Chinese extraterritoriality or the recognition of the Chinese imposition; these were “issues not to be approved without some kind of guarantee or reservation.” Shandong, the Twenty-One Demands, the leased territories, and the South Manchurian Railway were “issues not to be discussed,” whereas such diplomatic principles as the mutual respect of territory, the open door, and the equal opportunity were “issues to be positively discussed.” The Hara cabinet disagreed with the proposed international management of the Siberian Railway and the Chinese Eastern Railway, which they said could “slight Russian rights.” It insisted that the question of withdrawal of Japanese troops from Siberia and northern Manchuria “should not be examined” during the conference because Japan engaged in negotiations with the Far Eastern Republic.²¹⁾ This decision echoed the first plan of the Hara cabinet to limit negotiations on the Far Eastern question from the viewpoint of “sphere-of-influence diplomacy,” while positively accepting the diplomatic principles advocated by the U.S. government.

The Sino-Japanese confrontation on the Shandong question and the U.S.-Japan friction over the Chinese Eastern Railway were not resolved at all before the Washington Conference began. The Washington Conference provided the ideal opportunity to create an international order in East Asia; however, it could also reveal the Sino-Japanese and U.S.-Japan antagonism.

2. The Root Principles and the Nine-Power Treaty

The Root Principles

When the Washington Conference began on November 12, 1921, the reverberation of Prime Minister Hara's assassination lingered. Hughes's proposal on naval arms limitations surprised the other countries' delegations. Eiji Amō, dispatched by the Second Division of the American and European Bureau in the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, wrote in his diary that “the proposal of Hughes was a bolt out of the blue.”²²⁾ The first general committee on the Pacific and Far Eastern questions was held on November 16, and Hughes became the committee's chairman.

As the head of the Chinese plenipotentiaries, Chinese Minister to the U.S. Alfred Sze submitted a proposal on the Far Eastern question at the beginning of the committee, commenting that China had

the closest stakes. The Chinese proposal included ten articles: referred to the preservation of Chinese territory (article 1), the open door and the equal opportunity (article 2), the disavowal of concluding treaties related to China without notifying the Chinese government (article 3), the invalidity of vested interests in China when the authority was not clear (article 4), the abolition of limits on Chinese freedoms of action politically, judicially, and administratively (article 5), and so on.²³⁾ The Chinese hoped to undermine foreign interests in China by applying U.S. diplomatic principles to East Asia. The Japanese delegation suspected that the Chinese delegation was “flattering U.S. public opinion and trying to break the present situation, mainly depending on propaganda.”²⁴⁾

The Japanese delegation was not the only party that was cautious of the principles proposed by Minister Sze. Root said to his counsel, Chandler Parsons Anderson, on November 18, “[T]he Japanese could not afford not to agree to these principles, but the trouble would come when the practical application of them was taken up, and that would be the chief difficulty in coming to an agreement.”²⁵⁾ Root, who had been secretary of state under President Theodore Roosevelt and secretary of war under President William McKinley, when Secretary of State John Hay declared the open door principle, wanted to submit his own counterproposal, and did so.

He took the opportunity on November 19, when Aristide Briand, the French plenipotentiary, asked this cynical question on the Chinese geographical area: “What is China?”²⁶⁾ Root stated that the nine countries should have limited the Chinese geographical area to which the Far Eastern principles would be applied. Agreeing with Root’s suggestion, Arthur James Balfour, formerly the British secretary of state for foreign affairs, proposed that Root should be responsible for drafting the Far Eastern principles.²⁷⁾ When V. K. Wellington Koo, the Chinese minister to Britain, retorted that the Chinese constitution stipulated the Chinese territory, Balfour had qualms about this statement, believing that relying solely on China’s territorial claims could lead to diversionary discussions of Tibet rule.²⁸⁾ Therefore, Hughes put Root in charge of drafting the Far Eastern principles.

On November 21, Root submitted his draft containing four articles covering the signers’ intention to respect of the territorial and administrative integrity of China, maintenance of a stable government, equal opportunity, and refrainment of seeking special rights that would infringe upon the rights of friendly states. When Japanese plenipotentiary Tomosaburō Katō asked about the first article, wondering “whether it could affect the vested interests of powers,” Root pronounced, “This article would never have an influence on privileges which China has already given.” Balfour approved the fundamental points and denied “the obligation to modify” the extraterritoriality and the limit of tariff autonomy in China.²⁹⁾ Therefore, Koo reluctantly agreed to the Root Principles, stating, “on these restrictions of Chinese sovereignty, we will appropriately begin negotiations and seek the agreement of powers on the abolition.”³⁰⁾

The Root Principles adopted on the day were almost the same as those in the draft version. Each country agreed to maintain its vested interests and confirmed the interpretation that they did not have an obligation to deliberate the unequal Chinese treaties in the future. In particular, the fourth article of the Root Principles was almost the same as the U.S.-Japan secret protocol of the Lansing-Ishii Agreement concluded on November 2, 1917.³¹⁾ On this article, MacMurray told Japanese diplomat Sadao Saburi, “as I understand the statement formulated by Mr. Root it means that no other nationality shall

seek for itself any special rights or privileges which would abridge either the vested right of Mr. X to mine coal, or the general right of Japanese subjects to navigate Chinese waters in accordance with their treaty.”³²⁾

In other words, although Japanese “special interests” in the whole of Manchuria were not admitted comprehensively, the delegations agreed to preserve the status quo of the vested interests that were clearly based on treaties. The Japanese vested interests accepted in the deliberation of the Root Principles were the same as the “special interests” in southern Manchuria that were approved in the negotiations of the New Consortium. However, there was an important difference in the political intentions of the Wilson administration’s New Consortium negotiations and those of the Root Principles. The Wilson administration, relying on its open door principle, asked the Japanese government to offer part of her vested interests to the New Consortium. In contrast, the Root Principles revised the U.S. diplomatic principle in order to coexist with the Japanese diplomatic principle of “special interests.”

The Hughes Amendment Proposal and the Nine-Power Treaty

It must be noted here that the Root line, which could be summarized as the policy of the pro-Japanese status quo, in no way typified the general opinion of U.S. policymakers. The politician who began to form a different line was Hughes, who felt that the policy of the status quo symbolized by the Root Principles should be reconsidered and the open door principle further emphasized. Therefore, Hughes proposed a draft on the open door principle on January 16, 1922. In order to apply the principles of open door and equal opportunity more effectively, this draft required countries to eschew concluding agreements that would lead to their superiority or interfere with other nations’ business in any part of China.³³⁾

In addition, Hughes presented an amendment proposal on January 17, by which he attempted to form an investigative organization called the Board of Reference. Under the Hughes amendment proposal, all countries, including China, could ask the Board of Reference to investigate if one country’s interests were thought to be against the open door principle. This proposal could revive the question of applying the open door principle to vested interests that the Root Principles had shelved, because the Board of Reference would be able to deliberate whether vested interests conflicted with the open door principle.³⁴⁾ Thus, the open door policy proposed by Hughes was much more extensive than Root’s view and intransigent toward Japan. Hughes intended to establish a new order in East Asia by applying the open door principle aggressively, being more sympathetic to China than to Japan.

