



**E-ASIA**  
university of oregon libraries

<http://e-asia.uoregon.edu>

W. C. Barnes  
wh.C.

# THE FAR EASTERN REPUBLIC SIBERIA AND JAPAN

TOGETHER WITH A DISCUSSION OF THEIR RELATIONS  
TO THE UNITED STATES

*By*

FREDERICK F. MOORE  
*for Japan*

BORIS E. SKVIRSKY  
*for the Far Eastern Republic*

C. H. SMITH  
*formerly of the Inter-Allied Railway Committee in Siberia*

WITH INFORMAL DISCUSSION

*By*

ROGER SHERMAN BALDWIN	DR. TOYOKICHI IYENAGA
JOHN DEWEY	E. I. OMELTCHENKO
ROGER SHERMAN GREENE	GRAHAM ROMEYN TAYLOR
PAXTON HIBBEN	F. A. TRONE

---

A report of the 44th Luncheon Meeting  
of the

## FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION

NEW YORK, MARCH 4, 1922

FREDERICK F. MOORE, former Associated Press correspondent in the Far East, now Foreign Adviser to the Japanese Government.

BORIS E. SKVIRSKY, member of the Special Trade Delegation, Far Eastern Republic; former Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs.

C. H. SMITH, American member of the Inter-Allied Railway Committee in Siberia, 1919-21.

ROGER SHERMAN BALDWIN, New England farmer and a representative of the State Dairymen's League of Connecticut.

JOHN DEWEY, Professor Columbia University. Author of many special articles on Japan and China.

ROGER SHERMAN GREENE, formerly Consul-General at Vladivostock, at Dalny and at Harbin; Representative of the Rockefeller Foundation in China.

PAXTON HIBBEN, U. S. Diplomatic Service 1904-1912; Embassy Petrograd, 1905-1906; correspondent Near East and Russia, 1919-1921.

TOYOKICHI IYENAGA, Director of the East and West News Bureau.

E. I. OMELTCHENKO, formerly Economic Adviser to the Russian Embassy under M. Bakhmetieff.

GRAHAM ROMEYN TAYLOR, special Assistant to the American Ambassador to Russia, 1916-1919; detailed in 1918 to the work of the Committee on Public Information.

F. A. TRONE, Representative of the International General Electric Company in Siberia.

Pacific Ocean, gives access to practically the entire territory of the Russian Far East.

During the world war, when the internal conditions in Russia were exceedingly difficult, the Japanese tried to turn them to their own advantage by insisting on special economic advantages and privileges in the Russian Far East. Since the revolution and intervention, with Russia greatly weakened, and in no position to resist any aggression, the Japanese through the opportunity given them by the Allied intervention, finally succeeded in their ambition of encroaching upon the rights of the Russian people. With Japanese troops on Russian territory, it was easy for Japan to obtain whatever she wished. Realizing, however, that the fulfillment of Japan's ambitions could only come about by coercion, since the Russian people would not submit to foreign domination, the Japanese Government began bloody and terroristic actions against the Russian population of the Far East. Thousands of men, women and children were killed, villages were burned and destroyed and state property looted and seized. Since August, 1918, when at the invitation of the American Government the Japanese troops came into Russian territory, up to the present time, a constant struggle has been going on between the Japanese military forces and the population of the Far East.

Since a united Russian Far East would be an obstacle in the way of their intentions to dominate and control the Russian Far East, the Japanese have been organizing and maintaining counter-revolutionary armies consisting of the remnants of Kolchak and Semenov troops and other bandits and traitors like the Merkulov brothers, in an effort to create chaos and civil war and thus prevent the unification of the Russian Far East. In spite of these efforts, the people of the Russian Far East succeeded in their unification.

The first conference of the representatives of the provincial governments of the Russian Far East took place at Verkhne-Udinsk and the second took place at Chita. At this conference, the declaration of independence, proclaimed on the 6th of April, 1920, was reaffirmed, and in addition it was decided to hold an immediate election for members to a Constituent Assembly in order to frame a Constitution and elect a central government for the new Republic. Eighty per cent. of the population participated in this election for the Constituent Assembly and representatives of all parties were elected, including several monarchists. The majority elected were non-partisan peasants.

In April, 1921, a Constitution was adopted and a government elected. This Constitution has been functioning on the territory of the Far Eastern Republic since that time and provides for a democratic government in which personal liberty, secret and universal suffrage and the rights of private property are guaranteed.

Many progressive measures were undertaken, such as the development of trade and industry, the building of schools and the reorganization of currency on a gold basis. As a matter of fact, there is no paper money in use in the Far Eastern Republic, gold and silver being the only medium of exchange.

Much has been and is being accomplished in spite of the fact that unfortunately most of the money collected by the Government has to be used in an effort to maintain the local institutions against the onslaughts of the Japanese and the armed bandits hired by them.

The Japanese, however, have realized the impossibility of open territorial annexation and have abandoned that plan in favor of economic domination over the Russian Far East. In a conference which began at Dairen on the 26th of August, 1921, and which is still in session, the Japanese are officially negotiating with the Government of the Far Eastern Republic, in order to obtain their ambition. In a draft of an agreement presented by the Japanese to the Government of the Far Eastern Republic, they demand the following:

1. The razing of the Vladivostok fortress and the promise not to erect any fortifications on the Pacific coast.

2. Permission that Japanese troops "temporarily" be allowed to stay on the territory of the Far Eastern Republic if the Japanese should find it necessary.

