

JAPAN'S WAR MINISTER EXPLAINS

By GÜNTHER STEIN

Translated from the *Berliner Tageblatt*, Berlin Liberal Daily

ARAKI, the Minister of War and one of the most important statesmen in modern Japan, was kind enough to receive me and to reply to the following questions.

'What right has Japan to act as she has in Manchuria, and what necessity? I should like to know the official Japanese opinion on this subject, for people in Germany are perhaps not well enough informed.'

'The Japanese Government has answered this question from incident to incident, and it is too bad that Germany does not understand the matter, but in order to understand it one must recollect recent history. For Japan's existence to be assured, for her defense to be maintained, and for peace to be preserved in Eastern Asia, peace must be maintained in Manchuria and Japan must enjoy complete freedom of economic opportunity there. All these primary assumptions are absolutely necessary. Japan takes them for granted.

'We have discovered that Manchuria is a question of life and death for the Japanese people, as is proved by the fact that Japan has risked life and death in two great wars against China and Russia. The Russo-Japanese War also proves that Japan was determined to maintain peace throughout Eastern Asia, to guarantee the integrity of the Chinese frontiers, and at the same time to enjoy complete freedom of economic activity as an absolute essential for her existence. But recently the Chinese have wanted to retract the rights that they once granted to foreign countries. They are full of ideas about excluding foreigners and do not respect the special economic rights that Japan has attained in Manchuria as a consequence of two great wars with China and Russia. The Chinese want to undermine the influence of the Japanese people at its foundations and they threaten Japan's very existence.

'As anti-Japanese propaganda spread more widely, relations between the two countries became extremely acute. It was at this moment that Chinese soldiers attacked the South Manchuria Railway. The Japanese army of occupation from Kwantung, which was charged with protecting the railway zone and the Japanese colonies under the terms of existing treaties, was obliged to take measures of self-defense in order to protect Japanese rights. Then, as the situation developed further, Japan resorted to measures of self-defense quite within her rights as a nation. In other words, Japan is determined to defend her political and economic privileges as granted in the treaties. She will always protect her own land and maintain order in neighboring territory. She is determined to continue

the enormous business that goes on between Japan and Manchuria and to protect the Japanese capital invested in Manchuria, which amounts to some two billion yen, and the life and property of the million Japanese, including Koreans, established in Manchuria.

'Meanwhile, all over Manchuria bandits have been launching attacks and indulging in illegal activities, so that the life and property of a million Japanese are threatened. The independent state of Manchuria has only recently come into existence and is not yet strong enough to protect itself. Japan is therefore exerting herself in her own behalf and doing only what is obviously necessary.'

'WHAT MEASURES will Japan resort to now and in the future?'

'Both now and in the future Japan will stamp out bandits in Manchuria. Wherever unrest exists, whether its causes are domestic or foreign, Japan will oppose it and support and maintain peaceful conditions.'

'Japan is supporting the establishment and development of the new Manchurian state. What does Japan expect from this economic, political, and military province?'

'In respect to the foreign policy of Manchuria, Japan hopes that the new state will join the community of nations. In so far as Manchuria's domestic affairs are concerned, Japan desires that the government set up over thirty million people be conducted on moral principles. Japan hopes in this way to establish permanent peace in Manchuria and throughout Eastern Asia.'

'I beg Your Excellency's opinion of the propaganda being issued by Soviet Russia concerning the danger of a Japanese attack on Russia as well as of the mobilization of Russian troops on the Soviet frontier.'

'Japan does not dream of violating the rights of Russia, of venturing beyond the Russian frontier, or of using White Russians in any anti-Soviet movement. The whole world knows that Russia has concentrated troops at her frontier, that some of the Communists have warlike tendencies or at least want to aggravate relations between the two countries. As long as Russia has no intention of attacking Manchuria, I believe that there is no danger that anything will happen that would lead to serious and unfortunate consequences between the two countries. Peace in Eastern Asia depends in no small degree on the coöperation of Russia and Japan. It would therefore be to Russia's interests to let her fundamental policy take account of the new fact that the state of Manchuria has come into existence, to withdraw some of the troops from the frontier, to refrain from propaganda or intrigue, and thus to build up friendly relations between the two countries.'

'Can I have Your Excellency's opinion on the domestic situation in China?'

'Is China a modern state? The Investigating Committee of the League of Nations ought to concentrate on this question. That was why Japan urged the League of Nations to dispatch a committee of investigation. In so far as China's domestic conditions are concerned, peace and order have been destroyed by the struggles of the military cliques that are ravaging all parts of China. The economic situation is acute. Communist bandits are winning victories and the outlook is serious. Since the Chinese adopt an anti-foreign policy for domestic purposes, their relations with other countries are growing more and more tense. We believe that the whole world should look at the situation as it is and not be led astray by Chinese propaganda.'

G. L. DICKINSON: A TRIBUTE

By E. M. FORSTER

From *The Spectator*, London Conservative Weekly

TRIBUTES are empty things, yet when one has known a man for over thirty years and thought him great something has to be offered. Great? This is clearly the wrong word for Lowes Dickinson; it suggests inaccessibility and the power of making others feel small, whereas he had the power of bringing people out. While they were with him they were happy and amused. When they left him they found he had extended their sympathies and exercised their intelligence, so that the earth and the universe became larger places—this earth for which he has little hope, despite its beauty and fascination, that universe in whose light the earth will perhaps be reinterpreted. He has, indeed, the maieutic power, which Plato ascribes to Socrates, and he has been called Socratic; the epithet is kindly meant and is no doubt thought suitable for a don. But, whereas Socrates proceeded by snubbings and traps and with a pertinacity that would drive any modern youth to drink or the gramophone, Dickinson, as far as his method was concerned, belonged to a different tradition. Indeed, he had n't a method; he just lived his ordinary life; and because it was so precious it leavened the lumpishness of his hearers and made them his friends.

So, whether at Cambridge, where he was best known, or at the London School of Economics, where he lectured for over twenty years, or at Geneva, where he focused his hopes for our earthly salvation, or in America, India, and China, or in that unexplored country that has just been discovered by the microphone, or in that other country, non-existent he sometimes thought it, which psychical research has indicated—wherever he went he brought his liberating power, and a modesty