"As I look at it, Russian influence has largely been confined to an appeal for international liberalism, or as the Russians put it, an 'appeal for liberation of all oppressed peoples from the imperialist yoke.' That appeal is not Russian in origin; it is the principle of self-determination and goes back to the American Declaration of Independence. As long as international inequalities and injustices exist, such an appeal will always be effective."

—Dr. Hu Shih, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Pekin, and Leader of the Chinese Renaissance.
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Early Russian migrations into Asia from the 13th century on represented by traders and tillers of the soil. First definite and organized effort to colonize under Yermak, Cossack leader, in latter half of 16th century. Settlement of territory in the neighborhood of the Amur river by Russians between 1650 and 1700.

Amur territory ceded to Russia in 1858.

Vast increase in Russian migration to Asia from 1870 on.

1895—Russia’s protest, augmented by protests from France and Germany, to Japan as a result of her seizure of Southern Manchuria and Port Arthur after China’s defeat in the Sino-Japanese war.

1896—Concession granted for building the Chinese Eastern Railway.

1898—Port Arthur and Dairen leased by Russia for twenty-five years.

1900—Boxer Uprising. Russia’s occupation of the entire province of Manchuria on the pretext of protecting the Chinese Eastern Railway, 900 versts of which had been destroyed by the Chinese.

1903-05—Russo-Japanese war over the question of the extent of territorial suzerainty of the two countries in north China. Defeat of Russia in 1905. Cession of Port Arthur and Dairen to Japan. Russia’s withdrawal from Manchuria with the exception of the Chinese Eastern Railway which was to be used for economic and not for military purposes. Cession by Russia to Japan of southern half of island of Sakhalin.

Returning friendship between Imperial Russia and Japan evidenced by four secret agreements between 1907 and 1912, culminating in the secret treaty of 1916 whereby they pledged themselves to defend each other if their special interests in China should be endangered by a third power.

Russia’s growing interest in Mongolia after her defeat in Manchuria in 1905.

1911—Mongolia’s declaration of independence. Her recognition in 1912 through Russia’s mediation, as an autonomous state under the suzerainty of China. Valuable rights and privileges accorded Russia in Mongolia.

1917—The Russian Revolutions of March and November and the establishment of the Russian Soviet Republic.

1917-1920—Struggles between the Soviet forces and those of the allies and counter-revolutionary Russian leaders. Practical control of the Siberian coast by Japan.

1921—Revolutionary government proclaimed in Outer Mongolia. (Mongolia had been a base for counter-revolutionary attacks against Soviet Russia. Therefore Russia was glad to encourage the Mongolians to revolt and form a government friendly to Russia.)

1923—Russian advisers invited to Canton by Dr. Sun Yat-sen.

1924—Revision of Sino-Russian treaties, restoration of the Chinese Eastern Railway to joint control, and appointment of Karakhan as Soviet Ambassador to Pekin.


RUSSIA'S RELATION TO CHINA BEFORE 1917

The nature of Russia's contact with China during the last five decades offers vivid contrasts. Until her annexation of the Amur territory in 1858, whereby she acquired 360,000 square miles of land within the Chinese Empire, her expansion eastward had been gradual. The liberation of the serfs in 1861 and the construction of the trans-Siberian railway during the 80's stimulated emigration eastward. But it was Russia's contact with Japan's expanding interests in Manchuria and Korea which really aroused her to the actively aggressive course she pursued with varying success until the revolution of 1917.

In 1896 Russia was granted the concession for building the Chinese Eastern Railway, which runs through the heart of the rich province of Manchuria, connecting Chita with Vladivostok by a route 600 miles shorter than the line following the Amur river. The railway and all the land adjoining it, (which was made to include timberlands, rock quarries, etc.), was brought under extraterritorial jurisdiction; colonization of the territory by Russians was encouraged in every way by their government; a civil administration department was created which collected taxes, supervised the courts and municipal councils, and controlled the churches and schools. During the Boxer Uprising in 1900, Russian troops occupied the three provinces of Manchuria, and her complete domination there was practically achieved.