3. Recognition of all the secret concessions which were received by the Japanese from the governments created by the Japanese themselves, of Ataman Semenov and the Merkulov brothers. From these so-called governments, the Japanese received many valuable, exclusive, economic privileges by which the Japanese would attain complete economic domination in the Far Eastern Republic.

4. Exclusive rights in the Saghalien Province, i.e., on the Island of Saghalien and on the mainland in the area of the mouth of the Amur River.

5. The right of navigation on the Amur River and the right of coasting trade.

6. The right to own land, which right was not enjoyed by foreigners in the Russian Far East, even in the time of the Czar.

7. Reconsideration of the Fisheries Convention of 1907, insisting upon several changes which would deliver into their hands all the fishery wealth of the Far Eastern Republic.

The Government of the Far Eastern Republic, defending the interests of the people who elected them, have consistently refused to agree to these demands, declaring that they would not give exclusive rights or privileges to any foreign country, but that the Far Eastern Republic was willing and eager to have foreign co-operation in the development of its natural resources.

What are the future prospects of the Far Eastern Republic? What chances has it to survive and prosper? The Far Eastern Republic occupies a territory of over 1,000,000 square miles and stretches from Lake Baikal to the Pacific Ocean. It has a population of over 2,000,000, 65% of which are engaged in agriculture. The area of cultivated land is over three and a half million acres and there are 55 more million acres of arable land suitable for cultivation. The forest area is over 300,000,000 acres and the exploitation of this vast forest reserve, by private enterprise and the government, as planned by the government, would mean a revenue to the government of not less than \$15,000,000 to \$20,000,000, which would be about sufficient to cover the annual government budget.

Notwithstanding the disorganization resulting from the war and intervention, there are a great many cattle on the territory and hides, wool and bristles are being obtained and exported. The vastness of the forest area and the scarcity of the population makes possible the maintenance of animals from which valuable furs are obtained. Sev-

eral million dollars worth of furs are annually exported from the Russian Far East. The annual fish catch for export purposes runs into several million dollars.

These natural resources of the Far Eastern Republic are of tremendous value and of international importance in view of the fact that the world reserves are greatly depleted. This dangerous condition has even manifested itself in the United States. Exclusive domination of these natural resources of the Far Eastern Republic would mean practically exclusive control of the world market, and it is one of the chief reasons why the Japanese aim to secure domination over them. This would be not only to the detriment of the Far Eastern Republic, but of the whole world.

There is also on the territory of the Far Eastern Republic large deposits of valuable metals and minerals, such as gold, silver, lead, iron, copper, coal, tungsten, oil and even precious stones. With regard to gold, prior to the war, Russia occupied the third place in the production of this metal, and 33% of the annual supply of Russian gold came from the territory now occupied by the Far Eastern Republic.

With regard to silver and lead, in only one Zabaikal Province, 500 ore depositories are known. The deposits in the entire territory amount to many million tons. The conditions are similar with regard to iron, coal and other metals and minerals.

When you consider that only between 15 and 20% of the resources of the Far Eastern Republic have been investigated, it is possible to form an idea of the tremendous natural wealth on the territory. With the energies of the government of the Far Eastern Republic devoted to the development of these resources, and with the enthusiastic support of the Russian population, it is easy to see that the economic prospects of the Far Eastern Republic are very bright.

The development of the industries in the United States have reached the point where the production is far in excess of the domestic demand, and Siberia, as well as China would provide a good market for this surplus. American products such as agricultural and other machinery have always been welcome in Siberia.

The investment of capital for the development of natural resources in the United States has also reached the stage where there is enough capital for outside investment and Siberia would prove a most fertile country for such investment. Particularly in view of the fact that there is at the present time no Russian capital and because of the friendly feeling existing between the Russian and the American people, American capital would be very welcome in the Far Eastern Republic.

The need for creating normal economic conditions and relations is an important factor in the desire of the Far Eastern Republic for recognition from the United States. Besides this, however, there are other reasons which justify the claim of the Far Eastern Republic to recognition.

1. The principle of self-determination has always been sponsored by the people and the Government of the United States and on that score, recognition by the United States would be most natural, especially when the suffering and the hard struggle of the people to acquire their independence is considered. The United States herself went through a difficult struggle for her independence and can understand and sympathize with the Far Eastern Republic.

2. It is the moral duty of the United States to help the people of the Far Eastern Republic to rid themselves of the Japanese troops, inasmuch as it was at the invitation of the United States that the Japanese Government sent her troops to Russian territory. This moral responsibility has been acknowledged by Secretary Hughes at the Washington Conference. Recognition of the Far Eastern Republic would greatly help in the removal of the Japanese troops, because it would take away from the Japanese their pretext for the presence of Japanese troops on Russian territory; namely, that there is no responsible and stable government there. The very fact that the Government of the Far Eastern Republic has been able to maintain itself in the face of the tremendous difficulties placed in its way by the Japanese, proves the stability and popularity of the government.

3. The Government of the Far Eastern Republic was recognized by the Russian Soviet Government as an independent government on May 14, 1920. The Government of the Far Eastern Republic has been functioning as the only stable elected government on the territory of the Russian Far East, and conditions throughout the territory which is not occupied by the Japanese—and that is the greater part of the Republic's territory—are normal to the extent that there can be absolute guarantee for the lives and property of Russian as well as foreign citizens.

Recognition by the United States of the Far Eastern Republic would strengthen the already friendly feelings between the two countries and would prove of tremendous mutual advantage. Admission of the Government of the Far Eastern Republic into the family of nations would prove beneficial not only to the Far Eastern Republic but to the entire world.