Naturally, Sze welcomed the Hughes amendment proposal at the conference on January 18. However, Shidehara argued that subjects of the Board of Reference “should be limited to interests, which the Chinese government will admit in the future.” After the delegations from Britain, France, and Italy expressed solidarity with Shidehara’s concerns, an article, under which the vested interests could be examined, was eliminated. Hughes, though reluctantly, accepted substantially Japan’s “special interests” in southern Manchuria based on treaties.

Because decisions of the Board of Reference did not have compelling power, the resolution of the open door principle was based on a vague consensus.³⁵⁾ According to a telegram from the Japanese delegation to Uchida, this resolution was “supplementary to the Root Principles. The fourth article of the Root

Principles made it clear that each government should refrain from seeking special rights that would abridge the security of friendly states.”³⁶⁾ The Japanese delegation agreed with the Hughes resolution with the understanding that it did not change the policy of the status quo prescribed by the Root Principles. The original Hughes plan, under which vested interests could have been examined within the criteria of the open door principle, was mutilated by the agreement on the status quo between Japan, Britain, France, and Italy.

In addition, the treaty on the Chinese tariff that was finalized on February 6, 1922, stated that China’s tariff rate should become 5 percent immediately (article 1). It mandated a special conference within three months after the treaty became valid in order to abolish *likin*, the Chinese toll imposed by the local governments (article 2), specifying that the Chinese tariff would be increased by 2.5 percent at the special conference (article 3).³⁷⁾ However, nothing was agreed upon regarding China’s tariff autonomy.

Article 3 of the Nine-Power Treaty, approved on February 6, 1922, stipulated the principles of open door and equal opportunity in China.³⁸⁾ This was not disputed at the Washington Conference because Japan and Britain had already decided to accept these principles before the conference. The Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, led by Kinichi Komura, agreed to affirm these principles.³⁹⁾ Balfour’s draft, presented to Hughes just before the conference, contained the principles.⁴⁰⁾

The real issue was whether these principles should have been strictly applied to the vested interests. The Nine-Power Treaty, which adopted the Root Principles as the first article, did not ask countries to change their policies toward their vested interests. For the Japanese government, the principles of open door and equal opportunity presupposed the maintenance of “special interests” in southern Manchuria. Britain shared the idea of maintaining vested interests with Japan. George N. Curzon, the British secretary of state for foreign affairs, had already told Koo before the conference, “Manchuria was not a part of China proper; ... My own inclination, if I were a Chinaman, would be to allow the Japanese to expand, under reasonable conditions, in that direction, rather than to bring them down upon the main body of China.”⁴¹⁾ As shown during the deliberations of the Hughes amendment proposal, even Hughes had to implicitly approve the consensus on the maintenance of the vested interests between Japan and Britain. MacMurray wrote in his long memorandum of 1935 concerning the Nine-Power Treaty, “The obligation undertaken by the signatory Powers (other than China) was indeed a very important one, but one of purely negative character – of self-abnegation only.”⁴²⁾ Therefore, it does not mean a victory for U.S. diplomacy that the open door and equal opportunity principles were included in the Nine-Power Treaty. The notion of “sphere-of-influence diplomacy” was deeply rooted in the psyches of Japanese policy-makers, including Shidehara. Indeed, it was not a case of the U.S. government forcing Japan to convert the basis of Japanese diplomacy.

3. The Shandong Question and the Twenty-One Demands Question

The Shandong Question and the MacMurray Initiative

The Shandong question was the most serious among the pending problems concerning the Far East. The Japanese government attempted to directly negotiate the Shandong question with the Chinese government before the Washington Conference began. When Yasuya Uchida, the Japanese minister of

foreign affairs, talked with Zhou Ziqi in Tokyo on October 31, 1921, he said to the Chinese diplomatic adviser, who was on his way to the U.S., that even if the Chinese government brought up the Shandong question to the conference, “the Japanese government would never allow the conference to adopt it as an issue.”⁴³⁾ Though the Chinese government wanted to avoid direct negotiations, Hughes, Balfour, and MacMurray recommended that Katō and Sze negotiate directly.⁴⁴⁾ After the direct negotiations on the Shandong question began on December 1, Hughes, Balfour, MacMurray, U.S. ex-Chargé D'affaires to Japan Edward Bell, British ex-Minister to China John N. Jordan, and Chief of the China Service in the British Foreign Office Miles Wedderburn Lampson appeared as observers.⁴⁵⁾

Concerning the Shandong question, the Beijing government telegraphed the Chinese delegation, “We do not allow the Japanese government to succeed the German rights and interests,” and it dared to publish the telegraph.⁴⁶⁾ According to Hughes, “Tyau [Philip K. C.]’s resignation ... and Wang [Chung-hui]’s threat to resign unless there is a more uncompromising attitude have limited the freedom of action of Sze and Koo in presenting the case of China in a way to take the greatest advantage of opportunities, and consequently have restricted their usefulness as representatives of China’s interests.”⁴⁷⁾ Behind the friction within the Chinese delegation, there were misgivings about the conference of Minister of Foreign Affairs Yen Hui-ching and President Hsu Shih-chang. Yen told Jacob Gould Schurman, the U.S. minister to China, that the Shandong question could not be resolved without the complete restitution of the Shandong railway.⁴⁸⁾

Originally, the Japanese plan for the Shandong railway was to have Sino-Japanese joint management. However, that plan was not welcomed by the U.S. and British observers or the Chinese delegation. The Japanese delegation attempted to meet the Chinese halfway, proposing a plan in which the Shandong railway would be on loan to the Japanese government; Japanese managers would be appointed during the loan period. On the other hand, the Chinese were determined that China would purchase the Shandong railway and refund the railway property to Japan.⁴⁹⁾ The Japanese delegation was concerned that by “sticking to the purchase of the railway, ... the Chinese delegation [was] trying to attribute the failure of the negotiations to Japan.”⁵⁰⁾

It was the energetic activities of MacMurray and Lampson that broke the impasse of the Sino-Japanese negotiations. On January 7, 1922, with MacMurray’s agreement, Lampson notified Hanihara of three tentative plans; the Japanese government would sell all the rights on the Shandong railway to the Chinese side, and a Japanese would be appointed as the technical chief of the railway (plan 1), the Chinese government would refund the railway property over 12 years, and a Japanese would be appointed as the technical chief of the railway (plan 2), the Chinese government would purchase the railway, and the heads of the transit section and the accounts section would be elected from among the Japanese for five years (plan 3). When Hanihara talked with MacMurray and Lampson on the morning of January 9, he added a stipulation while admitting that the second plan was comparatively desirable. That same day, MacMurray and Lampson presented a fourth plan to the Japanese delegation: the Chinese government would refund the railway property to Japan over 12 years, during which the heads of the transit section and the accounts section would be chosen from among the Japanese.⁵¹⁾ Later, they showed the three original plans and the fourth plan to the Chinese delegation.⁵²⁾ MacMurray and Lampson regarded the fourth plan as a compromise formula that reflected the Japanese intent. There-

fore, it is not surprising that Uchida, who favored the fourth plan, telegraphed the Japanese delegation that the method of the compromise formula was "substantively close to our proposition."⁵³⁾