The Russo-Japanese War was precipitated by Russia's rapid penetration of Manchuria. Through her victory, Japan received the portion of the South Manchurian line, (a branch of the CER), running from Changchun to Port Arthur; and also Russia's rights in Port Arthur and Dairen, besides the southern half of the island of Sakhalin. Both countries continued to maintain military guards for their respective railroads in Manchuria. Russia withdrew her remaining troops, whereupon Japan took possession of the province for the understood purpose of restoring it to China. (Nominally it is under the control of the Chinese general, Chang Tso-lin, but it is actually dominated by Japan through her railway, economic, military, and industrial interests.)

Thereafter Russia, having been frustrated in Manchuria, turned to Mongolia as an excellent base for economic and political penetration. When the Manchu dynasty was deposed in 1911, she supported Mongolia's demands for independence, hoping to gain from an independent and grateful Mongolia the privileges which the Chinese government had refused. China rejected these original claims, but finally agreed in 1915 to a tri-partite arrangement whereby Mongolia became an autonomous state under Chinese suzerainty.

II.

SINCE 1917

After the Revolution of 1917, Russia entered upon a new era of diplomatic approach and economic expansion. Various counter-revolutionary campaigns
under Denikine and Wrangel in the west, and Kolchak, Ungern, and Semenov in the Far East, facilitated by foreign advice and support, followed the Bolshevik revolution in November. In 1919 Great Britain held the Caucasus, Trans-Caspia, Trans-Caucasia, and Turkestan; and controlled the Caspian Sea through Denikine; the Anglo-Persian agreement of 1919 made Persia a virtual part of the Empire. Anti-Soviet campaigns in Siberia had given Japan a dominant position along practically the entire Siberian coast. Mongolia had become a refuge for temporarily weakened White Russian atamans and a base for anti-Soviet campaigns. The political life of the new Russian Republic was seriously menaced and her economic life nearly destroyed. It was an obvious necessity for Russia if she wished to continue her governmental experiment to break the "sanitary cordon" imposed by Europe and Japan and to seek new allies. Those to whom she would most naturally turn were those Asiatic nations which had also experienced attempts on the part of European powers to achieve economic domination over them. Russia's policy in China is thus only a phase of her general Asiatic policy.

The main points in Russia's Asiatic policy are:
1. Cessation of Russian Imperialist aggression.
2. Self-determination of national and racial groups formerly within the Russian Empire.
3. Solidarity and cooperation between Asiatic nations in resistance to western capitalist aggression, especially as exemplified by England and France.
4. A new diplomatic language frank to the point of bluntness.
5. To achieve security for Soviet Russia by avoiding the possibility of isolation in world politics and in war.

Russia's first success in line with this policy is the series of treaties established in 1921 with Persia, Afghanistan, Bokhara, and Turkey, whereby Russia repudiated privileges acquired under the Empire and gave support to the nationalist movements in Turkey, Persia, and Afghanistan.

In 1920 the Third International convoked the Baku Congress. Cooperative resistance to western capitalist exploitation was urged. Revolutionary movements in the east, whether agrarian or nationalistic-democratic, were to be encouraged however their motives and philosophy might differ from those of the Third International, with the hope that a grateful and successful revolutionary government would establish a soviet form of government. The Congress resulted in the organization of a Council for Propaganda and Action in the Countries of the Orient.*

*The last few years have seen a gradual divergence from the practical policy of the Soviet Government and the doctrines of the Third International. The foreign policy of the International Communist Party is to assist the development of world revolution. Its members are pledged to this purpose. The Soviet Government on the other hand desires to establish friendly relations with other countries. It works through its authorized officials who are forbidden to take part in foreign political movements.

Just how much support the Soviet Government lends to the world-revolutionary movement, directly or indirectly, is difficult to determine. Bukharin, editor of the Government organ, "Pravda," has spoken recently to this effect: "We must convert the world first, but not by sending missionaries, not by wasting our gold in foreign propaganda. The best propaganda Soviet Russia can infuse in other countries is the propaganda that comes from successful application of our theories in Soviet Russia itself." While Tchicherin, Commissioner for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Soviet Government said as far back as 1925: "The Chinese people is and must be master of its own destiny. This is the basic principle of the Soviet Government."
In 1925 Russia strengthened her position by a treaty with Japan, granting her concessions for exploitation of mineral, timber, oil, and other resources. Japan therefore, for practical reasons became obligated to protect Russia from allied attack from the eastern coast. Great Britain's refusal to renew the Anglo-Japanese alliance, and the passage of the American Immigration law of 1924 made Japan even more ready to accept this agreement.

