

UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

UN LIBRARY  
UNITED NATIONS  
CENTRE FOR DISARMAMENT  
DEPARTMENT OF  
POLITICAL AND SECURITY COUNCIL AFFAIRS  
Reference Library  
UN/SC COLLECTION

UNRESTRICTED

A/AC.50/2 + Add.1 (Fr.)  
18 June 1951

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

HISTORICAL SURVEY OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS  
REGARDING THE QUESTION OF DISARMAMENT, 1920-1937

\*  
THE FRENCH DOCUMENT A/AC.50/2/ADD.1 CONTAINS THE  
ANNEXES FOUND IN PAGES 119 THROUGH 187 IN THE  
ENGLISH TEXT, COMPLETE IN DOCUMENT A/AC.50/2.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface by the Rapporteur . . . . .	8
Explanatory note. . . . .	9
Section I. General outline	
A. The Covenant provisions . . . . .	10
B. The Permanent Advisory Commission. . . . .	11
C. The Temporary Mixed Commission . . . . .	11
D. Relation between security and the reduction of armaments . . . . .	12
E. The Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference. . . . .	13
F. The Disarmament Conference . . . . .	14
Section II. First period, 1921-1924	
A. The work of the Temporary Mixed Commission	
1. Reduction of armaments. . . . .	16
2. Chemical and bacterial warfare. . . . .	17
3. Exchange of military information and statistics	
(a) Military statistics . . . . .	18
(b) Military information . . . . .	19
4. Private manufacture of arms and trade in arms	
(a) Prohibition of private manufacture . . . . .	21
(b) Relation between the manufacture of arms and the international trade in arms . . . . .	22
(c) Action of the League with respect to the control of the trade in arms . . . . .	23
5. Mutual assistance and disarmament	
(a) Resolution XIV of the Assembly . . . . .	25
(b) Lord Robert Cecil's draft treaty of mutual assistance. . . . .	27
(c) Colonel Roquin's draft . . . . .	28
(d) Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance. . . . .	29
(e) Attitudes of France, the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States . . . . .	30
B. The Draft Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International disputes (Geneva Protocol)	
1. Arbitration, security and reduction of armaments . . . . .	32
2. Determination of aggression . . . . .	33



	<u>Page</u>
3. Sanctions . . . . .	34
4. Relation between security and the reduction of armaments. .	35
5. The failure of the Geneva Protocol. . . . .	36
<b>Section III. Second period, 1923-1930</b>	
A. The Locarno Treaties . . . . .	37
B. The Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference	
1. Establishment of the Commission . . . . .	37
2. Terms of reference . . . . .	38
3. Definition of "armaments" . . . . .	38
4. Trained reserves and material in reserve. . . . .	39
5. Interdependence of armaments. . . . .	40
6. Definition of "reduction and limitation of armaments" . . .	41
7. Daily average of effectives . . . . .	41
8. Definition and classification of "defence expenditure". . .	42
9. "Trial model statement" of defence expenditure. . . . .	43
10. Chemical and bacterial warfare. . . . .	44
11. Supervision and control of armaments. . . . .	45
12. Exchange of military information. . . . .	46
C. The preliminary Draft Convention for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments	
1. General discussion . . . . .	46
2. United Kingdom draft convention . . . . .	47
3. French draft convention . . . . .	48
4. Discussion of the "synoptic analysis" of the drafts submitted by France and the United Kingdom. . . . .	50
5. USSR proposals	
(a) General statement by the USSR delegation . . . . .	51
(b) USSR Draft Convention for Immediate, Complete and General Disarmament . . . . .	53
(c) USSR Draft Convention for the Reduction of Armaments .	55
6. Resumption of the discussion on the draft convention	
(a) Chemical and bacterial warfare. . . . .	56
(b) Indirect limitation of war material. . . . .	57
(c) Adoption of the draft convention by the Preparatory Commission . . . . .	58

	<u>Page</u>
D. The problem of security	
1. Establishment of the Committee on Arbitration and Security . . . . .	59
2. The Committee's programme of work . . . . .	60
3. The memoranda of the Rapporteurs . . . . .	60
4. The model treaties . . . . .	61
E. The work of the League regarding the manufacture of and trade in arms	
1. The Conference of 1925. . . . .	63
2. Special committees . . . . .	65
Section IV. Third period, 1931-1937	
A. Armaments Truce . . . . .	67
B. Opening of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments . . . . .	67
1. Hearing of the petitions of non-governmental organizations. . . . .	68
2. General discussion in the Conference	
(a) Declaration of the United Kingdom delegation . . . . .	68
(b) Declaration of the French delegation . . . . .	69
(c) Declaration of the United States delegation. . . . .	69
(d) Declaration of the USSR delegation . . . . .	70
(e) Summary of the general discussion . . . . .	71
C. Organization and programme of work	
1. The organs of the Conference . . . . .	71
2. Terms of reference of principal organs. . . . .	71
D. Declarations and main proposals submitted by the delegations of France, the United Kingdom and the United States	
1. French proposals. . . . .	73
(a) Proposals of 5 February 1932 (internationalization of civil aviation, international police force, etc.). . . . .	73
(b) Proposals of 14 November 1932 and 17 February 1933 (organization of peace, standardization of armies of continental Europe) . . . . .	73
(c) Proposals of 8 June 1934 (regional security agreements) . . . . .	76

	<u>Page</u>
2. USSR proposals	
(a) Proposals of 19 February 1932 (immediate, general and complete disarmament, Draft Convention for the Reduction of Armaments) . . . . .	77
(b) Proposals of 25 April 1932 (factors for the reduction of armaments) . . . . .	79
(c) Proposals of 6 February 1933 (definition of aggression) . . . . .	80
(d) Proposals of 25 April 1933 (threats of breach of the Pact of Paris) . . . . .	82
(e) Proposals of 4 June 1934 (transformation of the Disarmament Conference into a permanent peace conference) . . . . .	82
3. United Kingdom proposals	
(a) Proposals of 22 February 1932 (qualitative disarmament) . . . . .	83
(b) Proposals of 30 January 1933 (programme of work) . . .	84
(c) Proposals of 16 March 1933 (draft convention) . . . . .	84
4. United States proposals	
(a) Proposals of 19 February 1932 (naval armaments and chemical warfare) . . . . .	87
(b) Proposals of 11 April 1932 (qualitative disarmament) .	87
(c) Proposals of 22 June 1932 (President Hoover's statement on the reduction of armaments) . . . . .	88
(d) Proposals of 19 May 1933 (President Roosevelt's Message on qualitative disarmament and a non-aggression pact) . . . . .	89
E. Basic decisions of the General Commission	
1. Criteria for the reduction and limitation of armaments adopted by the General Commission (11 April 1932) . . . . .	89
2. Resolution of 23 July 1932. . . . .	90
3. Resolutions of 27 March and 8 June 1933 . . . . .	93
F. Diplomatic negotiations relating to the work of the Conference	
1. First withdrawal of Germany from the Conference . . . . .	93
2. The President's negotiations on the provisional text of the United Kingdom draft convention . . . . .	94
3. Second withdrawal of Germany from the Conference. . . . .	95

	<u>Page</u>
G. Technical work of the Conference . . . . .	96
1. The problem of security . . . . .	97
2. Effectives . . . . .	97
(a) Military effectives . . . . .	97
(b) Police forces . . . . .	102
(c) Pre-military training and military training given outside the army . . . . .	104
3. Land material . . . . .	105
4. Naval material . . . . .	106
5. Air material . . . . .	106
6. National defence expenditure . . . . .	107
7. Chemical and bacterial warfare . . . . .	107
8. Manufacture of and trade in arms . . . . .	107
9. Exchange of information . . . . .	109
10. The Permanent Disarmament Commission . . . . .	110
11. Guarantees of execution . . . . .	111
12. Moral disarmament . . . . .	113
H. Last phase of the Conference	
1. General discussion on future work . . . . .	113
2. Statement of the President . . . . .	114
3. Statement of the United States delegation . . . . .	114
4. Statement of the USSR delegation . . . . .	115
5. Statement of the United Kingdom delegation . . . . .	116
6. Statement of the French delegation . . . . .	116
7. Resolution on future programme of work . . . . .	116
8. Modification of the programme of work . . . . .	117
I. Postponement of the Conference . . . . .	118

ANNEXES

I.	List of resolutions adopted by the Assembly of the League of Nations on the question of disarmament . . . . .	119
II.	List of principal resolutions adopted by the Council of the League of Nations on the question of disarmament . . . . .	131
III.	Chronology of developments of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments. . . . .	135
IV.	Annotated list of principal and subsidiary organs of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments . . . . .	140
V.	Annotated list of the principal proposals, draft conventions, reports, questionnaires and resolutions of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments . . . . .	146
VI.	Annotated list of the principal documents published by the League of Nations on the question of the reduction and limitation of armaments. . . . .	164

PREFACE BY THE RAPporteur

On 25 May, I reported to the fourth meeting of the Committee of Twelve on my discussions with the Secretariat and on the form which papers on the experience of the League of Nations in the field of disarmament, the preparation of which had been proposed in the Committee previously, could take. The Committee decided that the Secretariat, with my co-operation, should prepare and present the necessary paper or papers. The following historical survey was prepared after intensive study and on the basis of official documentation by the Secretariat, which for several years has given its attention to the problem of disarmament. In my view, the paper fulfils the purpose of introducing the reader to the problem of disarmament as it occupied the League during a crucial period of world history. The object has been to provide a general account of the League's work and a guide through the pertinent documents. I trust that the survey will contribute to a fuller understanding of the task of disarmament and of the difficulties with which every effort towards disarmament will be faced.

Dr. J.M.A.H. Luns

18 June 1951.

#### EXPLANATORY NOTE

This historical survey has been prepared by the Secretariat in co-operation with the Rapporteur pursuant to a decision taken at the fourth meeting of the Committee of Twelve (established by General Assembly resolution 496 (V)), on 25 May 1951. The activities of the League are divided into three periods: the first period, from 1921 to 1924, dealing principally with the work of the Temporary Mixed Commission; the second period, 1925-1930, dealing chiefly with the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference; and the third period, 1931-1937, devoted to the work of the Disarmament Conference.

The League of Nations and the various conferences organized by it devoted much time and effort to the question of disarmament; the records and documentation of this work are very extensive. As it was felt desirable to provide as concise a description as possible, the survey constitutes a selective account of the more important aspects of disarmament and does not pretend to treat the subject exhaustively. The survey presents a factual outline of the principal items and proposals considered by the various organs dealing with the question and of the declarations made by the representatives of certain great Powers concerning the policy of their governments with regard to disarmament. The presentation is based entirely on official documents of the League. No attempt has been made to evaluate the work or to appraise the policies and purposes of the participants.

Six annexes supplement the survey: a list of resolutions adopted by the Assembly of the League of Nations on the question of disarmament; a list of the principal resolutions adopted by the Council of the League of Nations on the question of disarmament; a chronology of developments of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments; an annotated list of the principal and subsidiary organs of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments; an annotated list of the principal proposals, draft conventions, reports, questionnaires and resolutions of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments; and an annotated list of the principal documents published by the League of Nations on the question of the reduction and limitation of armaments. These annexes will facilitate reference to the records of the meetings, the text of the proposals and all the material necessary for more detailed study. The League documents remain, of course, the authoritative source for the official views expressed on the question.

/HISTORICAL

# HISTORICAL SURVEY OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS REGARDING THE QUESTION OF DISARMAMENT, 1920-1937

## SECTION I. GENERAL OUTLINE

### A. The Covenant provisions

1. The League of Nations devoted approximately seventeen years of activity to the implementation of the provisions of the Covenant relating to the reduction and limitation of armaments.

Article 8 of the Covenant read as follows:

"1. The Members of the League recognize that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations.

"2. The Council, taking account of the geographical situation and circumstances of each State, shall formulate plans for such reduction for the consideration and action of the several governments:

"3. Such plans shall be subject to reconsideration and revision at least every ten years.

"4. After these plans shall have been adopted by the several governments, the limits of armaments therein fixed shall not be exceeded without the concurrence of the Council.

"5. The Members of the League agree that the manufacture by private enterprise of munitions and implements of war is open to grave objections. The Council shall advise how the evil effects attendant upon such manufacture can be prevented, due regard being had to the necessities of those Members of the League which are not able to manufacture the munitions and implements of war necessary for their safety.

"6. The Members of the League undertake to interchange full and frank information as to the scale of their armaments, their military, naval and air programmes and the condition of such of their industries as are adaptable to warlike purposes."



Article 9 of the Covenant read as follows:

"A permanent commission shall be constituted to advise the Council on the execution of the provisions of Articles 1 and 8 and on military, naval and air questions generally."<sup>1/</sup>

B. The Permanent Advisory Commission

2. On 19 May 1920, the Council of the League, pursuant to Article 9, established a Permanent Advisory Commission for Military, Naval and Air Questions, which was composed of representatives of the General Staffs of the countries members of the Council. The Commission created three sub-committees to deal with military, naval and air problems, respectively. While the Permanent Advisory Commission was constituted to advise the Council on military, naval and air questions, its main function was to collaborate with other organs of the League on the technical aspect of the disarmament problem.

C. The Temporary Mixed Commission

3. On 14 December 1920, the First Assembly of the League, considering that the question of disarmament was not a purely technical one, adopted a resolution inviting the Council to create a new commission. In accordance with that resolution, the Council established, on 25 February 1921, the Temporary Mixed Commission, and instructed it to prepare for submission to the Council proposals for the reduction of armaments, as provided for in Article 8 of the Covenant. The Temporary Mixed Commission appointed by the Council was composed as follows: six persons of recognized competence in political, social and economic matters; six members of the Permanent Advisory Commission for Military, Naval and Air Questions; four members of the Provisional Economic and Financial Committee of the League; six members of the Governing Body of the

---

<sup>1/</sup> Paragraph 2 of Article 1, dealing with the question of the election of new Members of the League of Nations, contained the following proviso:

"... provided that it [the applicant] shall give effective guarantees of its sincere intention to observe its international obligations, and shall accept such regulations as may be prescribed by the League in regard to its military, naval and air forces and armaments".

International Labour Office, three employers' representatives and three workmen's representatives. In March 1922, the Council appointed seven additional members especially qualified for this work.

4. The Temporary Mixed Commission set up three sub-committees; the First Sub-Committee, to study questions relating to the private manufacture of and trade in arms, ammunition and war material; the Second Sub-Committee, to deal with the right of investigation under the provisions of the peace treaties concerning the disarmament of defeated countries, and with the reciprocal control of the information submitted by the Members of the League in accordance with Article 8 of the Covenant; and the Third Sub-Committee, to collect statistics regarding the state of the armaments of various countries.

D. Relation between security and the reduction of armaments

5. During the period 1921-1924, the Temporary Mixed Commission devoted most of its time to the question of the relationship between security and the reduction of armaments. It prepared the Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance which was not adopted by the Assembly of the League. In addition, the Commission considered the following specific topics: reduction of national defence expenditure; private manufacture of and trade in armaments; chemical warfare; and armaments statistics.

6. The Third Committee of the Assembly dealt with the question of the reduction of armaments and in that capacity reviewed the work of the Temporary Mixed Committee. In 1924, in collaboration with the First Committee of the Assembly, it prepared the Draft Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes (Geneva Protocol), the acceptance of which was unanimously recommended by the Assembly in 1924, but which did not come into force.

7. After the failure of the Mutual Assistance Treaty and of the Geneva Protocol, and after the conclusion of the Locarno Treaties in 1925, the Assembly of the League took steps to initiate the holding of an international conference on disarmament. To that end, the sixth Assembly of the League, 1925, requested the Council to make a preparatory study with a view to holding an international conference for the reduction and limitation of armaments. On 12 December 1925, the Council constituted the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, and drew up a questionnaire to serve as its terms of reference.

E. The Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference

8. The Preparatory Commission, which was a central body for the preparation of the Conference, established two Sub-Commissions (A and B) composed of experts from each of the countries represented on the Commission. Sub-Commission A dealt with military questions, while Sub-Commission B considered economic and financial aspects of disarmament. Special committees were created to deal with various specific questions. The Committee of the Council was entrusted with the co-ordination of the work of the Preparatory Commission.

9. The Preparatory Commission held six sessions, the first in May 1926 and the last in December 1930. Its work began with the study of the Council's questionnaire under the five headings of effectives, material, budgetary expenditure, chemical warfare and miscellaneous provisions. Then followed the consideration of the Draft Disarmament Conventions submitted by the delegations of the United Kingdom and France.

10. In 1927, the Preparatory Commission was invited by the Assembly to consider "the measures capable of giving all States the necessary guarantees of arbitration and security". A special Arbitration and Security Committee was created by the Preparatory Commission on 30 November 1927, and in order to meet the requirements of different governments, the Committee drew up the following draft conventions: General Convention for the Pacific Settlement of all International Disputes (Convention A); General Convention for Judicial Settlement, Arbitration and Conciliation (Convention B); General Conciliation Convention (Convention C); Bilateral Convention for the Pacific Settlement of all International Disputes (Convention a); Bilateral Convention for Judicial Settlement, Arbitration and Conciliation (Convention b); Bilateral Conciliation Convention (Convention c); Collective Treaty of Mutual Assistance (Treaty D); Collective Treaty of Non-Aggression (Treaty E); Bilateral Treaty of Non-Aggression (Treaty F). The Arbitration and Security Committee also participated in the preparation of the General Convention to Improve the Means of Preventing War and of the Convention on Financial Assistance. The three general conventions (A, B and C) were combined by the Assembly in a single instrument on 28 September 1928, namely, the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.

11. The Preparatory Commission concluded its work in 1930 with the submission to the Council of a draft convention and a final report containing a commentary on the text of the draft convention and the reservations formulated by the delegations during the discussion of the draft.

12. The completion of the work of the Preparatory Commission made it possible for the Council to consider the convocation of a general conference for the reduction and limitation of armaments. During its 62nd session in January 1931, the Council adopted a resolution requesting the Secretary-General to transmit the draft convention and the report of the Preparatory Commission to the governments and convening the Disarmament Conference to meet at Geneva on 2 February 1932.

F. The Disarmament Conference

13. Sixty-one States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America and other non-members of the League, attended the Conference. The principal organs of the Conference were the Bureau and the General Commission. The striking feature of the method of work adopted by the Conference was the large number over forty of organs created by the Bureau and the General Commission.<sup>1a/</sup> Five principal commissions were created, namely, the Land, Naval, Air, National Defence Expenditure and Political Commissions. Subsequently, a number of committees and sub-committees were set up. Nine different organs dealt with various aspects of effectives; eleven commissions and committees studied the question of land, naval and air armaments; six organs dealt with the question of the manufacture of and trade in armaments.

14. For more than three years, the different organs of the Conference considered the following items:

Security (general undertakings concerning security; undertaking not to resort to force; definition of aggression; procedure for the establishment of facts constituting aggression; mutual assistance);

Effectives;

---

<sup>1a/</sup> See annex IV below.

Land, naval and air material;

National defence expenditure;

Chemical and bacterial warfare;

Control of the manufacture of and trade in armaments;

Exchange of information;

Permanent Disarmament Commission (supervision and guarantee of execution);

Moral disarmament.

15. The Conference, like the Preparatory Commission, devoted most of its time to the solution of various technical questions relating to land, naval and air armaments and armed forces. Except for the General Commission, the Bureau, the Political Commission and a few committees dealing with the questions of moral disarmament, guarantees of execution and security, all other organs of the Conference dealt with technical questions.

16. Prior to 16 March 1933, the draft convention submitted by the Preparatory Commission served as the basis of discussion in the Conference. Thereafter, a draft convention of 96 articles submitted by the United Kingdom delegation on that date was adopted as the basis of discussion, passed the first reading on 30 May, and was accepted as the basis for the future convention on 8 June. On 22 September 1933, a provisional text was prepared showing the amendments, declarations and observations offered by various delegations.

17. The Conference never reached the stage of a second reading of the draft convention because, as the President of the Conference reported, the divergencies between the Powers principally concerned could not be cleared up. On 22 January 1936, the Council of the League decided to postpone the further convocation of the Conference.

## SECTION II. FIRST PERIOD, 1921-1924

### A. The work of the Temporary Mixed Commission

18. The Temporary Mixed Commission, established by the Council on 25 February 1921, considered the following principal topics: Lord Esher's plan for the reduction of armaments; chemical and bacterial warfare; exchange of information and military statistics; private manufacture of arms and trade in arms; mutual assistance.

#### 1. Reduction of armaments

19. The first concrete proposal for the reduction of armaments considered by the Temporary Mixed Commission was that submitted by Lord Esher (United Kingdom). That proposal, which suggested a definite scale of reduction of peace effectives to be adopted by the various governments of Europe, was based on a fixed ratio of standing military and air forces. The proposal was examined by a sub-committee appointed by the Temporary Mixed Commission as well as by the Permanent Advisory Commission. The sub-committee and the Commission itself came to the conclusion, which was also that of the Permanent Advisory Commission, that in the actual form in which they were presented, Lord Esher's proposals could not be recommended for adoption on the ground that the effectives of armed forces did not constitute the only factor to be taken into consideration, and that other factors, such as war material and military expenditure, must also be included in any scheme for the reduction of armaments.

20. In its report to the Assembly on 7 September 1922, the Temporary Mixed Commission laid down a number of principles to the effect that the limitation of armaments must be based on peace-time strength, bearing in mind the essential factors on which such strength was based, which included not only effectives but other elements as well.

21. In the report it presented to the Assembly on 22 September 1922, the Third Committee approved the principles laid down by the Temporary Mixed Commission, but expressed the belief that the Commission should work out its principles in more detail and should elaborate the method by which they could be applied in the framing of an agreement for the reduction of armaments. Consequently the Third Committee recommended, for adoption by

/the

the Assembly, a resolution instructing the Temporary Mixed Commission to continue its investigations on the basis of these principles, with a view to preparing for the consideration of the following Assembly a definite scheme for the general reduction of land and air armaments.

2. Chemical and bacterial warfare

22. In 1921, the Assembly suggested that the Temporary Mixed Commission should examine the question whether any useful purpose could be served by inviting the scientists of the world to publish their discoveries relating to chemical warfare. It was believed that that proposal, if acted upon, might minimize the danger that chemical discoveries would be utilized for aggression. The Temporary Mixed Commission, however, came to the conclusion that such a suggestion could serve no useful purpose, on the ground that no treaty could prevent secret preparations for chemical warfare.

23. In its report to the Assembly on 22 September 1922, the Third Committee, while adopting the view of the Temporary Mixed Commission on that matter, considered the study of the development of chemical warfare and of its probable effect in any future war as a matter of vital interest. On the suggestion of the Commission, the Assembly adopted a resolution approving the action of the Temporary Mixed Commission in establishing a special sub-committee to report on that subject. A second resolution adopted by the Assembly requested the Council to recommend that Members of the League and other nations should give their adherence to the Treaty of Washington of 6 February 1922 "in relation to the use of asphyxiating gas and submarines in war and other similar matters".

24. The special sub-committee created by the Temporary Mixed Commission in 1923 decided to enlarge the scope of its inquiry so as to include bacterial warfare and it presented its report to the Temporary Mixed Commission in 1924. The report, based on replies to the questionnaire forwarded to different experts, included two chapters, one devoted to chemical warfare and the other to bacterial warfare.

25. The question of chemical and bacterial warfare was further considered by the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference,<sup>2/</sup>

<sup>2/</sup> See paragraphs 113 to 116, in section II below.

### 3. Exchange of military information and statistics

#### (a) Military statistics

26. In a resolution adopted by the first Assembly in 1920, it was recognized that, while the final and general limitation of armaments was subordinate to certain preliminary conditions, the first step towards disarmament should, nevertheless, be taken without delay. The Temporary Mixed Commission, considering that the ascertaining of the military strength of different States was one of the preliminary conditions for the final and general limitation of armaments, decided to carry out a statistical investigation on the armaments of the various countries for the years 1913-1921.

27. Under the direction of the Temporary Mixed Commission, the Secretariat prepared the "Statistical Enquiry on Armaments, First Series of Data", and the "Budget Expenditure on National Defence, 1913 and 1920-1922".

28. The Third Committee, in the report it presented to the Assembly on 22 September 1922, took the views that the "Statistical Enquiry on Armaments" was of great scientific interest, but of no practical value to the subsequent work of the Temporary Mixed Commission. The Committee found that the national security of each country depended very largely on the existing military strength of other countries. It therefore proposed to the Assembly that the subject of the statistical inquiry should be the existing military strength. While expressing the view that potential military strength should perhaps be studied at a later date, it proposed that for the time being the investigation should be limited to the two following points: peace-time armaments and expenditure on armaments.

29. As a result of the resolution adopted by the Assembly, the Temporary Mixed Commission forwarded to the Members of the League, on 1 March 1923, a questionnaire drawn up by the Permanent Advisory Commission including items relating to their actual peace-time armaments. The replies received from twenty-five countries were condensed in a single report, under the title of "Statistical Enquiry into National Armaments - Part I, Peace-time Military, Naval and Air Force (1923)", and were submitted to the fourth Assembly in 1923. That report included, in addition, a short survey of the system of recruiting in each country, drawn up by the Secretariat from official documents.



30. The statistical tables included detail data relating to the strength of land, naval and air forces; the number of war vessels according to their categories and tonnage; the number and various categories of aircraft; and war material in service in the units (such as rifles, machine-guns, guns, tanks). At the same time, the Commission presented the second part of the statistical inquiry under the title: "Statistical Enquiry into National Armaments - Part II, Budget Expenditure on National Defence, 1921-1923".

31. The method of questionnaires initiated by the Temporary Mixed Commission was not resumed until 1931, the year which preceded the convocation of the Disarmament Conference. The Temporary Mixed Commission was somewhat disappointed with the result of the inquiry; the Secretariat received replies from only twenty-five of the fifty-four Members of the League in 1923, and twenty-one of those Members were European countries.

(b) Military information

32. In accordance with the Assembly resolution of 27 September 1922 concerning the exchange of military information between States, the Temporary Mixed Commission suggested on 15 August 1923 that:

"The engagements undertaken by the signatories of the Covenant in the last paragraph of Article 8 might now be begun by giving instructions to the Secretariat periodically to publish a year-book containing a certain number of data regarding the matters referred to in the last paragraph of Article 8".

33. Pursuant to that suggestion, the Council adopted a resolution authorizing the Secretariat to publish a year-book beginning with an experimental volume dealing with the figures for 1923, it being understood that the information would be drawn solely from official publications. The objectives aimed at in the exchange of information were summarized by the Commission in its report for 1923. "Article 8 of the Covenant", declared the Commission, "was not drawn up with a view to facilitating the work of general staffs. Its object was to improve the political atmosphere by creating confidence". The Commission also considered that the exchange of information "would render it possible to nip in the bud any campaign started by an alarmist Press and based upon the armaments of countries considered as potential enemies".

34. The first edition of the Armaments Year-Book was published in September 1924, and the last in May 1940. The first volume contained information on thirty-six countries, including all the great Powers, Members and non-members of the League. The next edition included practically all the countries of the world, Members and non-members of the League, all Colonies, Protectorates and Mandated Territories.

35. The information published in the Armaments Year-Books included for most countries the following: main characteristics of their armed forces; organs of military command and administration; organization and composition of permanent and non-permanent land, naval and air forces; police and para-military forces; recruiting system and period of service; cadres; effectives; budgetary expenditure on national defence; list of naval units (number, categories and technical characteristics). The Year-Book included two annexes. Annex I contained the military agreements concluded between various countries for the reciprocal limitation of their armaments (reduction of effectives; limitation of naval forces; demilitarized zones, etc.) as well as the military clauses of the peace treaties established after the end of the First World War. Annex II included statistical and summary tables giving the chief characteristics of the armies of the different countries; male population by age groups; summary of naval units classified by the age of vessels. The collaboration with governments recommended by the Commission and endorsed by the Council developed in the course of time, until eventually about forty of the sixty governments listed in the Year-Book were supplying information to the Secretariat.

36. A resolution adopted by the Council in 1931 requested the Secretariat to prepare a special edition of the Armaments Year-Book for the use of the Disarmament Conference. That edition was based not only on official publications of various governments but also on their replies to a special questionnaire approved by the Council relating to the numerical strength of their respective forces.

37. At the request of the Temporary Mixed Commission, the Secretariat also published regularly a year-book containing statistical information on the trade in arms, ammunition and implements of war. That request was

made in connexion with the view expressed by the Temporary Mixed Commission, as early as 1921, "that it was imperative to establish a control over the export and import of arms and implements of war, and that it was essential for the League of Nations to receive complete information as to the extent and character of the trade in arms". The Year-Book on the Trade in Arms, Ammunition and Implements of War included statistical information on practically all States, Colonies, Protectorates and other territories of the world. The tables contained data on exports and imports of arms and ammunition by categories and according to countries of destination or of origin. The monographs were prepared by the Secretariat on the basis of official publications, and not as a result of any questionnaires.

4. Private manufacture of arms and trade in arms

(a) Prohibition of private manufacture

38. The Temporary Mixed Commission devoted much time to the study of the question of private manufacture of arms and trade in arms.

39. It must be recalled that paragraph 5 of Article 8 of the Covenant stated that:

"The Members of the League agree that the manufacture by private enterprise of munitions and implements of war is open to grave objections. The Council shall advise how the evil effects attendant upon such manufacture can be prevented, due regard being had to the necessities of those Members of the League which are not able to manufacture the munitions and implements of war necessary for their safety."

40. The Temporary Mixed Commission referred the question of the private manufacture of arms to Sub-Committee I and the conclusions of its work were presented in the Commission's report on 15 September 1921. The principal alternatives discussed by the Sub-Committee were the prohibition and national control (by means of licenses) of the private manufacture of war materials. Sub-Committee I was unable to reach a conclusion on the merits of those alternatives, but made the following observations: first, the prohibition of the private manufacture of munitions and implements of war would result in the nationalization of private enterprise, but the Covenant dealt with private manufacture only in so far as it affected the armaments race and the relations between States, not in so far as it affected the domestic industrial systems; secondly, the abolition of the private manufacture of

arms and ammunition would be objectionable to States which do not produce all the munitions that they need and, furthermore, the non-producing States would be forced to manufacture munitions to meet their own needs; thirdly, most of the great armaments enterprises do not produce war material only, but in normal times are chiefly engaged in production for peaceful purposes; finally, it was difficult to define the term, war industries.

41. A number of suggestions for the control of private manufacture were considered by the Sub-Committee. They concerned chiefly the system of licenses to be administered by governments of exporting or importing countries.

42. The Temporary Mixed Commission, in its report of 15 September 1921, did not put forward any general conclusion concerning the desirability or the possibility of prohibiting the private manufacture of arms; it suggested, however, that it might be more practicable to secure a strict control of the private manufacture of arms without proceeding to absolute prohibition.

43. The Third Committee of the Assembly, in the report it presented to the Assembly on 27 September 1921, included a recommendation, in accordance with the proposal of the Temporary Mixed Commission, to invite Members and non-members of the League to take part in an international conference on the private manufacture of and trade in arms.

44. The Temporary Mixed Commission continued, during 1924, to consider the question of the private manufacture of arms, but was unable to reach an agreement on that question. Majority and minority reports were presented to the Assembly. The former favoured national control by means of licensing while the latter sought the absolute prohibition of the private manufacture of arms, munitions and implements of war. The minority pointed out that even in a spirit of conciliation they would not be prepared to accept less than a system of international control of private manufacture.

(b) Relation between the manufacture of arms and the international trade in arms

45. During the discussion of the private manufacture of arms in the Temporary Mixed Commission, the question of the relation between the problem of the manufacture of arms and that of the international traffic in arms arose. In

/that

that connexion, the Third Committee shared the view expressed by the Temporary Mixed Commission in its report to the Assembly of 22 September 1922, that while the Temporary Mixed Commission should elaborate a draft convention on the private manufacture of arms to be submitted to the proposed international conference, it was evident that such a conference could not be summoned "until a definite programme of action in connexion with arms traffic has been agreed upon".

(c) Action of the League with respect to the control of the trade in arms

46. After the end of the First World War, the question of the international traffic in arms was considered at the Peace Conference in Paris and, on 10 September 1919, a Convention for the Control of the Trade in Arms and Ammunition was signed at St. Germain, France, by twenty-three countries, including France, the United Kingdom and the United States. By that convention it was agreed to extend the scope of the treaty of 2 July 1890 (Brussels Act) regulating the traffic in arms in certain regions. The Convention of 1919 was intended to prohibit the exports of certain specifically listed arms unless export licenses were issued by the interested contracting parties. The Convention also included provisions relating to imports of arms and ammunition into certain prohibited areas (Africa, with the exception of Algeria, Lybia and the Union of South Africa; Transcaucasia, Persia, Arabian Peninsula, the maritime zone of the Red Sea, the Gulf of Aden, the Persian Gulf, etc.). For the import of arms and ammunition into those areas, special licenses had to be issued. Article 23 of the Convention specified that the contracting parties "will use their best endeavours to secure the accession to the present Convention of other Members of the League of Nations".