## II. Mr. Frederick F. Moore

I am not the author of a recent book on Siberia. That is the work of another man who bears exactly my name, Frederick Ferdinand Moore. It was my fortune or misfortune to have been in Siberia last in 1916. Prior to that time I had made the journey back and forth between Peking and London on several occasions,—five in fact,—but only when, prior to the revolution in Russia, the journey was both safer and quicker than at present.

As this meeting today is called specially to consider the question of East Siberia, what I have to say may disappoint some of you, for I am not going to stick very close to the subject. I am going to wander far afield because I want to keep the Siberian question in its proper international place. To my way of thinking, it is very important for us in America to keep all such problems in the proper perspective. I am going to speak about China as well as Siberia, for China is Russia's and Japan's immediate neighbor and is vitally concerned in the situation.

Although I am not an authority on the territory in question,—that is to say, speaking generally, Siberia east of Lake Baikal,—I know some of the facts that one can find in histories and in encyclopedias. Siberia is a vast sparsely inhabited region, about the size of all North America. That which we are considering alone is about the size of the United States and is approximately twice as far away from us as Europe is. As the Nile is Egypt, so the Trans-Siberian Railway is

Siberia. The Russian development along it is comparatively both new and artificial,—obtained in following out her policies of conquest eastward and towards Constantinople, policies which brought on many wars. Taking the territory as a whole, the population approximates one person to the square mile. In the United States we have thirty-five to the square mile; in England there are three hundred and seventy; in Japan about four hundred. In East Siberia there is nowhere a town that we Americans would dignify by the name of city, with the exception perhaps of the port of Vladivostok. The action of the recent Washington Conference gave very definite indication of Siberia's place in relation to the affairs of Europe and America. As you know, little was done by the Conference except to record the position of Japan and the attitude of the United States.

On behalf of the Japanese Delegation, Baron Shidehara reviewed before the Far Eastern Committee the history of the Japanese military expedition to Siberia. He pointed out that this expedition was undertaken originally in accord and cooperation with the United States and other allied Powers, in 1918; and he declared that the disorders and the unstable condition of affairs in East Siberia had made it necessary, in the opinion of his Government, to maintain troops in the Vladivostok region, and that the massacre of over seven hundred Japanese at Nikolaievsk in 1920 was reason for the occupation of certain points in the Russian province of Saghalien, pending the establishment in Russia of a responsible authority with whom Japan could communicate in order to obtain due satisfaction.

Baron Shidehara said in conclusion :

“The Japanese Delegation is authorized to declare that it is the fixed and settled policy of Japan to respect the territorial integrity of Russia and to observe the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of that country as well as the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations in every part of the Russian possessions.”

There are some ten or twelve thousand Japanese in East Siberia, and I do not believe there are a score of Americans residing there. Moreover, if Russia should return as a military factor to the Pacific Ocean our American security would not be impaired one collar-button, whereas the situation touching the security of Japan might be totally changed.

I believe I am right in saying (but I am expressing only my own opinion), that the Chita representatives delayed and prevented the success of the Dairen negotiations with the hope of being able to get a hearing at the Washington Conference. That would have been a valuable thing for them. It would have meant in a way the recognition of the Chita Government by the Powers represented at Washington. And it was worth the effort whether the case against Japan was sufficient or not. But the Conference would not receive the Chita representatives, and now, therefore, it is likely that we shall see a settlement of the issues directly between Tokyo and Chita—with the exception, of course, of the Saghalien question.

With regard to Saghalien, as you no doubt know, that island, important to Japan, was originally Japanese territory; but in the days immediately after Commodore Perry persuaded Japan to open her



doors to the world, the Russian Government persuaded her to exchange that island, with its mineral wealth and strategic position, for a group of islands of little more than fishing value. That was in the day when the Japanese were "natives" to whom the Occidental could sell a gold brick. At the conclusion of the Russo-Japanese War, half the island was returned to Japan. Now, the Japanese have occupied the northern half, stating that they intended to hold it until proper compensation is paid for the Japanese lives lost in the Nikolaievsk massacre. Whether this is proper procedure or not, it is not unusual. In the case of Japan herself, Russia, Great Britain, France and the United States have exacted indemnities when their nationals have been assaulted by Japanese.

You have heard much of the presence of Japanese troops in Siberia and some of you no doubt think that they dominate and control the railways of the Maritime Province. But as a matter of fact they are stationed at two important points only,—Nikolsk and Vladivostok, which are about one hundred miles apart.

You have been told of this so-called Japanese occupation; but how many of you have heard of the establishment within the past year of a Bolshevik government at Urga, the capital of Mongolia, one of the dependencies of China and a strategic territory whose autonomy the Czar's government compelled China to recognize as late as 1911?

But, it is true, Mongolia, though vast in extent of territory, has come to matter little to China. The Chinese have neglected this as well as their other dependencies for scores of years. With the exception of Manchuria, which the Chinese may enter by a British controlled railway, there is no rail communication by which they can proceed from Peking to the capitals of any of their other extensive possessions. In most cases there is not even a roadway for a cart leading beyond the frontiers of China proper, and it is generally unsafe for a representative of the Chinese Government to reside in the principal towns or cities of those dependencies.

The problem of Siberia is one of the numerous secondary, not major, problems of the world. For the United States it has no chance of becoming a major problem. But to the Japanese it is as Mexico is to us. And I think we should be inclined to take a more active policy in Mexico if behind that country were a powerful, *potential* menace like Russia.