APPLICATION OF RUSSIA'S ASIATIC POLICY TO CHINA

The most important step in Russia's movement to secure cooperation from Asiatic nations has been her attempt to gain the friendship of China. Her success in winning over Outer Mongolia, (1921), to the Union of Soviet Republics, has not had such a happy result in this last respect. Some such event was bound to happen, however, for Russian influence had been steadily increasing since 1915. By means of schools, lectures, text-books, etc., the Russians have stimulated national independence among the Mongolians and have furnished technical advisers in various departments. Just what permanent effect Russian influence will have upon Mongolia is questionable. Tseren Dordji, Prime Minister of the Mongolia Republic is quoted as saying:

"You foreigners think that the Russians are everything in Mongolia. It's not so. We Mongols have been left behind by civilization and we need help. So we have invited Russians to aid us in building a national bank and an army, in organizing cooperative societies and a customs service. We like their experts, we trust them, but they will not always be here."

In 1924 Russia and China agreed to joint ownership of the Chinese Eastern Railway. Since the revolution the railway had become badly disorganized. The management was taken over in 1919 by an inter-allied board, on which the anti-Soviet faction was represented, with the promise of turning the railroad over eventually to the stockholders, most of whom seem to have been French, subscribing through the Russo-Asiatic Bank. In 1920 the Russo-Asiatic Bank claimed to be the sole shareholder in the Railway, and the Chinese Government in the absence of a recognized Russian Government took over supervision of the railway with a board of Chinese and White Russian administrators. The allied board was abolished in 1922 although the powers declared that they still felt a certain responsibility in seeing that the road was managed efficiently and that the rights of creditors and stockholders were considered.

The agreement with Russia in 1924 stated that China and Russia were sole managers of the railway. A board of five Chinese and five Soviet Russian directors was appointed, and also a Chinese president, Russian vice-president, Russian manager, and two vice-managers, one Russian and one Chinese. Protests from the powers were met by China with the declaration that "in the future the two governments of China and Russia will deal with the question of the Chinese Eastern Railway, in which only the two countries of China and Russia are interested."

In the same year, Russia abolished her unilateral treaties with China. In 1920 Tchicherin, Russia's foreign minister, had said:

"The Soviet Government renounces all conquests made by the government of the Tsar in China, Manchuria, or anywhere else. The Soviet Government restores to China without any compensation whatever the mining, forest, and all other concessions of which China was robbed by the Government of the Tsar."
The agreement of 1924 fulfilled his pledge and in addition renounced the extraterritorial privileges of Russian citizens in China. China in return recognized the Soviet Government. (In consequence of this action, Karakhan as Ambassador became the dean of the diplomatic corps at Pekin, all other powers being represented by ministers under the old treaty basis.)

Russia's assistance to the Nationalist Movement has won her both friends and enemies among the Chinese. It is difficult to get exact data as to the concrete help extended by Russia to the Nationalists. She has furnished an indeterminate amount of ammunition to the Nationalist army. Vast supplies were left in Russia after the failure of the counter-revolutionary campaigns there. Inasmuch, however, as all supplies would have to be carried by truck or camel across the Gobi desert, and over sometimes impassable mountain ranges, it would have been impracticable for her to have furnished any considerable amount.*

Russia is also credited with having helped to finance the Nationalist Government. Again it is improbable that a country which is emerging slowly and with great effort from economic bankruptcy, would be able to give appreciable help to foreign institutions and movements. Dr. Harold Quigley, expert on Far-Eastern politics at the Williamstown Institute of Politics last August declared that the raid on the Soviet Embassy in Pekin revealed that the Soviets were aiding the Nationalists with munitions and money, but showed nothing sensational, and nothing which might not have been found in the other embassies.

Russia's most obvious help to the Nationalists has been through the advisers supplied to various departments in their army and government. These men have been of great help in organizing these departments along lines of honesty and efficiency. Originally there were thirty-five or forty of them employed at Canton. Borodin was one of them. They have been in the pay of the Nationalist Government, and serving on the same basis as any Chinese employees of equal rank. Their number seems to have decreased rather than to have increased. They have been especially valuable in organizing the propaganda department of the Nationalist Army. (Bulletin No. 5.)

