

## Primary Source Packet

### Document A: Excerpt from Exchange of Notes between Secretary of State Robert Lansing and Japanese Special Envoy Ishii Kikujiro, 1917

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
*Washington*, NOV. 2, 1917

I have the honor to communicate herein my understanding of the agreement reached by us in our recent conversations touching the questions of mutual interest to our governments relating to the republic of China. . . .

The governments of the United States and Japan recognize that territorial propinquity creates special relations between countries, and, consequently, the government of the United States recognizes that Japan has special interests in China, particularly in the part to which her possessions are contiguous. . . .

The governments of the United States and Japan deny that they have any purpose to infringe in any way the independence or territorial integrity of China, and they declare, furthermore, that they always adhere to the principle of the so-called “open door” or equal opportunity for commerce and industry in China. . . .

(Signed) ROBERT LANSING.

Source: *The Imperial Japanese Mission 1917*, Publication No. 15 (New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1918),  
<http://net.lib.byu.edu/estu/wwi/comment/japanvisit/JapanA2.htm>.

## Document B: Excerpt from the Washington Naval Conference 1922

The United States of America, Belgium, the British Empire, China, France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands and Portugal:

Desiring to adopt a policy designed to stabilize conditions in the Far East, to safeguard the rights and interests of China, and to promote intercourse between China and the other Powers upon the basis of equality of opportunity;

Have resolved to conclude a treaty for that purpose. . .

### ARTICLE I

The Contracting Powers, other than China, agree:

(1) To respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China . . .

(4) To refrain from taking advantage of conditions in China in order to seek special rights or privileges which would abridge the rights of subjects or citizens of friendly States, and from countenancing action inimical to the security of such States. . . .

IN FAITH WHEREOF the above-named Plenipotentiaries [diplomats] have signed the present Treaty.

DONE at the City of Washington the Sixth day of February One Thousand Nine Hundred and Twenty-Two.

Source: *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States 1922*, Volume I, U.S. Department of State Publication 2033 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1938), [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/tr22-01.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/tr22-01.asp)

**Document C: “The Senate’s Declaration of War”:  
*Japan Times and Mail* Editorial Responding to Japanese Exclusion**

There is no denying that the adoption by the American Senate of the exclusion amendment to the Immigration Bill has given a shock to the whole Japanese race such as has never before been felt and which will undoubtedly be remembered for a long time to come. . . .

The knowledge that Senators Johnson, Shortridge and company do not necessarily represent the entire American nation in offering an unnecessary affront, is largely responsible for the spirit of forbearance which seems to be generally ruling the mind of the nation for the present. . . .

Nevertheless the fact remains that the Senate has passed, with an overwhelming majority, an amendment which they know is a most humiliating one to the Japanese race, and the event cuts the Japanese minds deep, a wound that will hurt and rankle for generations and generations. . . .

We are most deeply aggrieved that the American Senate has made itself an object of distrust and suspicion in the Japanese mind through an act which is characterized as unnecessary and ill-judged by the American organs of public opinion themselves.

Source: “The Senate’s Declaration of War,” *Japan Times and Mail* (April 19, 1924), 4,  
<http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/5077/>.

**Document D: Memorandum Handed by Secretary of State Henry Stimson to the Japanese Ambassador, 1931**

[WASHINGTON,] September 22, 1931.

Japanese military forces . . . have occupied the principal strategic points in South Manchuria . . .

The League of Nations has given evidence of its concern. . . .

This situation is of concern, morally, legally and politically to a considerable number of nations. . . . It brings into question at once the meaning of certain provisions of agreements, such as the Nine-Powers Treaty of February 6, 1922 . . .

The American Government is confident that it has not been the intention of the Japanese Government to create or to be a party to the creation of a situation which brings the applicability of treaty provisions into consideration. The American Government does not wish to be hasty in formulating its conclusions or in taking a position. However, the American Government feels that a very unfortunate situation exists, which no doubt is embarrassing to the Japanese Government. . . .

What has occurred has already shaken the confidence of the public with regard to the stability of conditions in Manchuria . . . continuance of military occupation would further undermine that confidence.

H[ENRY] L. S[TIMSON]

Source: *Peace and War: United States Foreign Policy, 1931-1941*, U.S. Department of State Publication 1983 (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1943), 156-57, <http://ibiblio.org/hyperwar/Dip/PaW/002.html>.

## Document E: Japan's Case in the League of Nations Dispute

ADDRESS DELIVERED  
AT THE NINTH PLENARY MEETING

December 6th, 1932

Japan is a loyal supporter of the League of Nations. . . . we have striven to avoid war for many years under provocations that, prior to the drafting of the Covenant, would certainly have brought it about. . . . when the incident of September 18th, 1931, took place. We wanted no such situation as has developed. We sought in Manchuria only the observance of our treaty rights and the safety of the lives of our people and their property. . . .

While the situation was developing in Manchuria, efforts were made in Europe and America to rally what is called "world opinion" against Japan. The craft of propaganda, in which our Chinese friends are particularly adept, was put into effective use in shaping world opinion against Japan before the facts were fully known.

. . . as for Japan and China in particular, we look for the time to come when these two nations of the distant East will realise the common origin of their culture and traditions and the common interests of their existence, and will co-operate with a sense of mutual understanding and respect, in the policy of upholding peace in the Far East, thereby serving the cause of world peace, in and with the League of Nations.

Source: *Japan's Case in the Sino-Japanese Dispute as Presented Before the Special Session of the Assembly of the League of Nations* (Geneva, Switzerland: Japanese Delegation to the League of Nations, 1933), digitized by the Internet Archive from the University of California Los Angeles Preservation Department Collections,  
[http://archive.org/stream/japanscaseinsino00leag/japanscaseinsino00leag\\_djvu.txt](http://archive.org/stream/japanscaseinsino00leag/japanscaseinsino00leag_djvu.txt)