Hughes and Balfour, who succeeded MacMurray and Lampson in the negotiations, drew up an amended proposal of the fourth plan that was more advantageous to Japan because the refund period of the railway property was 15 years. Hughes and Balfour showed the amended fourth plan to Shidehara and Hanihara on January 20. The Japanese delegation described the situation thus: "Hughes, as well as Balfour, continuously sympathetic to our side, implied that they were determined to pressure the Chinese side to a larger extent."⁵⁴⁾ Balfour notified British Minister to China Beilby Francis Alston that, "you should most strongly urge Chinese Govt. to accept these terms which Mr. Hughes and I regard as the only one chance of securing to China possession of a railroad and evacuation by Japanese of Shantung," thereafter, they informed the Chinese delegation of the amended fourth plan.⁵⁵⁾ Notified of the amended fourth plan, Minister of Foreign Affairs Yen Hui-ching reluctantly accepted the plan, protesting that it "would not satisfy our national aspirations."⁵⁶⁾

The treaty signed on February 2 to resolve the Shandong question incorporated the agreement that the railway property would be refunded to Japan in 15 years, during which the Japanese would be appointed as the heads of the transit section and the accounts section, and the mine would come under Sino-Japanese joint management.⁵⁷⁾ To what extent was this result of concessions from the viewpoint of Japan? Immediately before the conference, the Hara cabinet had made three fundamental decisions about the Shandong question. First, with the Versailles Treaty, Germany had lost the ability to return its former interests, so the Chinese opinion of the direct return from Germany was against international law; second, Japan and China had already agreed to the joint administration of the railway, notwithstanding China's entry into the war against Germany; and third, the property of the railway and the mine should not be monopolized by China but shared among foreign countries fairly.⁵⁸⁾ Therefore, the amended fourth plan satisfied the Japanese fundamentals, even though the Japanese government had compromised on the joint administration of the Shandong railway.

It was the assistance of the U.S. and Britain that made Japanese success possible. By partnering with the U.S. and Britain, the Japanese were able to negotiate the Shandong question with China concurrently with but outside of the nine-power conference. MacMurray and Lampson played a determinant role by finding common ground. Shidehara recollected that because of the help from the U.S. and Britain, "the Chinese delegation changed its attitudes drastically, although China had attempted to break off negotiations on the Shandong question."⁵⁹⁾ In addition, the reversion of Wei-Hai-Wei led by Balfour, was a measure in order to solve the Shandong question smoothly, as he stated at the conference of December 3, "intended to contribute greatly to the Shandong question."⁶⁰⁾ In contrast, the Chinese delegation had taken an unyielding stand at the beginning, but later exposed internal discord that broke the pro-Chinese atmosphere.

MacMurray and Lampson were meritorious for having helped resolve the Shandong question — the hardest of the Far Eastern problems under consideration. In particular, MacMurray took a line different from that of Hughes, who attempted to apply the open door principle to the vested interests and caused Japanese repulsion, and Root, whose pro-Japanese and status quo stances incurred Chinese distrust. Although MacMurray attached importance to Japan's intentions, he behaved as a fair mediator and

ingeniously found common ground. MacMurray deserves more credit than he often receives; the Shandong question was the key to the success of the Washington Conference, and he was instrumental in its resolution. Hughes and Balfour, the prominent figures of the conference, succeeded MacMurray and Lampson in the negotiations; after that, China had no option but to renounce the policy it had held since the Paris Peace Conference, where it had declared that it would never directly negotiate the Shandong question with Japan. A difficult question in the aftermath of the World War I was solved when MacMurray's cooperative efforts with Japan were supported by Britain.

The Twenty-One Demands Question

The consultations on the Kwantung Peninsula, Japanese-leased territory, began on December 3, 1921. Koo proposed abolishing Japan's leases in China, stating, "leased territories, something like kingdoms within a kingdom, are an impediment to Chinese defense and territorial preservation. They are making Chinese unity difficult."

In contrast to the British and French delegations, who agreed to return Weihaiwei and Guangzhou Bay to China, the Japanese delegation took a strong stand, maintaining that the Sino-Japanese treaty of 1915 extended the lease of the Kwantung Peninsula by 99 years. As Hanihara explained, "We cannot abandon the Kwantung Peninsula because Manchuria has special relations with Japan from an economic and security viewpoint. This point, already approved by powers last year when the New Consortium was established, is not against the Root Principles." In other words, Japan applied the Root Principles to its vested interests in China as a provision of the status quo with the understanding that Japanese "special interests" had already been approved by the U.S., Britain, and France when the former Hara cabinet negotiated the New Consortium. Balfour agreed with Hanihara, comparing the Kwantung Peninsula to Jiulong, a Chinese territory leased to Britain.⁶¹⁾

Accordingly, the Chinese delegation proposed an amendment to the treaties connected to Japan's Twenty-One Demands. On December 14, 1921, Wang Chung-hui demanded the amendment of the treaties, stating that "the Japanese government forced the signature with an ultimatum," and "the Chinese government hoped for an amendment or abolition in the future."⁶²⁾ However, the U.S. and Britain, as well as Japan, took little interest in the Chinese proposal. The British delegation supported the Japanese viewpoint that it was irrational to discuss the validity of existing treaties. On January 16, 1922, Hughes decided to postpone discussion of the Twenty-One Demands until the Shandong question had been resolved because they were closely related.⁶³⁾ On the following day when Hanihara said privately to Root that Japan would not amend the treaties related to the Twenty-One Demands, Root replied, "It simplifies the matter so far as the Conference is concerned" and implied that Japan did not need to change its policy.⁶⁴⁾ Root's attitude was consistently pro-Japanese and supported the status quo.

Therefore, it was not until February 2, the eve of the closing of the conference that the Twenty-One Demands question came up for consideration. Shidehara criticized China, saying "Japan would never agree on the Chinese policy to amend or abolish the treaties which the Chinese government concluded as an independent nation." Besides, Shidehara made three concessions. First, Japan would offer to the New Consortium the rights to grant credit in southern Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia, excepting those rights admitted during the negotiations of the New Consortium; second, Japan would

renounce the privilege of priority to employ advisers in southern Manchuria; and third, Japan would withdraw the fifth part of the Twenty-One Demands, which Japan had reserved during the negotiations.⁶⁵⁾ U.S. newspapers touted these concessions as a success of U.S. diplomacy.⁶⁶⁾ However, these demands had already been virtually retracted during the negotiations of the Twenty-One Demands and the New Consortium. On October 13, 1921, the Hara cabinet prepared for these superficial “concessions” from the viewpoint that they “would be necessary to impress Japanese friendship.”⁶⁷⁾