Russia's moral encouragement of the Nationalist Movement has also contributed to friendliness between the two countries. Her expressed support of its aims has deepened the sympathy aroused by the abrogation of the treaties. In 1924 Karakhan spoke out definitely to this effect:

"I was glad when I saw this morning the statement of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, who spoke quite naturally in guarded terms of the revision of the treaties with foreign powers as being in the order of the day. Now I am not the Foreign Minister of the Republic of China, and I may be permitted more definitely to say that these treaties should not only be revised: they ought to be torn asunder, abolished, because they strangle China, because China cannot live under them. No government, no efforts to reconstruct and improve the administration of the country can be successful unless you throw off the chains that bind each revolt and each attempt of yours to help the Chinese people."

*In connection with the general practise of furnishing ammunition to Chinese military leaders, the following statement is interesting:

"Every nation with munitions to spare, including the United States, has helped to supply the munitions that keep the civil wars in China going. The governments of the United States and Great Britain have shown greater vigilance than the others in enforcing the arms embargo agreed to in 1919. There is plenty of evidence that not only arms made in America find their way to China, but that many of the machines in the arsenals were made here. It is notorious in China that Italian artillery, French aeroplanes, and British Stokes mortar supplies are imported. Much, if not most of this material has found its way to China in ships of powers which are not bound by the embargo agreement."—Col. Edwin Landon, University of California.
On a smaller and more personal scale, Russia has made a sympathetic appeal to China through a consistent deference to Chinese customs and traditions, and courtesy on the part of Russian officials to Chinese people. Again her astute ambassador illustrates this method of approach:

"Last summer when student delegations flooded Pekin, I received them all, fed them just such tea and cakes as I am offering you, and talked to them. That was propaganda. It was good propaganda, too, especially when the same students went to your American legation and were received by a third assistant under-secretary who was obviously in a hurry to get away from them so that he could play golf. It was propaganda last week when we lowered our Embassy flag to half-mast on the anniversary of Sun Yat-sen's death, while no other legation remembered to honor the first president of China. They are fools, fools!"

**THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY**

In 1922 the Chinese Communist Party was admitted by Dr. Sun Yat-sen to the Kuo Min Tang with the understanding that its members were to submit to Kuo Min Tang discipline, and not to work towards those points in their own program which would counteract the aims of the Kuo Min Tang. This union was approved by both groups, for they had certain broad aims in common: the abolition of the unequal treaties, removal of despotic military leaders, establishment of a central government dedicated to the welfare of the masses, etc.

This Communist faction has been a proportionately small but very active body. Its main activities have been the development of propaganda, organization of labor and peasant unions, and so on. Problems occasioned by the too rapid advance of the Nationalist Army last spring, and conflict between the right and left wings of the Party as to methods employed in achieving their common ends, precipitated the break in the Kuo Min Tang. The right-wing Nationalists claimed that the Communists had broken their word and taken advantage of the general unrest and their growing strength in the Party to pursue their own aims. The Hankow Nationalists, who at first included the Communist faction, declared that theirs was a legitimate campaign against military dictatorship of the Party. Both accusations are to some extent true. The disorder at Nanking was inspired by persons within the radical faction; later disturbances among the peasants in the interior provinces have also been ascribed to their influence. On the other hand, the suppression of the Communist and labor unions by the right wing military leaders has been very ruthless. Many of these acts cannot be catalogued, however, as being the result of right-wing or left-wing policies. They are the result of personalities, of general confusion, of the vast, revolutionary upheaval stirring a quarter of the human race. Under its influence conservatives will commit violence; ultra-radical policies will create reaction and vice versa.

In Pekin the raid on the Soviet Embassy on April 6th was an avowed step in the campaign against the Communists. It is interpreted, however, as being either an attempt on the part of Chang Tso-lin to enlist foreign help, and especially from Japan, against the Nationalists, by provoking Russia, the Nationalist ally, to declare war; or else a move on the part of the other powers working through the Pekin Government to draw Russia into war.
The Soviet Government took the latter view, and replied to Pekin:

"The Soviet Government fully understands that irresponsible foreign imperialists are provoking Russia to war, and fully understands that the Pekin cabinet has become a tool in the game played by the foreign imperialist group. . . . Responding to the Pekin provocation the aim of which is to make worse the international situation and to transform the hostilities at the present time led by several imperialist powers into a new world war, the Soviet Government declares it will not allow itself to be provoked by anybody, but will by all means defend the peace between the nations."