There is a tendency among some of us to permit such secondary issues to obscure and warp what should be our proper outlook. In recent years our whole outlook towards the Orient has been warped. When we proposed, after the conclusion of the Great War, to go ahead with our famous 1916 naval program, we had to have justification for that project,—the creation of the greatest navy the world had ever known, the outbuilding by 1924, in capital ships, of Great Britain and Japan combined. That project opened the way for abundant and misleading speculation about "the next war," whether or not we should have to fight Japan, and whether Great Britain would be on the side of Japan when we did. Both foreigners and Americans campaigned among us to develop our suspicions. I do not mean to impute insincere motives to anyone, but I do emphatically declare that the result was bad—bad for the peace and welfare of the world and bad for the United States.

I don't think there was ever danger of war. As a whole the United States is too sane for any such unnecessary adventure; and the Japanese would not have accepted any challenge from us short of direct attack. They want peace. But I deplored the attitude that we were developing among us up to the memorable day of November 12, when Mr. Hughes made his remarkable naval proposals.

As Admiral Kato said, those proposals were a stroke of genius. They were the work primarily of five practical men,—Mr. Harding and the four American delegates,—who had considered the naval and Pacific situation from a broad, wise point of view, and who made a direct and practical proposal,—a proposal to cut down the three greater navies of the world in equal proportions, leaving the security of the respective countries exactly where they were. That was simple, comprehensible, and, as we have seen, successful.

The Hughes proposal wiped out at a stroke whatever notion had been roused in this country that we might be suddenly and wantonly attacked. The 5-5-3 proposal, based on existing navies, showed that Japan did not possess a navy sufficient to attack the United States; and her acceptance of the proposal demonstrated the truth of her declared policy of having no intention to rival either the American or the British fleet.

Admiral Kato, after accepting this telling ratio, made a very plain statement. He said:

“We never aspired nor intended to challenge the security of America or her far-ranging possessions; we have sought only security for ourselves. Never have we desired war,—certainly never a conflict with the nation that is the greatest purchaser of our goods and at the same time the most powerful factor on the Pacific.

“You have a saying in English that ‘whom the Gods would destroy they first make mad.’ The history of our country shows very clearly that neither the Gods nor the Japanese themselves have any intention of destroying Japan, but are determined to let her live and prosper for her own happiness and for the benefit and progress of other peoples.”

The first of Eastern problems, ladies and gentlemen, is not Eastern Siberia,—to which, although Russia has dominated most of the territory for over a century, the Russian people have not seen fit to migrate in serious numbers. The greater problem is that of China.

I notice by the program today that the Siberian question is described as the “unsettled problem” of the Washington Conference. If this means that the problem of China is settled, I am afraid we are putting our hopes far too high. No body of men in conference can settle the problem of China. That is a work of decades. We shall have China's problem before us for as long as we who are here may live, and it will go on for many years thereafter. China is a country considerably larger than the United States in territory and several times our size in population. It is the oldest civilization that exists in the world today, and, being steeped in traditions, will be one of the slowest to change. If anyone thought that the Conference at Washington could, by the drafting of declarations or treaties, remake that massive and splendid old state, he was very much mistaken. The

Chinese, if they are to adopt our methods and our manners, must do so of their own accord and in their own good time.

At the present time, in spite of her gigantic size, China has only about eight thousand miles of railway, most of it under foreign control,—British, French, Belgian, Japanese and American. Those railways are a great blessing, a great boon to China, and we have built, up to the present, almost none of them. Our work has been to stand by and criticise the capitalists and the diplomatist. You can get some idea of the difference that exists between China and the United States if you consider the fact that we have in this country over 270,000 miles of road. Imagine this country with railways connecting only New Orleans, St. Louis and Chicago with the Atlantic coast, and you will realize that calling China a Republic does not make her exactly like the United States.

The Conference at Washington, as Senator Underwood said, has given China a magna charta. The nations have renewed their pledges to respect her sovereignty, and it will be difficult for any of them to go behind their agreements even if any should want to do so. It is now for the Chinese to unify their country, create a condition of security for life and property within it, and establish their responsibility to others. When they have done that,—as the Japanese did with conspicuously fewer resources and advantages,—they will find equal facility in getting rid of the humiliation of extra-territoriality and the presence of foreign troops at their capital and elsewhere. These troops include Americans; and American gunboats, as well as those of other countries, ply the waters of the Yangtze river for the purpose of protecting business men and missionaries.

But in this connection, please permit me to point out that the so-called infringements of China's sovereignty have not always been detrimental to China's interests. For example, in the case of the British infringements,—if you wish to call them that,—great benefit has been brought to China. Without the British it is doubtful if China proper would be intact today. To say nothing of the manner in which Great Britain assisted in the thwarting of Russian and German projects in China, here are two present cases to consider: An Englishman, supported by his government, organized China's customs service; and today that service, still controlled by an Englishman under treaty with the British Government, is one of the two stabilizing factors that maintain China's credit in the world, and that, at the same time, help materially to keep the country unified. The other factor is the Salt Gabelle, or bureau, also controlled by a British subject under arrangement with several Consortium Powers. These two sources of revenue are the most important and most dependable that the Central government possesses, because no other tax is administered with complete honesty and modern efficiency. If these two departments of the government were relieved of foreign supervision, it is safe to say that China's foreign bonds, guaranteed by them, would immediately and seriously decline, while her rival military factions would promptly take control of the sources of these revenues in their particular districts,—with the result of further decentralization, if not actual disunion.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Conference at Washington has done much. As Mr. Balfour said, it has done more than the most experienced statesman believed possible prior to November 12. If any of

you see fit to criticise it for not settling the Siberian question to the taste of some of the critics of Japan, you are straining at an issue which affects a comparatively small number of people and not very seriously. There are scores of such problems as these in the world. In fact we have several right here, in and around the United States.