On February 3, 1922, Wang Chung-hui, quoting what we call the Bryan Note, criticized that, “It is to be greatly regretted that the Japanese government does not relinquish other demands related to the Sino-Japanese treaties and protocols of 1915.”⁶⁸⁾ The Bryan Note was a notification to Japan on May 11, 1915 by Secretary of State William J. Bryan that the U.S. would not approve any agreements against the principles of territorial integrity or open door. The Chinese delegation counted on U.S. diplomatic support by invoking the Bryan Note. However, Hughes avoided getting involved in the problem, stating, “The question of the validity of the Sino-Japanese treaties is not the same as the question of U.S. rights based on U.S.-China treaties.”⁶⁹⁾ According to Shidehara, “the floor was so dull that many participants were sleeping,” and the deliberation ended briefly.⁷⁰⁾ As *the New York Times* reported, “astute concessions” by Japan had restricted the discussions on the Twenty-One Demands.⁷¹⁾

The resolutions to the Shandong and the Twenty-One Demands questions were not satisfactory to the Chinese delegation, which had attached the greatest importance to these questions. However, the Japanese side had been able to negotiate the issues on favorable terms, receiving support from the U.S. and Britain. Hughes and Balfour did not sympathize with what they considered the excessive demands of the Chinese; doing so could have delayed the conference. Hughes, in particular, changed his pro-Chinese policy, as symbolized by the Hughes amendment proposal and tacitly accepted the Japanese viewpoints.

4. The Siberian Question and the Chinese Eastern Railway Question

The Siberian Question

The discussions of the Far Eastern matters included the Siberian question and the Chinese Eastern Railway question. According to Shidehara’s reminiscences, Hughes expected him to explain the Japanese attitude toward Siberia because the U.S. public opinion “was suspicious that Japan had a strong desire to invade.”⁷²⁾ At the conference, on January 23, 1922, Shidehara stated that there were a lot of Japanese residing in Siberia which was “notorious as the basis of the Korean independent movement against Japan.” He added that the activities of the Japanese army there were “within the limits of self-defense.” Moreover, Shidehara said that the Japanese government and the Far Eastern Republic had already begun negotiations on troop withdrawal, according to an established Japanese plan.⁷³⁾ On the following day, Hughes abruptly finished the discussion on the Siberian question, expressing his hope that the Japanese troops would be withdrawn as Shidehara had stated.

The Chinese Eastern Railway Question

The Chinese Eastern Railway (CER) question was of great importance to the basis of foreign policies toward the RSFSR. The Harding administration had attempted to strengthen the Inter-Allied Technical

Board of the CER, which was under the influence of U.S. President John F. Stevens, and, to negotiate it with Japan before the Washington Conference, hoping to maintain the international management system. However, the Hara cabinet rejected the proposals, so the Harding administration raised the CER question at the Washington Conference. On January 18, 1922, Hughes's offer to establish a committee to discuss the question was approved.⁷⁴⁾

On January 20, DeWitt Clinton Poole, the director of the Office of Russian Affairs in the State Department, submitted a proposal that the participating nations of the Washington Conference establish a finance committee in Harbin, China. That committee would handle finance and railway security, replacing the existing international management system. Tsuneo Matsudaira, a Japanese delegate, and the British and French members agreed on the U.S. proposal. However, only the Chinese member was against the U.S. proposal, arguing that the Chinese police were already in charge of railway security.⁷⁵⁾ Before the conference's opening, the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs had taken the stand that the CER was a matter of Sino-Russian relations, and telegraphed the Chinese delegation that the CER was "purely commercial, and, a third party has no right to intervene in it."⁷⁶⁾ Because the Beijing government firmly maintained this stand, and, Chang Tso-lin held the same opinion, the negotiations on the CER were going far from smoothly.⁷⁷⁾ In order to resolve this situation, the CER committee was promoted to a higher ranking committee consisting of plenipotentiaries.

Notably, Hanihara and Albert Sarraut, one of the French plenipotentiaries, became sympathetic to the Chinese viewpoint after joining the committee on January 31. Both of them, together with Koo, proposed a compromise plan on February 2. Vividly reflecting the Chinese opinion, the compromise plan did not include establishing the finance committee or reinforcing the Inter-Allied Technical Board. In short, the compromise plan virtually denied any development of the CER management system, contrary to the U.S. government's intentions. Root, as a chairman of the committee, criticized the compromise plan, saying that it "does nothing but exclude Stevens." However, although Root complained about the compromise plan, he did not cling to the original U.S. policy. As symbolized by the Root Principles, Root supported the status quo on the Far Eastern questions. Root told Hanihara before the opening of the committee on February 2, "I would never expedite the proceedings against Japanese reasonable interests."⁷⁸⁾ As a result, the Washington Conference closed without any plans to strengthen the CER international management system.⁷⁹⁾

Thus, the U.S. intention of strengthening the CER's international management system hit a snag. Under the apprehension that the U.S. influence in Manchuria could be increased, Japan did not permit the formation of a new order in Manchuria by approving the Chinese proposal and avoiding cooperative diplomacy with the U.S. Japan and China instantaneously joined hands with each other simply for the purpose of excluding U.S. intervention. In June 1922, the Katō cabinet decided to withdraw Japanese troops from Siberia.⁸⁰⁾ After the international CER management system collapsed in August of the same year, the initiative concerning the CER question passed to China and the USSR. The CER came under Sino-Soviet joint management in 1924 when they normalized diplomatic relations. For the USSR, the CER had been a base for its East Asian policies since the Czarist era. In return for preventing U.S. influence in Manchuria, Japan paid a painful price by offering the base for its East Asian policies to the USSR. If Japan, cooperating with the U.S., could have taken the initiative to strengthen the CER inter-

national management system, the strengthened system would have become the base for U.S.-Japan cooperative diplomacy toward the USSR. In reality, though they discussed the question concerning the keynote of policies toward the USSR, U.S.-Japan friction obstructed a fundamental agreement so that the USSR was left as an unsettled factor for the Washington System.

Conclusion

How can we evaluate each country's diplomacy efforts toward the Far Eastern questions at the Washington Conference? The Siberian and Twenty-One Demands questions were mostly settled in Japan's favor. The Shandong question was resolved in a way that was almost in line with Japanese demands, including the method of the Sino-Japanese direct negotiations, except for some concessions relating to the Shandong railroad. The Japanese were deeply impressed by the advantages of cooperating with the U.S. and Britain, which helped Japan resolve the Far Eastern questions.⁸¹⁾ At the same time, Japan prevented the U.S. from strengthening the CER international management system. In brief, Japan achieved most of its objective, although the Japanese seemed to be persuaded by U.S. diplomacy that held universal ideals. The Far Eastern questions of the Washington Conference were addressed along by the Hara line to balance the expansion of interests in China with cooperative diplomacy with the U.S. and Britain.