In the south the administrative power has again swung to the center and right, and the power of the labor unions has been greatly decreased. A report from a Hankow newspaper quotes a declaration from the Central Executive Committee of the Third International, strongly denouncing the Wuhan Government, and instructing all Communist members to withdraw from it, to demand punishment of those who oppress peasants and laborers, and make them rise by a systematic method, and to remain within the Kuomintang and to establish there a secret organ to conduct Communist activities.

The Central Executive Committee of the Kuo Min Tang addressed a letter to the C. E. C. of the Chinese Communist Party, asserting the right of the Kuo Min Tang to determine the course of the revolutionary movement in China, and charging the Chinese Communist Party with having attempted to usurp the authority of the Kuo Min Tang, to determine its policy, to create unrest, and to spread scandalous stories about it. It declared its adherence to the San Min doctrine of Dr. Sun.

Borodin, Mrs. Sun Yat-sen, and Eugene Chen have left Hankow for Russia, having severed their connection with the Kuo Min Tang. Other Nationalist officials, including the son of Dr. Sun, have remained. The two factions of the Kuo Min Tang have united since the withdrawal of Chiang Kai-Shih, and a new administration has been formed at Nanking.

But aside from this bitter flare-up and exchange of accusations, how have the Chinese people regarded Russia as a neighbor and an ally? Generally speaking they are inclined to be friendly. The younger and more ardent among the students are sometimes whole-heartedly pro-Russian. The older Chinese scholars and statesmen are inclined to qualify their friendship somewhat. There is a definite resentment on the part of some over Russia's share in encouraging Outer Mongolia to declare her complete independence from China. Furthermore, the Chinese Eastern Railway has not been made affectively Sino-Russian. The Russian directors have stayed away from meetings, thus preventing the Board from functioning. The Russian General Manager has accordingly had free jurisdiction. The last report is that the Chinese have taken over the Railway, which in Manchuria means that Japan will control it, at least for the present.

And then, the agreement in 1924 to abolish the unequal treaties was to have been formally confirmed at a conference to be held one month later. This conference has never been held. Of course the old treaty relations have been abandoned, but one can see why the Chinese would wish to have this formal confirmation after the questionable diplomatic record of the West in the East. Furthermore, although the moral significance of Russia's renunciation is very great, both as an advance in world diplomacy and an encouragement to Chinese Nationalism, the Chinese feel that it was not a great
material sacrifice for Russia, for many of her old privileges, (including extraterritoriality) were ineffective, or would have been difficult to defend against the powers established in China and hostile to Russia.

The South has been the main recipient of Russian assistance and sympathy, originally through the efforts of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, who had endeavored to enlist western support for his government, and finally received it from Russia. Dr. Sun was warmly appreciative of Russia's help. In his last will written the day before his death in 1925 he wrote:

"These forty years have impressed upon me the fact that before achieving freedom and equality for the people I must wake up the masses and in our struggle cooperate with those nations which deal on a basis of equality with my people."

On the same day he wrote to the Central Executive Committee of the U. S. S. R.:

"I leave behind me a Party which, as I always hoped, will be bound up with you in the historic work of final liberation of China and other exploited countries from the imperialist order. Therefore I charged the Kuomintang to continue the work of the revolutionary nationalist movement so that China should become free. With this object I have instructed the Party to be in constant contact with you I firmly believe in the continuance of the support which you have hitherto accorded to my country."

Dr. Sun did not, however, advocate the introduction of Communism to present-day China, and in conferences with Joffe, special emissary from Russia to China in 1923, he made it clear that China could not adopt Communism. In his "Three Principles" he wrote:

"Marx was wrong in making materialism the heart of history. The social problem is the heart of history, and the heart of the social problem is the maintenance of life. Marx thought that the surplus wealth of the capitalist was all wrung from the toil of the laborer. He gave the credit for production to the laborer to the exclusion of all other kinds of valuable contributions to society. Marx's theory that Class Strife is the basis of progress is putting the effect for the cause... is a confusion of basic principles."

Among contemporary leaders, we find T. V. Soong, the brilliant young finance minister in the Wuhan Government, saying:

"It's not up to us to ask what are Russia's motives. Suffice it to say she was the first nation voluntarily to give up advantages incompatible with our sovereignty and imposed upon us by force. You Americans are our friends in a politely conventional way and you have done many generous acts. But it is Russia who has taught us how to organize and fight, and has openly backed us up in our struggle with the powers. Show us such friendship as that and we might prefer relations with you. Of course we are not going to allow Russia to control us any more than we are now willing to allow the other powers to maintain their undue influence here. Nor are we going to be dominated by Russian thought."