47. On 8 March 1921, the Secretary-General of the League addressed a circular letter to governments signatories and non-signatories of the Convention, transmitting to them the resolution of the Assembly of 14 December 1920 urging all governments to ratify the Convention and to adhere to it. On 21 November 1921, the Secretary-General of the League addressed a letter to the United States Government inquiring, in the name of the Council, whether the Government of the United States was prepared to ratify the Convention of

/St. Germain.

St. Germain. In his reply of 28 July 1922, the Secretary of State declared that "while the Government of the United States is in cordial sympathy with efforts to restrict traffic in arms and munitions of war, it finds itself unable to approve the provisions of the Convention and to give any assurance of its ratification".

48. In its report to the third Assembly, in 1922 the Third Committee declared that in reply to the Secretary-General's letters, thirty-four governments had expressed their views on the subject, eleven governments had actually ratified the Convention, and four others had expressed their willingness to adhere to it.

49. On 1 May 1923, the Acting President of the Council of the League of Nations addressed a letter to the Secretary of State of the United States to inform him that the Permanent Advisory Commission and the Temporary Mixed Commission on the reduction of armaments had come to the conclusion that the two problems of private manufacture of arms and the international control of the arms traffic "were too closely connected to be dealt with separately, and that the solution of both had to be sought at the same time and by the same methods". He added that "the third Assembly considers it highly desirable that the Government of the United States should express the objections which it has to formulate to the provisions of the Convention of St. Germain, as well as any proposals which it may care to make as to the way in which these objections can be overcome".

50. In a letter addressed to the Council of the League on 12 September 1923, the Secretary of State formulated certain objections of the United States Government to the provisions of the Convention of St. Germain, and finally declared that "the provisions of the Convention relating to the League of Nations are so intertwined with the whole Convention as to make it impracticable for this Government to ratify in view of the fact that it is not a Member of the League of Nations".

51. On 18 December 1923, the Acting President of the Council informed the Secretary of State that the Assembly had recommended to the Temporary Mixed Commission the preparation of a new convention or conventions to replace that of St. Germain for the control of the traffic in arms, and that the

Council invited the Government of the United States to co-operate with the Temporary Mixed Commission on that subject. The United States Government acceded to the request expressed by the Council of the League to participate in the meetings of the Temporary Mixed Commission. The Commission adopted as a basis for its work the Convention of St. Germain, which was amended and completed in order to facilitate the adherence of the United States to the future convention.

52. The final draft Convention for the Control of the International Trade in Arms, Munitions and Implements of War, prepared by the Temporary Mixed Commission with technical advice from the Permanent Advisory Commission, was adopted by the Commission in July 1924, and included six chapters. Chapter 1 was devoted to a definition of arms, munitions and implements of war to be controlled for the purposes of international trade. Chapter 2 contained provisions concerning export and transit of arms, munitions and implements of war. Chapter 3 contained provisions on the import of arms, munitions and implements of war, and provisions on special licenses for the import of arms into certain zones. Chapter 4 and 5 were devoted to land and maritime supervision respectively. Chapter 6 included a number of general provisions.

53. The classification of arms and munitions prepared by the Permanent Advisory Commission included three categories of arms: arms and munitions exclusively designed for land, sea and aerial warfare; arms and munitions capable of being used both for military and other purposes; arms and munitions having no military value. Control was based on a system of licences for the export of arms, munitions and implements of war not prohibited by international law. Special licences for the import of arms were established for certain territorial and maritime zones to be defined further.

5. Mutual assistance and disarmament

(a) Resolution XIV of the Assembly

54. Resolution XIV, adopted by the Assembly on 27 September 1922, may be considered as the root of the Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance. The resolution was based on the previous work of the Temporary Mixed Commission,

/which

which had been entrusted by the Council, in accordance with resolution III of the first Assembly, adopted on 14 December 1920, "to prepare for submission to the Council, in the near future, reports and proposals for the reduction of armaments as provided for by Article 8 of the Covenant".

55. In 1922, the Temporary Mixed Commission was able to lay before the third Assembly the general principles which, after discussion, became resolution XIV. The main feature of that resolution was the close relation between security and reduction of armaments which it established.

56. The resolution included the following four articles:

"1. No scheme for the reduction of armaments, within the meaning of Article 8 of the Covenant, can be fully successful unless it is general.

"2. In the present state of the world, many governments would be unable to accept the responsibility for a serious reduction of armaments unless they received in exchange a satisfactory guarantee of the safety of their country.

"3. Such a guarantee can be found in a defensive agreement which should be open to all countries, binding them to provide immediate and effective assistance in accordance with a pre-arranged plan in the event of one of them being attacked, provided that the obligation to render assistance to a country attacked shall be limited in principle to those countries situated in the same part of the globe. In cases, however, where, for historical, geographical, or other reasons, a country is in special danger of attack, detailed arrangements should be made for its defence in accordance with the above-mentioned plan.

"4. As a general reduction of armaments is the object of the three preceding statements, and the Treaty of Mutual Guarantee the means of achieving that object, previous consent to this reduction is therefore the first condition for the Treaty..."

57. Following its adoption, resolution XIV was considered by the various organs charged with the study of the problem of disarmament. In the first place, the Permanent Advisory Commission considered the general principles of resolution XIV and drew up a report thereon. After examining that report, Lord Robert Cecil submitted a draft treaty, which was considered by the Temporary Mixed Commission at its February session. The draft was afterwards discussed by the Permanent Advisory Commission and by a Special Committee



of the Temporary Mixed Commission; another draft, prepared by Lieutenant-Colonel Requin, was also laid before the Permanent Advisory Commission and the same Special Committee. Finally, the Commission prepared a draft which was accepted by the majority of the Special Committee. That majority included the authors of the two original drafts. The opinions of all those bodies were reproduced in the report submitted by the Temporary Mixed Commission on 30 August 1923.

58. The principal differences of view turned on the question whether the guarantees in exchange for which States were to agree to disarm should be, in the main, general guarantees or should include specific and particular undertakings of mutual assistance between interested States as well.

(b) Lord Robert Cecil's draft treaty of mutual assistance

59. The text of the draft submitted to the Permanent Advisory Committee and included in the report of the Temporary Mixed Commission of 30 August 1923 was based mainly on the principle of a general treaty. Article 1 of the draft stated that if any one of the signatories was attacked, "all the others will forthwith take such action as they may respectively have agreed to take in accordance with this Treaty and any treaty supplementary hereto, provided that this obligation shall be conditional upon the reduction of the military forces of the party attacked". The action agreed was economic and financial blockade and military assistance. The military assistance was to be under the general command of the State entrusted by the Council with the organization of the military measures against an aggressor. The signatories were also to agree to maintain at the disposal of such military command an agreed proportion of not less than one-quarter of its naval and air forces.

60. In addition, the draft provided for special supplementary treaties in the form of military conventions. According to article 5 they were to be negotiated by the Council, but only if the latter, by not less than a three-fourths majority, was of the opinion that there was reasonable ground for thinking that the military or other preparations or actions of another State constituted a menace to the applying State or that the latter was in a position of peculiar danger.

61. The Permanent Advisory Commission, while regarding the combination of general and partial treaties as a happy one, was of the opinion that "from a military, naval and air point of view, Lord Robert Cecil's draft does not constitute a solid basis for the scheme for the limitation of armaments". The main reasons given were, first, that no State would have any certainty of immediate effective assistance pre-arranged in advance against invasion; secondly, that such pre-arrangements among an unlimited number of States were technically impossible even if States were willing to draw up plans for their own conquest; thirdly, that it was not possible to establish adequate controls of the readiness of the parties to carry out their military assistance obligations through the maintenance of the necessary minimum scale of armaments and, fourthly, that there were in the conception of a "general military command".

(c) Colonel Requin's draft

62. Colonel Requin's draft also provided for the combination of a general agreement and partial agreements, as suggested by resolution XIV. The general agreement would organize general measures of assistance, partial agreements freely negotiated by such States as felt in need of them were intended to establish defensive groups in order "to bring immediate and effective assistance in accordance with a pre-arranged plan". Such partial agreements were to be registered. States bound by partial agreements were to be under obligation to carry out the reduction which they considered to be proportionate to the guarantees afforded by the Treaty. States bound only by the general treaty would reduce their armaments "to the extent to which they are enabled to do so by the confidence which they feel in that assistance".

63. The opinion of the Permanent Advisory Commission was that "the draft submitted by Colonel Requin conformed within its limits to Assembly resolution XIV". The Commission added that the draft "embodies in a general sense the principles considered essential by the Permanent Advisory Commission" and that it provided "a hopeful basis for the elaboration of a scheme of mutual assistance leading to a reduction of armaments". The minority of the

/Commission,

Commission, composed of the Italian, Japanese and Spanish delegations, was of the opinion that the partial treaties "would lead to the formation of military coalitions and would thus, instead of facilitating the reduction of armaments, render it more difficult".

(d). Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance

64. The Temporary Mixed Commission drew up a compromise draft, since neither the Cecil nor the Requin text was deemed satisfactory. This formed the basis for a draft submitted by the Third Committee of the Assembly on 27 September 1923. The principal novelty in the Temporary Mixed Commission's draft, which was carried over into the Third Committee's text, was the provision (article 7) requiring partial treaties to be examined by the Council with a view to determining whether they were consonant with the Covenant and the general treaty.

65. The Third Committee pointed out that the foundation of the rule upon which the Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance was based was the principle of interdependence between guarantees and disarmament. But the Committee immediately added that "this rule is merely the result of practical experience, and is in no way the expression of a legal principle". This clarification was necessary because certain members of the Third Committee raised an objection founded upon the Covenant "and supported by the undeniable fact that the States signatories of the Covenant undertook to effect reductions in armaments without any question of guarantees other than those of the Covenant".

66. The draft treaty began with a declaration condemning all wars of aggression. Article 1, which declared that "aggressive war is an international crime", constituted a pact of non-aggression. Provisions of general assistance were embodied in articles 2 to 5 and those concerning complementary agreements of mutual defence in articles 6 to 8. Article 9 provided for negotiation through the Council of treaties for the establishment of demilitarized zones between neighbouring countries. Article 10 provided that the cost of assistance operations "shall be borne by the aggressor State up to the extreme limits of its financial capacity". Articles 11 to 13, which contained the consequent provisions for disarmament, provided

/that

that each State would estimate and communicate to the Council the reduction which it could effect in its armaments by virtue of the operation of the general and/or special treaties.

67. Article 4 provided that the Council was to determine, within four days of notification to the Secretary-General of the outbreak of hostilities, which party was the object of aggression and entitled to claim the assistance provided under the treaty. No criteria of aggression were laid down by reason of the difficulties of definition described in the "Commentary on the Definition of the Case of Aggression" which accompanied the Third Committee's report and which the Assembly was asked to communicate to the Members of the League.

68. The report of the Committee included also observations made by the Committee of Jurists on the text of the draft drawn up by the Temporary Mixed Commission. A large number of those observations were adopted by the Third Committee.

(e) Attitudes of France, the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States

69. In conformity with the resolution adopted by the fourth Assembly in September 1923, the Secretary-General circulated to Members and non-members of the League, for their consideration, the report of the Third Committee, including the Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance and other appropriate documents. Twenty-five countries sent replies to the Secretary-General.

70. The objections most frequently raised against the treaty were connected mainly with the question of the interrelation between the guarantees offered and the reduction of armaments, the question of partial treaties embodied in the Treaty of Mutual Assistance, and the question of the determination of aggression by the Council.

71. Certain governments pointed out that the treaty did not render sufficiently precise the reduction of armaments and that, though primarily intended to implement Article 8 of the Covenant, it did not secure its automatic execution. Moreover, the proposed system of partial agreements resembled, in their opinion, the military alliances which had existed

/previously.

previously. Finally, they emphasized the danger that the rule of unanimity might paralyze the Council's power to designate an aggression.

72. The French Government, in its reply of 19 August 1924, unreservedly approved the combination of the two forms of assistance, individual and general, embodied in the Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance. They also approved the combination of mutual assistance with the reduction or limitation of armaments. The French Government rejected the argument that there was a similarity between the partial guarantee treaties and the old type of alliance, on the ground that the first were open to adherence by other States, while the latter had been secret and limited.

73. In its reply dated 5 July 1924, the United Kingdom Government wondered whether the provisions for mutual assistance included in the treaty could be considered as sufficiently effective to justify a State reducing its armaments, the effectiveness of the scheme being dependent on the ability of the Council to determine by a unanimous vote which nation was the aggressor. The United Kingdom Government also wondered whether the obligations to be undertaken towards other States were such that the nations of the world could conscientiously engage to carry them out. Finally, the United Kingdom Government supported the criticism made by other States of the partial treaties, which were likely to bring about the formation of competing groups and result in the reappearance of the former system of alliances and counter-alliances and bring the signatories of such treaties into conflict with the Council.

74. The USSR Government, in its reply of 12 March 1924, considered that it was perfectly possible to fix the maximum strength of standing armies in each country without first having to settle the extremely complicated question of an international organization for the prevention of wars. The Soviet Union Government was of the opinion that the whole system of interdependence between disarmament and the treaty of guarantees merely delayed the realization of the immediate object, namely, the general limitation of armaments, which, in its opinion, was both feasible and practical in itself.

75. Without attempting an analysis of the provisions included in the draft treaty, the Government of the United States pointed out that since the fundamental principle was to provide guarantees of mutual assistance under the authority of the Council of the League of Nations, and since the United States was not a Member of the League of Nations, the United States Government would find it impossible to give its adherence to the treaty.

B. The Draft Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes (Geneva Protocol)

1. Arbitration, security and reduction of armaments

76. On 1 October 1924, a combined report of the First and Third Committees was presented to the fifth Assembly of the League. The report reviewed the objections to the Treaty of Mutual Assistance raised in the replies of various governments or in the statements made by delegates to the Assembly. Reviewing the previous history of the question, the report pointed out that in 1922 there had been a unanimous desire to reduce armaments and a still stronger desire to ensure the security of the world. Those attitudes gave rise at the third Assembly to resolution XIV, and at the fourth Assembly to the Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance, "for which we are now substituting the protocol submitted to the Fifth Assembly".

77. The Report of the two Committees was divided into two parts: the first dealing with the question of compulsory arbitration, and the second with that of security and the reduction of armaments.

78. The principle of compulsory arbitration, which was the cornerstone of the draft protocol, was emphasized by the Rapporteur of the First Committee in the following terms:

"It became evident, however, with greater clearness and force than ever before, that if the security and effective assistance demanded in the event of aggression was the condition sine qua non of the reduction of armaments, it was at the same time the necessary complement of the pacific settlement of international disputes, since the non-execution of a sentence obtained by pacific methods of settlement would necessarily drive the world back to the system of armed force. Sentences

/imperatively

imperatively required sanctions or the whole system would fall to the ground. Arbitration was therefore considered by the fifth Assembly to be the necessary third factor, the complement of the two others with which it must be combined in order to build up the new system set forth in the protocol."

79. The addition of arbitration to the earlier formula of security and disarmament was designed to close the gaps in the Covenant, which did not condemn all kinds of war. The protocol would have prohibited all except defensive war by the creation of a system of arbitration from which no international dispute of any kind could escape.

80. The Rapporteur of the First Committee analyzed the draft protocol in the following manner. He pointed out that compulsory arbitration was the fundamental basis of the proposed system. The obligation to submit disputes to arbitration was practical because it was always backed by a sanction, and its application was automatically ensured thanks to the intervention of the Council. The system also ensured the final decision of a dispute, since a dispute had to be submitted either to judgment by the Permanent Court of International Justice or arbitral award, or, failing these, to the decision by the Council. The latter decision had, however, to be unanimous, failing which it was to go to arbitration under arrangements made by the Council. A refusal to accept a solution arrived at in this manner was to be considered as a formal breach of the protocol, involving collective sanctions of an economic and financial order, as provided by the Covenant. It was not considered possible to employ force against a State which had not itself resorted to force.

## 2. Determination of aggression.

81. The question of sanctions necessarily involved the determination of aggression. Article 10 of the draft considered two aspects of the problem, namely, the definition of aggression, and the ascertainment of the existence of aggression. In the Rapporteur's opinion, the definition of aggression was a relatively easy matter under the Covenant and protocol; the ascertainment of the existence of aggression on the other hand presented very difficult problems.

The question might arise as to which country began the attack, and that was a question of fact on which opinions might differ.

82. After consideration of the possibility of entrusting the Council with such determination, and of the advantages and disadvantages of a unanimous or majority vote by the Council in a case of aggression, the conclusion reached was that the solution should be sought in some automatic procedure which would not necessarily be based on a decision of the Council.

83. In the opinion of the First Committee, that could be accomplished by establishing a presumption of aggression in the three following cases of resort to war: when such resort was accompanied by a refusal to accept the procedure of pacific settlement or to submit to the decision resulting therefrom; by violation of provisional measures enjoined by the Council, as contemplated in article 7 of the protocol, or by disregard of a decision recognizing that the dispute arose out of a matter which lay exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of the other party and by failure or by refusal to submit the question first to the Council or the Assembly. Those cases were viewed by the First Committee as justifying a presumption strong enough to support the application of sanctions unless the contrary was declared by a unanimous decision of the Council. If, in other cases not involving a presumption of aggression, the Council could not agree unanimously as to which party was the aggressor, it must enjoin upon the belligerents an armistice, the terms of which it was to fix, if necessary, by a two-thirds majority. A party, which rejected the armistice or violated it was to be held an aggressor. The report concluded: "the system is therefore complete and is as automatic as it can be made".

### 3. Sanctions

84. In analyzing the provisions laid down in the protocol concerning the sanctions, the Rapporteur of the Third Committee emphasized the difference which existed between the system laid down by the Covenant and that included in the system defined in the protocol. The new elements added to the Covenant by the protocol were the following:



"(a) The obligation to apply the necessary sanctions of every kind as a direct result of the decision of the Council.

"(b) The elimination of the case in which all parties would be practically free to abstain from any action. The introduction of a system of arbitration and of provisional measures which permits of the determination in every case as to who is the aggressor.

"(c) No decision is taken as to the strength of the military, naval and air forces, and no details are given as to the measures which are to be adopted in a particular case. None the less, objective criteria are supplied which define the obligation of each signatory: it is being bound, in resistance to an act of aggression, to collaborate loyally and effectively in applying the sanctions in accordance with its geographical situation and the special conditions of its armaments."

4. Relation between security and the reduction of armaments

85. Articles 17 to 21 of the protocol were devoted to the question of the reduction of armaments. Two very important principles were laid down in that part of the protocol in connexion with the suggestion concerning the convening of the Disarmament Conference. In the first place, the protocol was to come into force only with the adoption by the Disarmament Conference of a plan for the reduction and limitation of armaments. Secondly, in order to preserve the connexion between the three great problems involved, namely, the pacific settlement of disputes, sanctions, and the reduction of armaments, it was provided that the whole protocol would lapse in the event of the non-execution of the scheme adopted by the Disarmament Conference. In its conclusion, the combined report of the First and Third Committees stated that the Conference for the Reduction of Armaments was indissolubly bound up with that whole system. "There could be no arbitration or security without disarmament, nor could there be disarmament without arbitration and security."

5. The failure of the Geneva Protocol

86. The draft protocol, which was adopted unanimously by the Assembly on 1 October 1924, was signed by 19 Members, including one permanent Member of the Council, France; only one Member, Czechoslovakia, ratified the Protocol - on 28 October 1924.

87. During the session of the Council held in March 1925, certain members explained the policy of their governments regarding the Protocol. The representative of the United Kingdom declared in his statement before the Council that the United Kingdom Government considered that there were "insuperable objections to signing and ratifying the Protocol in its present shape". In the opinion of his Government, "whatever else its [the Protocol's] proposals give us, they do not give us security". Those proposals "multiply offences but do nothing to strengthen remedies; they increase responsibilities undertaken by individual Members of the League, but do nothing to readjust their burden". Reviewing particular features of the Protocol, the representative of the United Kingdom expressed doubt as to the practicability of economic sanctions, since certain great Powers were not Members of the League. "The fresh emphasis laid upon sanctions, the new occasions discovered for their employment, the elaboration of military procedure, insensibly suggest the idea that the vital business of the League is not so much to promote friendly co-operation and reasoned harmony in the management of international affairs, as to preserve peace by organizing war, and - it may be - war on the largest scale". Finally, he doubted whether the application of the Protocol would really lead to disarmament. "The Protocol designed to ensure universal peace may only extend the area of war - a possibility which, if realized, will not improve the chances of general disarmament". The representative of the French Government took an opposite position, declaring that the Government of France "remains definitely attached to the Protocol, but it does not refuse to enter into any discussion for improving it".

88. Discussion of the Protocol was never resumed after the Assembly of 1925, and the Protocol was thereafter considered as having been definitively abandoned.

## SECTION III. SECOND PERIOD, 1925-1930

A. The Locarno Treaties

89. At the Council meeting on 12 March 1925, the representative of the United Kingdom suggested that the reinforcement of security and mutual confidence might be sought through the conclusion of partial defence agreements between the countries directly concerned.

90. That was the origin of the Locarno Treaties signed in London on 1 December 1925. Seven separate agreements were concluded. The first was signed by Belgium, France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom, which agreed not to resort to war against each other and guaranteed respectively the territorial status quo and the observance of the clauses of the Treaty of Peace relating to the demilitarization of the Rhineland. Provisions were included concerning the part which the League of Nations would have to play in certain cases. Two additional agreements were concluded between France and Poland and France and Czechoslovakia, concerning the application of Article 16 (on sanctions) of the Covenant, and four others between Germany and Belgium, Germany and Czechoslovakia, Germany and France and Germany and Poland, creating a permanent Commission of Conciliation for the settlement of disputes as envisaged in Article 13 of the Covenant. All those agreements were to come into force after the admission of Germany to the League of Nations, which occurred on 8 September 1926.

91. While the Locarno Treaties were concluded independently of the League, they nevertheless had a direct bearing on the problem of the reduction and limitation of armaments. Indeed, the final Protocol of the Locarno Treaties pointed out that those Treaties and Conventions would contribute towards the solution of many economic and political problems, and would thus "effectively hasten disarmament provided for in Article 8 of the Covenant".

B. The Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference1. Establishment of the Commission

92. Taking into account the spirit of mutual understanding which prevailed in Locarno during the preparation of the Treaties, the sixth Assembly adopted a resolution requesting the Council to make a preparatory study with a view to a conference for the reduction and limitation of armaments in order that, as soon as satisfactory conditions had been assured from

/the point

the point of view of resolution XIV of the third Assembly, the conference might be convened and a general reduction and limitation of armaments realized. On 12 December 1925, the Council decided to establish a Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference.

## 2. Terms of reference

93. The initial programme of work was elaborated by a committee of inquiry of the Council which established a questionnaire, including items concerning the technical aspect of the reduction of armaments as well as the problem of security.

94. The Preparatory Commission met at Geneva for the first time on 18 May 1926, and in order to facilitate its task created Sub-Commission A and Sub-Commission B. The terms of reference of Sub-Commission A, which was composed of experts of twenty countries, included items of a technical nature relating to military, naval and air forces. Sub-Commission B was charged with the study of the economic and financial aspects of disarmament.

95. The work of Sub-Commission A may be considered as one of the most important technical works of the League of Nations on the reduction of armaments, and it influenced the method of work of various technical commissions of the Disarmament Conference itself. In the course of eighty-six meetings held in Geneva during 1926, the Sub-Commission and its sub-committees considered the items referred by the Preparatory Commission. Among the most important were the questions concerning the definition of the term "armaments"; the definition of trained reserves and material in reserve; interdependence of armaments; standards relating to land, naval and air armaments; comparison of defence expenditure; methods of limitation of armaments and effectives; effectives organized on a military basis; chemical warfare; supervision of armaments; exchange of information; sanctions.

## 3. Definition of "armaments"

96. In December 1926, Sub-Commission A submitted its report to the Preparatory Commission. The Sub-Commission was unable to reach unanimous agreement on all questions, and consequently its report reflected the differing views of delegations on various questions.

97. The first disagreement appeared during the discussion of the first item of the agenda, namely, the definition of "armaments". The representatives of the United Kingdom, the United States and some others submitted the following text:

"By the general expression 'armaments' must be understood:

- "1. The forces in service in peace-time (permanently organized armed forces and the materials and establishments which they use);
- "2. The forces prepared for war-time (reserves of trained personnel, stocks of materials and preparations of every description undertaken with a view to war);
- "3. The ultimate war forces created during hostilities by means of the general resources at the disposal of each country, these resources not being in themselves armaments properly so-called."

The delegations of Belgium and France, on the other hand, together with some others, wished to distinguish between peace-time and war-time armaments, in the latter of which they included trained reserves and mobilization of material, which were not to be subject to limitation.

4. Trained reserves and material in reserve

98. The French delegation considered trained reserves and material in reserve to be an essentially "defensive" factor. If they were to be limited, the security of a country "would no longer exist except for States with a higher potential". Moreover, the French delegation emphasized that "if limitation extends to the materials in reserve, the mobilization powers of the different States can be calculated and this removes the character of secrecy of the measures taken by each State for the organization of its national defence, which is a more important factor in the effectiveness of its organization".

99. The delegation of the United States was of the opinion that trained reserves and the material held in stock to arm and equip the trained reserves, "since both actually exist in peace-time", should be included under the heading of "peace-time armaments". The United States delegation considered "the difference in the two schools of thought on this subject" as of fundamental importance. In its opinion, "the crux of the whole question of land armaments is involved in the question of trained reserves

/and the

and the reserve material with which to equip these trained reserves". In taking this view, the delegation of the United States declared that "armaments are understood to mean the whole resources which would be used by a country in carrying on war".

100. The divergence of opinion between the two groups on the question of trained reserves and material in reserve was partly to be explained by the fundamental difference which existed in the principle of the organization of defence systems in most countries of continental Europe on the one hand and in the United Kingdom and the United States on the other hand. The defence system of France was based principally on its land forces; the United Kingdom and the United States relied chiefly on their navies. The permanent land forces of those two countries were at that time relatively small volunteer forces not backed by huge reserves of trained men. In addition to a small permanent force (regular army), the United Kingdom and the United States provided for "civilian components" or "non-regular components" (National Guard, Organized Reserves), which included civilians who, each year, during the period of their engagement, received brief military training. Those formations were intended to complement the regular army in time of war. In France and in most other European countries, the organization of national defence was based on a more or less numerous permanent force of conscripts (active army) supported, in case of war, by a strong and thoroughly trained reserve force of conscripts of earlier years.

##### 5. Interdependence of armaments

101. On the question of the interdependence of armaments, the Sub-Committee was also unable to come to an agreement. The delegations of France and of certain other continental European countries declared that the military, naval and air effort of a country must be evaluated and considered as a whole, and that the separation of those three categories of armaments, the combination of which constituted the security of a country, was an oversimplification of the problem.

102. The United Kingdom delegation considered that factors which applied to a continental country did not apply in equal measure to an insular country with large overseas possessions. Such a country was obliged to maintain its forces for reasons which differed from those applicable to

/continental

continental countries. A maritime country which had to safeguard its lines of communication required a navy which was affected only to a certain degree by the size of the navies of neighbouring countries. The United Kingdom delegation did not deny the close relationship which existed between the various forms of fighting services, but the main functions of each of the three categories of forces appeared, in the view of the United Kingdom delegation, so distinct as to warrant their consideration separately and not in combination.

#### 6. Definition of "reduction and limitation of armaments"

103. The disagreement on the definition of "armaments" provoked disagreement on the question "what is to be understood by the expression 'reduction and limitation of armaments'".

104. The delegations of the United Kingdom and the United States pointed out that, since the aim of limitation was to diminish the probability of war by limiting the striking power of a country, it would be necessary "to extend limitation or reduction by using simultaneously methods bearing upon effectives with the colours, trained reserves and the total quantity of material". The French delegation and its co-sponsors, on the contrary, rejected the limitation of trained reserves and recommended "direct limitation of effectives with the colours" which would bring "immediate, tangible, simple and practical results, in full consonance with the objects of disarmament".

#### 7. Daily average of effectives

105. During the discussion on the limitation of effectives, Sub-Commission A had to consider, among other methods, that of limitation of the "number of man-days per annum", which later became known as the "daily average of effectives". The Sub-Commission agreed on a definition of that method which consisted in "fixing for each army a certain number of man-days, leaving the different countries free to choose the composition of this figure". It also agreed on the respective advantages and disadvantages of that method. The delegation of France, together with some others added, however, that that method "raises the difficult question of supervision, because its execution could not be easily or permanently kept under observance".

### 8. Definition and classification of "defence expenditure"

106. While Sub-Commission A dealt with questions relating to effectives and armaments, Sub-Commission B considered those relating to the economic aspect of the reduction of armaments and to defence expenditures. On 30 November 1926, Sub-Commission B presented its first report, which included replies to the questions put to the Ad Hoc Joint Commission created by Sub-Commissions A and B. The Joint Commission considered such questions as the definition of defence expenditure, the relation between defence expenditure and the size of armed forces. It also presented observations on questions put to it by Sub-Commission A concerning raw materials of importance in war. The Joint Commission, according to the report of Sub-Commission B, found it impossible to compile a complete list of raw material resources in the order of their importance.

107. Sub-Commission B, in its introduction to the report, pointed out that the opinions submitted by the Joint Commission on various questions were those of experts freely chosen by the Council and were not the official views of the governments of the countries of which those experts happened to be nationals. The Sub-Commission stressed in particular that the United States delegation had had no connexion with the work of the Joint Commission nor an opportunity to express its views. The views of the United States delegation on each of the questions referred to Sub-Commission B were set forth by it in the report of Sub-Commission A. On 17 March 1927, Sub-Commission B submitted to the Preparatory Commission two reports: one relating to the question of civil aviation and the other to national defence expenditure. The latter was really the work of the Committee of Experts on Budgetary Questions, constituted by Sub-Commission B on 29 November 1936, whose report Sub-Commission B transmitted to the Preparatory Commission without expressing any opinion.

108. Among the items considered by the Committee of Experts, the most important were those relating to the definition of defence expenditures, their classification and their limitation by categories.

109. As far as the question of the definition of defence expenditure was concerned, the Committee of Experts considered "that no general synthetic definition of expenditure on national defence could be given at all



events without a previous analysis of that expenditure". Consequently the Committee of Experts limited its task to drawing up, as a basis for its future work, a complete list of different items of defence expenditure in accordance with the definition of armaments given previously by Sub-Commission A.

110. As to the question of the limitation of defence expenditure, it was agreed that a limitation of armaments through limitations of expenditure only would be an inadequate basis for a convention. The Committee of Experts wondered whether the limitation of expenditure could not be regarded as a subsidiary measure forming a useful supplement to the direct method of disarmament, but it was unable to form a definite opinion owing to the difficulty of establishing any classification of individual categories of expenditure. Certain experts preferred total limitation, which would involve less uncertainty than a limitation by categories.

9. "Trial model statement" of defence expenditure

111. The report included as an annex a "trial model statement" covering expenditure on land, naval and air forces intended for purposes of subsequent study. In that connexion, the report pointed out that the classification suggested by the Committee of Experts for establishing the model statement was "not intended to serve as a basis for comparisons between the armaments of different countries, but should make it possible to measure the trend of armaments in each individual country".

112. The Italian expert presented a minority report declaring that an examination of the statements would automatically involve a comparison between the different forms in which the defence expenditures evolved in the several States. "Comparison", in his opinion, "would be especially unsatisfactory as it would apply to a most complex and involved collection of elements."

10. Chemical and bacterial warfare<sup>3/</sup>

113. Among other items considered by Sub-Commission A was the question of chemical and bacterial warfare and, particularly, the question of "what effective sanctions can be proposed for the enforcement of the international undertaking not to employ poisonous gas or bacteria in warfare".

114. The delegations of Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Poland, Romania and Yugoslavia (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) considered that the only effective sanction in case of violations of provisions concerning the prohibition of chemical warfare consisted in the possibility of immediate, individual and joint reprisals.

115. Any special preparation for chemical warfare in peace-time for the purpose of eventual reprisal was considered unnecessary, since chemical industries could be converted in a short time to the manufacture of the products required for reprisals, which could easily be carried out by means of aircraft. The delegations of the Argentine, Chile, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States were unable to associate themselves with the proposal for sanctions, on the ground that the Sub-Commission was not required to express any opinion upon such a proposal which, in their opinion, was essentially of a political nature.

116. At the end of the discussion, the former group of delegations declared that, although they realized the practical difficulties of organizing collective reprisals and the political or moral problem which such organization might raise, they considered that "in the absence of these

---

3/ In the course of the 1925 Conference for the supervision of the international Trade in Arms, the delegation of the United States proposed the complete prohibition of the export of "asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of analogous liquids, materials or devices". The Polish delegation then proposed to extend the prohibition to bacteriological materials. In the course of discussion, those proposals were widened to include prohibition of the use of such materials in war. As finally adopted by the Conference on 17 June 1925, the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous and Other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare declared that "the High Contracting Parties, so far as they are not already Parties to treaties prohibiting such use, accept this prohibition, agree to extend this prohibition to the use of bacteriological methods of warfare and agree to be bound as between themselves according to the terms of this declaration". Forty-one countries ratified the Protocol or acceded to it. The United Kingdom and France were among the former; the USSR among the latter. Brazil, El Salvador, Japan, Nicaragua, the United States and Uruguay signed but did not ratify the Protocol, which came into force on 8 February 1928.

reprisals, the preventive effect of which they think might be decisive, there is no technical means of preventing chemical warfare".