The principle of sphere-of-interest diplomacy took root within the Japanese, including Shidehara. We could hardly say that the Washington Conference was a transition period for Japanese diplomacy. One external factor was that British diplomacy, led by Curzon and Balfour, shared with Japan the concept of sphere-of-influence diplomacy. Without the British aid, Japan might not have been able to carry out its original intention. The British delegation reduced the serious friction between the U.S. and Japan. Even in 1930, one British Foreign Office memorandum said, "co-operation rather than competition should be the guiding principle of the Powers in their dealing with China."⁸²⁾

Even the naval arms limitation treaty conformed to Japanese national interests in that it offered Japan an opportunity to adjust its finances to an appropriate budget. According to Katō, without the naval arms control treaties, "Japan would never compete with the U.S. naval expansion."⁸³⁾

Reflecting policymakers' diverse frameworks for their East Asian diplomacy, U.S. policies on the Far Eastern questions were not stable. Among the U.S. delegates, Root was undoubtedly the most sympathetic to Japan. As the Root Principles and the CER deliberations showed, the Root line could be called the "pro-Japanese status quo." In stark contrast, the Hughes line was more sympathetic to China. As exemplified by his draft and amendment, Hughes thought that the U.S.'s ideal East Asian policy should esteem the open door principle and apply it to the vested interests of powers. While Root considered the status quo of vested interests reasonable, Hughes did not intend to admit Japan's "special interests" in southern Manchuria. Furthermore, Hughes severely criticized the Japanese policy of occupying northern Sakhalin, as did the Wilson administration.⁸⁴⁾ Like Wilson, Hughes attempted to restrain the Japanese debouch into the continent, depending on diplomatic ideals. Understandably, Koo summarized that Hughes was "sympathetic toward China," while Root "understood Japan far more than China."⁸⁵⁾

When the Hughes amendment proposal on the open door principle was virtually denied, the Washington System came into existence. In other words, when Hughes reluctantly acknowledged an agree-

ment among Japan, Britain, and Root, three nations' consensus became the foundation of the Washington System. Also included were the status quo of the vested interests and Japan's "special interests" in southern Manchuria, which were approved in the negotiations of the New Consortium.

The Nine-Power Treaty meant that the U.S. diplomatic ideals of open door and equal opportunity, which the U.S. government had been advocating since the end of the nineteenth century, were approved at a huge international conference. In this sense, the significance of the treaty conclusion should not be underestimated. However, the Nine-Power Treaty, which included the stipulations of the Root Principles' status quo, was a vague compromise between the Hughes line and the Root line. Therefore, the Nine-Power Treaty did not indicate any new attitudes toward U.S. foreign policies relative to East Asia, because it went no further than ascertaining the traditional diplomatic principles. For Japan and Britain, the approval of the stipulations included in the Nine-Power Treaty was not the issue. In fact, it was one of their prearranged plans.

The epoch-making significance of U.S. diplomacy on the Far Eastern questions lies in the MacMurray line's appearance, which resolved the most difficult Far Eastern matter at hand, the Shandong question. MacMurray, along with Lampson, skillfully respected Japanese viewpoints and conducted himself as a fair mediator. He performed the role that Bryan and Lansing had intended to play but could not have accomplished as well. Without MacMurray's steady hand, the Sino-Japanese negotiations could have remained impassible. It was crucial for the establishment of the Washington System that MacMurray's policy, which could be called practical pro-Japanese diplomacy, acquired the support of Hughes and the British.

Subsequently, MacMurray was engaged in U.S. East Asian policy as a chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs and an assistant secretary of state by the middle of the 1920s. On the other hand, Hughes did not positively attempt to take any initiative equivalent to the Hughes amendment proposal after the Washington Conference, nor did he try to reform Chinese unequal treaties. Therefore, the difference between Wilson and Hughes is not qualitative but quantitative. While Wilson remained interested in East Asian policy from the Twenty-One Demands to the Paris Peace Conference and persisted in containing the Japanese debouch into the continent, Hughes decreased his participation in East Asian policy after the Washington Conference. By March 1925, when Hughes was still a secretary of state, the U.S. government rarely took the initiative in East Asian policy, and MacMurray lost his platform for practical pro-Japanese diplomacy.

As for China, the ten principles submitted by Sze were defeated by the Root Principles at the beginning of the conference. Thus, China failed to achieve its basic objectives, such as the direct return of the Shandong interests from Germany and the reform of the treaties connected with Japan's Twenty-One Demands. What China substantially obtained through the conference was the Japanese concessions on the Shandong question and a tariff of 5 percent. The vested interests of powers in China were maintained, and the reform of Chinese unequal treaties was not agreed to. The activities of MacMurray and Lampson, in particular, enabled China to reach an agreement on the Shandong question, albeit unwillingly; Yen plainly expressed anxiety about issuing bonds and assigning Japanese railway managers, but he had to accept the opinions of Sze and Koo that it was hard to resist the consensus among Japan, the U.S., and Britain.⁸⁶⁾

In that sense, the resolute line of Yen and Wang gave way to Sze and Koo's line that China should gradually recover national interests by keeping in step with the U.S. and Britain. Sze and Koo sent a gift to MacMurray with a letter: "Your collaboration as Mr. Hughes' representative in the conversations between the Chinese and Japanese delegations, which led to the conclusion of the Shandong Treaty here in Washington, was of invaluable help."⁸⁷⁾ In the context of Chinese diplomatic history, the Washington System was formed in such a way that the line of Sze and Koo contained the line of Yen and Wang; through the Washington Conference, Sze and Koo abandoned their firm policy from the Paris Peace Conference.

China, which was subordinately involved in the Washington System, must have been satisfied with the partial concessions regarding the reforms of the unequal treaties and the treaties related to the Twenty-One Demands, accepting them as future tasks. The establishment of the U.S.-Japan-British cooperation system applied by the MacMurray line led China to change its diplomatic position from its radicalism during the Paris Peace Conference to one of moderation during the Washington Conference. The Sino-Japanese negotiations on the Shandong question were recovered under the pressure of the U.S. and Britain.

The rebirth of the Sino-Japanese negotiations met the severest criticism from the southern regime in China. Sun Yat-sen said of President Hsu Shih-chang that "The agreements between the false delegation and Japan were the forfeiture of rights against the will of the Chinese people, which simultaneously made him a national foe."⁸⁸⁾ Uchida was afraid that, "because the Japanese position in Manchuria seems to have been further strengthened as a result of the Washington Conference," Chang Tso-lin "could have a tacit understanding with Sun Yat-sen and object to the treaties related to the so-called Twenty-One Demands."⁸⁹⁾

The RSFSR, later the USSR, which was excluded from the conference, was left as an unknown factor for the Washington System.⁹⁰⁾ More importantly, the international management system of the CER in the middle of northern Manchuria came to an end through Japanese diplomacy, and the initiative of its management was given to the USSR. The Japanese side, including Shidehara, considered the sphere-of-influence diplomacy in Manchuria to be self-evident and attempted to exclude any third parties. There was a confrontation between Japan and Hughes who, relying on multinational negotiations, attempted to positively apply the open door policy to East Asia. In consequence, the antipathy across the Pacific left room for Soviet policies toward Manchuria. This scenario was repeated in the Sino-Soviet War of 1929, when Japanese Foreign Minister Shidehara and U.S. Secretary of State Henry Lewis Stimson disagreed over their foreign policies toward Manchuria. The principal strife between Japan and the U.S. was not resolved, and the best opportunity for the formation of a consensus on policies toward the RSFSR or the USSR was lost. Therefore, when the USSR emerged as a regional power on the stage of East Asian international politics, the Washington System became less adaptable in the international order.