But there is one major problem before this country at present, one of incalculable importance to the world. Have you ever thought what we Americans would be inclined to say about Japan or Great Britain if either of them failed to ratify the Washington Treaties? But I believe America is going to do her duty!

### III. Mr. C. H. Smith

I am very glad to be here today to tell what I know about the Siberian situation.

When I stop to think of Allied intervention in Siberia, it reminds me very much of the story of the old colored gentleman who was reading the first chapter of St. Matthew. He read it and after he got through he scratched his head and said, "I never saw so much forgetting in all my life."

That is exactly the way I feel about Allied intervention in Siberia. They forgot that it never pays to mix in a family quarrel. They forgot that they are simply listening to the emigré and not the people who lived in Russia. They forgot that the real, patriotic, honest Russian stayed with his country in its time of trouble—and is there today. And they also forgot that an idea cannot be killed by bullets. And last, but not least, they forgot our own history—that after a revolution, there is always an evolution—and this is going on in Russia today.

Now, I will give you some idea of the actual intervention. In 1918 the Allies decided to aid the Czechs—who, by the way, didn't need the aid and without which they extricated themselves.

The Allies then decided that since they were there they must aid somebody, so they decided to aid the Russians—who hadn't asked for any aid.

As a result, the Inter-Allied Committee was formed—of which I had the good fortune or misfortune (I don't know which) to be a member.

At our first meeting we discussed the issuance of a declaration to the Russian people, telling them why we were there. I remember very well that the Russian member of the Committee (who was also the Minister of Communications of the Kolchak Government) said that we ought to declare that we would assist the all-Russian Government. Two other members said that this decision was agreeable to them. But Mr. Matsudaira, the Japanese member, and I said that we were there to aid the Russian people and a statement to this effect must be a part of the declaration.

The other members then withdrew their objections and the declaration stated that we were actuated by a sincere desire to aid the Russian people.

But, there is always a follow-up on aid to Russian people. We neglected to find out what each man meant by "the Russian people."

And each man had his own version. I found out in the course of time that some of them seemed to be looking through yellow tinted glasses at the Russian people.

Therefore, I want to call your attention to a remark that was made at that particular time. One gentleman said, "This is the first try-out of the League of Nations." If it were, then I suggest that if America ever enters another try-out, we form a clear, definite terminology and have the military put under the control of the civilians.

During the intervention, after we were fairly started, it was interesting to note what occurred. One nation only seemed to believe that it was the best policy to have the Russians help themselves, and this nation gave assistance in guarding the railway. We had Semenov on the Transbaikal Railway. You have all heard of Semenov. Semenov acknowledged that he was in the pay of this nation, and this the nation also acknowledged. Semenov has been the cause of the great difficulties that we have had in our Inter-Allied Committee work. Whenever we did anything, Semenov did something else; and, as he had command of the military forces, he could enforce his desires by ordering the guards on the railway at any point not to assist the Committee. Therefore our work on the railway to a great extent failed.

Today that nation is still there; although all the others left in 1920. It occupies at the present time the Maritime Province and also, of course, the Port of Dairen, which is one entrance to Siberia. This port belongs to the Japanese, who are also in Vladivostok—which is the main Russian entrance, and at the Summer Port—the mouth of the Amur River. The only three entrances into Siberia are absolutely under the control of the Japanese. If you had seen that control working last year, you would realize that there is little show for American business men in Russia.

We begged and pleaded with the Japanese to send twelve cars of American goods to Khabarovsk. Eleven cars were held; one car went through because it contained a very small Japanese shipment. It took us two months to get the others through the little station of Iman.

Let us hope that such occurrences are over, since Baron Shidehara, at Washington, has promised us faithfully that the Japanese will evacuate, and that the open door will be held wide open during the time that the Japanese remain.

I have watched the organization of the Far Eastern Republic, and in my travels back and forth in Siberia I have noted and reported to the State Department this fact:—that the Russians are determined in their stand. They are just as determined as our own people were in the time of our revolution. They are determined to have three things established: freedom of speech, private ownership and representative government. That is all that the Russians have ever wanted.

I remember very distinctly a little incident in Vladivostok, where they were celebrating the first year of their revolution. Admiral Knight sent his flag officer to ask me to go up and hear the speeches. I went, accompanied by the flag officer. While there, a soldier who was (even in that dry country) a little bit dampened, turned around and saw the American uniform. He put out his hand to shake hands with the officer.

The officer, not knowing any Russian held back, and I grabbed his hand and asked him what he wanted. He said, "I just want to tell that American officer I don't know exactly what you have in America, but whatever it is, that is what we want, and that is all!"

I saw the elections to the constitutional assembly. I watched them carefully, and they were absolutely honestly conducted. Everybody had a chance to vote.

I remember an amusing incident in regard to one of them. The ballot boxes in each precinct had the number of that precinct in large box-car figures on the side. The tickets also were numbered. It so happened in this precinct (number two) that the Communist Ticket was also number two. One Russian gentleman in voting saw that big number two staring him in the face on the ballot box. He said, "I refuse to vote." He was asked why. He said, "The Communists are advertising their ticket." After some difficulty he was convinced that this was not the case.