C. C. Wu, Foreign Minister in the Nanking Nationalist Government:

"We have no fear of Russia in South China. Why should we? She has no trade interests here, and no surplus capital to invest. She has renounced all special privileges and has no dangerous friends; all the imperialist nations are her enemies. It is to her interest today to have China strong, united and independent—not a tool which the West can turn against her. That is our interest too. Communism is impossible in China today: it need not even be feared. Ten years hence, when the unequal treaties are abolished, who knows? We may fight Russia then, about Mongolia or about Communism. Today we help each other."

Dr. Hu Shih, Leader in the Chinese Renaissance:

"We have our own intellectual experience to guide us. China experimented very thoroughly with state socialism and communism in the 12th century. As to new philosophies and economic theories coming in from abroad, we are much more influenced by American thought than by Russian. But we shall not forget that while other nations may have looked on sympathetically, Russia lifted us by the arm while we rose."

WHAT RUSSIA DESIRES IN CHINA

Roughly speaking, what has Russia been working for in China? First of all it would seem, for an independent and united China, friendly to Soviet Russia. As a friendly ally, China could control Japan and offer a broad barrier to European attacks against Russia from the Far East. Russia also
wishes to secure trade for the Siberian coast, and to maintain her outlet to the Pacific.

Undoubtedly Russia and more particularly the International Communist Party would like to swing the Chinese Revolution over to an orthodox Marxian revolution of the oppressed workers against capitalism of all nationalities, Chinese as well as foreign. In their opinion it is practically of this nature to begin with. To this end they have encouraged the formation of labor and peasant unions throughout south and central China.*

Stalin, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party, said in 1926:

"The Chinese Revolution as a bourgeois-democratic one is also a revolution for national freedom directed against the rule of foreign imperialism in China . . . . The part of initiator and guide of the Chinese revolution, the part of leader in the Chinese peasantry, must inevitably get into the hands of the Chinese proletariat, which is better organized and more active than the Chinese bourgeois . . . . Lenin was right when he said that, if in former times before the beginning of the epoch of the world revolution, national movements for freedom were part of the general democratic movement, now after the victory of the Soviet revolution in Russia, and since the beginning of the epoch of world revolution, national movements for freedom are part of the proletarian world revolution."

Undoubtedly Russia would like to see a Soviet form of government in China, just as other nations wish to see their institutions duplicated there, and for the same reasons: greater security and freedom in trade, together with a certain idealistic belief that her institutions are best and should be introduced everywhere. And she will work for it, just as we have encouraged Christian colleges, and international consortoriums, and democratic government in China. And China will eventually do what she pleases.

Russia has shown greater astuteness and good will towards China in her diplomatic relations since the revolution than any other foreign power. She has relinquished her privileges; she has delivered no ultimatums and sent no defense forces. And she has cast in her lot with the forces of progressive Chinese nationalism instead of supporting first one and then another military leader who gave promises of undisturbed trade under full treaty privileges, so frequently the policy of other major powers. According to the logic of events and to opinions of many experienced Chinese and Russian leaders the establishment of a Communist state in China is neither possible nor desirable at present. Whether that state is ever created depends on the nature of China's economic development, and the attitude taken by the other powers towards China.

Karl Radek, rector of the Sun Yat-sen University in Moscow, speaking in this connection said:

"You Americans still have an opportunity to keep the Chinese revolution in bourgeois channels. You are not tied, like England, to a burdensome past; and you have capital to invest. If you put yourselves on the side of the national renaissance you can keep the Chinese revolution bourgeois for twenty years at least, perhaps more—but I doubt if you will have the sense to do it."