If Japan and the U.S. had made additional steps toward meeting each other's demands and had reached a mutual understanding of a higher order, the later stories would likely have changed in measurable ways.

Notes

- 1) For the most influential works on the Washington System, see Akira Iriye, *After Imperialism: The Search for a New Order in the Far East 1921-1931* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), 16-22, 57-88; Chihiro Hosoya, *Ryotaisenkanki no Nihon Gaiko: 1914-1945* [Japanese diplomacy between the Wars] (Tokyo: Iwanami-shoten, 1988), 75-114. See also Ryuji Hattori, *Higashijia Kokusaikankyo no Hendo to Nihon Gaiko, 1918-1931* [Japanese diplomacy and East Asian international Politics, 1918-1931] (Tokyo: Yuhikaku, 2001), 89-112.
- 2) Sadao Asada, "Japan's 'Special Interests' and the Washington Conference, 1921-22," *The American Historical Review* 67, no. 1 (October 1961): 62-70; Asada, *Ryotaisenkan no Nitibeikankei: Kaigun to Seisakuketteikatei* [Japan-U.S. relations between the Wars: The Navy and the decision making] (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1993), 130-131; Thomas H. Buckley, *The United States and the Washington Conference, 1921-1922* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1970), 153.
- 3) Iriye, *After Imperialism*, 16.
- 4) Ian Nish, *Japanese Foreign Policy, 1869-1942* (London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1977), 141-142; Nish, "Japan in Britain's View of the International System, 1919-37," in Ian Nish, ed., *Anglo-Japanese Alienation 1919-1952* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 31-32.
- 5) For studies on MacMurray, see Thomas Buckley, "John Van Antwerp MacMurray: The Diplomacy of an American Mandarin," in Richard Dean Burns and Edward M. Bennett, eds., *Diplomats in Crisis: United States-Chinese-Japanese Relations, 1919-1941* (Santa Barbara: ABC-Clio, 1974), 27-48; Janet Sue Colleser, "J. V. A. MacMurray, American Minister to China, 1925-1929: The Failure of a Mission," (Ph. D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1977); Arthur Waldron, ed., *How the Peace Was Lost* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1992), 1-56.
- 6) For Chinese activities, see Wunsz King, *China at the Washington Conference, 1921-1922* (New York: St. John's University Press, 1963); Stanley J. Grant, "Chinese Participation at the Washington Conference, 1921-1922," (Ph. D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1969).
- 7) For other works on the Far Eastern questions of the Washington Conference see Sadao Asada, "Japan and the United States, 1915-1925," (Ph. D. dissertation, Yale University, 1963); Betty Glad, *Charles Evans Hughes and the Illusions of Innocence: A Study in American Diplomacy* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1966), 281-303; William Roger Louis, *British Strategy in the Far East, 1919-1939* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 79-108; Noel H. Pugach, "American Friendship for China and the Shandong Question at the Washington Conference," *Journal of American History* 64, no. 1 (June 1977), 67-86; Erik Goldstein and John Maurer, eds., *The Washington Conference, 1921-22: Naval Rivalry, East Asian Stability and the Road to Pearl Harbor* (London: Frank Cass, 1994).
- 8) For Hughes's recollection on the request of the U.S. Congress for armament limitations, see David J. Danelski and Joseph S. Tulchin, eds., *The Autobiographical Notes of Charles Evans Hughes* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), 238-248.
- 9) Ministry of Foreign Affairs, ed., *Nihon Gaiko Bunsho* [Documents on Japanese foreign policy, hereafter cited as *NGB*], *the Washington Conference*, 1 (Tokyo: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1977), 16-17.
- 10) Keiichiro Hara, ed., *Hara Takashi Nikki* [Takashi Hara diaries], vol. 5 (Tokyo: Fukumura Shuppan, 1981), 413.
- 11) Kensuke Horinouchi, *Horinouchi Kensuke Kaikoroku* [The memoirs of Kensuke Horinouchi] (Tokyo: Sankei Shimbunsha, 1979), 29. See also Itarō Ishii, *Gaikokan no Isshō* [A life of a diplomat] (Tokyo: Chuo Koronsha, 1986), 95.
- 12) *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 1: 39-42.
- 13) Memorandum by Hughes of a conversation with Shidehara, July 21, 1921, in Department of State, ed., *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States* [hereafter cited as *FRUS*], 1921, 1 (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1936), 613-615; Shidehara to Uchida, July 21, 1921, *NGB, 1921*, 2: 17-19; Shidehara to Uchida, August 18, 1921, *NGB, 1921*, 2: 25-27; Shidehara to Uchida, September 9, *NGB, 1921*, 2: 49-52.