Wherever the Far Eastern Republic is in full control there is perfect order, as good order as you find anywhere. In fact, I have found throughout my experience in Siberia that it was never necessary to own a revolver. In my five years in that country I never had need of one. Furthermore, those who are supporting the Far Eastern Republic called their army into existence again, and what has happened? They are almost back to Vladivostok, even with the Japanese there.

The people also have a great desire to work. They are tired of revolutions; they are tired of politics. We had a very striking incident in Vladivostok about a year ago. The longshoremen were causing trouble—they were striking for higher wages. Not only the government, but every labor union there, told them that they must accept what was offered to them and go to work, otherwise new men would be put in their places,—a fact that indicates that the Russian people mean what they say, and are ready to work when the opportunity offers.

The Russian people are also very anxious for education, because they know that they must have education in order to succeed.

I have been asked frequently what America should do. In 1918 we suggested to America what we believed should be done, namely, to enter into economic relations with the Russian people, regardless of the government.

This should be done today. The Far Eastern Republic has the necessary resources, it has stopped issuing paper money, and is on a gold basis; it has made laws favorable to intercourse, and I see no reason why we should not be working in that country; the Russians asked us to come. We should have men over there studying the situation, so that they may be able to direct American business men who go over seeking investments.

I will end by quoting a remark, the truth of which I firmly believe. Years ago an Englishman who had lived fifteen years in Russia, and had spent considerable time in America before that, remarked, "Some day the Russian and American peoples will sweep the whole world before them by their sheer warmth of heart."

I believe this, because the Russians are the greatest friends in the world that we have today, and the sooner we work with them, the sooner will America and the whole world benefit.

#### IV. Prof. John Dewey

I haven't been in Siberia and I shouldn't venture to speak about the Siberian question direct. But I spent some time in Peking during the time when the Far Eastern Republic was being founded, when Ataman Semenov, Kalmykov, Kappel and the other mercenaries of White Russian troops were overthrown, and I had an opportunity to meet many of the people who were going back and forth between Peking and Siberia. And also as Mr. Moore has called our attention to the fact that the problem is very closely connected with China, there are some aspects of that phase of the matter that I would like to speak of.

Mr. Moore called our attention to the fact that there was a Bolshevik menace, because of the Mongolian Government at Urga is under Soviet auspices. That is true, but how did it come to be so? Because after the defeat of Kappel and Kalmykov the White Russians who were defeated went over the border to Mongolia, according to reports subsidized from where they have got their money before, got their troops together, made an attack through Mongolia, captured Urga, carried out their usual policy of the massacre of the Reds, of many Chinese and of all of the Jews, and established themselves there.

Mongolia was nominally a Chinese protectorate. But China did nothing, although invited several times to do something by the Far Eastern Republic, and also from Moscow. Finally Moscow informed China that if they did nothing the Russians from Moscow would send an army there, because these men (and the statement was true) were a constant menace to the Far Eastern Republic. They had made it a military base for keeping up their raids, and, as we have already been told, the Far Eastern Republic army was dispersed. So finally, under these conditions, the Russian Red Army went there, captured Urga and finally set up this Government of Mongolia under their own auspices.

Now this fact, which is a direct product of previous Japanese activities, is used as an excuse, a justification for the continued Japanese occupation of Siberia. That is a fact, I take it, of the kind which has been repeated over and over again.

The first speaker told us, speaking from experience, that he had never found disorder where the Far Eastern Republic was in control. He left us to draw the inference as to where the disorder was found. And I don't want to make the inference any more pointed than he did, excepting to call attention to the fact that it is this disorder which in turn has been alleged as the justification for continued occupation by the Japanese.

Just one thing more. There were constant reports (newspaper reports) of disorder all over the Far Eastern Republic and Siberia. Those reports mostly came from Harbin. One and the same man was the agent in Harbin of Reuter and the Kokusai—the only news agencies represented there. Naturally both agencies sent out similar reports, and quite naturally each of them could be referred to as corroborating the reports of the other regarding the present disorder in the Far Eastern Republic. Where did this news agency man get his facts from? It is a fact of record, and not my personal opinion, that he got them from the Intelligence Department of the Japanese Army of Occupation.

## V. Mr. Moore

If we took up all these questions of details with regard to the Far East we should never get anywhere. It would be another case for a Washington Conference. We haven't got time here. But I just wanted to take up two points which Prof. Dewey made.

One is this: I think he is reading into my speech what I distinctly did not say in regard to drawing the Mongolian herring across the trail of Siberia. I have faced the issues pretty straight, as I see them. So far as I was able to do that, I was very careful that that charge couldn't be made.

However, with regard to Kolchak, Prof. Dewey and others are making the point—making the insinuation rather than the point—that the Japanese were the supporters of Kolchak. Now I happened to be pretty closely—not connected with—but a pretty close observer of that Kolchak question. And if my memory serves me right (I was in Paris at the time when President Wilson was fighting Mr. Clemenceau, so to speak, on broad terms over the matter of recognition of Kolchak) and with President Wilson at Paris in the Council of Four, in which the Japanese were not represented, it was agreed that the great powers should recognize Kolchak, and should give him assistance, and his assistance primarily—I believe I am right in saying, although I hold up that matter—came from the British and from the French.