If Russia continues her friendly attitude towards China, and does not destroy the confidence of the Chinese people by trying to alter the normal course of Chinese Nationalism, these two vast countries will undoubtedly

*The number of organized city workers has been given as 3,500,000, and of enrolled peasants as 10,000,000. It is hard to say just how accurate these figures were at the time, or what they would be now in view of the campaign against the unions.
cooperate for mutual protection and economic benefit. Whether this union will prove detrimental to the West depends on the West. Russia assumes that it will, declaring that western capitalist nations only desire to exploit and defraud weaker countries; and that oppressed nations must unite for common warfare against them. There is no reason why capitalist nations should continue to play the role thus outlined for them. The past justifies for the greater part Russia’s description of their policy. For them to continue to justify it is suicidal, and events of the past year indicate that they are considering a more conciliatory and liberal policy. (The rendition of the concessions at Hankow and Kiukiang by the British, no intervention at Nanking, the British Memorandum, and the Porter Resolution, the net result of which is very small, but indicates at least a changing attitude.)

Should Asiatic nations form any alliance along the lines suggested by Russia their union will naturally be one of defense, not of aggression. Asia comprises many people, many diverse interests, religions, and races. The only obvious cause to unite Asia against the West is the issue of the common enemy, not common interests. And if western nations refuse to be the aggressor, Russia’s attempt to create pan-Asiatic unity loses any menace for them.

Albert Sarraut, the French ambassador to Turkey, summed up the case very justly when he said:

"It is a mistake to regard Russia as being at the bottom of the present troubles in China and elsewhere in Asia—as if that were all there were to the question. It would be much more correct to say that Russia is at the top rather than at the bottom of the trouble in Asia. Russia is at the top not because she has shown greater skill in diplomacy, not because the diplomacy of Europe since the war has been so inferior in its dealings, but rather because the idea that the old diplomacy which had for its basic principle the exploitation of inferior peoples by European capitalists dominates the minds of a formidable opposition to European influence everywhere in Asia. This condition has created a new Asia, and the force of it grows apace. Bolshevist Russia was the first to recognize the potential value of this new state of the Asiatic mind, and used such insight as a basis for rearing an Asiatic policy."

—A. S. K.
M. S. C.
C. C. D.

The Committee on Publications wishes to acknowledge the following sources of information utilized in preparing this report: Russia’s Aims in China, Arthur Ransome in the Manchester Guardian; articles by Louis Gannett in the Nation; Report on Japan and China of the Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions for 1926; Russia Turns East, by Scott Nearing; report of lecture by Dr. Alexander Kaun; Taraknath Das in The People, Lahore, India; The Chinese Eastern Railway, report of the Foreign Policy Association, also article on same subject by C. C. Wang in the Chinese Students’ Monthly; New China, by C. L’Estrange Malone; Russia in the Far East, Leo Pasvolsky; report of speech by Stalin in pamphlet “China in Revolt”; current items and interviews from local and Chinese newspapers, and from the Christian Science Monitor.
The American Committee for Fair Play in China was organized in San Francisco in June, 1925, shortly after the demonstration in Shanghai resulting in the shooting of Chinese students by foreign police. The purpose of its founders was to create an agency through which uncolored and timely information concerning China might be made available to the people of this country, with the conviction that out of such work will grow a broader sympathy and understanding between the East and the West, and a surer guarantee of peace among nations.

In pursuance of this aim it has sponsored and arranged lectures and public meetings, furnished material for debates and speakers, distributed publicity to periodicals, and published and distributed 36,000 reports on various topics dealing with phases of the situation in China and of the life of her people. It has been from the beginning a volunteer movement both in matter of support and of service, with the exception of unavoidable cost expenditures.

Friends of China will be interested to know that Thomas F. Millard, former correspondent in China for the New York Times and the New York World, who has been in the United States for several months, has just returned to China. The New York Herald-Tribune will receive his dispatches during the months to come.

Miss Rosalee Venable, former national general secretary of the Y. W. C. A. in China and general secretary of the San Francisco Y. W. C. A., is a new member of the Executive Board.

Professor Meng Shou-Chun, one of the organizers of the American Committee for Fair Play in China, and who has served as adviser to the Executive Board and member of the National Board, has consented to be the representative of the Committee in China upon his return. Mr. Chew Cheng Paul has taken his place as adviser to the Executive Board.

For the benefit of friends of Benigna and Elizabeth Green, we submit their present address: 2709 Pacific Heights Road, Honolulu, T. H. Mrs. Green served as chairman during the first sixteen months of the existence of the American Committee; while her daughter, Elizabeth Green, represented the Committee in China and submitted reports which were published as bulletins until her return to Honolulu last fall. During past months Miss Green has been associated with the work of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Concerning the American Committee for Fair Play in China

The American Committee for Fair Play in China is a volunteer movement, organized in 1925 for the purpose of creating a better understanding among our people of the issues at stake in the Far East, and especially in China. It is unsubsidized, independent, and supported by volunteer contributions.