- 14) Memorandum by Hughes of a conversation with Sze, August 11, 1921, *FRUS, 1921*, 1: 615.
- 15) *Guangdong Qunbao*, September 6, 1921. See also Sun Yat-sen to Harding, September 16, 1921, 793.94/1238, General Records of the Department of State, Record Group 59, National Archives (hereafter cited as RG 59).
- 16) Edward Bell (acting ambassador to Japan) to Uchida, September 12, 1921, *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 1: 154-156; Jacob Gould Schurman (U.S. minister to China) to the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, September 12, 1921 in Cheng Daode, Zheng Yeming, and Rao Youping, eds., *Zhonghua minguo waijiaoshi ziliao xuanbian, 1919-1931* [Documents on Chinese diplomacy, hereafter cited as *MGWJ*] (Beijing: Beijing Daxue Chubanshe, 1985), 100-101. See also memorandum by the Department of State, November 5, 1921, 500.A4/258, RG 59.
- 17) Shidehara to Uchida, September 12, 1921 (arrived), *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 1: 150-153.
- 18) Memorandum by the Department of State, January 13, 1921, *FRUS, 1921*, 1: 564-566. See also memoranda by Stevens in connection with a suggested plan for the international control of the Chinese Eastern Railway, submitted at the request of the Department of State, undated, Hughes Papers, Reel 124, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress.
- 19) The cabinet decision, October 21, 1921, *NGB, 1921*, 3, no. 2: 1175-1176; Charles Beecher Warren (U.S. ambassador to Japan) to Hughes, October 29, 1921, *FRUS, 1921*, 1: 608-610.
- 20) Horinouchi, *Horinouchi Kensuke Kaikoroku*, 31-33.
- 21) *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 1: 181-218.
- 22) Amō Eiji Nikki Shiryōshū Kankōkai, ed., *Amō Eiji Nikki Shiryōshū*, vol. 1 [Documents and diaries of Eiji Amō] (Tokyo: Amō Eiji Nikki Shiryōshū Kankōkai, 1984), 1065.
- 23) *MGWJ*, 102-104.
- 24) The Japanese delegation to Uchida, November 11, 1921 (arrived), *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 7-8.
- 25) Chandler Parsons Anderson diary, November 18, 1921, Chandler Parsons Anderson Papers, Box 2, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress. Root had already told Stanley Washburn before the conference, "The most difficult problem is the Japanese." See Stanley Washburn oral history, 1950, Columbia University.
- 26) *NGB, the Washington Conference Far Eastern Questions*, 56.
- 27) The Japanese delegation to Uchida, November 20, 1921 (arrived), *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 10-12. See also Anderson diary, November 20, 1921, Anderson Papers, Box 2.
- 28) Balfour to Foreign Office (hereafter cited as F.O.), November 19, 1921, 12391/21/108, FO 228/3538, Public Record Office; the Chinese delegation to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, November 20, 1921 in Zhongguo Shehui Kexueyuan Jindaishi Yanjiusuo Jindaishi Ziliao Bianji Shi, ed., *Mijilucun* [hereafter cited as *Mijilucun*] (Beijing: Zhongguo Shehuikexue Chubanshe, 1984), 404-405.
- 29) The Japanese delegation to Uchida, November 26, 1921 (arrived), *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 16-18. See also Anderson diary, November 24, 26, December 5, 1921, Anderson Papers, Box 2.
- 30) The Chinese delegation to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, November 24, 1921, *Mijilucun*, 407-408.
- 31) Ministry of Foreign Affairs, ed., *Nihon Gaiko Nenpyo Narabini Shuyo Bunsho* [Chronological table and main documents of Japanese diplomacy, hereafter cited as *NGN*], 2 (Tokyo: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1965), 440. However, Lansing's recollection of the Lansing-Ishii Agreement was this: "It was never intended to admit that Japan had any peculiar "advantages" or "benefits" in China which other countries did not possess." See Robert Lansing, "Lansing-Ishii Agreement," October 3, 1921, Robert Lansing Papers, Reel 1, Library of Congress. In addition, the protocol was not printed in John V. A. MacMurray, ed., *Treaties and Agreements with and concerning China, 1894-1919*, vol. 2 (New York: Howard Fertig, 1973), 1394-1397.
- 32) MacMurray to Hughes, November 21, 1921, Hughes Papers, Reel 124.
- 33) Balfour to F.O., January 18, 1922, 561/22/49, FO 228/3539, Public Record Office; *NGB, the Washington Conference Far Eastern Questions*, 247-248. This was written when Hughes prepared a draft of the Nine-Power Treaty. See Anderson diary, January 14, 17, 1922, Anderson Papers, Box 2.
- 34) The Japanese delegation to Uchida, January 21, 1922 (arrived), *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 134-136.

- For Hughes's faith in the Open Door principle, see Charles E. Hughes, "Some Aspects of Our Foreign Policy," December 29, 1922, 29-33, 500.A4/508, RG 59; Hughes, *The Centenary of the Monroe Doctrine* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1923), 4-5, Leland Harrison Papers, Box 6, Library of Congress.
- 35) The Japanese delegation to Uchida, January 23, 1922 (arrived), *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 136-139. See also Balfour to F. O., January 19, 1922, 619/22/53, FO 228/3539, Public Record Office; resolution establishing a Bord of Reference for Far Eastern questions, February 4, 1922, *FRUS, 1922*, 1: 289.
- 36) The Japanese delegation to Uchida, January 26, 1922 (arrived), *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 144-147.
- 37) *NGN*, 2: 12-15; *FRUS, 1922*, 1: 282-287; *MGWJ*, 125-128.
- 38) *NGN*, 2: 15-19; *FRUS, 1922*, 1: 276-281; *MGWJ*, pp. 122-125.
- 39) Horinouchi, *Horinouchi Kensuke Kaikoroku*, 35. See also Shidehara Heiwazaidan, ed., *Shidehara Kijūrō* (Tokyo: Shidehara Heiwazaidan, 1955), 224-225; Kijūrō Shidehara, *Gaiko Gojunen* [Fifty years' diplomacy] (Tokyo: Chuo Koronsha, 1987), 93-94.
- 40) Draft handed to Hughes by Balfour during their conversation of November 11, 1921, *FRUS, 1922*, 1: 271-272; memorandum by Maurice Hankey respecting Balfour's interview with Hughes, November 11, 1921, in Rohan Butler and J. P. T. Bury, eds., *Documents on British Foreign Policy, 1919-1939* [hereafter cited as *DBFP*], *first series*, 14 (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1966), 470-471.
- 41) Curzon to Alston, October 24, 1921, *DBFP, first series*, 14: 451-452.
- 42) John Van Antwerp MacMurray, "Developments Affecting American Policy in the Far East," November 1, 1935, in Waldron, ed., *How the Peace Was Lost*, 63.
- 43) Uchida to the Japanese delegation, November 19, 1921, *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 423-425.
- 44) Balfour to Curzon, November 25, 1921, *DBFP, first series*, 14: 511; the Chinese delegation to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, November 25, 1921, *Mijilucun*, 409-410; Sze to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, November 27 in Zhongyang Yanjiuyuan Jindaishi Yanjiusuo, ed., *Zhongri Guanxi Shiliao* [Documents on Sino-Japanese relations, hereafter cited as *ZGS*], *the Shandong Question*, 1 (Taipei: Academia Sinica, 1987), 345-346; the Chinese delegation to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, November 30, *ZGS, the Shandong Question*, 1: 346-347, the Japanese delegation to Uchida, November 27, 1921 (arrived), *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 439-440.
- 45) The Chinese delegation to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, December 1, 1921, *Mijilucun*, 471-472; the Japanese delegation to Uchida, December 4, 1921 (arrived), *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 444-446. See also Anderson diary, February 6, 1922, Anderson Papers, Box 2.
- 46) The Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Chinese delegation, November 28, 1921, *ZGS, the Shandong Question*, 1: 346; the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, declaration on the Shandong question, December 11, *MGWJ*, 105-106.
- 47) Hughes to Schurman, December 7, 1921, *FRUS, 1922*, 1: 274-275. See also Anderson diary, December 27, 1921, Anderson Papers, Box 2.
- 48) Schurman to Hughes, December 11, 1921, *FRUS, 1922*, 1: 275-276.
- 49) The Japanese delegation to Uchida, December 17, 1921 (arrived), *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 476-478; the Chinese delegation to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, December 21, 1921, *Mijilucun*, 480.
- 50) The Japanese delegation to Uchida, December 20, 1921 (arrived), *NGB: the Washington Conference*, 2: 496-497.
- 51) Balfour to Alston, January 10, 1922, 345/22/42, FO 228/3539, Public Record Office; the Japanese delegation to Uchida, January 11, 1922 (arrived), *NGB: the Washington Conference*, 2: 542-544; the Japanese delegation to Uchida, January 12 (arrived), *NGB: the Washington Conference*, 2: 544-545; the Japanese delegation to Uchida, January 10 (arrived), *NGB: the Washington Conference*, 2: 546. MacMurray was already searching for a plan to resolve the Shandong question, as evidenced by his memorandum of August 29, 1921, submitted to Hughes. See MacMurray to Hughes, August 29, 1921, Harrison Papers, Box 3; MacMurray to Hughes, November 25, 1921, Hughes Papers, Reel 124; MacMurray, "Memorandum of Conversation with Chinese Minister Mr. Alfred Sze,"