## VI. Mr. F. A. Trone

Mr. Trone found that Vladivostok in 1917 and 1918, under the Provincial Government, offered a life that was "so normal that the reactionaries wished a change." These Russians joined with Japan in delivering Vladivostok to a new Russian government—officially Russian, but in reality carrying out Japanese policies. Chita is orderly, and life there is becoming normal.

## VII. Mr. Roger Sherman Baldwin

Mr. Baldwin, in speaking of the attitude of New England farmers, stated that they wished to have the Far Eastern Republic recognized, as by this measure new and much needed markets would be opened to Western trade. Under Japanese control the Eastern markets have been reduced to a minimum.

## VIII. Mr. Graham Romeyn Taylor

Whatever we may think of the wisdom of sending the expeditionary force to Siberia (and I have my own views on that question) the men representing America on the Inter-Allied Boards of Control on the Siberian Railway, and the others who were in the service of our Government in Siberia, and particularly General Graves, who was the head of our expeditionary force in Siberia, were men who primarily looked at the Russian problem, not from the standpoint of military occupation, but from the standpoint of the relations which America should have with the people of Siberia.

Certainly those of us who were in Vladivostok at that time and who came into contact with General Graves as he faced those very difficult problems saw that he approached them, not from the point of view merely of the military man, but from the standpoint of the tactful, patient and understanding statesman—we should have an everlasting



appreciation and gratitude for that democratic spirit and common-sense point of view of our American representatives in Siberia.

#### IX. Mr. E. I. Omeltchenko

I would like to emphasize the democratic character of the Far Eastern question. The Far Eastern Republic has its national assembly, assisted by universal suffrage. It has its cabinet ministers who are responsible to the national assembly and a board under the British Parliamentary system. It recognizes the right of private property.

It is the only Russian government which the Russian people have succeeded in establishing as a democracy.

In Siberia democracy is under trial, and for this reason I consider that this country should extend its undivided good will to help Russian democracy.

#### X. Mr. Roger Sherman Greene

The commander of an expeditionary force is obliged first of all to consider the safety of his troops in bringing them into the interior of another country. He is obliged to consider their provision with food; he is obliged to consider transport to the port where he maintains his contact with his base; he is obliged to protect his troops against attacks of those who may be hostile to them.

It is perfectly clear that if a government is to maintain order in its territory, it must have complete control over that area. If there are certain areas that are controlled by foreigners the administration of justice, the policing, etc., are interfered with and cannot be carried out efficiently.

I should like you to consider whether if foreign nations are sincerely desirous of seeing peace and order, they should not in the first place refrain from interference.

Immediate withdrawal of troops may cause a certain temporary disturbance until the properly constituted authorities can establish their control, but it is all alike in the end for the results of good order and peace.

#### XI. Mr. Paxton Hibben

I just want to throw out one little suggestion to you, which I think is appropriate in the consideration of this Far Eastern Republic matter.

When I returned from Russia this last summer, I went to Washington to see Mr. Hughes to make a very strong and a very heartfelt plea for the recognition by the United States of the little Socialist Soviet Republic of Armenia which I have been interested in for a very long time, and into which, of course, a very great deal of money that has been contributed by the charitable people all over the United States has gone, to save the Armenian people from starvation.

Now, Mr. Hughes replied to my pleas for the recognition of this little Republic that there were three things that were wrong. In the first place that it had not a democratic form of government as we look upon democracy in the United States. In the second place that its government as he said, did not represent the majority of the people—at least so he had been told, and anyhow there was no way by which one could know whether it did or did not represent the majority of the Armenian people because no really general elec-

tions had been held in Armenia. And the third objection was that the right of private property was not recognized in this Socialist Soviet Government which is modeled more or less on some of the Russian Soviet lines. So he felt that the administration would be unwilling to recognize the Armenian Government as the Government of an independent state.

What I want to throw out to you today is that here is a Republic made out of Russia as little Armenia was made out of Russia, to which no one of these objections applies. It is a democratic government in the sense in which we define democracy in the United States. Its constitution is modeled after our own. The people in the Far Eastern Republic have expressed their will by an election which we have been told here today was absolutely fair—and I have no doubt of it. And third, the rights of private property are recognized in this little Far Eastern Republic, just as they are in the United States or any other country.

Then, what is the objection to the recognition by the United States of this country?

And in this connection I am wondering very much, and I dare say some of you ought to be wondering also, just exactly what is the purpose of this policy of non-recognition, this "naughty, naughty" policy that they have in Washington—you know, saying to some country like Mexico or Greece or Russia or Armenia or Georgia or Chita: "You don't behave just right to suit us and we won't recognize you."

I believe very strongly that there are no major and minor international questions that are not major and minor because of their moral implications. It has been said here this afternoon that the question of the Far Eastern Republic is a minor question because the Far Eastern Republic, after all, is a very small part of the world and inhabited by comparatively few people. That might apply to many countries. But in my mind, my friends, the thing that is important is not the size of a country seeking recognition but the moral basis upon which decisions of this sort are reached. And however small a country may be—indeed precisely because a country may be small—it is the more incumbent upon us to consider the moral question than the material one.

Now we say that we believe in democracy in this country and we lay down certain rules for democracy as we see it, but when we are confronted with a case where democracy is a real thing as it is in the Far Eastern Republic, or when we are confronted with a case like Greece where the whole people by vote of ninety-eight per cent of the entire electorate chose a person whom we didn't like as Chief of State, why we overthrow that moral principle of democracy that we have talked so much about and say, "No, we won't recognize you for some other reasons." What these other reasons are I don't know, but it does seem to me that slowly, little by little in this country, my friends, we are getting away from fundamental principles and are governing our foreign policy on the basis of concessions, banking interests—of commercial things instead of on the basis of profound and fundamental ideas of right and wrong.