# 11. Supervision and control of armaments

117. Sub-Commission A reported complete disagreement on the question of the supervision and control of armaments. The delegations of Chile, Italy, Japan, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States were of the opinion "that any form of supervision or control of armaments by an international body is more calculated to foment evil and suspicion between States than to foster international confidence". In their opinion, the execution of the provisions of any convention for the reduction and limitation of armaments "must depend upon the good faith of nations scrupulously to carry out their treaty obligations".

118. The delegations of Chile, Italy, Japan and the United States were of the opinion that the inquiries contemplated would in general prove "fruitless and illusory" and that, to be successful, such inquiries would have to be carried out under strict and definite rules which would involve serious commitments in regard to military secrecy on the part of the State subjected to the inquiry. The same delegations, except the United States, recalled the opinion expressed by the Permanent Advisory Commission that "the undertakings contained in Article 8 are based on a belief in the pledged word and the Permanent Advisory Commission does not consider that it is either opportune or conducive to great efficiency to substitute mistrust for this belief".

119. The French delegation, together with a number of others, did not agree that inquiries would be "illusory and ineffective". They recalled the precedent of the Opium Convention, which had introduced a system of supervision, and that of the Treaty for the Pacific Settlement of Disputes between American States, signed at Santiago de Chile on 3 May 1923. They also mentioned the League's right of investigation under the clauses of the Treaties of Peace relating to the disarmament of the defeated States, which showed that it was "technically possible for armaments to be placed under supervision. They concluded that all States must be given a guarantee that the convention would be strictly observed, "because, in the absence of such a guarantee, those States which regulated their armaments in strict accordance with the provisions of the convention would lack that adequate security upon which such limitations of armaments as were accepted should properly be based".

12. Exchange of military information

120. On the question of the exchange of military information as provided for under Article 8 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, Sub-Commission A submitted a text which was unanimously accepted. That text provided for the collection and periodical publication by the Secretariat of the League of military information in an enlarged "Armaments Year-Book". In addition to the Year-Book itself, Sub-Commission A considered the possibility of publishing a number of bulletins in the course of the year. The delegations of Belgium, France and some others proposed, in addition to the "Armaments Year-Book" and the periodical bulletins, the preparation of objective reports on the carrying out of the convention for the limitation of armaments, on the basis of periodic uniform statistical returns by governments on their armaments, whether subject to limitation or not. The reports prepared on the basis of those returns were to be discussed by a commission to be set up by the Conference. The delegations of Chile, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States objected that that proposal would raise the question of supervision or control. In their declaration concerning supervision of armaments by an international organization, those delegations, except Spain, pointed out that "most unfortunate results, both political and technical, would follow from these inquiries". They continued: "It is impossible to disregard the possibility that, in certain circumstances, one country might bring a charge against another in order to obtain, unjustifiably, information about the secret defensive organizations of the country accused. Moreover, the delegations of Chile, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States are entirely unable to accept for their own governments anything in the nature of itinerant inquisitorial commissions".

C. The preliminary Draft Convention for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments

1. General discussion

121. The reports of Sub-Commissions A and B were transmitted to the Preparatory Commission, which met at Geneva on 21 March 1927 to discuss as a whole the problem of disarmament. Five meetings were devoted to the general discussion, which ended on 25 March 1927.

122. The President of the Commission, opening the general discussion, pointed out that "until such time as real, moral disarmament has been achieved - and this alone can bring about universal peace, towards which the whole work of the League is directed - material disarmament can only take place gradually". He also stressed the point that public opinion was "not to expect marvels" from the first stage of the work of the Commission. The Commission's task was to consider reduction of armaments and not "disarmament, which has a false ring, as in the present state of affairs it must be regarded as difficult of achievement".

123. The suggestions made by the President concerning the Commission's method of work stressed the necessity for concrete results in the form of agreement on Principles on the basis of which to lay the foundation of a future convention and, if possible, even to draft a text to help simplify the work of the future Conference. He thought the first question to consider was the limitation of armaments in the three great categories which the technical committees had examined: effectives, material and budgets. As the President had suggested, the Commission did not engage in a general discussion of the reports of the Sub-Commissions. Instead, the Commission's work went forward on the basis of draft conventions introduced separately by the delegations of the United Kingdom and France of which a synoptic analysis was prepared for purposes of ready comparison. At the end of the discussion, a common draft convention in first reading was prepared.

## 2. United Kingdom draft convention

124. In a statement introducing the United Kingdom draft convention, the representative of the United Kingdom agreed with the President that it was unnecessary to enter again into the discussions that had taken place in the Sub-Commissions. Agreement on certain questions, he stated, had already been reached, for instance, that land, sea and air armaments formed part of a common problem and, most important in his opinion, that a reduction and limitation of armaments must affect peacetime armaments alone. "What we have to limit is the power of aggression - the power of sudden attack." He added that there was complete agreement that land armaments could best be limited by limiting the number of effectives, naval armaments by limiting tonnage, and air armaments by limiting the number of aircraft. There was also agreement to limit material by budget limitations or in other ways, although

/he noted the

he noted the existence of doubt on the question as to how far that would be practical.

125. Among the differences of opinion reviewed by the United Kingdom representative, the chief ones concerned the inclusion or non-inclusion of trained reserves in peace-time armaments, the limitation of vessels of war by total tonnage or by categories of tonnage, and international supervision. He stressed the opinion of the United Kingdom Government that any solution must take full account of the necessities of military organization in the continental countries and, in the maritime countries, of "naval requirements and necessities". He thought the insertion of the figures of the agreed armaments should be left to the Conference itself.

126. The first paragraph of the first chapter of the United Kingdom draft convention recited the engagement of the parties to limit land, naval and air armaments to the figures to be agreed. The second paragraph permitted an increase of armaments over such figures in case of war, rebellion or other grave emergencies, or if the Council of the League concurred. The third and fourth paragraphs concerned the obligation to make annual returns in prescribed forms of proposed and actual expenditures on armaments. The second chapter limited land armaments by limiting the number of effectives, among which trained reserves were included. The third chapter limited naval tonnage by categories, following the method adopted in the Washington Agreement. The fourth chapter limited air armaments by restricting the number of shore-based aircraft in commission in first line combatant groups. The fifth chapter, "Miscellaneous provisions" covered violations and complaints and forbade investigation within a party's territory without its consent.

### 3. French draft convention

127. In the discussion following the submission of the United Kingdom draft, the representative of France declared that he had envisaged a different method from that employed by the United Kingdom delegation. He had hoped that different delegations would express the opinions of their governments on the work as a whole rather than in detail, after which a draft convention would have been drawn up "which would not appear to have come from one or other of the delegations and which perhaps would not have led to the inevitable opposition which might be caused by the draft submitted by the United Kingdom representative". In the circumstances he felt obliged to submit a draft

/convention

convention of his own with the hope, however, that the result would not be, as too often before, a debate between the British and French views on the subject. The French draft was introduced on 23 March 1927.

128. By contrast with the United Kingdom draft convention, the provisions of the French draft convention reflected the primacy of the question of security. The French representative pointed out that through the Locarno Treaties the conditions of security for some nations had been improved. He noted, however, that the failure of the Treaty of Mutual Assistance and of the Geneva Protocol had made it impossible to give the necessary precision to the application of Article 16 of the Covenant, "the pivot on which the whole international organization for security turns". Nations had therefore to estimate their needs for defence themselves; it was thus not possible for the League to lay down any irreducible figures for them. "Views", he stated, "must be exchanged and a given reduction by one State must lead to a given reduction by another." For that reason the French draft convention, like that of the United Kingdom, contained no figures.

127. Analysing chapter 1 of his draft, the representative of France declared its essential point to be that "the limitation which an international convention may lay down can only be applicable to permanent peace armaments, whether we are dealing with effectives, material or expenditure".

128. A second leading principle of the French draft was that "only that which can be controlled can be limited" and that "no less closely connected... than are the different forms of armaments are the limitations on the possibility of controlling these limitations". Since, according to Article 8 of the Covenant, no increase in armaments might take place without the consent of the Council, the French representative thought that "the Council cannot, in so grave, so fundamental a question, take the responsibility of accepting or refusing without first of all making sure of the means of verifying the facts". Such verification was possible as to permanent peace armaments. But supervision of the means and methods whereby a State passed from a peace footing to a war footing would require such permanent and incessant supervision of one nation by another as, in existing circumstances no nation would endure. For that reason he expressed the hope that the Commission would not seek to deal with the question of war potential and "not condemn the Conference to certain failure by attempting to limit a few, and only a few, of the elements which

composed, this war potential, for we will soon be asked from other quarters to limit other factors, and we shall end, after innumerable deliberations, in certain failure". The disarmament effort would cover only "what can be limited because it can be seen and supervised".

129. The French draft provided for the direct limitation of effectives and of air and naval material, and the indirect limitation of land material through limitation of expenditure. The limitation of numerical strength was based on the "average daily effectives" of the home and sea forces. The limitation of air material was based on the total horsepower employed, and that of naval material on the tonnage of vessels. The limitation of material, however, was to be effected through the limitation of budget expenditure because, in the opinion of the French representative, it was the "only way of securing a limitation of material in reserve, and thereby of the possibility of using reserves." Article XX of the draft provided that "the total expenditure on the upkeep, purchase and manufacture of war material in the strict sense of the term, for the duration of the present Convention, shall be limited for the land, naval and air armaments to the respective sums fixed in columns X, Y and Z of tables..."

130. Provision was also made for a permanent disarmament commission. The French delegation anticipated that there would be agreement that that commission should have the task of recording and co-ordinating, since everybody agreed that limitation implied publicity and that comparisons of information would have to be made. Someone would also have to report on the progress made in the limitation and reduction of armaments.

131. Indispensable, but more delicate in the French view, was the power to undertake necessary investigations without which "an international convention for disarmament or the reduction of armaments would leave in the minds of the contracting nations a feeling of mistrust, of menace, anxiety and nervous tension". The French delegation declared that France accepted in advance all forms of supervision and "will not regard its dignity as in any way impaired or diminished because an international body is authorized to come and ascertain whether it is fulfilling a convention which it has signed".

4. Discussion of the "synoptic analysis" of the drafts submitted by France and the United Kingdom

132. At the end of the general discussion, the Preparatory Commission began

/the examination



the examination of a synoptic analysis of the United Kingdom and French drafts. Part I of the synopsis covered effectives, naval armaments, air armaments and expenditures. Part II covered organization, exchange of information, derogations, procedure with regard to complaints and revision, ratification, entry into force and denunciation. The preamble was put at the end of the synopsis.

133. The Commission did not succeed in establishing a single text for all the points discussed, and the document resulting from first reading showed separately for each question the points of agreement, the reservations entered on special points and, where agreement on a text had not been possible, the different proposals submitted. A reservation concerning land armaments was made by the delegation of the United States, which declared that: "The delegation of the United States of America makes a general reservation on the failure to include provisions for the limitation of material both in the hands of forces serving with the colours and reserve material of land and air forces."<sup>4/</sup> The delegations of the United States and Italy also made a general reservation concerning the table submitted by the French delegation in connexion with the limitation of naval armaments. In connexion with air armaments, the delegation of the United States made a general reservation on the inclusion of provisions basing limitation upon the development of civil aviation in other countries. The delegations of Italy, Japan and the United Kingdom declared that budgetary limitation should be effected solely by publicity. The delegation of the United States made a general reservation on the inclusion in the draft convention of any limitation of budgetary expenditure.

## 5. USSR proposals

### (a) General statement by the USSR delegation

134. At the fourth session of the Preparatory Commission, which opened on 30 November 1927, the delegation of the USSR, represented on the Preparatory Commission for the first time, declared that it had been authorized by its Government to propose measures for the complete and immediate abolition of all land, naval and air forces along the following lines:

<sup>4/</sup> At the eighteenth meeting of the Preparatory Commission, held on 2 May 1929, the United States delegation declared that although its convictions had not altered as to the reasons which had dictated its reservation with regard to material in reserve, it was ready in this, as in the matter of trained reserves, "to defer to the conviction of the majority of those Powers whose defence is primarily military".

"(a) The dissolution of all land, sea and air forces and the non-admittance of their existence in any concealed form whatsoever; (b) The destruction of all weapons, military supplies, means for chemical warfare and all other forms of armament and means of destruction in the possession of troops or in military or general stores; (c) The scrapping of all warships and military air vessels; (d) The discontinuance of calling up citizens for military training either in armies or public bodies; (e) Legislation for the abolition of military service, either compulsory, voluntary or recruited; (f) Legislation prohibiting the calling-up of trained reserves; (g) The destruction of fortresses and naval and air bases; (h) The scrapping of military plants and factories and of war industry equipment in general industrial works; (i) The discontinuance of assigning funds for military purposes both on State budgets and those of public bodies; (k) The abolition of military, naval and air ministries, and the dissolution of general staffs and military administrations, departments and institutions of every kind; (l) The legislative prohibition of military propaganda and military training of the population and of military education both in State and public bodies; (m) The legislative prohibition of the patenting of all kinds of armaments and means of destruction with a view to the removal of incentives to the invention of the same; (n) Legislation making the infringement of any of the above stipulations a grave crime against the State; (o) The withdrawal or corresponding alteration of all legislative acts, both of national or international scope, infringing the above stipulations."

135. The following draft resolution was presented by the USSR delegation:

"Whereas the existence of armaments and the tendency they show to growth by their very nature inevitably lead to armed conflicts between nations, diverting the workers and peasants from peaceful productive labour and bringing in its train countless disasters;

"Whereas armed force is a weapon in the hands of great Powers for the oppression of peoples in small and colonial countries, and

"Whereas the complete abolition of armaments is at present the only real means of guaranteeing security and affording a guarantee against the outbreak of war,

"The fourth session of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference resolves:

"(1) To proceed immediately to the working out in detail of a draft convention for complete and general disarmament on the principles proposed by the delegation of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics;

"(2) To propose the convocation, not later than March 1928, of a disarmament conference for the discussion and confirmation of the proposals provided for in paragraph (1)."

136. The French representative declared that the League of Nations had taken an altogether different path from that proposed by the USSR draft resolution. It had linked the problem of disarmament to the problem of security and, in accordance with

accordance with the governing Article 8 of the Covenant, had "subjected and graduated the reduction of armaments to the minimum compatible with national security and the fulfilment of international obligations concluded for the purposes of common action". When the Preparatory Commission had reached such a definite stage in its work, it would be making "the gravest of mistakes" if it changed its procedure for an "incompatible" one which the French delegation thought "too simple" because it ignored the difference between the great and small Powers and the problem of "war potential". The chief difficulty encountered by the Preparatory Commission, in the French representative's view, had not been a technical one but "the lack of an international spirit". It was to meet the latter difficulty that the Assembly had, shortly before, called for the establishment of a committee on arbitration and security within the Preparatory Commission.

137. Upon the suggestion of the President of the Commission, which the representative of the USSR accepted, the latter's proposal was deferred for consideration at the following session, should the representative of the USSR so desire at that time.

(b) USSR Draft Convention for Immediate, Complete and General Disarmament

138. At the fifth session of the Preparatory Commission (20 February to 7 March 1928), the delegation of the USSR submitted a draft convention of five chapters for immediate, complete and general disarmament. According to the accompanying explanatory memorandum, the draft convention was based "on the destruction of the principal elements which form the armed strength of a country, that is to say, the organized armed forces on land, on sea and in the air, their material, and the industries connected with the production of armaments". Chapter 1 provided for the disbandment of effectives in stages over a period of four years and, in the first year, for the closing down of training and command establishments, and the destruction of mobilization plans. Chapter 2 dealt with the destruction of land, naval and air material, fortifications and bases, and war industries. Chapter 3 dealt with the organization of protection and the permitted size of various kinds of police forces. Special provision was made for the organization of a system of international protection on the high seas through the establishment of a maritime police operated by regional groups of States responsible for designated zones, of which there were to be sixteen. While, according to the

/explanatory

explanatory memorandum, disarmament was wholly conditional upon good will, chapter 4 envisaged controls "based upon the widest reciprocity, full publicity, and participation in the work by those classes of the population which are most interested in the speedy completion of disarmament". The system envisaged included a permanent international commission of control aided by a committee of experts together with national and local commissions of control working under the instructions of the international commission. Chapter 5 dealt with questions of transitional procedure, including the negotiation of supplementary conventions, one of which was to lay down "the measures of non-military pressure to be taken against States disturbing the normal progress of disarmament". The explanatory memorandum declared that the draft convention of set purpose "does not allow of any military pressure being brought to bear on any country".

139. On presenting the draft, the USSR representative declared that "nothing but the fulfilment of the Convention for Immediate, Complete and General Disarmament proposed by the Government of the USSR is capable of solving in a satisfactory manner the problem of general security and peace". He thought the execution of the scheme would not encounter the difficulties inevitably connected with partial disarmament. It would, for example, "be infinitely easier to control total than partial disarmament". The representative of the USSR declared that detailed consideration of his delegation's draft would not be possible until the Preparatory Commission had answered the following questions:

"1. Does the Commission agree to base its further labours on the principle of complete and general disarmament during the periods proposed by us?

"2. Is it prepared so to carry out the first stage of disarmament as to make the conduct of war, if not an absolute impossibility, of extreme difficulty in a year's time?"

140. After some discussion, in which the opinions expressed at the previous session on the general proposals of the USSR were maintained, the Commission, on 24 March 1928, adopted a resolution, the pertinent paragraph of which read as follows:

"The Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference:

"I. Having examined the bases of the Draft Convention for Immediate, Complete and General Disarmament submitted by the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, notes that the immense majority of

/its members

its members are of opinion that this draft, while in harmony with the ideals of mankind, is under existing world conditions incapable of being carried into execution, that it can only be realized when international organization is strengthened in respect both of methods of pacific procedure and the system of sanctions, and that, consequently, the said draft cannot be accepted by the Commission as a basis for its work, which work must be pursued along the lines already mapped out."

(c) USSR Draft Convention for the Reduction of Armaments

141. On the previous day, the USSR delegation had submitted a Draft Convention for the Reduction of Armaments which, however, was deferred for discussion at the following session. The principles of the USSR draft were stated by the representative of the USSR on 17 April 1929 as follows: "(1) the substantial reduction of existing armaments; (2) the carrying out of reduction on proportional principles, with certain deviations in favour of less protected and smaller countries; (3) the establishment at once of a coefficient for proportional reduction". He invited a decision of the Commission on those principles before a detailed discussion of the draft.

142. In response, the Commission, on 19 April 1929, expressed the following opinion which the Bureau, on its instructions, had formulated.

"1. The Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference has been instructed by the Council, not to effect the reduction of armaments, but to prepare a scheme for the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations. This plan is to be submitted for the consideration and action of the governments taking part in the Conference.

"The Commission is preparing a scheme to enable the Conference, when it meets, to effect as substantial as possible a reduction of national armaments - on the understanding that the convention adopted shall be subject to reconsideration and revision at least every ten years.

"2. The Commission has not seen its way to adhere to the method of reduction based on the proportional principle. At the same time, there is nothing to prevent the government representatives assembled at the Conference, when they finally come to draw up the Disarmament Convention, from taking account of this principle or of any other similar objective criterion in addition to those indicated in Article 8 of the Covenant.

"3. The numerical coefficients for the reduction of armaments constitute a method of applying the proportional principle laid down in point 2 of the Soviet draft resolution. Consequently, the arguments set forth above in connexion with point 2 apply equally to point 3.

... /"Having regard

"Having regard to the foregoing considerations, the Bureau is of the opinion that the Preparatory Commission, while continuing the examination of its draft of 1927, should decide, if the Soviet delegation so desires, to append the Soviet draft convention to the report to be submitted by the Commission on the conclusion of its proceedings, and to be subsequently laid before the Disarmament Conference, without prejudice to the right, shared by the Soviet delegation with all the other delegations, to bring forward amendments to the articles of the 1927 draft in the course of the discussion in the Preparatory Commission."

6. Resumption of the discussion on the draft convention

(a) Chemical and bacterial warfare

143. On resuming its consideration of the draft convention at the first part of the sixth session in 1929, the Preparatory Commission took up the question of chemical warfare. The text before it, which had been submitted by the Belgian delegation, provided that the signatories were to abstain, subject to reciprocity, from the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or similar gases, liquids, substances and processes. They were also to undertake unconditionally to abstain from the use of all bacteriological methods of warfare. The Commission also had before it proposals for the prohibition of peace-time preparation of the use of such methods of warfare and of the importation, exportation or manufacture with a view to such use of substances which could be utilized for chemical or bacteriological warfare.

144. Opinion was divided on the propriety of including in a disarmament convention a prohibition of the kind proposed. Some delegations would have preferred to declare separately, at the end of the convention, that ratification of the latter should automatically involve accession to the Protocol adopted on 17 June 1925<sup>5/</sup> by the Conference for the Supervision of the International Trade in Arms, prohibiting the use in war of such gases and of bacteriological methods of warfare. Another difficulty was the conclusion of Sub-Commission A that the practical difficulties in the way of effective supervision in that field were insurmountable. There was also the general difficulty of principle which had been raised by various delegations concerning the institution of any system of supervision. Certain delegations sought the inclusion of sanctions against the use of the prohibited weapons. By reason of those complications, it was finally agreed to drop the proposals concerning manufacture and trade, and return to the Belgian proposal.

5/ See footnote 3 on page 44 above.

/145. The Commission

145. The Commission then adopted the following texts on 23 April 1929. The first, which was included in the draft convention, read:

"The High Contracting Parties undertake, subject to reciprocity, to abstain from the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or similar gases and of all analogous liquids, substances or processes.

"They undertake unreservedly to abstain from the use of all bacteriological methods of warfare."

A second decision, taken at the instance of the Polish delegation "reserved the right of the Preparatory Commission to submit to the Conference proposals concerning the chemical and bacteriological arm, in order to supplement and extend the provisions of the 1925 Protocol". A third decision, taken at the instance of the USSR delegation, read as follows:

"The Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference recommends all States signatories to the Protocol of 17 June 1925 which have not yet done so to ratify it as soon as possible."

(b) Indirect limitation of war material

146. The discussion on this subject at the first part of the sixth session was marked by divergencies of view which constrained the Commission to adopt a resolution to the effect that limitation of material should be effected through publicity. At the second part of the session in 1930, the question was reopened. Agreement on direct limitation of material could not be obtained for the following reasons, among others: first, the difficulties of comparing weapons; secondly, the opposition of some delegations to supervision, while other delegations considered such supervision a prerequisite for the acceptance of direct limitation; thirdly, continued differences over the problem of materials in reserve. Agreement was finally reached on the principle of limitation of material through control of expenditures. Constitutional difficulties prevented the United States delegation from accepting budgetary control but, to facilitate agreement on effective and practical budgetary controls by other countries, that delegation announced that the United States was prepared to apply direct limitation in its own case. The principle of limitation of land material was then voted in the following form:

"Accepts, so far as the majority is concerned, the principle of budgetary limitation for land material, while recognizing that certain members prefer the method of direct limitation by specific enumeration and that certain members would desire to see some combination of the two methods."

/(c) Adoption

(c) Adoption of the draft convention by the Preparatory Commission

147. At the end of the sixth session, on 9 December 1930, the Preparatory Commission adopted the draft convention which included the following parts: (I) Personnel; (II) Material; (III) Budgetary expenditure; (IV) Exchange of information; (V) Chemical arms; (VI) Miscellaneous provisions. The provisions of part I, relating to effectives and period of service limited the numerical strength of armed forces by limiting the number of average daily effectives of the regular forces and of other formations organized on a military basis and stationed in the home country or overseas. The draft convention also provided for the limitation of the maximum total periods of service in the forces recruited by conscription. It contained no figures; those were left for the Conference to fill in.

148. The following, in outline, were the provisions for the limitation of land, naval and air armaments. The limitation of land armaments was to be effected through the limitation of expenditure on their upkeep, purchase and manufacture. That method was not applied to air armaments. Aircraft in commission and in immediate reserve in the land, sea and air armed forces were to be limited by number and total horsepower. The limitation of naval armaments was based on the principle of global tonnage and limitation by categories of vessels, together with the limitation of expenditure.<sup>6/</sup>

149. Limits were also to be placed on the total annual expenditure on land, sea and air forces and formations organized on a military basis,

150. The draft convention provided for the exchange of information by the submission of returns, according to prescribed models, of data on all those matters which were subjected to limitation by the Convention.

151. The chapter on miscellaneous provisions provided for a permanent disarmament commission composed of members appointed by governments but not representing them. The commission was to have the duty of "following the execution" of the Convention by collating information and presenting an annual report to the Council of the League. It was to hear complaints of violations and make a report to the signatories and the Council of the League.

<sup>6/</sup> In connexion with the articles of the draft convention on expenditure (article 10, limiting expenditure on land material; article 24, limiting expenditure on naval material; article 29, limiting total expenditure on all armaments, and article 33, relating to publicity of the foregoing expenditures) the Commission established a Committee of Budgetary Experts to report on various technical matters in order to enable the Conference to draw up the annexes to the foregoing articles of the draft convention. The Committee presented its report on the publicity and limitation of national defence expenditure on 28 February 1931.



That chapter also permitted temporary suspension by a signatory in so far as concerned itself of the provisions of the Convention in case of a threat to its national security.

D. The problem of Security

1. Establishment of the Committee on Arbitration and Security

152. Throughout the work of the Preparatory Commission, the problem of international security continued to be stressed. Study of the question was conducted through special machinery. The eighth Assembly requested the Council to instruct the Preparatory Commission to create a committee on arbitration and security, to be composed of representatives of the States having seats on the Commission, with the duty of considering the measures capable of giving all States the guarantees of arbitration and security needed "to enable them to fix the level of their armaments at the lowest possible figures in an international disarmament agreement". The eighth Assembly took the view that those guarantees should be sought through special and general agreements on arbitration and security.

153. The Committee on Arbitration and Security was established at the fourth session of the Preparatory Commission, on 30 November 1927. Neither the United States nor the USSR would participate. The representative of the United States, while emphasizing that his Government "championed the idea of international arbitration and conciliation, both in principle and practice", declared that his delegation could not co-operate in the work of the proposed committee of arbitration and security because of the non-membership of the United States in the League of Nations, and its consequent inability to accept the control of that body. The Government of the United States would, however, consider all recommendations which the Committee on Arbitration and Security might submit to the Preparatory Commission.

154. The USSR delegation declared that the creation of the Committee on Arbitration and Security, "occupied with such complicated issues as arbitration, guarantee pacts, the Geneva Protocol, and the like, must inevitably divert attention from the fundamental question of disarmament". Immediate or gradual complete disarmament continued to be the most effective and universally acceptable guarantee of security but, in view of the interdependence which had been established between the Committee on Arbitration and Security and the Preparatory Commission, the USSR delegation was prepared to observe and follow the work of the Committee.

2. The Committee's Programme of work

155. The programme and method of work of the Committee were fixed at its first meeting, on 1 December 1927. The questions to be considered were grouped as follows: first, arbitration and conciliation; secondly, security with a view to facilitating performance by Members of their obligations; thirdly, Articles 10, 11 and 16 of the Covenant, together with financial assistance to victims of aggression. Three rapporteurs were appointed to prepare memoranda on those questions on the basis, *inter alia*, of replies to a questionnaire on the programme of work which had been circulated by the Committee to governments. The rapporteurs presented memoranda to the Committee at its second session, in February 1928.

3. The memoranda of the Rapporteurs

156. The memorandum on arbitration and conciliation dealt with the types of arbitration treaties suitable for conclusion by two States or limited groups of States, the extension of such treaties to other States and the negotiation of a general treaty.

157. The memorandum on security questions reviewed the inadequacies of the Covenant provisions for security. Recognizing that the relation between disarmament and security was not one of subordination, but of co-ordination through equal and simultaneous progress, it declared that a third abortive attempt to conclude a general agreement of security should be avoided, and guarantees of security should be sought in separate agreements consistent with the spirit of the Covenant. It noted that, by 1 February 1928, eighty-five treaties of conciliation or arbitration, or of the two together, had been registered with the League. They were of the following kinds: regional collective agreements for non-aggression, pacific settlement and mutual assistance; separate agreements of the same nature; agreements for non-aggression; collective agreements for conciliation, arbitration and judicial settlement; separate agreements of the same nature; arbitration agreements; conciliation agreements; agreements for simple political co-operation. Preference for regional as against separate agreements was expressed on the ground that the former could be more easily brought into line with the Covenant system. The drafting of model treaties of security within the general pattern of the Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance and the Geneva Protocol was suggested.

158. Essential provisions of the model treaties were suggested to be, first, the exclusion of recourse to war; secondly, the organization of pacific procedure for the settlement of all disputes; thirdly, the establishment of a system of mutual assistance, linked with the functions of the Council of the League. Suggested subsidiary provisions related, first, to the connexion between regional pacts and the reduction of the armaments of the contracting countries; secondly, to the accession of third States; thirdly, to the co-ordination of each regional pact with the others and with the Covenant of the League; fourthly, to the guarantee of the territorial integrity of the contracting parties. On the question of the determination of unprovoked aggression, the memorandum found that there were grave objections to the system adopted in the Locarno Agreement (unanimous decision by the Council, exclusive of the representatives of the belligerent countries) and in the Geneva Protocol (automatic designation of the aggressor on the basis of presumptive evidence). It was recommended that consideration should be given to the idea of empowering the Council to order an armistice by a two-thirds vote, with refusal or violation of the armistice constituting definitive proof of aggression. It was suggested that the regional security pacts should be linked with disarmament along the lines of the Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance and the Geneva Protocol.

159. The memorandum on Articles 10, 11 and 16 of the Covenant, in addition to a detailed analysis of the problems presented by those articles, dealt with the financial assistance to be given to States threatened with aggression, a scheme originally developed in the Financial Committee of the League.

#### 4. The model treaties

160. Adhering closely to the organization of the subject matter in the memoranda of the rapporteurs, the Committee on Arbitration and Security assigned to a drafting committee the preparation of model treaties of conciliation, arbitration, non-aggression and mutual assistance. The preference of some delegations for particular, and of others for general, treaties of arbitration and conciliation resulted in instructions to the drafting committee to draw up both general and bilateral treaties on those subjects.

161. At its third session (June-July 1928), the Committee approved the following model treaties:

(a) General

- (a) General Convention for the Pacific Settlement of all International Disputes;
- (b) Bilateral Convention for the Pacific Settlement of all International Disputes;
- (c) General Convention for Judicial Settlement, Arbitration and Conciliation;
- (d) Bilateral Convention for Judicial Settlement, Arbitration and Conciliation;
- (e) General Conciliation Convention;
- (f) Bilateral Conciliation Convention;
- (g) Collective Treaty of Mutual Assistance;<sup>7/</sup>
- (h) Collective Treaty of Non-Aggression;
- (i) Bilateral Treaty of Non-Aggression;
- (j) Draft Treaty for the Strengthening of the Means of Preventing War.

All those treaties were forwarded to the ninth Assembly (September 1928).

162. The ninth Assembly combined the first three general conventions listed above into a General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.<sup>8/</sup>

The other model treaties were approved by the Assembly and recommended to the Members of the League for consideration and adoption.

The following countries acceded to the General Act: Australia (1931), Belgium (1929), Canada (1931), Denmark (1930), Estonia (1931), Ethiopia (1931), Finland (1930), France (1931), Greece (1931), India (1931), Ireland (1931), Italy (1931), Latvia (1935), Luxembourg (1930), New Zealand (1931), Norway (1930), Peru (1931), Spain (1930), Switzerland (1934), Turkey (1934), United Kingdom (1931).

163. The ninth Assembly, on the suggestion of the Committee on Arbitration and Security, also recommended accession to the "optional clause recognizing the Court's compulsory jurisdiction" (Article 36 of the Statute of the Court)

<sup>7/</sup> The Collective Treaty of Mutual Assistance combined the three elements of non-aggression, peaceful settlement of disputes and mutual assistance. Complaints of attack, invasion or resort to war, and complaints of refusal to submit a question to pacific settlement or to execute an award, were to be submitted to and decided by the Council. Thereafter the signatories were to give immediate assistance to the complaining Power or, in the second case, to carry out the proposals of the Council. No provision was made for mutual assistance before decision by the Council, for third party guarantees, or for maintenance of the territorial status quo.

<sup>8/</sup> A history and analysis of the General Act will be found in document A/AC.18/56 of 4 May 1948.

Of thirty-one States which had become bound by the optional clause, twelve denounced it before or during the Second World War.

164. The model treaty to strengthen the means of preventing war, after being considered over a period of years by various committees of the League, became in 1931 the General Convention for Improving the Means of Preventing War.<sup>2/</sup>

The General Convention was signed at Geneva on 26 September 1931 by twenty-two States, four of which ratified it or acceded to it (the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway and Peru).

165. A product of collaboration between the Financial Committee of the League and the Committee on Arbitration and Security was the Convention on Financial Assistance submitted to the Assembly by the Third Committee on 26 September 1930. The Convention was signed on 2 October 1930 by twenty-nine Members of the League. Three States ratified it (Denmark, Finland and Iran), but the Convention never came into force.