- December 15, 1921, Hughes Papers, Reel 126.
- 52) The Chinese delegation to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, January 9, 1922, *Mijilucun*, 486-487; Balfour to E. Crowe, January 10, 1922, *DBFP, first series*, 14: 592-593.
- 53) Uchida to the Japanese delegation, January 12, 1922, *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 548-550.
- 54) The Japanese delegation to Uchida, January 29, 1922 (arrived), *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 583-586.
- 55) Balfour to Alston, January 22, 1922, 815/22/64, FO 228/3539, Public Record Office. See also the Chinese delegation to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, January 19, 1922, *ZGS, the Shandong Question*, 1: 414; Hughes to Schurman, January 22, 1922, *FRUS, 1922*, 1: 941-943; Balfour to Curzon, January 24, 1922, *DBFP, first series*, 14: 621-622; Hughes to MacMurray, January 26, 1922, 793.94/1265, RG 59.
- 56) The Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Chinese delegation, January 26, 1922, *Mijilucun*, pp. 497-498. See also a conversation between Yen Hui-ching and Schurman, January 18, 1922, diplomatic documents, 03.39.17.17.3, Institute of Modern History, Academia Sinica; Lampson to Hughes, February 2, 1922, Hughes Papers, Reel 126.
- 57) *NGN*, 2: 3-8; *FRUS, 1922*, 1: 948-956; *MGWJ*, 109-114.
- 58) The Hara cabinet decision, October 21, 1921, *NGN*, 2: 530-532.
- 59) Shidehara, *Gaiko Gojunen*, 84, 88.
- 60) The Japanese delegation to Uchida, December 8, 1921 (arrived), *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 70-73. See also Balfour to Curzon, November 27, 1921, *DBFP, first series*, 14: 516-517; Balfour to Curzon, December 19, *DBFP, first series*, 14: 565-566; Balfour to Lloyd George, February 4, 1922, *DBFP, first series*, 14: 636-640. In the British Foreign Office, the return of Weihaiwei was already discussed during the period of the Paris Peace Conference. See F.O. to Jordan, February 8, 1919, Jordan to F.O., February 11, 634/1/2, FO 608/209, Public Record Office; memorandum by Wellesley, August 22, 1921, F 3102/833/10, FO 228/3538, Public Record Office.
- 61) The Japanese delegation to Uchida, December 8, 1921, *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 70-73. The actual returns of Weihaiwei and Guangzhou Bay were in 1930 and 1946.
- 62) The Japanese delegation to Uchida, December 18, 1921, *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 115-116.
- 63) *NGB, the Washington Conference Far Eastern Questions*, 301.
- 64) The Japanese delegation to Uchida, January 24, 1922, *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 142-144.
- 65) The Japanese delegation to Uchida, February 6, 1922 (arrived), *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 190-195.
- 66) The Japanese delegation to Uchida, February 6, 1922 (arrived), *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 186.
- 67) *NGB, Washington Conference*, 1: 193-194.
- 68) *MGWJ*, 116-118.
- 69) The Japanese delegation to Uchida, February 12, 1922, *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 224-229.
- 70) Shidehara, *Gaiko Gojunen*, 92.
- 71) *The New York Times*, February 3, 1922, p. 1.
- 72) Shidehara, *Gaiko Gojunen*, 95.
- 73) The Japanese delegation to Uchida, January 28, 1922 (arrived), *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 346-355.
- 74) Balfour to Curzon, January 19, 1922, *DBFP, first series*, 14: 613-614; *NGB, the Washington Conference Far Eastern Questions*, 437; the Chinese delegation to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, January 20, 1922, diplomatic documents, 03.39.16.16.1, Institute of Modern History, Academia Sinica. Along with the conference, the United States attempted to informally negotiate with Chang Tso-lin so that Japanese influence on the Chinese Eastern Railroad would not increase. See Hughes to Schurman, December 24, 1921, 893.00/4168, RG 59.
- 75) The Chinese delegation to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, January 20, 1922, *Mijilucun*, 469; the Japanese delegation to Uchida, January 27, 1922 (arrived), *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 398-399.
- 76) The Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Chinese delegation, October 27, 1921, *Mijilucun*, 389-391.
- 77) Schurman to Hughes, January 2, 1922, *FRUS, 1922*, 1: 877-878; the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Chinese delegation, January 24, 1922, *Mijilucun*, 470; Alston to the British delegation, January 25, 1922, 660/22/52, FO 228/2778, Public Record Office; Chang to Yan, January 28, 1922, diplomatic documents, 03.39.16.16.1, Institute of

Modern History, Academia Sinica.

- 78) The Japanese delegation to Uchida, February 5, 1922 (arrived), *NGB, the Washington Conference*, 2: 414-416. See also Hughes to Warren, Schurman, Cunningham (consul general to Shanghai), February 3, 1922, *FRUS, 1922*, 1: 883-884; Balfour to Lloyd George, February 4, 1922, *DBFP, first series*, 14: 634-636.
- 79) The Chinese delegation to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, February 3, 1922, diplomatic documents, 03.39.16.16.1, Institute of Modern History, Academia Sinica.
- 80) The Kato cabinet decision, August 8, 1922, *NGB, 1922*, 1: 774-775.
- 81) Ishii, *Gaikokan no Isshō*, 108.
- 82) F.O. memorandum, January 8, 1930, *DBFP, second series*, 8: 4.
- 83) Kato to Kenji Ide (Japanese vice minister of the navy), December 27, 1921, in Masao Inaba, Tatsuo Kobayashi, and Toshihiko Shimada, eds., *Taiheiyosenso eno Michi*, supplement [The road to the Pacific War] (Tokyo: Asahi Shimbun, 1963), 3-7.
- 84) Memorandum handed by Hughes to Shidehara, June 3, 1921, *FRUS, 1921*, 2: 702-705.
- 85) Wellington Koo, "The Wellington Koo Memoir," 1976, Chinese Oral History Project of the East Asian Institute, Columbia University.
- 86) The Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Chinese delegation, January 12, 1922, *ZGS, the Shandong Question*, 1: 395; conversation between Yan and Schurman, January 16, 1922, *ZGS, the Shandong Question*, 1: 407-408; the Chinese delegation to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, January 18, 1922, *ZGS, the Shandong Question*, 1: 412.
- 87) Sze and Koo to MacMurray, February 27, 1922, John Van Antwerp MacMurray Papers, Box 23, Seeley G. Mudd Manuscript Library, Princeton University.
- 88) *Minguo Ribao*, February 21, 1922.
- 89) Uchida to Obata, January 6, 1922, *NGB, 1922*, 2: 265-266.
- 90) For the most comprehensive document on the propaganda diplomacy of the Far Eastern Republic, see the Special Delegation of the Far Eastern Republic, "To the Washington Conference on Limitation of Armaments," January 5, 1922, Hughes Papers, Reel 126.

*This paper is a result of the Chuo University Grant for Special Research.