Our main activity is the publication and distribution of reports on phases of the situation in China, of the political and economic transformation taking place in her large cities, and of the reaction of her people to new influences. Our desire is to interpret these vast changes from a friendly but non-partisan standpoint.

Since June, 1925, we have, largely through volunteer help, distributed 36,000 copies of the seven reports issued by our organization throughout the United States and also to twenty-two foreign countries.

We have arranged over fifty lectures before clubs and educational institutions, many of these in the middle-west and New England states.

Over 350 people are distributing our reports.
16 libraries receive and distribute our reports. Two of these are in foreign countries.
70 educational institutions receive information periodically.
We have worked and corresponded with 68 organizations.
Publicity has been distributed to nationally representative newspapers and magazines.
Active correspondence has been carried on with the State Department and the Congressional Committees on Foreign Affairs.

We have held public meetings and supplied speakers on many occasions to local organizations.
Material for dozens of theses and interscholastic debates has been supplied.
We have cooperated with conferences and occasionally worked towards the adjustment of local difficulties involving Chinese and westerners.

Since the organization of the Committee, headquarters have been constantly maintained, and active correspondence carried on.

Reports are issued whenever our financial situation justifies, but we are glad at all times to supply such information as we have available to those requesting it.

There is no specific charge for our bulletins nor for any phase of our service. But if it is possible for you to give us any degree of financial help, we ask your cooperation. Such help is our only source of support.

Address all correspondence to the American Committee for Fair Play in China, 1218 Hearst Building, San Francisco, Calif.
Dear Friend:

The work of the American Committee for Fair Play in China continues to broaden, both in scope and diversity of service. Since June, 1925, we have arranged over fifty lectures at universities, clubs, and other institutions, distributed 36,000 copies of the seven bulletins published, and supplied special material for theses and college debates. Our correspondence now includes 22 countries. We have held ourselves ready at all times to speak out in the interest of sanity and fair dealing with China.

It is generally admitted that the moderate policy of the United States during the tense days last April, and the refusal to cooperate in an ultimatum against the Nationalist Government, were the result of active and widely expressed public opinion against such action. We believe that our organization performed a valuable service in helping to create that sentiment and in bringing it to the attention of our Government. In view of increasing political complications in China, patience and a friendly readiness to cooperate on the part of western peoples, are needed more than ever. To create and maintain this attitude is both possible and of the utmost importance.

We wish to intensify our work during the coming year, and have prepared a general program which will include the publication of five bulletins to be chosen from the subjects given below:

I. The History and Development of the Kuomintang Party
II. The Mass Education Movement
III. The Development of American Policy in China, and its Affect upon the Present Situation. (To include remarks on the influence of returned students.)
IV. The China Nobody Knows.
V. The Background and Rise of the Labor Movement in China
VI. The Pan-Asia Movement
VII. The Rise of Feminism in China
VIII. Foreign Trade in China. (To include a survey of the attitude of American business men towards the new order in China.)

(Please mark your preference on five out of these eight subjects and return to us.)

You who have assisted us and believe this work is of importance are urgently requested to give your financial support. The work has expanded until it is impossible to carry on without more adequate and dependable funds. 6000 people receive our bulletins; 225 have borne the entire financial burden. We have deeply appreciated the help they have given us and hope we may continue to receive it. But if we are to meet the new and increasing demands upon us we must have the cooperation of all who believe with us in the value and necessity of our activity.

This is a busy month and one full of personal interests. Nevertheless, we are writing to you and sending you this report, because it is ready, and we believe you want it now. And we ask that you help us, whether by contribution or pledge, to carry out the plans we have outlined. To publish these bulletins on a cost basis and carry on activities, will require about $2000. Generally shared this is a burden to no one.

Let us hear from you soon.

AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR FAIR PLAY IN CHINA,
1218 Hearst Building, San Francisco, Calif.

Please pin your check or contribution to this letter and mail to us.

☐ I enclose contribution of _______ towards the 1928 budget of the A.C.F.P.C.
☐ I pledge _______ towards the 1928 budget of the A.C.F.P.C. to be paid _______

Name ____________________________ Address ____________________________