E. The work of the League regarding the manufacture of and trade in arms<sup>10/</sup>

1. The Conference of 1925

166. Following a request by the fifth Assembly to the Council to explore the holding of a conference on the subject, a Conference on the Supervision of the International Trade in Arms assembled at Geneva on 24 May 1925.

167. Five committees were set up by the Conference: a General Committee, to undertake the first reading of the convention and determine questions of principle; a Military, Naval and Air Technical Committee, to examine questions particularly connected with armaments; a Legal Committee; a Customs Committee, to deal with licences; statistics and transit; and a Geographical Committee, to deal with the question of special zones. A Co-ordination Committee examined the reports submitted to the General Committee. The Bureau of the Conference included the President and Vice-President of the Conference, the Chairmen of the Technical Committees and eight representatives, including the representative of the United States.

---

<sup>2/</sup> A history and analysis of this Convention and of the regulations it provided will be found in document A/AC.18/55 of 3 May 1948.

<sup>10/</sup> During the period 1925-1929, the question of the manufacture of and trade in arms was handled in isolation from the general question of disarmament. Nevertheless it had some bearing on that question and it is therefore briefly described here.

168. Five categories of arms were established, namely, (I) arms used exclusively for war; (II) arms capable of being used for war; (III) warships; (IV) aircraft; (V) gunpowder and explosives and other arms.

169. The Convention as drawn up made all export of material in category I subject to licence or export declaration. Export to private individuals except when authorized by the government of the importing country was to be prohibited. The export of goods in category II, while also to be made under licence, did not require authorization from the government of the importing country. The export of goods in categories IV and V to places other than the special zones was not made subject to any formalities or restrictions.

170. The question of an international organ to exercise control through publicity created some difficulties. The United States drew attention to the practical difficulties standing in its way in dealing with an organization directed by the League of Nations; while the Members of the League found difficulties with a control separate from that organization. The General Committee found it possible to dispense with a special organ of control, since its task of periodic and uniform publication of facts regarding international trade in arms and the laws and regulations of various countries on the subject, could be met by the reciprocal undertakings of the signatories to facilitate the publication of such data.

171. Only eight countries (Bulgaria, Canada, China, Egypt, Liberia, the Netherlands, Spain and Venezuela) ratified the Convention without reservation. Nine others ratified with reservations, mainly concerning reciprocal ratification or accession by named countries. Because of those conditional ratifications, the number required to bring the Convention into force was never reached.

172. The Conference completed its work with the preparation of a Convention for the supervision of the International Trade in Arms, which was signed on 17 June 1925 by forty-four States. In a number of cases non-ratification of the Convention was due to dissatisfaction with the failure of the Conference to cover manufacture. The Final Act of the Conference stated that "it is desirable that the international aspect of the manufacture of such arms, ammunition and implements of war should receive early consideration by the different governments". The question of manufacture was particularly stressed by the non-producing States, which felt that a system of licences

/and publicity

and publicity limited to the trade in arms would put them at a disadvantage in relation to countries which could manufacture their own arms free from publicity.

173. To meet that point of view, the Third Committee submitted to the sixth Assembly, in 1925, a draft resolution to convene an international conference on the supervision of manufacture. Acting upon that resolution, the Council, on 12 December 1925, requested the Secretary-General to communicate a questionnaire to governments, Members and non-Members of the League of Nations, concerning the control of private manufacture.

## 2. Special committees

174. A preliminary convention was drafted in 1926 by a committee of the Council. The chief difficulties encountered turned on the questions of State manufacture and of national as against international mechanisms of control. Some States were of the opinion that control should be established over both State and private manufacture. Governments were also divided on the form of control.

175. The committee proposed that supervision of private manufacture should be based on a system of governmental licences, and that publicity should be given to all private or State manufacture on the same conditions as those fixed for the export of armaments by the Convention on the Trade in Arms.

176. On 9 December 1926, the Council appointed a special commission on private manufacture composed of all members of the Council and, by invitation, of the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States. The Commission, which met in March and April 1927, was unable to frame a single text. It submitted to the Council a draft which included the divergent opinions expressed by certain delegations without attempting to analyze the various points of view expressed during the debate.

177. The main difficulty continued to be whether to deal only with private manufacture or with State manufacture also. Private manufacture was to be subject to licence. Publicity which covered both State and private manufacture was to be effected through transmission to the Secretary-General of the League, for publication, of an annual return showing the total production by value of certain categories of arms as well as the total production of material manufactured by both State and private undertakings.

178. A draft

178. A draft convention prepared in 1929 showed that the Special Commission had been unable to make progress with the question of government manufacture. The categories of arms were defined as in the Convention of 1925, and it was generally agreed that private manufacture of the first four categories should be subject to government licence. The United States, however, declared itself powerless for constitutional reasons "to prescribe or enforce a prohibition or a system of licences upon private manufacture".

179. Publicity was to take the form of annual publication of returns to the Secretary-General of the League covering production by value, number and weight of licenced private manufacture. A number of delegations, including the French did not accept the provisions for publicity in regard to State manufacture on the grounds that such provisions must be governed by the decisions to be taken by the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference on the whole question of the publicity of war material.



SECTION IV. THIRD PERIOD, 1931-1937

Armaments Truce

180. On 29 September 1931, the Assembly adopted a resolution urging Governments to refrain for a period of one year, from 1 November 1931, from any measures involving any increase in armaments, to facilitate the work of the Disarmament Conference.

181. The Council was requested to ask the governments to state whether they were prepared to accept that proposal. In accordance with the instructions of the Council, the Secretary-General communicated the Assembly resolution to all the States invited to the Disarmament Conference. Fifty-five States replied to the Secretary-General's circular letter. All governments, including all the great Powers, declared their willingness to accept the Armaments Truce. Certain governments made their acceptance conditional on reciprocity, but in the opinion of the President of the Council such reciprocity appeared in fact to have been achieved. Accordingly the President of the Council declared that the Armaments Truce, under the conditions laid down by the Assembly, had been accepted by governments as from November 1931.

182. The Armaments Truce was later renewed on 1 November 1932 for a period of four months, in accordance with a recommendation made by the General Commission, and adopted on 23 July 1932 by the Conference. Fifty governments, including all the great Powers, signified their agreement to the renewal of the Armaments Truce for the above-mentioned period.

B. Opening of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments

183. The Conference opened on 2 February 1932. The President, after a brief survey of the preparatory work of the League, defined the main task of the Conference as follows:

"(a) To arrive at a collective agreement on an effective programme of practical proposals speedily to secure a substantial reduction and limitation of all national armaments.

"(b) To determine that no armaments might be maintained outside the scope of the treaty by which all the nations represented were to make the achievement of universal disarmament their common aim.

"(c) To ensure continuity of advance towards the ultimate goal of the Conference without detracting in any way from the fullest measure of

success for its immediate effort, by planning the holding of similar conferences at reasonably short intervals of time."

At the close of his speech, the President declared:

"I refuse to contemplate even the possibility of failure. For if we fail, no one can foretell the evil consequences that might ensue. But of this we may be certain: the world would again be in danger of falling back into the vain and perilous competition of rapidly expanding armaments. That is the inexorable alternative to success."

1. Hearing of the petitions of non-governmental organizations

184. At the extraordinary meeting of the Assembly on 6 February 1932, which had been convened for the purpose of receiving petitions from the representatives of national and international organizations, Viscount Cecil (United Kingdom) presented the resolution adopted by the International Federation of League of Nations Societies at its annual meeting in Budapest in 1931. The main features of that resolution were, first, that security and disarmament must go hand in hand; secondly, that with a further increase in security, further disarmament might take place; thirdly, that there should be equality in disarmament between the victors and the vanquished. Three recommendations were made: one in favour of the limitation of armaments expenditures, another in favour of the prohibition, to all nations, of the armaments forbidden to the vanquished Powers (offensive armaments); and a third in favour of the international supervision of armaments. Viscount Cecil emphasized that the final aim of any disarmament proposals must be a decrease in the offensive power of armaments, leaving their defensive power untouched. "The removal of the power of aggression," he stated, "would eventually bring about a complete security". In accordance with that view of the aim of the reduction of armaments, the International Federation of League of Nations Societies called for the prohibition of the construction of war vessels of more than 10,000 tons, and for the abolition of submarines, tanks, large land guns and military aircraft.

2. General Discussion in the Conference

(a) Declaration of the United Kingdom delegation

185. The general discussion opened on 8 February 1932. The representative of the United Kingdom declared that he did not agree with those who suggest

/that the moment

that the moment was not opportune for the Disarmament Conference because "in the Far East armaments are being employed, bombs are dropping from the sky, troops are now on the move and the ideals of the Covenant are in jeopardy". He affirmed that, on the contrary, "now is the accepted time for the promotion of disarmament". "The work of effective international disarmament", he said, "will not be rendered easier but will, in fact, become more and more difficult to achieve as the years go on unless we achieve something now... the security which we set before us as an ideal is security for all, and security for all fundamentally depends on armaments reduction.". He declared that the United Kingdom delegation, accepting the draft disarmament convention as the basis of discussion, would urge the abolition of chemical warfare and of submarines and the study of practical methods for limiting effectives and reducing the armaments expenditure. A safeguard - "some international authority which will effectively secure that these limitations are not overstepped" - was also needed.

(b) Declaration of the French delegation

186. The French representative declared that it was the duty of the Conference to prepare a scheme for the limitation and reduction of armaments which would pay heed to the requirements of security, the assured execution of common obligations and the geographical situation and circumstances of each State. He emphasized that the French conception of disarmament was and remained anchored in the belief that "as long as the League is without means to secure the execution of its decisions, it will always tend to shrink from taking decisions".

(c) Declaration of the United States delegation

187. On 9 February 1932, the representative of the United States declared that the problem before the Conference was to establish the margin that "now exists beyond what is essential for the maintenance of internal order and the defence of [a country's] territories", and then to proceed in a practical way to reduce armaments "to the level to which we are all alike committed". As a corollary task, the Conference should abolish those weapons "devoted primarily to aggressive war". He then laid before the Conference a list of points which his delegation would advocate: first, consideration of the Preparatory Commission's draft convention as a convenient outline of discussion; secondly, prolongation of the naval agreements concluded at Washington

Washington and London; thirdly, proportional reductions of the naval tonnage permitted by those agreements; fourthly, total abolition of submarines; fifthly, protection of the civilian population against bombing from the air; sixthly, total abolition of lethal gases and bacteriological warfare; seventhly, computation of the numbers of the armed forces on the basis of the effectives necessary for the maintenance of internal order in addition to a suitable contingent for defence; eighthly, special restrictions for tanks and heavy mobile guns; monthly, limitation of expenditure on material as a complementary method to direct limitation.

(d) Declaration of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics delegation

188. On 11 February 1932, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declared that "once war is excluded as an instrument of national policy, the Soviet Union Government sees no need for maintaining armies or navies and other armed forces". He recalled that the Soviet Union Government had already proposed, at the Genoa Conference in 1923, total general disarmament as the only way of putting an end to war and had renewed that proposal before the Preparatory Commission; that during the discussions in that Commission, he had warned of the imminent danger of new wars and that the only means of averting that danger "would be total disarmament, and that no treaties, pacts, protocols or international organizations could create real security for all nations". The difference between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics conception of security and the prevailing one could be summed up in the words: "security against war". The endeavour must be to make war itself impossible rather than to ensure "the utmost possible chances of victory to a State subjected to attack".

189. He criticized the French proposals submitted to the Conference on 5 February 1932<sup>11/</sup> as having the effect of converting the Conference into a preparatory conference for a future disarmament conference. He expressed doubts of their practical value as well. He stressed that his Government had always been ready for international co-operation by participation in international congresses and organizations and by concluding international

<sup>11/</sup> See paragraph 196 below.

treaties and undertakings for peace. Considering the Preparatory Commission's draft convention inadequate, he declared that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics delegation would advocate, at the Conference, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Draft Convention for the Reduction of Armaments, which it regarded merely as the first step towards total disarmament.

(e) Summary of the general discussion

190. The general discussion closed on 24 February 1932. Summing up, the President declared, first, that no fundamental objection had been raised to utilizing the draft convention; secondly, that the principle of an effective limitation of armaments and an efficient supervision had been definitely accepted; thirdly, that the necessity of prohibiting or, in any case, of limiting or regulating the use of certain offensive arms had also been accepted; fourthly, that chemical and bacteriological warfare had met with universal condemnation.

C. Organization and Programme of Work

1. The organs of the Conference<sup>12/</sup>

191. The Conference set up two main organs, the General Commission and the Bureau. On 24 February 1932, the General Commission was authorized by the Conference to set up such commissions, sub-commissions and committees as it might consider desirable. It established five main commissions on which all delegations were represented: the Political Commission; the Land Commission; the Naval Commission; the Air Commission; and the National Defence Expenditure Commission. The Bureau also established a certain number of committees to study specific problems. The main commissions, in turn, set up a number of committees, many of which worked through sub-committees. The items studied by those bodies included the following: security, effectives, land armaments, naval armaments, air armaments, chemical warfare, manufacture of and trade in arms, exchange of information, Permanent Disarmament Commission, moral disarmament.

2. Terms of reference of principal organs<sup>13/</sup>

192. The General Commission itself undertook the discussion of principle on the following questions:

<sup>12/</sup> For more details, see annex IV below.

<sup>13/</sup> See annex IV below.

/The principle of

The principle of reduction of armaments;

Criteria for limitation or reduction;

Simultaneous application of a quantitative and qualitative limitation by the prohibition of certain material or of certain categories of armaments;

Reduction of armaments subject to measures to be taken in regard to the organization of peace (international force, arbitration, mutual assistance, sanctions, etc.);

Disarmament laid down in the Treaties of Peace and equality of rights between all States;

Limitation and reduction of the whole of the armed forces capable of immediate mobilization;

Regional agreements within the framework of the general agreement

Demilitarized zones;

Limitation of international law regulations with regard to blockade.

In addition to the foregoing questions of principle, the list included the questions of principle involved in the following items:

Personnel (compulsory service, trained reserves, annual contingents)

Limitation or prohibition of certain categories of war materials (qualitative disarmament);

Land, naval and air armaments;

Trade in and manufacture of armaments;

Limitation of expenditure;

Chemical arms;

Protection of the civilian population.

193. The Political Commission was to deal with moral disarmament and the Permanent Disarmament Commission.

194. Among the matters dealt with by the Land, Naval and Air Commissions were the definition and limitation of average daily effectives, formations organized on a military basis, reduction in the number of units, publicity regarding effectives, compulsory preparatory military training, chemical warfare, exchange of information, questions relating to naval personnel and material, limitation of air effectives and aircraft, civil aviation, inter-dependence between civil and military aviation.

/195. The Commission

195. The Commission on National Defence Expenditure was to deal with such matters as the limitation of total annual expenditure and publicity of land and naval as well as of total expenditure.

D. Declarations and main proposals submitted by the delegations of France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and the United States<sup>14/</sup>

1. French proposals

(a) Proposals of 5 February 1932 (internationalization of civil aviation, international police force, etc.)

196. On 5 February 1932, the French delegation submitted proposals for internationalizing civil air transport under a régime to be organized by the League, for placing limitations on certain types of bombing aircraft, and for placing certain types of aircraft and of land and naval material at the disposal of the League in cases of the application of Article 16 of the Covenant. It was proposed that the number, power and use of bombing aircraft should be limited in order to ensure the League superiority of air strength. Proposals were also made for the creation of an international police force and of a coercitory force to stop war and to bring immediate assistance to any State which became a victim of aggression, and for the protection of civilian populations.

197. The French Government emphasized that its proposals entailed certain political measures of security which included compulsory arbitration, definition of the aggressor, guarantees of quick decision, and international control of the execution of all agreements concerning armaments.

(b) Proposals of 14 November 1932 and 17 February 1933 (organization of peace, standardization of armies of continental Europe)

198. On 14 November 1932, the French delegation submitted a plan, in the form of a memorandum, for the organization of peace. That plan was based on the principle that the reduction of armaments was necessarily bound up with the conditions of security which existed or might be created and must take into account the geographical situation and special conditions of each State.

199. Chapter 1 provided for prompt concerted economic and financial action by all Powers in case of violation of the Pact of Paris (Briand-Kellogg Pact). Chapter 2 stipulated that the application of the principles of

<sup>14/</sup> See annex V below.

Chapter 1 should enable the Members of the League to give full effect to the obligations under the Covenant and, especially, under Article 16 (on sanctions). Chapter 3 envisaged a uniform type of military organization for the countries of continental Europe, namely, a national short-service army with limited effectives not adapted to a sudden offensive, with consequent uniformity of war materials and international supervision and organization of their manufacture. Provision was also to be made for specialized contingents armed with prohibited offensive weapons to be placed at the disposal of the League for use in giving effect to the obligation of mutual assistance in case of aggression established in that chapter and controlled by the Council of the League. Chapter 4 envisaged the qualitative and quantitative reduction of certain types of war vessels in accordance with the spirit of President Hoover's proposals<sup>15/</sup>. Under Chapter 5, the same principles were to be applied to aircraft.

200. The spirit of those proposals was summed up by the representative of France. He said: "it is still impossible to combine, on a universal basis both the political conditions and the technical conditions - the latter varying with the geographical position - which appear necessary for a coherent and effective application of the principles... The French Government therefore considered it preferable to conceive of their full application only within a limited geographical framework... By graduating obligations according to their geographical scope, and by combining political and technical factors at every stage, it seems to us possible to solve the problem... of qualitative disarmament... If we seek a solution on the international plane, if with all the essential guarantees and precautions, we reserve for the League of Nations contingents with very limited effectives ready for immediate intervention, powerful stocks of material and an international air force, it becomes much easier to envisage a reduction of national forces since, in case of need, international means of action will come to the rescue of these national forces under the operation of the system of mutual assistance".

201. In connexion with the discussion of the question of effectives in the General Commission, and more particularly with that relating to the propos

---

<sup>15/</sup> See paragraph 227 below.



standardization of the armies of the continental European countries, the French delegation, on 17 February 1933, submitted the following draft resolution:

"The General Commission notes:

"(a) That only a military status of a definitely defensive character is compatible with a régime of security.

"(b) That in continental Europe an army with a short-term service and limited effectives is the type of military organization which represents the most defensive character and with which mobilization is slowest and which therefore is the most capable of ensuring that the pacific procedures provided for in the Covenant can be set in motion, without the League of Nations, in case of aggression, being faced with an accomplished fact.

"It considers that the general adoption of this type of army will in itself bring about a general reduction of effectives both by a decrease in the number of men called up and by a reduction in the duration of service; that in addition it will render the effectives comparable and will permit of the application of methods of calculation like those which have been proposed by the United States delegation and of which the Effectives Committee has undertaken the study.

"It decides to pass on to the study of the conditions in which this general adoption might be brought about on the European continent in order to lead to an equality of defensive status between the Powers of that continent."

202. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, discussing the question of the standardization of armies of European countries, expressed the hope that the representative of France would have no objection to leaving the different countries to some extent free to retain the type of army they thought most suitable to their needs, as long as it was not a professional army. "To change a system required considerable time", and he hoped that "it would not be necessary to wait for five to eight years, until all armies had been standardized, before armaments were reduced". If it were necessary to adopt only one type of army, in order to compare the value of armies, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics representative wished to know how the non-European States would be dealt with and how their armies were to be compared with the European for purposes of reduction. Those arguments, in his opinion, told in favour

/of leaving

of leaving European countries free to adopt the types of short-term service armies which best suited them. On 23 February 1933, the French draft resolution was adopted by the majority of the Commission.

(c) Proposals of 8 June 1934 (regional security agreements)

203. On 8 June 1934, the French delegation moved a draft resolution in the General Commission which read in part as follows:

"II.

"Having regard to the peculiar importance presented by the study and solution of certain problems to which attention was drawn at the beginning of the general discussion,

"Takes the following decisions:

"(1) Security

"(a) Since the results of the earlier work of the Conference have enabled certain regional security agreements to be concluded in Europe during the past year, the General Commission decides to appoint a special committee to conduct such preliminary studies as it may consider appropriate in order to facilitate the conclusion of further agreements of the same nature which may be negotiated outside the Conference. It would be for the General Commission to determine the relationship, if any, of these agreements to the General Convention.

"(b) The General Commission decides to appoint a special committee to study the question of guarantees of execution, and to resume the work relating to supervision.

"(2) Air Forces

"The General Commission instructs its Air Committee to resume forthwith the study of the questions mentioned in its resolution of July 23rd, 1932, under the heading: '1. Air Forces'.

"(3) Manufacture of and trade in arms

"The General Commission requests its special Committee on questions relating to the manufacture of and trade in arms to resume its work forthwith and, in the light of the statements made by the United States delegate at the meeting of May 29th, 1934, to report to it as early as possible on the solutions it recommends.

"III.

"The General Commission leaves it to the Bureau to take the necessary steps at the proper time to ensure that, when the President

/convenes the

convenes the General Commission, it will have before it, as far as possible, a complete draft convention.

IV.

Recognizing that the proposal of the Soviet delegation<sup>16/</sup> that the conference be declared a permanent institution under the title of the peace conference calls for careful study, the General Commission requests the President to submit that proposal (Conf.D./C.G.163) to the governments.

204. That draft resolution, which was adopted by the General Commission, was supported by the delegations of the United Kingdom and the United States. The latter declared that the text provided "for a programme of work by which it was possible to proceed usefully towards the achievement of an ultimate agreement for a reduction and limitation of armaments".

205. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics representative declared himself not opposed to the French draft resolution and expressed satisfaction with the important place "reserved for the problem of security, which formed one - a very substantial one - of the Soviet delegation's two proposals". He pointed out that he had suggested that "not only regional pacts should be discussed, but also the problem of the definition of aggression; but one question would logically bring the other in its train". Indeed, he said, it would be "very difficult to solve the problem of international pacts, the problem of security, without solving the problem of definition of aggression, if the work were to be thoroughly performed".

2. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics proposals

(a) Proposals of 19 February 1932 (immediate general and complete disarmament, Draft Convention for the Reduction of Armaments)

206. On 19 February 1932, the Soviet Union delegation submitted to the Conference a draft resolution concerning general and complete disarmament which read as follows:

"Animated by the firm desire for an effective and solidly organized peace;

"Actuated by the determination to create genuine security for all States and all peoples by preventing the possibility of future wars;

<sup>16/</sup> See paragraph 213 below.

/"Convinced that

"Convinced that the very existence of armaments and the tendency they show constantly to increase inevitably lead to armed international conflicts which tear the workers from their peaceful occupations and bring innumerable calamities in their train;

"Considering that military expenditure, which imposes an intolerable burden upon the masses of the people, fosters and enhances the economic crisis with all its consequences;

"Noting that the States which it represents have renounced war as an instrument of national policy;

"Believing that the only effective means of contributing to the organization of peace and the establishment of security against war is the general complete and rapid abolition of all armed forces, setting out from the principle of equality for all;

"Convinced that the idea of general and complete disarmament answers to the sincere aspirations of the masses towards peace;

"The Conference decides to base its work on the principle of general and complete disarmament."

207. As an alternative in case its draft resolution was rejected, the USSR presented an amended version of the Draft Convention for the Reduction of Armaments previously submitted to the Preparatory Commission.<sup>17/</sup>

208. Article 1 was to be amended as follows:

"In accordance with the preamble to the present Convention, the Contracting States, when effecting the progressive and proportional reduction of the effectives of their armed land forces, agree to divide all the Contracting States into the following groups:

"States maintaining in peace-time armed land forces:

- "A. Of over 200,000 men;
- "B. Of 30,000 to 200,000 men;
- "C. Of 30,000 men or less.

#### Remarks

"1. States disarmed as a result of the world war are not included in any of the groups provided for in the present article.

"2. States having contracted alliances or agreements of mutual military assistance in case of armed conflicts shall be classified in the groups provided for in the present article, for the purpose of the

<sup>17/</sup> See paragraph 141 above.

reduction of their armaments, on the basis of a figure representing the total land forces of these States added together."

"Remarks 1, 2 and 3 of the draft shall be maintained and shall become remarks 3, 4 and 5 respectively."

Article 2 of the draft was to be amended as follows:

"The effectives of the land armed forces shall be reduced:

"1. For States in group A, by 50 per cent;

"2. For States in group B, from 0 to 50 per cent according to the number of their effectives and to the scale of progressive and proportional reduction attached;

"3. For States in group C, the effectives shall be limited to the present level.

"Remark.

"The effectives of the armed land forces of the States disarmed as a result of the world war are not included in the above schedule and shall be fixed separately."

The amendments to articles 12 and 21 concerned the reduction of naval and air forces.

(b) Proposals of 25 April 1932 (factors for the reduction of armaments).

209. On 25 April 1932, the USSR delegation submitted to the General Commission a memorandum on the considerations to be taken into account, inter alia, in the reduction of armaments

"I.

"1. Size of the territory.

"2. Length of the land and sea frontiers.

"3. Density of the population and equality of its distribution by regions.

"4. Relation of the railway system to the size of the territory; distribution of railways by regions.

"5. Extent and condition of the road communications.

"II.

- "1. Particulars of the railway system near the frontiers.
- "2. Communications between the different maritime docks adjoining the coasts; distance between each.
- "3. Number of seaports and comparative facility of blockading the maritime outlets.

"III.

- "1. Military alliances or conventions between the country concerned and other States.
- "2. Military alliances or conventions between neighbouring States or between the latter and a third State.
- "3. State of political relations with other countries - in particular whether normal relations exist with the latter.
- "4. State of security since the end of the world war - namely, has the country concerned been invaded by foreign armed forces during that period for the purpose of (a) interfering in its internal affairs, organizing or supporting a civil war; (b) taking from it a part of its territory; (c) for any other purpose.
- "5. The existence of neighbouring States which have violated international obligations designed to safeguard peace, have engaged in hostilities without declaring war, have sent land, sea or air armed forces to the foreign territory on the pretext of defending their citizens or their interests, and which consequently do not afford sufficient guarantees for the observance of the proposed convention for the reduction of armaments."

(c) Proposals of 6 February 1933 (definition of aggression)

210. On 6 February 1933, in connexion with the discussion of the French plan for the organization of peace, the USSR representative declared that "to secure the minimum of authority, impartiality and confidence to the international organ to be called into life" by the extension of the Briand-Kellogg Pact proposed by the French delegation, a definition of an aggressor was imperative.

211. Therefore the Soviet Union delegation submitted the following draft declaration for the definition of the term "aggressor":

- "1. The aggressor in an international conflict shall be considered that State which is the first to take any of the following actions:

/"(a)

- "(a) Declaration of war against another State;
- "(b) The invasion by its armed forces on the territory of another State without declaration of war;
- "(c) Bombarding the territory of another State by its land, naval or air forces or knowingly attacking the naval or air forces of another State;
- "(d) The landing in, or introduction within the frontiers of, another State of land, naval or air forces without the permission of the government of such a State, or the infringement of the conditions of such permission, particularly as regards the duration of sojourn or extension of area;
- "(e) The establishment of a naval blockade of the coast or ports of another State.

"2. No considerations whatsoever of a political, strategical or economic nature, including the desire to exploit natural riches or to obtain any sort of advantages or privileges on the territory of another State, no references to considerable capital investments or other special interests in a given State, or to the alleged absence of certain attributes of State organization in the case of a given country, shall be accepted as justification of aggression as defined in clause 1.

"In particular, justification for attack cannot be based upon:

"A. The internal situation in a given State, as, for instance:

- "(a) Political, economic or cultural backwardness of a given country;
- "(b) Alleged maladministration;
- "(c) Possible danger to life or property of foreign residents;
- "(d) Revolutionary or counter-revolutionary movement, civil war, disorders or strikes;
- "(e) The establishment or maintenance in any State of any political, economic or social order.

"B. Any acts, laws, or regulations of a given State, as, for instance:

- "(a) The infringement of international agreements;
- "(b) The infringement of the commercial, concessional or other economic rights or interests of a given State or its citizens;

/"(c) The

"(c) The rupture of diplomatic or economic relations;

"(d) Economic or financial boycott;

"(e) Repudiation of debts;

"(f) Non-admission or limitation of immigration, or restriction of rights or privileges of foreign residents;

"(g) The infringement of the privileges of official representatives of other States;

"(h) The refusal to allow armed forces transit to the territory of a third State;

"(i) Religious or anti-religious measures;

"(k) Frontier incidents.

"3. In the case of the mobilization or concentration of armed forces to a considerable extent in the vicinity of its frontiers, the State which such activities threaten may have recourse to diplomatic or other means for the peaceful solution of international controversies. It may at the same time take steps of a military nature, analogous to those described above, without, however, crossing the frontier."

(d) Proposals of 25 April 1933 (threats of breach of the Pact of Paris)

212. During the discussion of the United Kingdom draft convention on 25 April 1933, the USSR delegation submitted, in connexion with the question of security, proposals for additions to that draft concerning the following cases of threats of breach of the Pact of Paris which would have to be considered: open and official threats to resort to military measures; handing in an ultimatum; severance of diplomatic relations; naval or air demonstrations; concentration of large armed forces near the frontier; mobilization; declaration of blockade or measures preparatory to a blockade; declaration of the existence of a state of war.

(e) Proposals of 4 June 1934 (transformation of the Disarmament Conference into a permanent peace conference)

213. On 4 June 1934, the USSR delegation submitted to the Bureau the following draft resolution:

"The General Commission decides:

"(1) To resume immediately the work which was interrupted by

/studying



studying existing proposals for pacts of mutual assistance and the definition of the aggressor;

"(2) To recommend the Conference, in plenary meeting, in view of the special importance at the present moment of an extensive and continuous organization for the safeguarding of peace, to declare the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments a permanent body, to be described as the peace conference, with the following aims:

"(a) Continuation of the task of securing an agreement upon the establishment of a Convention for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments;

"(b) Establishment of agreements and the adoption of decisions and measures creating new guarantees of security;

"(c) Adoption of any preventive measures likely to prevent armed conflicts;

"(d) Supervision of the execution of the conventions and decisions of the Conference;

"(e) Consultation in the event of a violation of international treaties for the maintenance of peace.

"The change in the name of the Conference will in no way affect the relations previously existing between the Conference and the League of Nations.

"(3) To instruct the Bureau of the Conference to reconsider the rules of procedure of the Conference in the light of the extension of its aims and to submit them, after revision, for examination by the Conference in plenary meeting."

214. As already noted,<sup>18/</sup> this proposal found a place in the French draft resolution adopted by the General Commission on 8 June 1934.

### 3. United Kingdom proposals

#### (a) Proposals of 22 February 1932 (qualitative disarmament)

215. On 22 February 1932, the United Kingdom delegation proposed that special attention should be directed to the following: the most practicable course for limiting the number of effectives; the prohibition of mobile land guns above a certain calibre; the abolition (and prohibition) of submarines as a humanitarian measure; reduction of the size of capital ships and the maximum calibre of guns carried by them; bombing from the air.

<sup>18/</sup> See paragraph 203 above.

216. In connexion with President Hoover's proposals,<sup>19/</sup> the United Kingdom delegation communicated to the Conference a "statement of views of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom regarding the proposals contained in President Hoover's declaration", in which the United Kingdom delegation put forward "for immediate adoption by international agreement" the following proposals relating to the navies of the world:

"(1) Reduce the maximum size of any future capital ship to 22,000 tons, and the maximum calibre of the guns carried to 11 inches."

217. As for air armaments, the United Kingdom Government proposed:

"(i) The complete prohibition of all bombing from the air, save within limits to be laid down as precisely as possible by an international convention. Attacks upon the civilian population would be entirely prohibited.

"(ii) A strict limitation in the unladen weight of all military and naval aircraft (troop-carriers and flying boats excepted).

"(iii) A restriction in the numbers of all kinds of military and naval aircraft."

(b) Proposals of 30 January 1933 (programme of work)

218. On 13 February 1933, the General Commission considered a programme of work for the Conference submitted by the United Kingdom on 30 January 1933 which included the following: affirmation to be made by all European States that they would not resort to force; conclusion of mutual assistance agreements by continental European States; qualitative equality of war material; reduction of the armies of the continental European States to a uniform general type of organization; computation of the irreducible component (police forces) of land forces in accordance with President Hoover's proposals. The General Commission decided to send to the Political Committee the questions relating to security and to retain for its own consideration the other questions.

(c) Proposals of 16 March 1933 (draft convention)

219. On 16 March 1933, the United Kingdom delegation submitted a draft convention which was discussed by the General Commission from 23 to 27 March. Part I of the draft, which dealt with the question of security, provided that, in the event of a breach or threat of breach of the Pact of Paris, the

<sup>19/</sup> See paragraph 227, below.

contracting parties should meet in conference at the request of any five parties to the Pact of Paris. Any conclusions reached at such a meeting, to be valid, were to require the concurrence of the representatives of France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States. Part II concerned disarmament proper. The draft laid down the following maximum figures for the effectives of the continental countries in Europe:

Party	Land Armed Forces	
	Stationed in home country	Total including overseas
Germany	200,000	200,000
Belgium	60,000	75,000
Bulgaria	60,000	60,000
Spain	120,000	170,000
France	200,000	400,000
Greece	60,000	60,000
Hungary	60,000	60,000
Italy	200,000	250,000
Netherlands	25,000	75,000
Poland	200,000	200,000
Portugal	50,000	60,000
Romania	150,000	150,000
Czechoslovakia	100,000	100,000
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	500,000	500,000
Yugoslavia	100,000	100,000
Each other continental European State	(no separate figure)	50,000

The table was accompanied by the following note:

"This table contains only the figures which are suggested for the countries of continental Europe. It would, of course, require to be completed by the addition of figures in respect of all the other parties."