## XII. Dr. Toyokichi Iyenaga

I believe it was a noble act on the part of Japan to have sent out

her troops in conjunction with those of America and other Allies for the rescue of those brave Czecho-Slovaks, who were fighting there for their homes across the wastes of Siberia; but to have retained some of her troops therein on the part of Japan, after the first object had been accomplished, with the avowed purpose of maintaining peace and order within the friendly nation's territory, was, in my opinion, not only a thankless task, but a foolish move.

I suppose the Japanese people have a vast sum of money. What good reason can the Japanese Government give to the Japanese people for the expenditure of about eight hundred million yen involved in that enterprise? It is said that in case of the withdrawal of Japanese troops the Allies' rights and properties and those of Japan in Siberia, about ten thousand in all, will be endangered, and further, that Korea will be thrown into disorder by the activities of the Bolsheviki acting in conjunction with the Korean revolters.

If so, could not the Japanese Government have warned—possibly ordered—their nationals to return home or to seek refuge in places of safety? If any compensation was needed for the loss of property involved in such a move, why a very small part of that eight hundred million yen would have been sufficient to meet it. In fact, that sum might have been ample enough to purchase—if Russia wished to sell—the Northern half of the Saghalien Island, and thus terminate the abnormal division of sovereignty and administration within the same Island.

They might have dreamt of territorial aggrandizement at the expense of Russia, but they should have known that such a dream could never have been realized so long as the proclamation of the Japanese Government of August 2, 1917, is not made a scrap of paper. By that proclamation the Japanese Government is pledged to withdraw her troops immediately after the first object is accomplished, to respect the territory and integrity of Russia, and not to interfere with her domestic affairs.

Now, ladies and gentleman, Japan has always kept her word, and I confidently believe that she will redeem the pledges she has made. But she is too slow to face boldly the embarrassing situation which is destined to arise in the course of human affairs.

Japan, of course, is not bound to regulate her conduct to please you American people, or any other people, but she has to tread the path of international justice, peace and amity. This she must do, whatever the difficulties are that might lie on the straight path. Why, the presence of the Japanese troops in Siberia is recognized by all Russians, both by the Bolsheviki and the Bolsheviks. Why then this proclamation on the part of Japan to do the very thing which will not arouse their suspicion and will win their friendship?

It is my sincere hope that Japan and the Far Eastern Republic will soon come to terms which will at once enhance the prestige of the new-born Republic, and at the same time assure the security of Japan's position and the protection of those Japanese nationals who have gone there in obedience to the treaty and who are greatly concerned in the preservation of their vested interests; then the withdrawal of the Japanese troops will be forthwith consummated.

# FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION

*For a Liberal and Constructive American Foreign Policy*

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS  
3 West Twenty-ninth Street, New York City

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

JAMES G. McDONALD, Chairman	GEORGE W. KIRCHWEY
EDWIN BJORKMAN	GEORGE M. La MONTE
BRUCE BLIVEN	MRS. HENRY GODDARD LEACH
COURTENAY CROCKER	OWEN R. LOVEJOY
STEPHEN P. DUGGAN	RALPH S. ROUNDS
HUGHELL FOSBROKE	MRS. V. G. SIMKHOVITCH
ROBERT H. GARDINER	MRS. WILLARD D. STRAIGHT
CARLTON J. H. HAYES	MRS. CHARLES L. TIFFANY
CHARLES P. HOWLAND	MISS LILLIAN D. WALD
PAUL U. KELLOGG	

---

CHRISTINA MERRIMAN	ROBERT H. GARDINER
Secretary	Treasurer

ESTHER G. OGDEN  
Membership Secretary

---

## NATIONAL COUNCIL THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE and

MISS JANE ADDAMS Illinois	SAM A. LEWISOHN New York
ARTHUR E. BESTOR New York	BISHOP FRANCIS J. McCONNELL Pennsylvania
RT. REV. BENJ. BREWSTER, D.D. Maine	JULIAN W. MACK Illinois
JOHN GRAHAM BROOKS Massachusetts	MISS RUTH MORGAN New York
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM New York	ROBERT R. MOTON Alabama
GEORGE BURNHAM, JR. Pennsylvania	MRS. BEVERLY B. MUNFORD Virginia
MISS MABEL CHOATE New York	WILLIAM A. NEILSON Massachusetts
WINSTON CHURCHILL Vermont	MRS. GORDON NORRIE New York
JOHN DEWEY New York	J. J. PETTIJOHN Minnesota
FRANK HAIGH DIXON New Jersey	GIFFORD PINCHOT Pennsylvania
ROBERT ERSKINE ELY New York	ROSCOE POUND Massachusetts
MRS. J. MALC OLM FORBES Massachusetts	VERY REV. H. C. ROBBINS New York
FELIX FRANKFURTER Massachusetts	REV. JOHN A. RYAN District of Columbia
FERRIS GREENSLET Massachusetts	HENRY R. SEAGER New York
FREDERIC C. HOWE District of Columbia	GRAHAM TAYLOR Illinois
HORACE M. KALLEN Massachusetts	JOHN A. VOLL Pennsylvania
EDWARD KREHBIEL California	HENRY M. WAITE New York
THOMAS W. LAMONT New York	FRANK P. WALSH Missouri
	MRS. H. OTTO WITTPENN New Jersey