Section II of part II concerned the qualitative limitation of land and naval armaments.

220. The number of aeroplanes to be allowed was as follows:

Belgium . . . . .	150	Norway . . . . .	75
United Kingdom . . . . .	500	Poland . . . . .	200
China . . . . .	100	Portugal . . . . .	25
Czechoslovakia . . . . .	200	Romania . . . . .	150
Denmark . . . . .	50	Siam . . . . .	75
Estonia . . . . .	50	Spain . . . . .	200
Finland . . . . .	25	Sweden . . . . .	75
France . . . . .	500	Switzerland . . . . .	75
Greece . . . . .	75	USSR . . . . .	500
Italy . . . . .	500	United States . . . . .	500
Japan . . . . .	500	Yugoslavia . . . . .	200
Latvia . . . . .	50		
Lithuania . . . . .	50		
Netherlands . . . . .	150		

The table was accompanied by the following note:

"Figures will have to be inserted subsequently for the other parties which at present possess military or naval aeroplanes."

221. Part III was reserved for the question of exchange of information. It was stated that the provisions to be inserted would be governed by the limitations and restrictions imposed by the other parts of the convention. Part IV dealt with chemical and bacterial weapons. Part V contained miscellaneous provisions (permanent disarmament commission, regulations etc.).

222. During the general discussion of the United Kingdom draft convention, the representative of the USSR, on 27 March 1933, noted serious deficiencies in the figures set out in that draft. He observed that the figures for effectives covered only European countries. Moreover, no indication had been given of the criteria for establishing those figures. The USSR delegation was therefore unable to examine the figures proposed for the USSR. The representative of France found in the United Kingdom draft features also contained in the French plan and endorsed by the General Commission. On the other hand, the United Kingdom draft did not take into consideration certain points adopted in the General Commission resolution of 23 July and, in particular, various points concerning supervision, although a first step in

/that direction

that direction, which the French delegation considered insufficient, was taken by the United Kingdom Draft Convention.

223. On 27 March 1933, the General Commission decided unanimously "to take this draft as a basis for its subsequent discussions, the various delegations retaining the right to propose modifications, amendments or additions according to the wishes they manifested in their communications to the General Commission".

224. On 8 June 1933, the General Commission adopted the recommendation of the Bureau to accept the United Kingdom Draft Convention as a basis for the future convention. The United Kingdom Draft Convention thus replaced the draft convention framed by the Preparatory Commission.

4. United States proposals

(a) Proposals of 19 February 1932 (naval armaments and chemical warfare)

225. On 19 February 1932, the United States delegation submitted the suggestions already described<sup>20/</sup> in connexion with that delegation's opening statement to the Conference.

(b) Proposals of 11 April 1932 (qualitative disarmament)

226. On 11 April 1932, the United States delegation submitted to the General Commission a draft resolution, the operative part of which read as follows:

"1. (a) That the following weapons are of a peculiarly aggressive value against land defences--tanks, heavy mobile guns and gases--and as such should be abolished; and

"(b) To request the Land Commission to draw up and submit to the General Commission a plan for scrapping tanks and mobile guns exceeding 155 millimetres in calibre and for the abolition of the use of gases in war.

"2. (a) That an undertaking by the States not to avail themselves of the aforementioned weapons in the event of war is equally essential; and

"(b) To request the Political Commission to draw up and submit to the General Commission texts for these purposes."

<sup>20/</sup> See paragraph 187 above.

(c) Proposals of 22 June 1932 (President Hoover's statement on the reduction of armaments)

227. On 22 June 1932, the representatives of the United States read to the General Commission the "statement of the instructions issued by President Hoover to the American delegation to the Conference for the Limitation and Reduction of Armaments". The principles underlying those proposals were stated to be:

"(I) The Briand-Kellogg Pact meant that the nations of the world had agreed that they would use their arms solely for defence;

"(II) The reduction of armaments should be carried out by increasing the comparative power of defence through decreases in the power of attack;

"(III) The existing relativity as between the armaments of the world, which had grown up in mutual relation to one another, should be preserved in making reductions;

"(IV) The reductions must be real and positive and effect economic relief;

"(V) The problems of land forces, air forces and naval forces were interconnected and the proposals submitted should not be dissociated one from another."

On the basis of these principles, the United States delegation proposed that the arms of the world should be reduced by nearly one-third. In regard to land forces, the proposal involved the abolition of all tanks, of chemical warfare and of large mobile guns. In regard to effectives, there should be a reduction of one-third in the strength of all land arms over and above the so-called "police component", or strength necessary for the maintenance of internal order.

228. On 7 July 1932, the United Kingdom delegation submitted a statement of views of the United Kingdom Government regarding the proposals contained in President Hoover's declaration. The United Kingdom Government agreed with the two principles of quantitative and qualitative limitation; it also agreed with the principle that the three problems of military, naval and air disarmament were interconnected. As for particular items, the United Kingdom Government declared that it found itself very largely in accord with President Hoover's proposal with regard to land disarmament, "it being understood that before expressing a final opinion, it would be necessary to examine in detail their suitability to the situation in each country."

(d) Proposals of 19 May 1933 (President Roosevelt's Message on qualitative disarmament and a non-aggression pact)

229. On 19 May 1933, the President of the United States addressed to the heads of States a Message which was communicated formally to the President of the Conference, urging that the ultimate aim of the Conference "must be the complete elimination of offensive measures" and recommending that, in the meantime, no nation should increase its armament and suggesting that all nations should enter into a solemn pact of non-aggression.

E. Basic decisions of the General Commission<sup>21/</sup>

1. Criteria for the reduction and limitation of armaments adopted by the General Commission (11 April 1932)

230. On 11 April 1932, the General Commission began the discussion of the general principles raised by article 1 of the draft convention, and on 19, 20 and 22 April, adopted the following resolutions:

"(I) In view of the opinions expressed during the discussion at the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, the General Commission considers that the reduction of armaments, as provided for in Article 8 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, shall, after this Conference has taken the first decisive step of general reduction to the lowest possible level, be progressively achieved by means of successive revisions at appropriate intervals." (19 April 1932).

"(II) In view of the proposals submitted by various delegations concerning the criteria for the limitation and reduction of armaments, the General Commission declares that, in determining those criteria, the provisions of Article 8 of the Covenant of the League of Nations shall be applied, and that, in consequence, armaments must be reduced to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations.

"It will be necessary, further, to take account of the geographical situation and special circumstances of each State.

"The General Commission decides that the application of these criteria and the methods by which the reduction and limitation of armaments must be effected, shall be immediately examined from a practical standpoint." (20 April 1932).

"(III) Without prejudice to other proposals which fall to be discussed under later heads of the agenda, the Conference declares its

<sup>21/</sup> See annex V below.

approval of the principle of qualitative disarmament--i.e., the selection of certain classes or descriptions of weapons the possession or use of which should be absolutely prohibited to all States or internationalized by means of a general convention." (22 April 1932).

"(IV) In seeking to apply the principle of qualitative disarmament, as defined in the previous resolution, the Conference is of opinion that the range of land, sea and air armaments should be examined by the competent special Commissions with a view to selecting those weapons whose character is the most specifically offensive or those most efficacious against national defence or most threatening to civilians." (22 April 1932).

## 2. Resolution of 23 July 1932

231. Taking into account the points on which agreement had been reached and the proposals submitted by President Hoover, the General Commission adopted, on 23 July 1932, the following basic resolution:

"The Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments...

"Decides forthwith and unanimously, guided by the general principle underlying President Hoover's declaration:

"1. That a substantial reduction of world armaments shall be effected, to be applied by a general convention alike to land, naval and air armaments;

"2. That a primary objective shall be to reduce the means of attack.

## "II. CONCLUSIONS OF THE FIRST PHASE OF THE CONFERENCE

"The Conference, noting that agreement has now been reached on a certain number of important points, decides, without prejudice to more far-reaching agreements hereafter, to record forthwith the following concrete measures of disarmament, which should form part of the general convention to be concluded. The Conference also decides to establish certain principles as the basis for further reductions of armaments, and to determine the procedure necessary for the active prosecution of its work.

### "1. Air Forces

"The Conference, deeply impressed with the danger overhanging civilization from the potential use of bombardment from the air in the event of future conflict, and determined to take all practicable measures to provide against this danger, records at this stage of its work the following conclusions:



"1. Air attack against the civilian population shall be absolutely prohibited;

"2. The High Contracting Parties shall agree as between themselves that all bombardment from the air shall be abolished, subject to agreement with regard to measures to be adopted for the purpose of rendering effective the observance of this rule;

"These measures should include the following:

"(a) There shall be effected a limitation by number and a restriction by characteristics of military aircraft;

"(b) Civil aircraft shall be submitted to regulation and full publicity. Further, civil aircraft not conforming to the specified limitations shall be subjected to an international régime (except for certain regions where such a régime is not suitable) such as to prevent effectively the misuse of such civil aircraft."

Article 2 of part II laid down the principles for the limitation in number of heavy land artillery of a calibre to fixed by the convention.

## "2. Land armaments

### "(a) Land artillery

"1. All heavy land artillery of calibre between any maximum limit as determined in the succeeding paragraph and a lower limit to be defined shall be limited in number;

"2. The limitation of calibre of land artillery shall be fixed by the convention;

"Subject to an effective method being established to prevent the rapid transformation of guns on fixed mountings into mobile guns, different maxima for the calibre of land guns may be fixed as follows:

"(a) A maximum limit for the calibre of coastal guns, which shall not be less than the maximum calibre of naval guns;

"(b) A maximum limit for the calibre of guns in permanent frontier or fortress defensive systems;

"(c) A maximum limit for the calibre of mobile land guns (other than guns employed for coastal defence).

### "(b) Tanks

"The maximum unit tonnage of tanks shall be limited."

Part III of the resolution listed the following questions on which agreement had been reached in principle and which were to be examined by the Bureau in order that definite conclusions might be reached:

## "1. Effectives

"A strict limitation and a real reduction of effectives shall be brought about.

/"For this purpose

"For this purpose, the Conference invites the Bureau to examine, with the collaboration of such delegations as it considers necessary, the proposal of President Hoover relating to effectives. These studies should take into consideration, in the case of each country, the actual conditions of defence and the number and character of its forces.

## "2. Limitation of national defence expenditure

"(a) The Conference shall decide on the resumption of its labours, taking into account the special conditions of each State, what system of limitation and publicity of expenditure on national defence will provide the peoples with the best guarantee of an alleviation of their financial burdens, and will prevent the measures of qualitative and quantitative disarmament to be inserted in the convention from being neutralized by increases or improvements in authorized armaments.

"(b) With a view to the decisions to be taken under this head, the Conference requests the Committee on National Defence Expenditure and its technical committee to continue and to complete the work entrusted to its organ and to submit their report as soon as possible. The Conference requests its Bureau to draw up, on the basis of this report, a plan accomplishing the purpose aimed at and taking into consideration the special conditions of the various States.

## "3. Trade in and manufacture of arms

"The Bureau will set up a special Committee to submit proposals to the Conference, immediately on the resumption of its work, in regard to the regulations to be applied to the trade in, and private manufacture of, arms and implements of war."

Article 4 dealt with naval armament in connexion with the proposals made by President Hoover:

## "5. Violations

"Rules of international law shall be formulated in connexion with the provisions relating to the prohibition of the use of chemical, bacteriological and incendiary weapons and bombing from the air, and shall be supplemented by special measures dealing with infringement of these provisions."

Article 6 of part III dealt with the resumption of the work of the General Commission. Part IV contained the general provisions:

## "IV. General Provisions

"The present resolution in no way prejudices the attitude of the Conference towards any more comprehensive measures of disarmament or towards the political proposals submitted by various delegations."

232. The USSR delegation voted against the resolution on the ground that it did not go as far as certain delegations desired in the direction of disarmament. The adoption of the resolution was followed by the first withdrawal of Germany.

## /3. Resolutions

3. Resolutions of 27 March and 8 June 1933

233. As already noted,<sup>22/</sup> the Commission, on 27 March 1933, abandoned the Preparatory Commission's draft convention and adopted the United Kingdom draft convention as the basis of discussion. On 8 June 1933, the Commission decided that the United Kingdom draft convention should constitute the basis for the future convention.

F. Diplomatic negotiations relating to the work of the Conference

1. First withdrawal of Germany from the Conference

234. In the course of discussion in the General Commission of the draft resolution inspired by President Hoover's proposals of 22 June 1932, the German delegation made an official declaration to the effect that the German Government could not undertake to continue to take part in the work of the Conference unless the proceedings were in future to be conducted on the basis of a recognition of legal equality between the States. When the Bureau of the Conference met on 21 September to begin the work assigned to it under the resolution adopted by the General Commission on 23 July 1932, the President read a letter from the German Government recalling its attitude towards that resolution. The German Government stated that since its efforts to clarify the question of the recognition of the principle of equality of rights as between nations had proved unavailing, Germany would be unable to take part in the further work of the Conference. The German Government added that it would, however, follow the proceedings of the Conference with interest, and its further attitude would be determined by the course which they might take.

235. On 17 November 1932, the representative of the United Kingdom submitted to the Bureau a programme of work intended more particularly to meet the German claim to equality of rights. He suggested that acknowledgement of the moral right to parity of treatment put forward by Germany entailed upon Germany as upon other countries the acceptance of an obligation not to attempt to solve differences by resort to force. He suggested that the German claim to equality should be met so far as it did not involve measures of rearmament. He proposed also that the limitations imposed on the armaments of Germany should be contained in the same disarmament convention as that defining the limitations to be imposed on the armaments of other nations, and that the principle of qualitative equality should be extended to Germany.

22/ See paragraphs 223 and 224 above.

/236. In the last

236. In the last months of 1932, negotiations took place between the representatives of France, Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States in order to render possible the continuation of the work of the Conference with the collaboration of Germany. Agreement was reached, on 11 December 1932, along the lines of the United Kingdom proposals mentioned above. The formula adopted was the granting to the disarmed nations of equality of rights in a system which would provide security for all nations. The five governments also declared that they would seek without delay to work out a convention which would effect a substantial reduction and a limitation of armaments.

237. Following Germany's return to the Conference in January 1933, the basis of Conference discussion shifted from the Preparatory Commission draft convention to the United Kingdom draft convention of March 1933 which was intended to carry out the engagement contained in the five-Power declaration of 11 December 1932. The United Kingdom draft convention, however, envisaged a period of transition. No delegations voted against the adoption of the United Kingdom draft convention as the basis of the future convention.

2. The President's negotiations on the provisional text of the United Kingdom draft convention

238. After the conclusion of the first reading of the United Kingdom draft convention, the President of the Conference, acting under authorization from the General Commission to undertake any negotiations necessary to facilitate the preparation by the Bureau of a text of the draft convention for a second reading, visited the capitals of various countries for that purpose. On 9 October 1933, he informed the Bureau of the results of the conversations which had taken place in the course of his negotiations. In his opinion, agreement appeared to be relatively easy to reach on the following questions: non-resort to force on a universal basis; definition of the aggressor; control and supervision; standardization of the continental European armies; budgetary publicity and control; bombing from the air; early constitution of the permanent disarmament commission; naval questions. The following questions had not proved so easy of adjustment: the period of duration of a first-stage convention; size of tanks and artillery; reduction of land war material; manufacture of and trade in arms; military and naval aviation; penalties for a violation of the convention. On 26 October 1933, the General Commission

/expressed the

expressed the unanimous opinion that the Conference should continue to work for the establishment of a disarmament convention based on the United Kingdom draft convention. Further efforts would have to be made, by way of negotiations, to clear up existing divergencies. The General Commission then adjourned until 4 December 1933 to permit further efforts to narrow existing divergencies.

### 3. Second withdrawal of Germany from the Conference

239. While the General Commission was in recess during the summer of 1933, diplomatic negotiations continued between the principal Powers concerned. The results of those discussions were set forth in a statement of the United Kingdom representative to the Bureau on 14 October 1933. He reported that the conclusion to which he had come was that his delegation's draft convention would require modification in the following sense. The period to be covered would have to be extended to eight years and the provisions of the convention carried out by stages in view of the disturbed condition of Europe. The first years of this extended period would see the transformation of continental armies into short-term service armies, and the institution, through the permanent disarmament commission, of an adequate system of supervision. Ultimately, there should be a substantial disarmament of the heavily armed Powers in accordance with a detailed and agreed plan of reduction which must be fully defined and embodied in the convention at the time of its signature. An essential correlative requirement was that the disarmed Powers should not begin to increase their armaments immediately since agreement could not be reached on the basis of a convention which contemplated such rearmament.

240. Immediately after the meeting of the Bureau at which the foregoing statement was made, a communication was received by the President of the Conference in which the German Government announced its decision to discontinue German participation in the work of the Conference. The reason was "the unwillingness on the part of the highly armed States to carry out their contractual obligations to disarm". "This renders impossible the satisfaction of Germany's recognized claim to equality of rights, and the condition on which the German Government agreed . . . again to take part in the work of the Conference thus no longer exists".<sup>23/</sup>

<sup>23/</sup> On 21 October 1933, Germany gave notice of its withdrawal from the League of Nations, which became effective on 21 October 1935.

241. In reply the President declared that he was unable to accept as valid the reasons given by the Germany Government since the programme which the Bureau had decided to submit to the General Commission, provided for the realization, progressively within a limited period, of reduction of armaments comparable to those contemplated in the draft convention submitted to the General Commission.

242. On 29 January 1934, the United Kingdom Government forwarded a memorandum to the President of the Conference and informed him at the same time that it was sending Mr. Eden to the capitals of the States most directly concerned to ascertain their attitude to certain proposals contained in the memorandum, including those raised in connexion with the question of Germany.

243. The French Government, in reply to a question from the United Kingdom Government, declared that even before determining whether a convention legalizing German rearmament could be signed, even with guarantees of execution France must consider the conditions of its own security and that of other interested Powers. A principle condition was the return of Germany to the League.

244. The German Government, for its part, while declaring its willingness to accept the United Kingdom memorandum of 29 January 1934, subject to certain important modifications, as the basis for the convention, stated that the return of Germany to the League could be considered only after the questions of disarmament and particularly of Germany's equality of rights had been settled.

245. On 10 April 1934, the President of the Conference summarized before the Bureau the outstanding divergencies revealed by the exchanges of opinion between the interested countries. It was decided that supplementary efforts would have to be continued until a date in May 1934, when the General Commission was to meet. The results of those efforts and of later exchanges of views are described in section IV H below.

#### G. Technical work of the Conference

246. The following summary of the technical work of the Conference is based on the conclusions formulated by the President of the Conference in his "Preliminary report on the work of the Conference" published in September 1936 after his death in October 1935.

1. The problem of security

247. In the opinion of the President, appreciable progress had been made in the system of collective security. Agreement had been reached as to the measures which should be taken in case of breach or threat of breach of the Pact of Paris. Those agreed measures were embodied in the United Kingdom draft convention. Definite progress had been made by the adoption, on 2 March 1933, of the draft undertaking not to resort to war, to be signed by all European States. In that connexion, the President of the Conference recalled that the President of the United States, in a Message to the Conference on 19 May 1933, had proposed that all the nations of the world should enter into a pact of non-aggression. The position in regard to the definition of the aggressor, the procedure for the establishment of facts constituting aggression, and the problem of mutual aggression, was less clear. The President mentioned the European Pact of Mutual Assistance of 30 May 1933, which had given rise, in the General Commission, to a divergence of views. No conclusions had been reached on the question of regional agreements, which had been considered by the Special Committee in accordance with the General Commission's resolution of 8 June 1934, because the General Commission had had no subsequent opportunity to discuss the problem.

2. Effectives

248. The various proposals on effectives had been, in the opinion of the President, constantly outstripped by political events.

(a) Military effectives

249. After rejecting at previous meetings, the principle of general and complete disarmament, and, as an alternative, that of proportional and progressive reduction of armaments proposed by the USSR delegation,<sup>24/</sup> the General Commission adopted, on 8 June 1933, the provisional text of the United Kingdom draft convention as the basis for the future convention. The limitation of armed forces laid down in that draft convention was based on the principle of the average daily effectives.

250. The conception of average daily effectives was used for the first time in a questionnaire which was sent by the Secretary-General in 1931 to different governments in order to obtain information on the position of their armaments. The replies received by the Secretariat demonstrated a lack of uniformity in the

<sup>24/</sup> See paragraphs 206 to 208 above,

calculation by governments of their average daily effectives. Certain governments based their calculations on the budgetary effectives, while others used legal (theoretical) or real effectives.

251. In 1932, the Land Commission appointed a Technical Committee to examine how the different governments had interpreted the definitions of effectives given in the draft convention when drawing up the particulars they had sent to the League of Nations. For the purpose of that examination the Technical Committee adopted a questionnaire which included the following questions:

"What meaning have you given to the word effectives (theoretical, budgetary, actual or other effectives)?"

"What have you counted as days of presence (short leave, long leave, illness, travelling, early discharge, etc.)?"

"What have you counted in your effectives (different services, missions, persons attached to civilian services, etc.)?"

252. After considering the returns of governments, the Technical Committee noted, in its report of 16 March 1932, "the variety of interpretations given by the different governments and the resulting absence of uniformity of their returns". Indeed, ten governments took legal effectives in calculating the average daily effectives; eight countries used budgetary effectives, and twenty four countries adopted the system of actual effectives.

253. On 19 May 1932, the General Commission established, in accordance with a resolution submitted by the United States delegation, the Committee on Effectives, which was to study "information relating to figures for effectives with a view to preparing a report as to the numerical strength, on a comparable basis, of effectives maintained by each country, to the General Commission." In connexion with that study, the Committee on Effectives was authorized to invite representatives of each country concerned to appear before it to discuss figures submitted by that country.

254. On 9 June 1932, the Committee presented its report, declaring that it had not been possible to obtain unanimity upon the precise definition to be used as a basis for the compilation of comparative tables of the average daily effectives of armed forces.

255. The question of effectives received a new impulse following President Hoover's proposals of 22 June 1932,<sup>25/</sup> suggesting "a reduction of one-third

<sup>25/</sup> See paragraph 227 above.



in the strength of all land armies over and above the so-called 'police component' or forces necessary for the maintenance of internal order", the latter to be proportionate to the average allowed to Germany (100,000 troops for a population of 65 million people) and other disarmed States, and taking into account allowances which might be required by Powers with colonial possessions.

256. As the question of effectives had become one of the most important items on the agenda of the Conference, the Bureau decided, on 22 September 1932, in accordance with a suggestion submitted by the representative of the United States, that a Special Committee on Effectives should be created which would include members of the former Committee on Effectives with the addition of representatives of countries which were members of the Bureau but which were not represented on the former Committee. It was understood that the members of the Special Committee would be government representatives and not experts. The Special Committee after discussing President Hoover's proposals, adopted on 20 January 1933 the principle of dividing effectives into reducible and irreducible (police) components, the latter based on the number of population, corrected if necessary by the factors of area, length and nature of frontiers, and the situation of vital centres in relation to them.

257. To attain the objective laid down in President Hoover's proposals, the French delegation suggested in its memorandum on the organization of peace and the standardization of armies in continental Europe<sup>26/</sup> that the land defence forces of the continental States of Europe should be reduced to a uniform general type - that of a national short-term service army with limited effectives, taking into account conditions peculiar to each State, the pre-regimental training or military training received in political organizations, and effectives in home police forces.

258. On 20 January 1933, the United Kingdom delegation, in accordance with President Hoover's proposals, submitted to the Bureau a programme of work relating to the military effectives, and instructing the Special Committee on Effectives to submit recommendations concerning the ratios to be applied to the existing land forces of each country in order to determine its "police component" (irreducible component) and to agree upon the percentage by which the "defence component" (excess over the "police component") of each State should be reduced,

<sup>26/</sup> See paragraphs 198 and 199 above.

259. On 13 February 1933, the General Commission decided to discuss the question of effectives on the basis of the French and United Kingdom proposals. A list of questions was drawn up by a drafting committee; it included questions relating to the standardization of the European continental armies, questions on effectives in general and questions relating to overseas effectives.

260. The General Commission, after discussing those questions between 23 February 1933 and 6 March 1933, took the following main decisions of principle:

The European continental armies should be converted into armies with short-term service and limited effectives;

Such transformation should not apply to the effective stationed overseas;

Pre-military training and military training received outside the army should be counted as part of the period of training in the army;

Police forces of a military character should be limited on a common basis;

Numerical limitation of effectives should apply to average daily effectives;

Division of effectives in the home country into two components (irreducible and reducible) should in principle be accepted;

The strength of the irreducible component should be based, as a first approximation, upon figures of population and further adjusted in order to take into account the character of the forces and special conditions of States;

The calculation of the irreducible component should be based on the effectives of countries with armaments limited by the Peace Treaties;

Legal effectives should be taken as a basis for calculating the reducible component;

Governments might be left completely free to apply reduction to whatever categories of effectives they might choose.

Some of the above decisions of the General Commission were taken by a majority vote by show of hands, while others were regarded as having been unanimously approved in the absence of any declared objection to the principle involved.

261. The question of effectives entered a new phase with the submission of 16 March 1933 by the United Kingdom of a draft convention which embodied the provisions

provisions for the numerical limitation of effectives. Fifteen Powers of continental Europe were mentioned by name and figures were assigned to them for total armed forces.<sup>27/</sup> The principle of the average daily effectives was included. The reduction in the average daily effectives was to be carried out as follows: 30 per cent of the total reduction required by the end of the second year from the coming into force of the convention; 75 per cent by the end of the fourth year; and 100 per cent by the end of the fifth year. Those principles, as well as the table of effectives assigned to continental European countries, were maintained in the text adopted by the General Commission in the first reading of the United Kingdom draft.

262. The question of effectives became more acute after the final withdrawal of Germany from the Conference on 14 October 1933. Under the terms of the United Kingdom draft convention, Germany would have been allowed an army of 200,000 men instead of the 100,000 allowed by the Peace Treaty, but the German Government claimed an army of 300,000 men on the basis of twelve months' service instead of the professional long-term army recruited by voluntary enlistment for twelve years, as allowed by the Peace Treaty.

263. After negotiations between the Governments of France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom, it was considered, according to the United Kingdom memorandum of 29 January 1934 submitted to the Bureau, that accommodation might presumably be found between the two figures of 200,000 and 300,000, provided it was understood that there would be parity in the matter of effectives as between the home forces allotted to France, Germany, Poland and Italy.

264. At the meeting of the Bureau held on 10 April 1934, the President reviewed the differences of opinion between the various governments in regard to effectives. The German Government insisted that, for a fair comparison of effectives, account should be taken of the trained reserves and that overseas troops stationed in territories near the home country, as distinguished from those stationed afar, must be considered as part of the home forces.

265. The French Government was prepared to include overseas forces and the mobile reserve stationed in the home country in the system of limitation. In its opinion, French and German effectives could be compared only in respect of effectives intended for the defence of the home country; moreover, the comparison was possible only if all forces with a military character were subject to limitation. The French Government also made express reservations

<sup>27/</sup> See paragraph 27 above.

with regard to the German demand for 300,000 men without any preliminary inquiry into the existing position of the German army.

266. After April 1934, there was no further discussion of the problem of effectives either in the Bureau of the Conference or in the General Commission.

(b). Police forces

267. The discussion of the question of police forces became particularly active in connexion with President Hoover's proposals of 22 June 1932, which suggested that effectives should be divided into two components: irreducible (police component) and reducible.

268. On 14 October 1932, the Special Committee on Effectives appointed a Technical Committee with instructions to examine the characteristics of the police forces and similar formations of different countries, to enable the General Commission to determine which of the police forces of the various States should be taken into account in calculating effectives.

269. On 28 October 1932, the Technical Committee submitted a report to the Special Committee. The recommendations contained in that report served as a basis for article 12 of the United Kingdom draft convention of 16 March 1933. The provisions of that article, with certain modifications, were maintained in the provisional text of the draft convention as adopted in the first reading by the General Commission.

Article 12 of the provisional text of the draft convention read as follows:

"1. Subject to the provisions of paragraph 2 of this article, a police force or similar formation will be included in the total of effectives in Table I 28/ if it has one or more of the following characteristics:

"(a) Arms other than individual (machine-pistols, Lewis guns, machine-guns and weapons of accompaniment, etc.);

"(b) Training of a military nature other than close-order drill, physical training or technical training in the use of individual arms;

"(c) Transport, signalling or engineer equipment of a suitable nature and on a sufficient scale to enable it to be employed by units in tactical operations.

"The possession by a force of one or more of the above characteristics will, in principle, determine its inclusion in whole or in part in the calculation of effectives of the land armed forces. Cases which

28/ See paragraph 219 above.

/might appear

might appear doubtful after the present Convention comes into force should be referred to the Permanent Disarmament Commission, while will give a decision by reviewing the military capacity of the force in the light of the above characteristics and taking into account, in particular, the following confirmatory conditions:

- "(i) Quartering in barracks;
- "(ii) Training in groups of 100 men or more;
- "(iii) Organization on a military basis;
- "(iv) Previous military training;
- "(v) The possession of the arms referred to in sub-paragraph (a) above in such number as to permit of the tactical employment of the forces possessing them as military units.

"2. Of the police force maintained by any High Contracting Party and possessing one or more of the characteristics set out in paragraph I of this article, a number not exceeding 10 per cent. of the figure assigned to such party in table I . . . may be exempted from inclusion in the effectives of the land armed forces of such party."

270. After the United Kingdom draft convention had been adopted as a basis for discussion in the General Commission on 27 March 1933, the Special Committee on Effectives instructed the Technical Committee, on 29 March 1933, to continue the examination of police forces in the various countries.

271. On 30 May 1933, the Technical Committee submitted its report to the Special Committee, which transmitted it on 13 June 1933 to the General Commission without expressing any opinion on the non-technical aspects of the questions with which it dealt.

272. The Technical Committee examined the police forces of thirty-nine States and nine overseas territories in the light of information received from different governments; no information was received from twenty-two other countries. Out of thirty-nine returns, the Technical Committee established a list of the police forces of sixteen countries which, in the opinion of the Committee, should be included in the effectives. Some representatives made reservations concerning the inclusion of the whole police strength or of part of it in the effectives of their countries' armed forces. In certain cases the Technical Committee's decisions were taken by a majority vote, but in most cases the votes, which included those of the countries concerned, were taken unanimously.

273. Out of nine police forces in the overseas territories examined by the Technical Committee (Belgium, France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States) only police forces stationed in certain French and Portuguese overseas territories were included by the

Committee in the effectives of overseas armed forces.

(c) Pre-military training and military training given outside the army

274. The problem of pre-military training and military training given outside the army was considered by the Technical Committee in connexion with the question of effectives. The Technical Committee gave the following definition of pre-military training:

"Pre-military training shall be deemed to mean all kinds of training involving military instruction given in any form whatsoever (voluntary or compulsory) to young men aged 18 years at least, prior to their possible incorporation in the armed forces."

The Technical Committee defined military training elsewhere than in the army as being training having the following principal characteristics:

"(1) Technical and tactical training in the use of individual and collective arms used in war;

"(2) Training for field service in varied terrain.

"In addition, individual cases will have to be examined, taking into account especially the following criteria:

"(1) Training of cadres in indoor (on the map) and outdoor exercises;

"(2) Use of military means of liaison and signalling."

275. On 16 March 1933, the President of the Conference requested each delegation, in a circular letter addressed to them, to supply the Technical Committee with the figures of all cases of pre-military training or military training elsewhere than in the army. The circular letter from the President recited the above-mentioned definitions adopted by the Technical Committee.

276. The Committee received and examined replies from twenty-five countries, and the figures included in those replies were accepted by the Committee. The replies of certain delegations emphasized the difficulty of drawing a distinction between pre-military training and physical and athletic training in the strict sense.

277. In its conclusions on pre-military training, the Technical Committee pointed out that the nature of the training received by men aged between eighteen and twenty in various organizations was very varied. There were organizations which gave military training of the same kind as was received by recruits in the armed forces; on the other hand, there were athletic associations with voluntary or compulsory membership. In the opinion of the Committee, it was particularly difficult to draw a precise line between  
/organizations

organizations which gave military training and must therefore be included in the effectives, and organizations which were not military and could be disregarded. The Committee declared that it could not regard as satisfactory the solution provided in the United Kingdom draft convention, and had not been able to devise any alternative system. It raised the question whether training outside the army should not be absolutely prohibited on the grounds that such training would offer possibilities for evasion. It considered that such training might be permitted in certain cases, but that the organizations in which such training was given must be regarded for the purposes of the convention, as military forces and must be included as such in the effectives. 278. The following provisions of the draft convention adopted in first reading reflected some of the considerations advanced by the Technical Committee with regard to pre-military training or military training given outside the army:

"Article 9

"It is understood that effectives consist of . . . . .

"(o) All other persons of at least 18 years of age who receive military training under the control of the State. Military training is taken to mean any training given to persons of at least 18 years of age under the military regulations in force in each country or under regulations containing similar provisions, with a view to preparing those who receive it for performing military duty in the armed forces.

"The main characteristics of this training are as follows:

"(1) Technical and tactical training in the use of the individual and other than individual arms used in war;

"(2) Training in field service over broken ground.

"Furthermore, in the examination of special cases, account will be taken, in particular, of the following criteria:

"(1) Theoretical (by map) and field training of cadres;

"(2) Use of military methods of communication and signalling.

"Physical and sports training in the strict sense of the term, for whatever purpose given, shall not be regarded as military training.

"Article 10

"The High Contracting Parties undertake to prohibit any military training whatsoever, except in organizations under the control of their respective Government."

3. Land material

279. The draft convention framed by the Preparatory Commission contained no  
/provision for

provisions for the direct limitation of land material. Proposals for the direct limitation and for an absolute prohibition of certain categories of land material were put forward by a number of delegations. Nevertheless, the report presented by the Land Commission, dealing with the technical aspects of qualitative disarmament, was thought by the President to be inconclusive. The technical work undertaken with a view to fixing the maximum calibre for land artillery and the maximum tonnage for tanks was superseded upon the submission to the General Commission of the United Kingdom draft convention, articles 19 to 22 of which dealt with the question of land material. The articles concerning land war material in the provisional text of the draft convention adopted on the first reading were accompanied by numerous amendments and proposals to be discussed during the second reading of the draft.

#### 4. Naval material

280. The discussions of the naval problem during the Conference were largely governed by the fact that the Washington and London Naval Treaties were to be revised at a naval conference to be held in 1935. The discussions on qualitative disarmament were, in the opinion of the President, inconclusive. The Naval Commission decided that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, from a purely technical point of view to establish criteria for defining specifically offensive naval weapons. The naval provisions of the United Kingdom draft convention discussed in the General Commission in May 1933 were accompanied by numerous observations and amendments. Certain delegations considered that the embodiment in the general disarmament convention of provisions contained in treaties between certain naval Powers was not an appropriate solution of the general problem of naval disarmament.

#### 5. Air material

281. The United Kingdom draft convention provided for the complete abolition of bombing from the air except for police purposes in certain outlying regions. It was recognized that a complete abolition of military and naval aircraft must depend on an effective supervision of civil aviation. It was proposed to leave it to the Permanent Disarmament Commission to study measures in that field to be considered by the Second Disarmament Conference. The provisions of the United Kingdom draft convention concerning air material gave rise to a series of declarations and observations which in effect postponed any definite decision to a second reading.

#### /6. National



6. National defence expenditure

282. The Conference, in dealing with the question of national defence expenditure, provided for a limitation of annual expenditure on war material and on the armed forces of the various States. No particular difficulties were encountered in the field of budgetary publicity, and the President regarded the relevant articles of the draft convention with their annexes as available for immediate application. On the other hand, differences of opinion were expressed as to the possibility of an immediate application of an effective system of budgetary limitation, on the ground that because of the fluctuation in currencies and the differences of the budgetary systems in use in various countries, four to five years would have to elapse before it could be ascertained whether the recommended budgetary limitation could be adopted.

7. Chemical and bacterial warfare

283. In the opinion of the President, real and substantial progress had been achieved in that field, although discussion in the Conference revealed certain practical difficulties. It was, for instance, realized that an absolute prohibition of the use of chemical weapons would need to be reinforced by provisions prohibiting preparation and training, and accompanied by effective sanctions. The technical conclusions of the Special Committee created by the Bureau of the Conference on 11 November 1932 were, in the opinion of the President, mainly negative in character, since no effective method of supervision of the preparation of defensive material or of enforcing the prohibition against preparations for chemical warfare could be formulated. No further action in the matter of chemical and ~~bacterial~~ warfare was undertaken by the Conference after the General Commission had discussed for the first time, on 30 May 1933, the provisions on that subject contained in the United Kingdom draft.

8. Manufacture of and trade in arms

284. The starting point for the Conference discussion of the question of the manufacture of and trade in arms was the earlier work of the League: on the one hand, the Convention on Supervision of Trade in Arms, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925,<sup>29/</sup> and, on the other the draft convention of 1929 prepared by a special committee appointed by the Council in December 1926 which covered manufacture.

<sup>29/</sup> See paragraphs 166 to 175 above.

/285. During the

285. During the plenary meetings of the Conference in February 1932, a number of delegations submitted proposals which indicated a definite desire to introduce a system of regulation both in regard to trade and private and State manufacture which would be more complete and effective than that proposed in the Convention of 1925, or the draft convention of 1929. The General Commission, on 23 July 1932, established a Special Committee for the Regulation of the Trade in and Private and State Manufacture of Arms and Implements of War. Two main currents of opinion were revealed at the meetings of the Special Committee in October 1932. Certain delegations insisted that neither the Convention of 1925 nor the draft convention of 1929 reflected the realities of the existing situation. Other delegations, however, were not prepared to accept more radical proposals. An important decision was taken by the Bureau in 1932, when it determined that the provisions on that subject should be included in the same legal instrument as the Convention for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments.

286. The aspects of the problem discussed in the Conference included the abolition of private manufacture and the internationalization of manufacture; a national as against an international licensing system for manufacture, restrictions and prohibitions of manufacture, supervision and others. The Special Committee's report to the General Commission of 3 June 1933 emphasized the divergencies of opinion which had developed. The ensuing discussion in the General Commission in June 1933 was inconclusive, and the Commission entrusted the President of the Conference with the task of negotiating with delegations in order to permit the framing of a text suitable for inclusion in the disarmament convention.

287. No effective progress was made during a period of nearly twelve months in the settlement of outstanding questions of principle, until the delegation of the United States, on 29 May 1934, made proposals which marked advances in certain directions. The principle of national responsibility for the manufacture of arms was to be accepted and specific provisions were indicated for national control of the manufacture of and trade in arms by means of licenses and special permits for export. In addition, a system of publicity supervised by the Permanent Disarmament Commission was to be established.

288. On 23 July 1934, draft articles for insertion in a disarmament convention were approved by the Special Committee, and thus marked an advance as compared

/with the

with the provisions of previous conventions. In the opinion of the President of the Conference, those provisions represented "a larger measure of agreement than was reached at any period of the Conference prior to the submission of the United States proposals."

289. It was unanimously agreed in the Special Committee that the private manufacture of arms should be subject to licenses issued by governments and that each contracting party should assume full responsibility for the supervision to be exercised over the manufacture of and trade in arms. Provisions for stricter control and more detailed publicity were not accepted by a minority of delegation, including that of the United Kingdom. Though there was a difference of opinion as to the degree of supervision, the principle of international publicity and control was accepted by all the delegations. The control was to be exercised by the Permanent Disarmament Commission, which was authorized to request any supplementary information in regard to returns furnished under the Convention. The text adopted by the majority of the Committee provided, in addition, for the constitution of regional committees to be entrusted with the duty of following the execution of the Convention. The Commission was also entitled to examine on the spot the conditions under which the national control was organized, and the accuracy of the information furnished.

290. Certain delegations, including that of the United Kingdom, were unable to accept a system of continuous and automatic supervision on the spot limited to manufacture and trade, and proposed instead that the Permanent Disarmament Commission should be empowered to call for explanations if it had reason to believe that an infringement had occurred or that information supplied was incomplete or inaccurate. The French delegation, on the other hand, expressed the desire for a system of control and publicity even stricter than that proposed by the majority. In its opinion, the weakness of the conditions proposed was that publicity and the exercise of control would be too long delayed.

#### 9. Exchange of information

291. Part IV of the draft convention drawn up by the Preparatory Commission had contained articles providing for the regular dispatch by each of the contracting parties of information concerning their military forces, which was subsequently

to be published by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. Information was to be given on the following points:

- Average daily number of effectives stationed at home and overseas;
- In States with systems of compulsory military training, the number of men receiving such training;
- Length of service;
- Total annual expenditure for land and naval war materials;
- Details of all war vessels;
- Number and tonnage of certain categories of merchant vessels;
- Number and total horse-power of aircraft;
- Number and total horse-power of civil aeroplanes;
- Total of actual expenditure on armaments.

292. As noted earlier, the United Kingdom draft convention contained no corresponding stipulations, though place was reserved for them. A note in the draft convention explained that the eventual provisions relating to the exchange of information would depend in the main on the limitation and restriction of armaments imposed by the Convention.

#### 10. The Permanent Disarmament Commission

293. Many delegations looked on the provisions concerning supervision in the draft convention framed by the Preparatory Commission as incomplete or indefinite. There was no provision for local investigations, which several delegations urged as necessary. The French delegation thought that periodical local investigations should be a normal and regular feature of the system of inspection. Other delegations, however, remained doubtful that such investigations would be effective. Differences of opinion occurred also over the question of the procedure to be employed in exceptional investigations, but it was generally agreed that a State which was under suspicion or charged with having violated the Convention would have a right to invite inquiry.

294. Texts marking a large advance over the Preparatory Commission's scheme were approved by the Bureau in January 1933 and embodied in the United Kingdom draft convention submitted to the General Commission on 16 March 1933. The Commission was to be accorded authority to have investigations conducted on the territory of any contracting party at the request of one or more of the contracting parties, those decisions to be taken by a two-thirds majority of the members present. Periodic investigations, however, were to be made only

/in States

in States which had made a special agreement to that effect. Those provisions were discussed by the General Commission on 1 June 1933. The French delegation submitted proposals for strengthening still further the system of supervision, particularly by means of a regular system of inspection involving an investigation in each State at least once a year. Those proposals were supported by some other delegations.

295. In November 1933, the Bureau of the Conference decided that additional articles should be prepared supplementing those already included in the United Kingdom draft convention. A Committee on Miscellaneous Provisions submitted to the President of the Conference, on 7 December 1933, the text of provisions for local inspection of the armaments of the contracting parties at least once a year, to be organized by the Permanent Disarmament Commission. The matter was further considered, in connexion with the manufacture of and trade in arms, in February 1935.

#### 11. Guarantees of execution

296. The French delegation, on 1 June 1933, submitted a proposal defining more precisely the action to be taken in the event of a violation than that which appeared in the draft convention framed by the Preparatory Commission. The contracting parties were to employ in common against the defaulting party the necessary means of pressure to ensure the execution of the Convention, and if war ensued, the defaulting party was to be regarded as having resorted to war within the meaning of Article 16 of the Covenant.

297. The President of the Conference, after his negotiations with certain governments in 1933, found the question of the system of penalties to be established for breaches of the Convention to be especially difficult. The Bureau decided in October 1933 that the question should be discussed by the Committee on Miscellaneous Provisions. The Committee, on 28 June 1934, considered a note submitted by the Chairman of the Committee embodying the results of his exchange of views with various delegations. The principle which emerged was that the guarantees of execution must be proportionate to the gravity of the offences.

"Four categories of offences were discussed:

"(1) The first category would cover slight breaches of the Convention, not at first sight involving an intentional and deliberate violation. Such breaches might occur either through negligence or error or through the action of subordinate officials or authorities. The attention of the governments would in such

cases be specially drawn to the matter, possibly by the supervisory committees responsible for local inspections appointed under the general system of supervision embodied in the Convention.

"(2) The second category would cover breaches of the same essential character, but requiring stronger measures, either owing to their duration or number. In such cases, intervention by the Permanent Disarmament Commission or any permanent organ to which it might delegate its powers would appear to be necessary. The governments concerned might be requested to restore conditions in keeping with the Convention, a time limit for doing so being indicated. Such intervention would have a political character, but would not exceed the limits of a friendly warning.

"(3) The third category would cover irregularities which could not be explained as a result of error or negligence. Such breaches would be clearly intentional, but might still be remedied. In such cases collective action would need to be more vigorous and rapid. It was suggested that the Permanent Disarmament Commission might first address an urgent and formal appeal to the governments concerned to put an end to the breach at the earliest possible moment. This appeal might appropriately be supported by joint diplomatic representations on the part of States signatories of the Convention. In such cases the Convention would provide, as a last resource, for the application of economic pressure, such as an immediate embargo on arms and raw materials or the granting of favours and facilities to the States most directly threatened by the breach.

"(4) The fourth category would include only breaches which directly involved a danger of war. The signatories of the Convention would, in such an event, be faced with a threatened breach of the Pact of Paris, and the problem of security in the strict sense would thereupon arise. The means of collective action provided for the previous category of offences would accordingly be strengthened by the procedures devised for the guaranteeing of security.

"The sole purpose of the note was to suggest certain solutions, which would in any case need to be supplemented at a later stage.

"Certain delegations made important reservations in regard to the proceedings and decisions of the Committee.

"The Japanese delegation stated that the general reservation which it had made in the Committee on Miscellaneous Provisions in regard to the question of supervision applied equally to guarantees of execution. The Soviet delegation made a counter-reservation to the effect that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics could only be a party to undertakings relating to supervision and guarantees of execution which were of a universal character. Finally, the United States delegation indicated that it would be difficult for its Government to accept any positive obligations regarding guarantees of execution. The note drawn up by the Chairman of the Committee was forwarded to the President of the Conference, who communicated it to the governments for their consideration."

## 12. Moral disarmament

298. The question of moral disarmament was discussed by the Political Commission on the basis of a memorandum presented by the Polish delegation, which suggested the conclusion of an international convention wherein governments would agree to make punishable, under their law, certain actions incompatible with satisfactory international relations and dangerous to the peace of the world. Among them were inciting public opinion to warlike sentiments, propaganda aimed at inducing States to violate international law, and the deliberate spreading of false or distorted reports or forged documents likely to embitter the relations between States. It was also proposed that a conference should be held of qualified representatives of the Press to consider what steps could be taken to put the idea of moral disarmament into effect so far as the Press was concerned. International undertakings were also proposed, with a view to interesting young people in the organization of international peace.

299. On 15 March 1932, the Political Commission appointed a Committee on Moral Disarmament which, on 1 December 1933, submitted a text to the President of the Conference containing suggestions on the education of the younger generation, the co-operation of the intellectual world, the use of technical means of spreading information and ways and means of giving effect to possible undertakings. A Legal Committee considered the adaptation of municipal laws to the requirements of moral disarmament.

### Last phase of the Conference

#### 1. General discussion on future work

300. The discussions and negotiations between governments on outstanding differences were previewed by the Bureau at a meeting of 28 May 1934. The Bureau had before it the notes exchanged in the interval since its last meeting between the governments of France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom, as well as a memorandum of 14 April 1934 submitted by Denmark, Norway, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland, with which the Netherlands declared itself in substantial agreement. The signatories of the memorandum urged that it would be necessary to limit the disarmament convention to certain branches of armaments, postponing a comprehensive solution until a later date; that it was not sufficient to accept a limitation of armaments to the status quo but that it was essential to adopt a certain substantial measure of disarmament;

/that a

that a moderate practical realization of the principle of equality should be provided for; that it would not be possible to secure a convention of even limited scope without a reinforcement of security, particularly in respect of concrete and definite guarantees for the execution of the Convention; that it was important that Germany should return to the League.

## 2. Statement of the President

301. On 29 May 1934, the President of the Conference invited the General Commission to decide on the future work of the Conference. He declared that the current situation of the Conference was "really critical", and that a speedy decision was necessary. His next remarks were summarized as follows: "If the Conference represented--as he believed it did--a genuine effort to place armaments on a new basis, making their reduction and limitation subject to international supervision and control; if the international community of States invited its members, in the common interest, to diminish the forces they individually might think necessary to protect their frontiers from invasion, it must, in return, accept responsibility for ensuring that, through collective action, such invasion, in fact, would not occur." The whole League of Nations system was intended to substitute international treaty guarantees of security for reliance by each nation on its own armed forces alone. That system could not become effective, he said, "unless the present towering armaments were drastically reduced and limited by international agreement". In his opinion, such general reduction of the armaments of the world would itself be an important contribution to the security of nations.

## 3. Statement of the United States Delegation

302. In the view of the representative of the United States, there were two ways to achieve security: On the one hand, by superiority in armament, coupled perhaps with reinsurance in the form of alliances; on the other, an increase in the power of defence and a decrease in the power of attack (abolition of those types of weapons especially suitable for invasion). In his opinion, the first way must lead to a race in armaments and then to a war. The Government of the United States believed that only the second way, that of disarmament, could promote the peace of the world and the national security of every country. The President of the United States had authorized him to state the attitude and policy of the United States, which was summarized as follows:

/"They were"



"They were prepared to co-operate in every practicable way in efforts to secure a general disarmament agreement and thus to help to promote the general peace and progress of the world. They were furthermore willing, in connection with a general Disarmament Convention, to negotiate a universal pact of non-aggression, and to join with other nations in conferring on international problems arising out of any treaties to which they were a party. The United States of America would not, however, participate in European political negotiations and settlements and would not make any commitment whatever to use its armed forces for the settlement of any dispute anywhere. In effect, the policy of the United States of America was to keep out of war, but to help in every possible way to discourage and prevent war."

#### 4. Statement of the USSR delegation

303. The representative of the USSR started from the premise that it would be impossible to find a solution of the problem of disarmament because of the irreconcilable differences which had come to light. His delegation considered that so long as armaments existed, peace could not be ensured. It had proposed total universal disarmament which would have eliminated the numerous differences at the Conference, but that had not been accepted. The Soviet Union delegation had not in the least abandoned its attitude to the cause of disarmament. Because of the absence of agreement, the logical conclusion appeared to be that the Conference should close down. The USSR representative wished, however, to urge a wider conception of the Conference as being intended by means of disarmament to bring into being one of the guarantees of world peace. Consequently, the question was not that of "disarmament itself", since that was only a "means to an end", but that of "guaranteeing peace". While unanimity was needed for disarmament, it was not required to realize other measures of security. The USSR representative did not by any means intend to contrast security with disarmament or to exclude disarmament from the Conference programme. He felt, however, that every question ought to be taken up when there was some chance of a satisfactory solution--today it might be security, tomorrow disarmament. He did not, as did others, use the word "security" as an antonym to disarmament, but he could find no more suitable term for the guarantees of peace he had in mind. Accordingly, he proposed the transformation of the Conference into a permanent conference of peace, concerned to preserve by every possible means the security of all nations and to safeguard universal peace.

5. Statement of the United Kingdom delegation

304. On 30 May 1934, the representative of the United Kingdom declared that his Government was prepared to support with energy an international agreement on armaments if such agreement was, in existing circumstances, possible of achievement. But while the United Kingdom Government would still co-operate in any new effort to produce general agreement, it would not lend itself to "the indefinite continuance of vague and inconclusive discussion justified by nothing better than the sanguine hope that after all, something in the way of a solution might still turn up". The United Kingdom representative then submitted a limited programme of work including the following questions which, in his opinion, appeared to be ripe for prompt and effective treatment: chemical warfare; budgetary publicity; setting up the Permanent Disarmament Commission. The representative of the United Kingdom concluded that he was profoundly convinced "that the spectacle of actual achievement in a limited field" would "at that moment be of the greatest value".

6. Statement of the French delegation

305. The French representative's speech on 30 May 1934 emphasized the question of security. He recalled the opinion expressed by the President of the Conference who "still had a remnant of platonic veneration for the attitude which hoped that peace would come from disarmament; but his good sense had immediately resumed its sway". In the opinion of the French representative, the gist of the President's speech was: "Disarmament certainly; but no disarmament without security."

7. Resolution on future programme of work

306. As a result of those discussions, the French delegation, on 8 June 1934, submitted to the Bureau a draft resolution which was adopted on the same date by the General Commission. The resolution dealt with security, air forces, and manufacture of and trade in arms. A special committee was appointed to make preliminary studies to facilitate the conclusion of further regional security agreements outside the Conference of the same kind as those concluded in Europe in 1933. Another special committee was to study the question of guarantees of execution and to resume the work relating to supervision. The Air Committee was instructed to resume forthwith the study of the question of air forces. The Special Committee on manufacture of and trade in arms was also to resume its work.

/The last

The last paragraph of the resolution read as follows:

"Recognizing that the proposal of the Soviet delegation that the Conference be declared a permanent institution under the title of the peace conference calls for careful study, the General Commission requests the President to submit that proposal to the governments."

8. Modification of the programme of work

307. On 5 November 1934, the President of the Conference circulated to the members of the Bureau a communication suggesting that the probable trend of political events in the near future made it necessary for the Bureau to reconsider its method of work, without prejudice to the principles underlying the decisions taken by the General Commission on 8 June 1934. He expressed the view that it would be necessary to postpone until after the beginning of 1935 any attempt to deal with the problem of disarmament, and to modify the procedure of the Conference. He mentioned the following subjects as being sufficiently advanced to be embodied in separate protocols coming into force one by one without the Conference having necessarily to wait for the completion of an entire convention. Those questions were: the regulation of the manufacture of arms and the trade in arms; budgetary publicity; establishment of the permanent disarmament commission. The Bureau of the Conference considered those proposals at its meeting on 20 November 1934.

308. The President's proposals were supported by the delegations of France, the United Kingdom and the United States. The United Kingdom, however, emphasized that the main objective of the Conference was the conclusion of a convention for the reduction and limitation of armaments. The USSR delegation wondered whether the lack of universality of obligation would not obstruct work on those three specific problems also. It was also in doubt whether a permanent disarmament commission could be usefully appointed until definite obligations and restrictions in respect of armaments had been accepted. In that connexion it recalled its proposal for the establishment of a permanent peace conference.

309. As a result of the decision taken by the Bureau on 20 November 1934, arrangements were made to call together in February 1935 the Special Committee for the Regulation of the Trade in and the Private and State Manufacture of Arms; the Technical Committee of the National Defence Expenditure Commission, and the Committee on Miscellaneous Provisions (Establishment of a Permanent

Disarmament Commission). The latter body was to deal with the proposal of the USSR delegation for a permanent peace conference. Those committees considered their respective questions in the first months of 1935. On 13 April 1935, the Special Committee for the Regulation of the Trade in and the Private and State Manufacture of Arms submitted a report which was forwarded to the governments by the President of the Conference.

I. Postponement of the Conference

310. The General Commission held its last meeting on 8 June 1934. On 13 April 1935, the President, after consulting the delegations of States present in Geneva, decided that for the moment no meeting of the Bureau could be usefully convened. On 22 January 1936, the Council of the League decided to postpone the further convocation of the Conference.<sup>30/</sup>

<sup>30/</sup> On 31 May 1937, the Bureau of the Conference met for the last time.

ANNEX I

LIST OF RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE ASSEMBLY OF THE  
LEAGUE OF NATIONS ON THE QUESTION OF DISARMAMENT

First Assembly

14 December 1920

- Resolution I Invitation to the Council to urge upon all governments ratification of or adhesion to the Convention for the trade in arms signed at Saint-Germain on 10 September 1919.
- Resolution II Request to the Council that the problem of the private manufacture of arms and of war material, should be studied by the appropriate organs.
- Resolution III Invitation to the Council:
- (a) To request the Permanent Advisory Commission to complete its examination on the conditions of armaments;
  - (b) To instruct a temporary commission (Temporary Mixed Commission) to prepare proposals for the reduction of armaments;
  - (c) To form within the Secretariat a section to serve the Temporary Commission;
  - (d) To consider the mechanism by means of which the military information to be exchanged can be verified.
- Recommendation Recommendation that an armaments truce, based on military expenditure should be submitted by the Council for the consideration of the governments.

Second Assembly

1 October 1921

- Resolution 1 Prolongation of the Temporary Mixed Commission (T.M.C.).
- Resolution 2 Request to the T.M.C. to make proposals in the form of a draft treaty for the reduction of armaments.
- Resolution 3 Request that a statistical investigation on the armaments of the various countries should be undertaken.
- Resolution 4 Request to the T.M.C. to continue the consideration of the problem of private manufacture of arms and trade in arms.
- Resolution 5 Request to the T.M.C. to prepare a draft convention on the private manufacture of arms and the trade in arms to be submitted to an international conference.

/Resolution 6

- Resolution 6      Desire that the ratification of the Convention of Saint-German should be urged at the Washington Conference on Disarmament.
- Resolution 7      Request to the Council to prepare a draft protocol with a view to excluding the import of arms in time of peace from countries in which the traffic is uncontrolled.
- Resolution 8      Submission to all Members of the recommendation of the First Assembly on an armaments truce together with the replies already received.
- Resolution 9      Request to the T.M.C. to examine the advisability of addressing an appeal to the scientific men to publish their discoveries in poison gas.
- Resolution 10     Desire that propaganda in favour of the reduction of armaments should be carried out among all nations.
- Resolution 11     Recommendation that the Secretariat Section on Disarmament should have a directorship of its own.

Third Assembly

27 September 1922

- Resolution I      Prolongation of the T.M.C.
- Resolution II     Recommendation to certain European States to reduce their military expenditure to the figures for 1913.
- Resolution III    Proposal to collect statistical information on peace-time armaments and expenditure on armaments.
- Resolution IV     Opinion that the control of the international traffic in arms is the only step to be taken in connexion with surplus stock of arms.
- Resolution V      Request to the Council to consider the advisability of summoning a conference for the control of the private manufacture of arms.
- Resolution VI     Request to the T.M.C. to prepare a new scheme for the control of the international traffic in arms.
- Resolution VII    Approval of the establishment by the T.M.C. of a Sub-Committee on Chemical Warfare. Recommendation to the governments to adhere to the Treaty of Washington (concerning chemical warfare).

/Resolution VIII

- Resolution VIII Statement on the importance of the replies by the governments to the inquiry as to the requirements of their national security.
- Resolution IX Recommendation to the Council to consider the question of the exchange of information.
- Resolution X Appreciation of the work accomplished by the Washington Conference.
- Resolution XI Expression of hope that the Pan-American Congress (Santiago 1923) may arrive at practical solutions capable of being fitted into a general scheme of disarmament.
- Resolution XII Recommendation to the Council to summon a conference with a view to extending the principles of the Washington Treaty for the limitation of naval armaments.
- Resolution XIII Instructions to the T.M.C. to continue its investigations on land and air armaments.
- Resolution XIV Principles governing the reduction of armaments:  
(a) The reduction must be general.  
(b) No reduction without a satisfactory guarantee for the safety of the respective countries.  
(c) Guarantee can be found in a defensive agreement on the immediate assistance to be provided to a country being situated in the same area when attacked.  
(d) The reduction of armaments is the first condition of a treaty of mutual guarantee. The reduction could be carried out either by means of a general treaty or by means of partial treaties.
- Resolution XV Principles (continuation);  
Importance of regional agreements for the reduction of armaments.
- Resolution XVI Principles (continuation);  
Moral disarmament is a preliminary condition of material disarmament. In this respect confidence cannot be attained so long as the inter-Allied debts are not settled.

Fourth Assembly

29 September 1923

- Resolution I Request to the Council to submit the Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance to the governments for their consideration.
- Resolution II Recommendation to the Members to adopt an armaments truce based on their national defence expenditure for the last fiscal year.

/Resolution III

- Resolution III Approval of the Council's decision in connexion with the publication of the Military Year Book.
- Resolution IV (a) Recommendation to the T.M.C. to prepare a new convention to replace that of Sanit-Germain for the control of the traffic in arms;  
(b) Recommendation to the Council to consider the question of summoning an international conference for the control of private manufacture of arms.
- Resolution V Request to the Council to ensure the fullest publicity for the report of the Sub-Committee on the effects of chemical discoveries in future wars.
- Resolution VI Recommendation to the T.M.C. to consider the possibility of concluding draft partial agreements for the reduction of armaments.
- Resolution VII Request to the Council to co-ordinate the work of the T.M.C. and the P.A.C. (Permanent Advisory Commission) with regard to the reduction of armaments.

Fifth Assembly

6 September 1924

Reduction of  
armaments

Resolution instructing the Third Committee to consider the material dealing with security and the reduction of armaments, and the First Committee to consider the articles of the Covenant relating to the settlement of disputes, with a view to enabling the summoning of an international conference on the reduction of armaments. (As a result of this resolution, the two Committees submitted the Draft Protocol on the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes. See resolution of 2 October 1924 on arbitration, security and reduction of armaments).

27 September 1924

Control of the  
international  
trade in arms

Request to the Council to submit to the governments the draft convention drawn up by the T.M.C., and proposal to convene a conference in 1925.

Statistical  
inquiry on the  
trade in Arms

Request to the Council to ensure the periodical publication of statistical data.

Private  
manufacture  
of arms

Request to the T.M.C. to prepare a draft convention to serve as a basis of discussions of an international conference.

/Co-ordination



27 September 1924  
(continued)

Co-ordination  
of the work  
of the T.M.C.  
and the P.A.C.

Recommendation to the Council to co-ordinate the work of its  
Commissions and to reorganize the T.M.C.

Chemical  
warfare

Recommendation to the Council to publish the report of  
the T.M.C. with regard to chemical discoveries and to draw  
the attention of public opinion to the necessity of  
removing the causes of war by the pacific settlement of  
disputes and by the solution of the problem of security  
in order that nations may no longer be tempted to  
utilize their economic, industrial or scientific power as  
weapons of war.

Military  
Year Book

Continuation of its publication.

2 October 1924

Arbitration,  
security and  
reduction of  
armaments

I. Resolution on the Draft Protocol for the pacific  
settlement of international disputes: Recommendation of  
the acceptance of the Protocol by the Members.  
Opening of Protocol for signature.  
Request to the Council to convene an International Conference  
for the reduction of armaments, and to request the economic  
and financial organizations of the League to report on the  
steps to be taken to give effect to the financial and  
economic sanctions contemplated in Article 16 of the  
Covenant.

II. Recommendation to States to accede to the Special  
Protocol (Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the  
Permanent Court of International Justice).

Conference for  
the Reduction  
of Armaments

I. Recommendation to put the question of regional agreements  
on the agenda of the Conference for the reduction of  
armaments.

II. Limitation of national defence expenditure to be placed  
upon the agenda of the Conference.

III. The question of naval disarmament to be dealt with  
by the Conference.

IV. Request to the Council to consider the programme of the  
conference and in particular the formulation of a general plan  
in accordance with Article 8 of the Covenant, the  
consideration of the special position of certain States, the  
control of armaments.

Sixth Assembly

25 September 1925

Arbitration,  
security and  
reduction of  
armaments

Resolution taking note that the Protocol for the Pacific  
Settlement of International Disputes has not received the  
necessary ratifications;  
Welcoming the conclusion of Arbitration Conventions and  
Treaties

Treaties of Mutual Security (Locarno) and requesting the Council to study the possibility of summoning a Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments.

Organization set up by the council	Resolution on the functioning of the Co-ordination Commission on Disarmament.
Statistical Information on the trade in arms	Recommendations to all States to adopt the models given in some of the Conventions for the supervision of the International Trade in Arms (Geneva, 17 June 1925) for the documents they supply to the Secretariat.
Manufacture of arms	Resolution requesting the Council to continue the preparatory work in order to prepare a draft Convention and to summon a Conference.
Military Year Book	Continuation of its publication.

#### Seventh Assembly

#### 21 September 1926

Supervision of the private manufacture of arms	Resolution requesting the Council to continue the study of the problem.
--	---

#### 24 September 1926

Work of the preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference	Resolution taking note of the work accomplished and requesting the Council to call upon the Preparatory Commission to draw up a programme for a Conference on the Limitation and Reduction of Armaments.
---	--

#### 25 September 1926

Arbitration, security and pacific settlement of disputes	Resolution commending the conclusion of arbitration conventions and treaties of security; considering the treaties of Locarno as a definite step forward in the establishment of mutual confidence; agreements of this kind need not necessarily be restricted to a limited area; and requesting the Council to recommend the States to put into practice those principles likely to establish confidence and security and to facilitate the reduction of armaments.
--	--

Eight Assembly

24 September 1927

- Wars of aggression : Declaration that the States Members are under an obligation to conform with the following principles:
- (a) Wars of aggression are prohibited; and
  - (b) Pacific means must be employed to settle disputes.
- Private manufacture of arms : Request to the Council to convey its views to the Special Committee on the Supervision of the Private Manufacture of Arms in order to convene an international conference.

26 September 1927

Arbitration,  
security,  
disarmament and  
work of the  
Preparatory  
Commission

- Resolution I : Declaration on the desirability of developing civil aviation solely towards economic ends to the exclusion of military interests.
- Resolution II : Approval of the report of the Committee of the Council with regard to the methods to be adopted by the Council in case of emergency.
- Resolution III : Invitation to the States Members to take in advance the necessary measures to facilitate the rapid meeting of the Council at times of emergency.
- Resolution IV : Request to the Council to continue the study of the plan submitted by its financial committee on the financial aid to any State victim of aggression.
- Resolution V :
  - (a) Recommendation of the extension of arbitration by means of special or collective agreements;
  - (b) Request to the Council to urge the Preparatory Commission to hasten its work and to convene a conference for the limitation and reduction of armaments;
  - (c) Request to the Council to instruct the Preparatory Commission to create a Committee on Arbitration and Security.

Ninth Assembly

18 September 1928

Financial assistance to states victims of aggression

Request to the Council to invite the Financial Committee to continue the preparation of a draft convention.

20 September 1928

Articles 10, 11 and 16 of the Covenant

Appreciation of the work done by the Committee on Arbitration and Security, and Recommendation that a study be undertaken of the other articles of the Covenant, the application of which offers guarantees of security.

Model Treaty to strengthen the means for preventing war

Recommendation of this Model Treaty framed by the Committee on Arbitration and Security for consideration by the governments.

Supervision of the manufacture of arms.

Request to the Council to make an appeal to the governments represented on the Special Commission with a view to finding a single final text for a draft convention on the supervision of the manufacture of arms.

24 September 1928

Radiotelegraphic station

Request to the Council to take the necessary measures for a further study of the question of the erection of a radiotelegraphic station for the purpose of providing the League with independent communications in time of emergency.

25 September 1928

Work of the Preparatory Commission

Resolution urging the necessity of accomplishing the final step towards the reduction and limitation of armaments. Invitation to the governments among which differences of opinion still exist as to the conditions for the reduction and limitation of armaments, to seek agreed solutions.

26 September 1928

Pacific Settlement of International disputes, Non-Aggression and Mutual Assistance

- (1) General Act:  
Invitation to the States to accept the obligations as contemplated in the General Act.
- (2) Good Offices of the Council:  
and Invitation to the Council to inform all States that it would, if requested, offer its good offices for the undertakings on the pacific settlement of any disputes for concluding treaties of non-aggression and mutual assistance.
- (4)

(3) Treaties

26 September 1928  
(continued)

- (3) Treaties of Non-Aggression and Mutual Assistance:  
Recommendation of the Model Treaties drawn up by the Committee on Arbitration and Security to the Consideration of States.
- (5) Optional clause of Article 36 of the Permanent Court of International Justice:  
Recommendation to the governments to consider whether they can accede to the clause.
- (6) Revision of the Systematic Survey of Arbitration Conventions:  
Secretariat to request governments to communicate the text of treaties and arbitration awards.

Tenth Assembly

23 September 1929

Communications affecting the working of the League at times of emergency

Request to the Council to have a study made of the requisite measures to ensure that aircraft engaged in the working of the League of Nations may be free to fly, in times of emergency, over such territory as may be necessary.

24 September 1929

Progress work of the preparatory Commission

Resolution on the resumption of the work of the Preparatory Commission interrupted at its last session.

Model Treaty to Strengthen the Means of Preventing War

Request to the Committee on Arbitration and Security to consider the possibility of establishing a Draft Convention on the lines of the Treaty.

Draft Convention on Financial Assistance

Request to the Council to take steps to ensure the establishment of a text to be submitted to States for signature.

Supervision of the private manufacture of arms

Request to the Council to consider the desirability of convening a further meeting of the Special Commission to complete the text of a preparatory convention.

Establishment of a wireless station

Resolution instructing the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps for the provision of a radiotelegraphic station for the use of the League of Nations in times of emergency.

Eleventh Assembly

29 September 1930

Convention on  
Financial Assist-  
ance

Decision to open for signature by the Members the Convention framed by the Committee on Arbitration and Security and by the Financial Committee and drawn up by the Third Committee.

30 September 1930

Work of the  
Preparatory  
Commission

Taking note of the results of the London Naval Conference of 1930 and expressing hope that the Preparatory Commission will be able to finish the drawing up of a preliminary draft convention.

General Conven-  
tion to Strengthen  
the Means of  
Preventing War

Decision that the study of this question be continued.

Communications of  
Importance to the  
League of Nations in  
times of emergency

Decision concerning the regime applicable to aircraft and the regime of motor transport.

Twelfth Assembly

24 September 1931

Communications of  
importance to the  
League of Nations in  
times of emergency

Approval of the report of the Third Committee.

Co-operation of  
women and of the  
Press

Request to the Council to examine the possibility of women co-operating in the work of the League, and to consider the study of the spread of false information.

26 September 1931

General Convention  
to Improve the  
Means of Preventing  
War

Decision to open the Convention for signature by States.

/29 September 1931

29 September 1931

Armaments Truce  
and information  
on armaments

Request to the governments invited to the  
Disarmament Conference to prepare for the event by  
means of an armaments truce. Request to the Council  
to ask governments to state before 1 November 1931,  
whether they are prepared for a period of one year,  
to accept the armaments truce.  
Request to the Council to invite governments which  
had not yet transmitted their replies on the position  
of their armaments to do so before 1 November 1931.

1932, 1933, 1934, 1935

Since all questions relating to the reduction  
of armaments were examined and negotiated by  
the various organs set up by the Conference  
for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments,  
the General Assembly, at its 13th, 14th, 15th  
and 16th sessions, did not take any decisions  
on the subject.

Seventeenth Assembly

10 October 1936

Reduction and  
limitation of  
armaments

Approval of the Convocation of the Bureau of the  
Conference.

Eighteenth Assembly

30 September 1937

Reduction and  
limitation of  
armaments

Recommendation of the conclusion of an international  
convention on the publicity of national defence  
expenditure and the working of an organ of  
supervision and co-ordination.

Recommendation to the governments to examine the  
possibility of adopting internal measures with a  
view to the effective supervision of the manufacture  
of and trade in arms.

Nineteenth Assembly

Nineteenth Assembly

30 September 1938

I. Reduction and  
limitation of  
armaments

Request to the governments which have not given effect to its recommendation of 30 September 1937 on the supervision of manufacture of and trade in arms to do so before the next session of the Assembly.

II. Protection of  
civilian population  
against  
bombing from  
the air

(a) Recognition of the three following principles:

1. The intentional bombing of civilian population is illegal;
2. Objectives aimed at from the air must be legitimate military objects and must be identifiable;
3. Any attack on legitimate military objectives must be carried out in such a way that civilian population in the neighbourhood are not bombed through negligence.

(b) Recommendation to the Council to have the report of the Committee of Investigation of the bombing from the air of civilian population in Spain published.



ANNEX II

LIST OF PRINCIPAL RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL  
OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS ON THE  
QUESTION OF DISARMAMENT

1920

- 19 May
1. Constitution of the Permanent Advisory Commission (P.A.C.) for Military, Naval and Air Questions
  2. Request to the Member States to furnish information on their export of arms
  3. Instruction to the P.A.C. to begin the study of such technical questions as are required for the execution of Articles 1 and 8 of the Covenant.
- 20 October
- Instruction to the Secretary-General to request the P.A.C. to undertake at the earliest possible moment the preliminary work with regard to the reduction of armaments
- 28 October
- Instruction to the P.A.C. to examine methods for obtaining information regarding armaments and also principles upon which can be based the future schemes for the reduction of armaments.
- 12 December
- Approval of the Model Questionnaire on the exchange of information on armaments prepared by the P.A.C.

1921

- 25 February
1. Constitution of the Temporary Mixed Commission (T.M.C.)
  2. Invitation to all governments to ratify or to adhere to the Convention for the Control of the Trade in Arms signed at Saint-Germain on 10 September 1919.
- 12 October
- Request to the T.M.C. to make a further study of the problem of the Trade in Arms.

1922

- 20 July
- New recommendation to all governments to ratify or to adhere to the Convention of Saint-Germain
- 4 October
- Instruction to the Secretary-General to collect information on armaments from the governments.

1923

- 21 April Request to the United States Government to give its views concerning its possible co-operation on the control of the trade in arms and on the private manufacture of arms.
- 7 July Authorization to the Secretariat to publish a Military Year Book.
- 20 September Invitation to the P.A.C. to study the question of the application of the principles of the Naval Treaty of Washington to the non-signatory States.
- 10 December Request to the T.M.C. to make further studies on the question of the private manufacture of and the trade in arms, chemical warfare and regional agreements.

1924

- 11 March Instruction to the Secretary-General to collect and to publish information on the imports and exports of arms from all governments.
- 14 June Transmission to the T.M.C. of the list of categories of arms prepared by the P.A.C. with a view to enabling it to prepare a Draft Convention on the traffic in arms.
- 30 September Transmission to all governments of the Draft Convention on the Supervision of the Trade in Arms prepared by the T.M.C. with a view to summoning a conference to discuss the draft convention.
- 3 October Re-organization of the T.M.C. under the name of Co-ordination Commission.
- 9 December Convocation of the Conference for the supervision of the International Trade in Arms for 4 May 1925.

1925

- 12 December Adoption of the plan submitted by the Committee of the Council on the Constitution of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference (Preparatory Commission) together with a questionnaire to be studied by the latter.
- Adoption of a questionnaire submitted by the Committee of the Council concerning the private manufacture of arms.

1926

- 8 March Approval of the composition of the Preparatory Commission.
- 8 December Request to the Preparatory Commission to make proposals concerning the date of the summoning of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments.
- 9 December Transmission of a preliminary Draft Convention on the Private Manufacture of Arms to the Special Commission dealing with this question.

1927

- 8 March Request to the Special Commission for the Preparation of a Draft Convention on the Private Manufacture of Arms to study the question of the possible date for the convocation of an international conference.
- 19 March Request to the Financial Organization of the League to establish a plan of financial mutual assistance to the States victims of an aggression.
- 15 June Taking note of the preliminary Draft Convention adopted by the Preparatory Commission.
- 27 September Request to the Preparatory Commission to constitute a Committee to study the measures likely to give guarantees of arbitration and security (Committee on Arbitration and Security.)

1928

- 26 September Transmission of the General Act to all governments.

1929

- 2 June Authorization to the Secretary-General to draw the attention of governments to the resolution of the Preparatory Commission concerning the ratification of the Protocol of 17 June 1925 on the prohibition of poisonous gas and bacteriological warfare.

1931

- 24 January Convocation of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments.
- 22 May Appointment of Mr. Arthur Henderson as President of the Conference.

/23 May

23 May

Request to the governments invited to the Conference to furnish information on their armaments.

1936

22 January

Tribute to the memory of the late President of the Conference and decision to postpone the further convocation of the Conference.

## ANNEX III

## CHRONOLOGY OF DEVELOPMENTS OF THE CONFERENCE FOR THE REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS

L. 1932

- |             |   |
|-------------|---|
| 2 February  | Opening of the Conference   |
| 5 February  | Constitution of the Bureau  |
| 8 February  | Constitution of the General Commission  |
| 25 February | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rejection by the General Commission of the USSR proposal on the principle of general and complete disarmament.</li> <li>2. Adoption by the General Commission of the Draft Convention prepared by the Preparatory Commission as the framework for its discussions.</li> <li>3. Setting up of the Land Commission,<br/>Air Commission,<br/>Naval Commission,<br/>National Defence Expenditure Commission,<br/>Political Commission.</li> </ol> |
| 15 March    | Appointment by the Political Commission of a Committee on Moral Disarmament.  |
| 19 April    | Adoption by the General Commission of the principle of the reduction of armaments carried out by stages.  |
| 20 April    | Adoption by the General Commission of the principle linking the reduction of armaments with security, in application of the provisions of Article 8 of the Covenant.  |
| 22 April    | <p>Adoption by the General Commission of the principle of qualitative disarmament (prohibition or internationalization of certain types of weapons).</p> <p>Selection of weapons whose character is most offensive, most efficacious against national defence or most threatening to civilians.</p>   |
| 10 May      | Appointment by the General Commission of a Special Committee on Chemical and Bacterial Warfare, and of a Committee on Effectives.   |
| 28 May      | Submission of the report of the Naval Commission to the General Commission.   |

/31 May

- 31 May Submission to the General Commission of the report of the Special Committee on Chemical and Bacterial Warfare.
- 7 June Submission of the report of the Land Commission to the General Commission.
- 8 June Submission of the report of the Air Commission to the General Commission.
- 9 June Submission of the report of the Committee on Effectives.
- 22 June President Hoover's declaration concerning the prohibition of offensive weapons and the reduction of other armaments by one-third.
- 23 July Eighteenth and last plenary meeting of the Conference.  
Adoption by the General Commission of a resolution for the reduction of armaments to be applied alike to land, air and naval armaments - the primary objective being to reduce the means of attack.  
Decision by the German delegation to leave the Conference.<sup>1/</sup>
- 21 September Discussion of the programme of work by the Bureau of the Conference.
- 22 September Appointment by the Bureau of the Special Committee on Effectives, and of the Special Committee for the regulation of the manufacture of and trade in arms.
- 1 November End of the one-year armaments truce.  
Renewal of the truce for four months.
- 14 November French memorandum on disarmament and security, stressing in particular the importance of the standardization of European armies.
- 17 November United Kingdom proposals in connexion with Germany's claims to equality of rights.
- 12 December Five-Power declaration on the agreement reached on 11 December concerning the equality of rights claimed by Germany.
- 14 December Return of Germany to the Conference.

---

<sup>1/</sup> The German delegation returned to the Conference on 14 December 1932 and left again permanently on 14 October 1933.

II. 1933

- 30 January United Kingdom draft resolution concerning a programme of work for the Conference.
- 2 February Renewal of the General Commission's meetings.
- 6 February Submission by the USSR to the General Commission of a declaration on the definition of an aggressor.
- 13 February Submission by the General Commission to the Political Commission of all proposals related to security.
- 16 February Appointment by the General Commission of a Special Committee on Air Questions.
- 28 February End of the four months renewed armaments truce.
- 16 March United Kingdom draft convention submitted to the General Commission.
- 27 March Adoption by the General Commission of the United Kingdom draft convention of 16 March 1933 as a future basis for discussion.
- 16 May President Roosevelt's message on qualitative and quantitative disarmament together with the proposal for the entry into a pact of non-aggression.
- 17 May Declaration by the German Chancellor to the Reichstag on the German point of view with regard to equality of rights.
- 24 May Submission by the Committee on Security Questions of a report on the definition of the aggressor and the conclusion of a European security pact.
- 30 May Completion by the General Commission of the first reading of the United Kingdom draft convention.
- 3 June Submission of the report of the National Defence Expenditure Commission.
- Submission of the report of the Special Committee on the Manufacture of and the Trade in Arms.
- 8 June Adoption by the General Commission of the United Kingdom draft convention as a basis for the future Convention.
- 13 June Submission of the report of the Special Committee on Effectives.

/29 June

- 29 June                   Adjournment of the General Commission and decision to entrust the President with the task of concluding negotiations with the principal Powers to remove their divergencies of opinion on certain items concluded in the draft convention.
- 22 September           Submission of a provisional text of the draft convention with amendments and observations offered by various delegations in meetings of the General Commission.
- 9 October               Declaration of the President concerning the negotiations undertaken in accordance with the decision of the General Commission of 29 June 1933.
- 14 October              United Kingdom statement on the result of the negotiations between the principal Powers. Decision of Germany to leave the Conference.
- 11 November           Appointment by the Bureau of the Committee on Miscellaneous Provisions with a view to preparing draft articles on supervision and control, to be inserted in the draft convention for the second reading.
- Appointment by the Bureau of a Committee on Effectives with a view to preparing draft articles on effectives for the second reading of the draft convention.
- 5 December             Submission of the report of the Committee of the Bureau (Effectives).

### III. 1934

- 1 January               French memorandum on the question of the reduction of armaments in reply to a German memorandum of 18 December 1933.
- 29 January              United Kingdom memorandum to the principal Powers on a possible compromise with a view to arriving at an acceptable text for a draft convention.
- 16 April               German point of view on the United Kingdom memorandum of 29 January 1934.
- 17 April               French point of view on the United Kingdom memorandum of 29 January 1934.
- 28 May                  New programme of work for the Conference discussed by the Bureau.
- 29 May                  Future course of the Conference discussed in the General Commission.



- 8 June Adoption by the General Commission of a French proposal concerning the future programme of work of the Conference.
- 11 June Appointment by the General Commission of the Special Committee on Security.
- Request by the General Commission to the Committee on Miscellaneous Provisions to consider the question of the guarantees of execution.
- 5 July Submission of the report of the Special Committee on Security.
- 20 November Meeting of the Bureau calling some technical committees to meet in early 1935.
- IV. 1935-1937
- 13 April 1935 Submission of the last report of the Special Committee for the Regulation of the Manufacture of and the Trade in Arms.
- 20 October 1935 Death of the President of the Conference.
- 22 January 1936 Decision of the Council of the League of Nations to postpone the further convocation of the Conference.
- July 1936 Publication of the preliminary report on the work of the Conference by the President.
- 31 May 1937 Adoption by the Bureau of the Conference of a resolution calling for action in the field of national defence expenditure and on manufacture of and trade in arms.

ANNEX IV

ANNOTATED LIST OF PRINCIPAL AND SUBSIDIARY ORGANS  
OF THE CONFERENCE FOR THE REDUCTION  
AND LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS

A. The Conference (plenary meetings)

Called by the Council of the League of Nations.

Attended by sixty-one delegations, including some delegations not Members of the League. Sixty-five States were invited. Four States were not represented: Ecuador, Nicaragua, Paraguay and Salvador.

Held seventeen plenary meetings from 2 February to 24 February 1932, devoted to the adoption of rules of procedure, the establishment of the General Commission and a general discussion.

On 6 February, held an extraordinary meeting for the purpose of receiving petitions from private organizations.

On 23 July, held its 18th and last plenary meeting devoted to the renewal for four months of the armaments truce, and to the conclusion of the first phase of the Conference.

B. Organs set up by the Conference

1. General Commission. Created on 8 February 1932. Composed of one representative of each delegation. Its task, specified on 24 February 1932, consisted of the study and co-ordination of the Draft Convention prepared by the Preparatory Commission, and the plans and proposals presented by the delegations. Held twenty-seven meetings from 9 February to 23 July 1932, fifty-two meetings from 14 December 1932 to 29 June 1933 and seven meetings from 16 October 1933 to 11 June 1934.
2. Bureau. Constituted on 5 February 1932 to assist the President in directing its work. Composed of the President of the Conference, the Honorary President, the fourteen Vice-Presidents, the Chairman of the Commissions on which all the delegations were represented, and the Vice-Chairman of the General Commission. Held sixty-two meetings from 5 February 1932 to 20 November 1934.
3. Credentials Committee. Appointed on 2 February 1932. Presented three reports, adopted respectively on 4, 5 and 8 February 1932.
4. Committee on Rules of Procedure. Set up on 2 February 1932. Composed of sixteen members with the President of the Conference as Chairman. Submitted its report which was adopted together with the Rules of Procedure on 4 February 1932.

5. Committee for the Examination of Petitions, Established on 2 February 1932. Composed of five members. Submitted its report, together with Rules of Procedure for receiving petitions on 4 February 1932. Adopted the same day by the Conference.

C. Organs set up by the General Commission, by the Bureau and by the Main Commissions

I. Security questions

1. Political Commission. Set up by the General Commission, on 25 February 1932, with a view to co-ordinating the questions of organization of peace and supervision. Composed of one representative from each delegation. Held eight meetings from 27 February 1932 to 10 March 1933. On 15 March 1932, appointed a Committee on Moral Disarmament. On 10 March 1933, appointed a Committee on Security Questions.
2. Committee on Security Questions. Set up by the Political Commission on 10 March 1933. Composed of seventeen members. Submitted a report to the General Commission on 24 May 1933 on the definition of the aggressor and the establishment of facts constituting aggression. On 25 May 1933, submitted another report on a European security pact.
3. Special Committee on Security. Set up by the General Commission on 11 June 1934, with a view to studying the question of regional agreements. Composed of the representatives of the European countries. Held three meetings and submitted its report on 5 July 1934 on the basis of conclusions reached by its Technical Committee.
4. Technical Committee of the Special Committee on Security. Appointed on 18 June 1934 with a view to studying the technical aspects of the problem of regional agreements. Held five meetings and submitted its conclusions to the Special Committee on 25 June 1934.

II. Question of effectives

1. Land Commission<sup>1/</sup>. Created by the General Commission on 25 February 1932. Devoted its second meeting on 9 March 1932 to the question of effectives and appointed on the same day a Technical Committee on the definitions contained in articles 2 and 3 of the draft convention.
2. Technical Committee on the Definitions. Set up by the Land Commission on 9 March 1932. Composed of thirteen members. Prepared and circulated to all delegations a questionnaire relating to the definitions of effectives contained in articles 2 and 3 of the draft convention of the Preparatory Commission. Submitted its report on 16 March 1932 together with replies to the questionnaire.

<sup>1/</sup> See also III, "Question of Land Armaments", below.

3. Bureau of the Naval Commission. Requested by the Naval Commission on 17 March 1932 to prepare a questionnaire on naval effectives. This questionnaire was drafted on 22 March 1932 and sent to all delegations. Replies were published on 31 May 1932.
4. Committee on Effectives. Constituted by the General Commission on 10 May 1932 to study the information relating to effectives. Composed of twelve members. Submitted its report on 9 June 1932.
5. Special Committee on Effectives. Set up by the Bureau on 22 September 1932. Composed of twenty members (the Bureau and members of the Committee on Effectives). Was requested by the General Commission, on 6 March 1933, to study a series of technical questions. Submitted two reports on 13 June and 30 June 1933.
6. Technical Committee of the Special Committee. Appointed by the Special Committee on Effectives on 14 October 1932, to study the question of police forces and similar formations. Submitted two reports on 28 October 1932 and 13 June 1933.
7. Colonial Committee. Appointed on 12 October 1932 by the Special Committee, to consider some specific methods of calculation of overseas effectives. Composed of representatives of countries possessing colonies.
8. Drafting Committee on Effectives. Set up by the General Commission on 13 February 1933, to draw up a list of questions on which the General Commission would have to take decisions of principle. Composed of twelve members. Submitted a list of questions on 15 and 16 February 1933.
9. Committee of the Bureau (Effectives). Appointed by the Bureau on 11 November 1933 to prepare for a second reading the provisions of the draft convention relating to the reduction and control of effectives. Composed of ten members. Preliminary reports were submitted on 4 and 5 December 1933.

### III. Questions of land armaments

1. Land Commission.<sup>2/</sup> Constituted by the General Commission on 25 February 1932. Composed of one representative from each delegation. Was requested to study the questions of land armaments and effectives. Submitted its report on 7 June 1932 on the question of qualitative disarmament with regard to heavy artillery and tanks.
2. Committee of Experts. Appointed by the Land Commission on 29 April 1932. Composed of one representative from each delegation. Considered and

<sup>2/</sup> See also II, "Question of Effectives", above.

replied to two questionnaires dealing respectively with artillery and with tanks.

3. Drafting Committee on Land Armaments. Set up by the General Commission on 9 March 1933. Composed of fourteen members. Submitted on 15 March 1933 a questionnaire concerning the qualitative and quantitative limitation of artillery and tanks.

#### IV. Question of naval armaments

1. Naval Commission. Constituted by the General Commission on 25 February 1932. Composed of one representative for each delegation. Held twenty-one meetings from 27 February to 20 July 1932. Submitted on 28 May 1932 a report prepared by a drafting committee on the principle of qualitative disarmament with regard to naval armaments. Considered the provisions of the draft convention of the Preparatory Commission concerning naval armaments, without reaching any definitive conclusion.
2. Drafting Committee. Set up by the Naval Commission on 9 May 1932, to review the points expressed on qualitative disarmament with regard to naval armaments. Composed of twelve members.
3. Sub-Commission of Fourteen Members. Appointed on 3 June 1932, to settle the points held over on the discussion of the provisions of the draft convention relating to naval armaments. Submitted its report to the Commission on 11 June 1932.

#### V. Question of air armaments

1. Air Commission. Created by the General Commission on 25 February 1932. Composed of one representative from each delegation. Held twenty-six meetings from 27 February to 24 June 1932. Considered the questions of qualitative disarmament and of civil aviation and submitted reports on those questions respectively on 8 June and 18 July 1932.
2. Bureau of the Air Commission. Requested on 17 March 1932, to prepare a study on the organization of national civil aviation and on the internationalization of civil aviation. Replies by the delegations on a questionnaire on the organization of national civil aviation were published on 20 May and 8 June 1932. A working paper on the internationalization of civil aviation was presented on 15 April 1932 to the Air Commission.
3. Sub-Committee of Fourteen Members of the Air Commission. Set up on 27 April 1932, to consider the question of qualitative disarmament with regard to air armaments. Submitted a report on 18 May 1932, which became the basis of the report of the Commission of 8 June 1932.
4. Sub-Committee of Seventeen Members of the Air Commission. Set up on

/24 June 1932

24 June 1932, to draw up rules for civil aviation. Submitted its report on 18 July 1932.

5. Air Committee. Created by the General Commission on 16 February 1933, in accordance with a recommendation of the Chairman of the Air Commission to the Bureau dated 24 October 1932. Composed of twenty members representing the principal air Powers. Was requested to examine the possibility of the abolition of military aviation and aerial bombing combined with an effective international control of civil aviation. Framed a questionnaire on 13 March 1933 on the principles of the internationalization of civil aviation and of an international police air force. Was instructed on 11 June 1934, by the General Commission, to resume the study of air questions.

#### VI. Question of national defence expenditure

1. National Defence Expenditure Commission. Established by the General Commission on 25 February 1932. Composed of one representative of each delegation. Requested to consider the problems of limitation and publicity of national defence expenditure. Held twenty meetings from 27 February 1932 and submitted its report on 3 June 1933.
2. Technical Committee of the National Defence Expenditure Commission. Appointed on 16 March 1932 to study technical questions in connexion with the limitation and publicity of expenditure. Composed of twelve members. Submitted its report, together with a compilation of information from Member States on 8 April 1933, and a draft of the "Instruments necessary for the application of a system of publicity of National Defence Expenditure". On 14 January 1935 submitted a supplementary report on limitation and publicity of expenditure.

#### VII. Question of chemical and bacterial warfare

Special Committee on Chemical and Bacterial Warfare. Constituted by the General Commission, on 10 May 1932. Composed of fourteen members. Submitted a report on 31 May 1932, on the offensive character of chemical and bacterial warfare. Requested on 11 November 1932, by the Bureau to consider and to reply to a questionnaire concerning the prohibition of the preparation of chemical warfare and the measures to be taken in the event of a breach of the prohibition. Submitted a report to the Bureau on 13 December 1932.

#### VIII. Question of the manufacture of and trade in arms

1. Special Committee for the Regulation of the Manufacture of and the Trade in Arms. Set up by the Bureau, on 22 September 1932. Composed of fifteen members. Submitted three reports respectively on 18 November 1932, 4 March and 3 June 1933, the latter containing replies to a questionnaire sent to all delegations. On 23 July 1934, submitted a report together with draft articles. On 13 April 1935, submitted its fifth report.

2. Sub-Committee on Manufacture of Arms. Set up on 19 October 1932. Composed of ten members. Submitted its report on 17 February 1933.
3. Sub-Committee on Trade in Arms. Set up on 19 October 1932. Composed of nine members. Submitted its report on 27 May 1933.
4. Technical Committee on Categories of Arms. Set up on 12 April 1933. Submitted its report on 5 May 1933.
5. Committee of Jurists. Appointed in March 1935. Submitted its report on 6 April 1935.
6. Transit Committee. Set up on 1 April 1935. Composed of ten members. Submitted its report on 8 April 1935.

#### IX. Question of supervision

Committee on Miscellaneous Provisions. Established by the Bureau on 11 November 1933, with a view to preparing additional articles on supervision and control to be inserted in the draft convention. Composed of fifteen members. Submitted a first report on 7 December 1933. On 11 June 1934 was requested by the General Commission to consider the question of guarantees of execution. On 20 November 1934 was instructed by the Bureau to consider the possible establishment of a permanent disarmament commission. Met in February 1935, without presenting a report.

#### X. Question of moral disarmament

1. Committee on Moral Disarmament. Constituted by the Political Commission on 15 March 1932. Composed of twenty-two members. Submitted three reports on 20 July 1932, 3 June 1933 and 1 December 1933.
2. Sub-Committee on Intellectual Co-Operation. Appointed by the Committee on Moral Disarmament on 27 April 1932. Considered a draft text prepared by the Organization on Intellectual Co-operation and adopted it as a basis of discussion.
3. Sub-Committee on the Co-Operation of the Press. Appointed by the Committee on Moral Disarmament on 14 June 1932. Considered a draft text prepared by the Polish delegation and adopted it as a basis of discussion.
4. Legal Sub-Committee. Appointed by the Committee on Moral Disarmament on 14 June 1932, to study questions of a legal character with regard to moral disarmament.

ANNEX V

ANNOTATED LIST OF THE PRINCIPAL PROPOSALS, DRAFT CONVENTIONS,  
REPORTS, QUESTIONNAIRES AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE  
FOR THE REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS

I. MAIN PROPOSALS, AMENDMENTS AND STATEMENTS SUBMITTED TO THE GENERAL COMMISSION  
BY FRANCE, THE USSR, THE UNITED KINGDOM AND THE UNITED STATES

(a) Trench proposals

5 February 1932 (Document 1932, IX, 63, p. 113)

Air, land, and naval armaments to be put at the disposal of the League of Nations; internationalization of civil aviation; creation of an international force; protection of civilian populations; commissions for the organization of peace (security).

Discussed at the plenary meetings of the Conference (2 February - 24 February 1932).

14 November 1932 (Document 1935, IX, 4, p. 435)

Mutual assistance and standardization of the land defence forces of continental Europe with limited effective and short-service armies.

Discussed by the General Commission (2 February - 8 February 1933).

17 February 1933 (Document 1933, IX, 10, p. 283)

Establishment in continental Europe of short-term service armies with limited effectives.

Twenty-one delegations voted in favour of this proposal on 23 February 1933.

8 June 1934 (Document 1936, IX, 4, p. 885)

Regional security agreements; guarantees of execution.

Adopted as a programme of work by the General Commission on 8 June 1934.

(b) USSR proposals

19 February 1932 (Document 1932, IX, 63, p. 124)

Draft resolution on the principle of general and complete disarmament.

Rejected by the General Commission on 25 February 1932.

/12 April 1932



12 April 1932 (Document 1932, IX, 64, p. 49)

Draft resolution on the principle of progressive proportional reduction.

Considered by the General Commission during the general discussion on article 1 of the draft convention prepared by the Preparatory Commission.

Was not voted upon on the grounds that the reduction of armaments must be in accordance with national safety, enforcement of international obligations, geographical situation and special circumstances of each State.

25 April 1932 (Document 1932, IX, 63, p. 202)

Memorandum on the geographical, political and other factors to be taken into account for the reduction of armaments (size of territories, population, railway system, military alliances, etc.).

21 July 1932 (Document 1932, IX, 64, pp. 166 and 164)

Statement with regard to President Hoover's declaration of 22 June 1932 concerning the reduction of armed forces; reduction must apply to all sections of armed forces, with police and colonial components included, with the exception of the weakest States.

Opposition to the resolution adopted by the General Commission on 23 July 1932 on the ground that it did not provide any concrete measures for the reduction of armaments.

6 February 1933 (Document 1933, IX, 10, p. 237)

Definition of the aggressor.

Submitted on 13 February to the Political Commission. After a slight modification by the latter, served as a model inserted in a number of bilateral treaties of mutual assistance.

4 June 1934 (Document 1936, IX, 2, p. 212)

Programme of work concerning security. Suggestion concerning the permanent character of the Conference, to be described as the Peace Conference.

Submitted to all governments participating in the Conference, by the General Commission, on 8 June 1934.

(c) United Kingdom proposals

22 February 1932 (Document 1932, IX, 63, p. 144)

/Prohibition

Prohibition or limitation of the arms and methods of war specially fit for attack. Prohibition of submarines and heavy load mobile guns; reduction in size of warships; limitation of effectives; consideration of the problem of bombing from the air.

Considered by the Conference in plenary meetings (2 February - 24 February 1932).

7 July 1932 (Document 1932, IX, 63, p. 265)

(1) Abolition of all tanks above 20 tons; (2) reduction in size and in calibre of the guns of naval armaments; (3) limitation in the unladen weight of aircraft and prohibition of all bombing from the air.

These proposals were taken into account in formulating the General Commission's resolution of 23 July 1932.

17 November 1932 (Document 1935, IX, 2, p. 89)

Statements concerning the claim to equality of rights by the German delegation and the principle of qualitative equality.

(d) United States proposals

19 February 1932 (Document 1932, IX, 63, p. 139)

(1) Proportional reductions from the figures laid down in the Washington and London naval agreements; (2) total abolition of sub-marines and of chemical and bacteriological warfare; (3) restrictions for tanks and heavy mobile guns; (4) protection of civilian populations from air bombings; (5) computation of the effectives on the basis of the maintenance of internal order plus some suitable contingent for defence; (6) limitation of expenditure as a complementary method of limitation.

Considered during the general discussion in plenary meetings (2 February, 24 February 1932).

11 April 1932 (Document 1932, IX, 64, p. 40)

Draft resolution relating to the abolition of tanks, heavy mobile guns and gas and to a declaration by the States not to avail themselves of these aggressive weapons.

Considered by the General Commission during the general discussion on article 1 of the draft convention prepared by the Preparatory Commission.

Taken into account in the resolution adopted by the General Commission, on 22 April 1932, on the principle of qualitative disarmament.

/22 June 1932

22 June 1932 (Document 1932, IX, 63, p. 259)

President Hoover's declaration with a view to reduce the expenses, in all nations, of land, sea and air forces, and to reduce offensive strength compared to defensive strength.

(1) Abolition of tanks, large mobile guns, bombing planes, submarine tonnage in excess of 35,000 tons and prohibition of chemical warfare; (2) reduction by one-third of land armies over and above the police component, reduction by one-third of battleships and submarines; (3) the reduction by one-fourth of aircraft carriers, cruisers and destroyers.

Considered from 22 June to 8 July 1932, and mentioned in the General Commission's resolution of 23 July 1932.

16 May 1933 (Document 1933, IX, 10, p. 461)

President Roosevelt's message read at the General Commission's meeting on 19 May 1933. Complete elimination of all offensive weapons; entry by all nations of the world into a solemn pact of non-aggression.

29 May 1934 (Document 1936, IX, 1, p. 656)

Statement covering the necessity to enter a convention on the international control of the traffic in arms.

15 June 1934 (Document 1936, IX, 4, p. 893)

Memorandum and draft articles setting up the machinery for international system for the control of the manufacture of and the trade in arms.

20 November 1934 (Document 1936, IX, 4, p. 776)

Control of the manufacture of and the trade in arms and establishment of a permanent disarmament Commission.

## II. DRAFT CONVENTIONS AND AMENDMENTS

(a) Preparatory Commission's draft convention (Document 1930, IX, 8)

Includes provisions on personnel, material, national defence expenditure, chemical warfare, exchange of information under supervision of the Permanent Disarmament Commission.

Adopted by the General Commission on 25 February 1932 as the framework of future discussions.

(b) Amendments to the Preparatory Commission's draft convention (Document 1932, IX, 25 and 1932, IX, 28)

Proposals and amendments made during the general discussion (2 February - 25 February 1932) by various delegations on the Preparatory Commission's draft convention.

(c) USSR draft convention (Document 1932, IX, 63, pp. 125, 129)

Submitted on 23 March 1928 to the Preparatory Commission, and to the General Commission on 19 February 1932, together with amendments.

Progressive and proportional reduction of effectives and armaments.

It did not receive general support and was not voted upon.

(d) United Kingdom draft convention (Document 1933, IX, 10, p. 353 and 1933, IX, 2)

Submitted on 16 March 1933.

Prepared on the same lines as the Preparatory Commission's draft convention but contained more elaborated details and a new chapter on security, together with additional provisions on the prohibition of aggressive armaments, as a result of the previous discussion in the Conference and its subsidiary organs.

Adopted by the General Commission on 27 March 1933, as a basis for future discussion.

(e) Draft convention passed in first reading by the General Commission on 30 May 1933 (Document 1935, IX, 4, p. 600)

Draft convention based on the United Kingdom draft of 16 March 1933 together with amendments and observations made during the discussions.

Adopted on 8 June 1933 as the basis for the future convention, and published by the Secretariat on 22 September 1933.

/(f) USSR amendments

- (f) USSR amendments to the United Kingdom draft convention of 16 March 1933 (Document 1933, IX, 10, pp. 408, 439, 447, 505, and 535)

Submitted respectively on 25 April, 1, 3, 25 and 27 May 1933, extending the provisions for the European effectives to the effectives of all countries, defining threats of breach of the Pact of Paris, extending the naval limitations to be imposed on the principal naval Powers, suppressing the exception to the prohibition of bombing from the air, etc.

- (g) United States declaration with regard to the United Kingdom draft convention of 16 March 1933 (Document 1933, IX, 10, p. 494)

Submitted on 24 May 1933, sets forth the precise position of the United States Government with regard to a possible breach or threat of breach of the Pact of Paris.

- (h) French amendments to the United Kingdom draft convention of 16 March 1933 (Document 1933, IX, 10, pp. 578, 591 and 612)

Submitted respectively on 1, 6 and 7 June 1933.

Dealing with the establishment of the Permanent Disarmament Commission, proposing additional provisions regarding the manufacture of and the trade in arms and amending the provisions regarding military expenditures.

### III. REPORTS SUBMITTED BY THE VARIOUS ORGANS

#### (a) General survey

Work of the Conference (Document 1936, IX, 3)

Prepared by the President of the Conference and submitted in July 1936.

Surveys the work accomplished by the Conference and its various organs.

#### (b) Security questions

Reports of the Committee on Security Questions (Document 1935, IX, 4, p. 679)

Submitted on 24 and 25 May 1932.

The first report provides for two Acts concerning respectively the definition of the aggressor and the establishment of facts constituting an aggression. The latter was adopted at first reading on 30 May 1933.

The second report provided for a European pact of security, i.e., a declaration of non-recourse to force and provisions for mutual assistance.

Report by the Special Committee on Security (Document 1936, IX, 4, p. 885)

Submitted on 5 July 1934.

Provided for regional security agreements based on the Covenant and the Pact of Paris.

#### (c) Question of effectives

Report by the Technical Committee on Definitions of Effectives (Document 1935, IX, 9, p. 100)

Submitted on 16 March 1932, on the basis of government replies to a questionnaire referring to the definition of effectives.

Report of the Committee of Effectives (Document 1932, IX, 63, p. 276)

Submitted on 9 June 1932.

Average daily effectives and pre-military training.

Report of the Technical Committee of the Special Committee on Effectives (Document 1935, IX, 4, p. 666)

Submitted on 28 October 1932 and adopted by the Special Committee on 2 November 1932.

/Characteristics

Characteristics of police forces and similar formations which should be taken into account for the computation of effectives.

Served as a basis for the United Kingdom draft convention of 16 March 1933.

Reports of the Special Committee on Effectives (Document 1935, IX, 4, p. 583 and Document 1935, IX, 4, p. 655)

First report submitted on 13 June 1933, on the basis of the second report of the Technical Committee of the same date.

Consisted of a technical analysis of information received from various governments on police forces, naval effectives to be assimilated to land effectives and on pre-military training.

Second report dated 30 June 1933 on the question of an absolute maximum for effectives.

Report of the Committee of the Bureau (Effectives) (Document 1936, IX, 4, p. 911)

Submitted on 5 December 1933.

Progressive reduction of average daily effectives and long-term service personnel; exchange of information; limitation of the period of service.

(d) Question of land armaments

Report of the Land Commission (Document 1932, IX, 63, p. 227)

Submitted on 7 June 1932.

Qualitative disarmament (offensive character of heavy artillery, tanks and fortifications).

(e) Question of naval armaments

Report of the Naval Commission (Document 1932, IX, 63, p. 215)

Submitted on 28 May 1932.

Qualitative disarmament (capital ships, aircraft carriers, submarines, automatic contact mines, etc.).

(f) Question of air armaments

Reports of the Air Commission (Document 1932, IX, 63, p. 245 and Document 1936, IX, 7, p. 313)

First report submitted on 8 June 1932.

Offensive character of air armaments.

/Second report

Second report of 18 July 1932 on rules for civil aviation.

Report of the Vice-President of the Air Commission (Document 1936, IX, 4, p. 878)

Submitted on 24 November 1933, to the President of the Conference.

Internationalization of civil aviation; universality of the prohibition of bombing from the air.

(g) Question of national defence expenditure

Reports of the Technical Committee of the National Defence Expenditure Commission

(Document 1933, IX, 3, Vol. 1)

Technical study of the problem of limitation and publicity of National Defence Expenditure. Submitted on 8 April 1933.

(Document 1933, IX, 3, Vol. 2)

Summary of the information supplied by several States on their defence expenditure. Submitted on 8 April 1933.

(Document 1935, IX, 1)

Complementary report (Vol. III). Submitted on 14 January 1935.

(Document 1933, IX, 11)

Draft for the application of a system of publicity of National Defence Expenditure. Submitted on 11 December 1933.

(Document 1935, IX, 3)

Revised edition of the above draft submitted on 7 December 1934.

Report of the National Defence Expenditure Commission (Document 1935, IX, 4, p. 577)

Submitted to the General Commission on 3 June 1933.

Supervision of the separate expenditures of the military, naval and air forces; criterion for a comparison of armaments of different countries.

(h) Question of chemical and bacterial warfare

Reports of the Special Committee on Chemical Warfare (Document 1932, IX, 63, p. 210 and Document 1932, IX, 65)

First report submitted on 31 May 1932. System of qualitative disarmament applied to chemical and bacterial warfare.

/Second report



Second report submitted on 13 December 1932, on the prohibition and control of the prohibition of chemical warfare and on sanctions.

Report of the President of the Special Committee on Chemical Warfare (Document 1932, IX, 55)

Submitted to the Bureau on 8 November 1932.

Prohibition of the preparation for chemical and bacterial warfare; establishment of the fact of the use of chemical weapons.

(1) Question of the manufacture of and trade in arms

Reports of the Special Committee on the Manufacture of and the Trade in Arms

(Document 1935, IX, 4, p. 428)

Progress report of 19 October submitted to the Bureau on 18 November 1932.

(Document 1935, IX, 4, p. 503)

Report of 3 June 1933 including replies to the questionnaire dated 19 October 1932 on the manufacture of arms.

(Document 1936, IX, 4, p. 891)

Report submitted on 23 July 1934 on the principle of equality with regard to State and private manufacture of arms and responsibility of the States for the control of all manufacture.

(Document 1936, IX, 4, p. 785)

Progress report of 13 April 1935 on the supervision and the publicity of the manufacture of and the trade in arms.

Report of the Sub-Committee on Manufacture of Arms (Document 1933, IX, 7, p. 49)

Submitted on 17 February 1933.

Restrictions, limitations, publicity and control of the manufacture of arms.

Report of the Technical Committee on Categories of Arms (Document 1933, IX, 7, p. 60)

Submitted on 5 May 1933.

Categories of authorized arms.

/Report of the

Report of the Sub-Committee on Trade in Arms (Document 1933, IX, 7, p. 62)

Submitted on 27 May 1933.

Restrictions, limitations, control and publicity of the trade in arms.

Report of the Committee of Jurists (Document 1936, IX, 4, p. 822)

Submitted on 6 April 1935.

Dealt among other things with the question of neutrality and with the problem of embargo.

Report of the Transit Committee (Document 1936, IX, 4, p. 831)

Submitted on 8 April 1935.

Related to the USSR, French and the United Kingdom proposals on the matter of transit of arms.

(j) Question of supervision

Reports of the Rapporteur on the question of control (Document 1935, IX, 4, pp. 357, 440 and 723)

Three reports submitted respectively on 3 November, 15 November 1932, and 23 January 1933.

Composition, functioning, attributions and means of control of the Permanent Disarmament Commission.

Reports of the President of the Committee on Miscellaneous Provisions (Document 1936, IX, 4, pp. 875 and 888)

First report submitted on 3 April 1934 on the question of control.

Second report submitted on 28 June 1934 on the question of the guarantees of execution.

(k) Question of moral disarmament

Report of the Committee on Moral Disarmament (Document 1932, IX, 63, p. 271)

Submitted on 20 July 1932.

Intellectual co-operation, co-operation of the Press and national legislation.

Report of the Legal Sub-Committee of the Committee on Moral  
Disarmament (Document 1935, IX, 4, p. 701)

Submitted on 15 June 1933.

Requirements of national legislation to attain moral disarmament.

#### IV. QUESTIONNAIRES

##### (a) Question of effectives

###### Definition of effectives (Document 1935, IX, 9, p. 100)

Prepared by the Technical Committee on Definitions of Effectives, set up on 9 March 1932.

Refers to the meanings of the word "effectives" (Budgetary, legal or actual), to the days of presence and to the categories of personnel counted as effectives.

Replies were incorporated in the report of the Committee of 16 March 1932.

###### Definition of naval effectives (Document 1937, IX, 1, p. 138)

Drawn up on 22 March 1932, by the Bureau of the Naval Commission.

Refers to naval effectives, on the basis of the questionnaire drawn up for land effectives.

Replies were received from governments and published on 31 May 1932.

###### Effectives in connexion with the French plan for the standardization of European armies (Document 1935, IX, 4, p. 665)

Drawn up by a drafting committee of the General Commission on 15 February 1933.

Considered and replied by the General Commission from 16 February to 1 March 1933.

Refers to premilitary instruction, to police forces and to overseas forces.

###### Effectives (in general) (Document 1935, IX, 4, p. 667)

Drawn up by the Drafting Committee of the General Commission on 16 February 1933.

Considered and replied to by the General Commission from 1 March to 6 March 1933.

General considerations and overseas effectives.

##### (b) Question of land armaments

###### Artillery (Document 1932, IX, 63, p. 234)

/Drawn

Drawn up by the Land Commission and forwarded to its Committee of Experts on 29 April 1932.

Replied to by the Committee of Experts on 10 May.

Selection of offensive weapons.

Tanks (Document 1932, IX, 63, p. 237)

Drawn up by the Land Commission on 24 May 1932 for reference to its Committee of Experts.

Replied to by the Committee of Experts on 31 May 1932.

Selection of offensive weapons.

Limitation of Land Armaments (Document 1935, IX, d, 4: 670)

Drawn up on 15 March 1933, by a Drafting Committee of the General Commission to enable it to consider the principles of a qualitative and a quantitative limitation.

Was not considered by the General Commission.

(c) Question of aviation

Organization of national civilian airforces (Documents 1932, IX, 31 and 1932, IX, 31 Add.)

Prepared by the Bureau of the Air Commission at the request of the Air Commission, on 17 March 1932.

Organization, effectives and expenses of the National Civil Air forces.

Replies from governments were received and published on 20 May and 8 June 1932.

Qualitative disarmament. Air weapons (Document 1936, IX, 7, p. 280)

Note of the President of the Air Commission of 27 April 1932 and replies from governments on 28 April 1932.

Internationalization of civil aviation. Constitution of a police air force (Document Conf. D/C.9/C.A.8)

Drawn up by the Air Committee on 13 March 1933.

Was not distributed to the delegations.

(d) Question of national defence expenditure

Budget systems (Document 1933, IX, 3, Vol. I, p. 235)

Drafted by the Technical Committee of the National Defence Expenditure Commission.

Forwarded to delegations on 10 March 1932. Replies are contained in the Committee report (Vol. II and Vol. III).

Preparation, discussions, structure, execution and control of the budget.

Characteristics, limitation and publicity of national defence expenditure (Documents 1935, IX, 2, p. 6, and 1933, IX, 3, Vol. I)

Referred by the National Defence Expenditure Commission to its Technical Committee on 16 March 1932.

The report of the Technical Committee constitutes the reply to the questionnaire.

(e) Question of chemical warfare

Chemical, bacterial and incendiary weapons (Document 1932, IX, 65)

Submitted by the Bureau to the Special Committee on Chemical Incendiary and Bacterial Warfare, on 11 November 1932.

Prohibition of the preparation of chemical and bacterial warfare; establishment of the fact of its use; sanctions to be applied in case of violation.

Replied to by the Special Committee in a report dated 13 December 1932.

(f) Question of the manufacture of arms

Private and State manufacture of arms (Document 1935, IX, 4, p. 509)

Drawn up by the Special Committee on the manufacture of and the trade in arms and forwarded on 28 October 1932 to the governments.

Replies were published in an annex in the report of the Special Committee, dated 3 June 1932.

Publicity for the control of the manufacture of and the trade in arms (Document 1936, IX, 4, p. 835)

Drawn up by the Special Committee on the manufacture of and the trade in arms.

/Forwarded

Forwarded to the Technical Committee of the National Defence Expenditure Commission in March 1935.

Replies were published in the report of the Special Committee, dated 13 April 1935.

(g) Question of moral disarmament

On the legal and constitutional provisions of each state related to the maintenance of peace (Document 1935, IX, 4. p. 701)

Drawn up by the Legal Sub-Committee of the Committee for Moral Disarmament.

Sent to delegations of the Conference on 15 June 1933.

V. GENERAL COMMISSION'S MAIN RESOLUTIONS

25 February 1932 (Document 1932, IX, 64, p. 15)

Adoption of the principle of partial disarmament (United Kingdom draft resolution on the carrying out of the discussions within the framework of the Draft Disarmament Convention prepared by the Preparatory Commission).

19 April 1932 (Document 1932, IX, 64, pp. 81 and 82)

Adoption of the principle of progressive reduction (resolution establishing that the reduction be progressively achieved by means of successive revisions at appropriate intervals, after a first decisive step to the lowest possible level).

20 April 1932 (Document 1932, IX, 64, pp. 91 and 93)

Adoption of a subjective method of reduction of armaments (resolution establishing the principle of the reduction to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations, taking into account the geographical situation and special circumstances).

22 April 1932 (Document 1932, IX, 64, pp. 113 and 116)

Approval of the principle of qualitative disarmament (prohibition or internationalization of certain classes of weapons) and decision to consider the armaments whose character is most offensive, most efficacious against national defence or most threatening to civilians (United Kingdom draft resolutions).

23 July 1932 (Document 1932, IX, 64, pp. 153 and 205)

Adoption of a resolution on the conclusion of the first phase, preparation of the second phase of the Conference, principle of a reduction to be applied alike to land, naval and air armaments with the primary objective being to reduce the means of attack.

17 December 1932 (Document 1933, IX, 10, p. 215)

Adoption of a resolution taking note of the agreement among the five Powers on the equality of status claimed by Germany.

27 March 1932 (Document 1933, IX, 10, pp. 402 and 403)

Adoption of the draft convention submitted by the United Kingdom delegation as a basis for subsequent discussions.

8 June 1933, (Document 1933, IX, 10, p. 630)

Adoption as a basis for the future convention of the draft convention

/submitted



submitted by the United Kingdom delegation after it had passed its first reading.

16 October 1933 (Document 1936, IX, 1, p. 646)

Adoption of the text of a telegram to be sent to the German Government in reply to its decision to leave the conference.

8 June 1934 (Document 1936, IX, 1, pp. 681 and 688)

Adoption of a French draft resolution on a future programme of work of the Commission.

ANNEX VI

ANNOTATED LIST OF THE PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTS PUBLISHED BY THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS  
ON THE QUESTION OF THE REDUCTION AND  
LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS

A. TEMPORARY MIXED COMMISSION FOR THE REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS

SYMBOL	TITLE	CONTENT
A.158.(I).1921	Reduction of armaments  Report of the Third Committee adopted by the Assembly on 1 October 1921	Analysis of the first report of the Temporary Mixed Commission on the following subjects:  1. Statistical investigation on national armaments. 2. Private manufacture of and trade in arms. 3. Traffic in arms. 4. Armaments truce. 5. Chemical warfare. 6. Proposals for the reduction of armaments.
A.124.1922.IX	Reduction of armaments  Report of the Third Committee to the third assembly	Analysis of the second report of the Temporary Mixed Commission on the following subjects:  1. Limitation of national expenditure on armaments. 2. Statistical inquiry on peace-time armaments and expenditure on armaments. 3. Private manufacture of arms. 4. Arms traffic. 5. Chemical warfare. 6. National security. 7. Exchange of information. 8. Washington Conference. 9. Reduction of naval armaments. 10. Reduction of land and air armaments. 11. Treaty of mutual guarantee. 12. Regional agreements for the reduction of armaments.

SYMBOL

TITLE

CONTENT

A.35.1923.IX  
Part I

Report of the Temporary Mixed  
Commission for the Reduction  
of Armaments. Part I

Draft Treaty of Mutual  
Assistance:

1. Report.
2. Draft text.
3. Statements by some delegates.
4. Opinion of the Permanent Advisory Commission regarding Assembly resolutions XIV and XV.
5. Replies of the governments regarding Assembly resolution XIV.
6. Draft Treaty of Mutual Guarantee prepared by Lord Cecil.
7. Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance prepared by Lt. Colonel Requin.

A.35.1923.IX  
Part II

Report of the Temporary Mixed  
Commission for the Reduction  
of Armaments. Part II.

1. Limitation of national expenditure on armaments.
2. Statistical inquiry on armament budgets.
3. Private manufacture of arms and control of the traffic in arms.
4. Chemical warfare.
5. Exchange of information.
6. Washington Naval Treaty: extension to non-signatory States.
7. Moscow Conference on the Reduction of Armaments (2-12/12/1922).
8. Resolutions of the Pan-American Conference at Santiago.
9. Convention on the Limitation of Armaments between five Republics of Central America-Washington (7/2/1923).

SYMBOL	TITLE	CONTENT
A.III.1923.IX First Part	Reduction of armaments Report of the Third Committee to the fourth Assembly (first part)	Analysis of the report of the Temporary Mixed Commission (Part I). Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance.  1. Origin. 2. Analysis: Draft Treaty and Covenant. War of aggression. Guarantee and Disarmament. Case of aggression. Special treaties. Special situations. 3. Text of the Treaty. 4. Commentary on the definition of a case of aggression. 5. Notes by the Committee of Jurists.
A.III.1923.IX Second Part	Reduction of armaments Report of the Third Committee to the fourth Assembly (second part)	Analysis of the report of the Temporary Mixed Commission (Part II)  1. Limitation of national expenditure on armaments. 2. Statistical inquiry and exchange of information. 3. Private manufacture of arms and control of the traffic in arms. 4. Chemical warfare. 5. Naval treaty of Washington: extension to non-signatory States. 6. Draft regional agreements for the reduction of armaments.
A.16.1924.IX	Report of the Temporary Mixed Commission for the Reduction of Armaments.	1. Control of the international trade in arms, munitions and implements of war. 2. Private manufacture of arms, munitions and implements of war. 3. Chemical warfare. 4. Regional agreements.

SYMBOL	TITLE	CONTENT
A.35.1924.IX	Reduction of armaments Treaty of Mutual Assistance Replies from Governments	Replies from twenty-six governments (including France, USSR, United Kingdom and United States) on their points of view on the Treaty of Mutual Assistance and on resolution XIV of the third Assembly.
A.36.1924.IX	Reduction of armaments Limitation of naval armaments Replies from Governments	Action taken by the Council and the Commission of the League. Replies from governments on the report of the Naval Experts (Rome, February 1924).
A.135.1924.IX, and Annexes I and II	Arbitration, security and reduction of armaments  General report from the First and Third Committees to the fifth Assembly	Report of Mr. Politis and Mr. Benes on the Draft Geneva Protocol for the settlement of international disputes.  1. Historical summary. 2. Analysis of the scheme: (a) Compulsory arbitration. (b) Condemnation of aggressive war. (c) Strengthening of pacific methods of procedure. (d) Domestic jurisdiction of States. (e) Determination of the aggressor. (f) Security and reduction of armaments. (g) Preventive measures. (h) Sanctions. (i) Reduction of armaments. (j) Conclusions. 3. Annex I Assembly resolution. 4. Annex II Text of the Draft Protocol.
C.708.1924.IX	Arbitration, security and reduction of armaments  Extracts from the debates of the fifth Assembly, including those of the First and Third Committees	1. General discussion in plenary meeting of the Assembly (4-6 Sept. 1924) and resolution adopted on 6 September. 2. Extracts from the minutes of the First Committee. 3. Extracts from the minutes of the Third Committee.

## SYMBOL

## TITLE

## CONTENT

A.25.1925.IX

Arbitration, security and  
reduction of armamentsProtocol (of Geneva) for  
the pacific settlement of  
international disputes

A.99.1925.IX

Arbitration, security and  
reduction of armamentsReport of the Third Com-  
mittee to the sixth Assembly

4. Adoption of the reports of the  
First and Third Committees in  
plenary meetings of the  
Assembly.

Annex 1: Reports of First and  
Third Committees.

Annex 2: Protocol

5. Programme adopted by the Council  
concerning the preparation of  
the Conference for the reduction  
of armaments.

1. Action taken by the Council.
2. Declarations by the members of  
the Council.

1. Preparatory studies concerning  
the Conference for the  
reduction and limitation of  
armaments.
2. Permanent Council Organization  
for work on disarmament.

B. CONFERENCE FOR THE SUPERVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE  
IN ARMS, MUNITIONS AND IMPLEMENTS OF WAR

SYMBOL	TITLE	CONTENT
C.758,M.258.1924	Conference for the control of the international trade in arms, munitions and implements of war	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Historical survey.</li> <li>2. Text of the draft convention drawn up by the Temporary Mixed Commission.</li> <li>3. Analysis of the draft convention</li> <li>4. Annexes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Convention of St Germain for the control of the trade in arms and ammunition - 10 September 1919.</li> <li>(b) Extracts from the minutes of the Temporary Mixed Commission, the Permanent Advisory Commission and the Council, related to the question.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
A.13.1925.IX	Proceedings of the Conference for the supervision of the international trade in arms and ammunition and in implements of war (Geneva, 4 May to 17 June 1925)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Text of the draft convention submitted by the Temporary Mixed Commission.</li> <li>2. Convention for the supervision of the international trade in arms and ammunition and in implements of war</li> <li>3. Protocol for the prohibition of the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases and of bacteriological methods of warfare.</li> </ol>
A.109.1925.IX	Reduction of armaments  Report of the Third Committee to the sixth Assembly  Manufacture of arms, ammunition and implements of war	Report on the work of the Conference for the supervision of the international trade in arms and ammunition and implements of war (May-June 1925) and draft resolution.

C. PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

SYMBOL	TITLE	CONTENT
C.793 (2). M.278.1925. IX	List of questions to be examined by the Preparatory Commission	Report on the list of questions to be submitted to the Preparatory Commission.
1926.IX.7	Documents of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, Series II	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Report to the Council of the League of Nations (18 March 1926) on the constitution of the Preparatory Commission.</li> <li>2. Minutes of the First Session (18-26 May 1926):               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) General discussion.</li> <li>(b) Consideration of the questionnaire submitted by the Council.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Report of the Preparatory Commission on the work of its first session.</li> </ol>
1926.IX.15	Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, Sub-Commission B, Report No. 1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Report on economic and financial questions related to armaments and disarmament.</li> <li>2. Replies by the Joint Commission to the questions put by Sub-Commission A and by Sub-Commission B.</li> </ol>
1926.IX.16	Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, Report of Sub-Commission A (Military, Naval and Air)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Definition of armaments.</li> <li>2. Factors of a country's war power.</li> <li>3. Categories of armaments.</li> <li>4. Limitation of war or peace strength of a country.</li> <li>5. Reduction and limitation of armaments.</li> <li>6. Standards of measurement with regard to land, naval and air armaments.</li> <li>7. Methods of reduction, advantages and disadvantages.</li> <li>8. Defensive and offensive armaments.</li> <li>9. Factors involved in the drawing of a scale of armaments.</li> <li>10. Civil and military aircraft.</li> <li>11. Regional disarmament and security.</li> <li>12. Exchange of information on armaments.</li> <li>13. Chemical warfare.</li> </ol>

/1927.IX.2



## SYMBOL

## TITLE

## CONTENT

1927.IX.2

Documents of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, Series III

1. Minutes of the second session of the Preparatory Commission (22-27 September 1926).
2. Memorandum by the Secretariat on the progress of work of the Preparatory Commission (6 September 1926 and 11 November 1926).
3. Minutes of the fourth and fifth sessions of the Committee of the Council.
4. Report by M. de Brouckere on Article 16 of the Covenant.
5. Report by the Advisory Committee for Communications and Transit.
6. Report of the Committee of the Council on the work of its fifth session.

1927.IX.3

Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, Sub-Commission B, Report No. II

Report of the Committee of Experts on Civil Aviation (7-12 February 1927).

1927.IX.4

Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, Sub-Commission B, Report No. III

Report of the Committee of Experts on Budgetary Questions (21-27 February 1927).

1927.IX.5

Documents of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, Series IV, Minutes of the third session (21 March - 26 April 1927)

1. General discussion.
2. Examination of the synoptic analysis of the United Kingdom and French drafts: effectives, air and naval armaments, expenses and miscellaneous.
3. Annexes:
  - (a) Draft convention submitted by Lord Cecil.
  - (b) Draft convention submitted by the French delegation.
  - (c) Synoptic analysis of the United Kingdom and French proposals.
  - (d) Draft texts resulting from the first reading proposed by the Bureau.
  - (e) Report of the Commission after its third session.
  - (f) Report of the Committee of experts on civil aviation.

/1928.IX.2

SYMBOL	TITLE	CONTENT
1928.IX.2	Documents of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, Series V., (A) Minutes of the fourth session of the Preparatory Commission, (B) Minutes of the first session of the Committee on Arbitration and Security	<p>(A) Minutes of the fourth session of the Preparatory Commission:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. USSR draft resolution on general and complete disarmament.</li> <li>2. Appointment of the Committee on Arbitration and Security.</li> <li>3. Annex Memorandum by the USSR delegation on the danger of imperialist warfare.</li> </ol> <p>(B) Minutes of the first session of the Committee on Arbitration and Security:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Programme of work.</li> </ol>
1928.IX.3	Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, Committee on Arbitration and Security	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction to the three memoranda on arbitration, security and the articles of the Covenant submitted by the Chairman of the Committee on Arbitration and Security.</li> <li>2. Memorandum on arbitration and conciliation.</li> <li>3. Memorandum on security questions.</li> <li>4. Memorandum on articles 10, 11 and 16.</li> <li>5. Annexes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Work of the Committee on Arbitration and Security</li> <li>(b) Assembly resolution of 26 September 1927.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
1928.IX.5	Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, draft disarmament convention submitted by the delegation of the USSR	<p>Draft Convention for immediate, complete and general disarmament:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Effectives.</li> <li>2. Material.</li> <li>3. Organization of protection.</li> <li>4. Control.</li> <li>5. Breaches of the Convention.</li> <li>6. Explanatory memorandum.</li> </ol>

SYMBOL	TITLE	CONTENT
1928.IX.6	Documents of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, Series VI (A) Minutes of the Second session of the Committee on Arbitration and Security, (B) Minutes of the fifth session of the Preparatory Commission	(A) Minutes of the second session of the Committee on Arbitration and Security (20 February to 7 March): 1. Memoranda on arbitration and conciliation, on security questions, on Articles 10, 11 and 16 of the Covenant and on German proposal on methods to prevent war. 2. Report of the Committee on the work of its second session. (B) Minutes of the fifth session of the Preparatory Commission (15-24 March 1928): 1. General discussion of the Soviet Union draft convention for immediate, complete and general disarmament. 2. Progress of the work of the Commission. 3. Annexes: (a) German proposal on last paragraph of Article 8 of the Covenant. (b) Soviet Union draft convention for immediate, complete and general disarmament (c) Soviet Union draft convention on the reduction of armaments.
1928.IX.8	Documents of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, Series VII, Minutes of the third session of the Committee on Arbitration and Security (27 June - 7 July 1928)	1. Adoption of Model Conventions A, B and C on Conciliation, Arbitration and Judicial Settlement. 2. Adoption of the Model Treaties D, E and F on Mutual Assistance and Non-Aggression. 3. Adoption of the Model Treaties a, b and c. 4. Financial assistance to States victims of aggression.

SYMBOL

TITLE

CONTENT

1928.IX.2

Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference Committee on Arbitration and Security - Report of the Committee on Arbitration and Security on the work of its third session (27 June to 4 July 1928)

5. Treaty to strengthen the means of preventing war.  
6. Annex: Report of the Committee on Arbitration and Security.

1. Account of the Committee's work from the beginning.
2. Pacific settlement of international disputes - Model Conventions A, B, C and a, b, c.
3. Non-aggression and mutual assistance - Model Treaties D, E and F.
4. Articles of the Covenant
  - (a) Memorandum on Articles 10, 11 and 16.
  - (b) Communications to the League of Nations in case of emergency.
  - (c) Financial assistance to States victims of aggression.
5. German suggestion for a Model Treaty to strengthen the Means of Preventing War.

1929.IX.3

Documents of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, Minutes of the sixth session (first part) of the Preparatory Commission (15 April - 6 May 1929), Series VIII

1. Soviet Union draft convention.
2. German proposal on Article 8 of the Covenant.
3. Draft convention adopted at first reading; chemical warfare; effectives; land and air armaments.
4. Annex: Texts drawn up at second reading.

1930.IX.3

Documents of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, Series IX Minutes of the fourth session of the Committee on Arbitration and Security

1. Working of the League of Nations at times of emergency (facilities to be granted to aircraft).
2. Treaty to strengthen the means of preventing war.
3. Financial assistance.
4. Annexes.
5. Minutes of the Drafting Committee.

/D. SPECIAL

D. SPECIAL COMMISSION FOR THE PREPARATION OF A DRAFT  
CONVENTION ON THE PRIVATE MANUFACTURE OF ARMS  
AND AMMUNITION AND OF IMPLEMENTS OF WAR

SYMBOL	TITLE	CONTENT
1926.IX.8	Reduction of armaments	1. Report adopted by the Council on 4 September 1946.
	Supervision of the private manufacture of arms and ammunition and implements of war	2. Preliminary draft convention concerning the publicity of such manufacture, submitted to the Committee of the Council by the Committee of Inquiry.
1927.IX.6	Special Commission for the Preparation of a Draft Convention on the Private Manufacture of Arms and Ammunition and of Implements of War	1. Report of the Special Commission on its first session (1927).
		2. Preliminary draft convention.
		3. Amendments and observations.
	Report to the Council on the work of its first session	
1928.IX.10	Reduction of armaments	1. Report of the Special Commission to the Council on its second session (August 1928).
	Supervision of the private manufacture and publicity of the manufacture of arms and ammunition and of implements of war	2. Preliminary draft convention submitted to the Council.
1929.IX.5	Reduction of armaments	1. Report of the Special Commission to the Council.
	Supervision of the private manufacture and publicity of the manufacture of arms and ammunition and of implements of war	2. Draft convention.
		3. Minutes of the fourth session of the Special Commission (1929).

## E. CONFERENCE FOR THE REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS

SYMBOL	TITLE	CONTENT
1932.IX.25	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments. Survey of proposals made by various delegations during the general discussion	Extracts from speeches and proposals with an index by subject.
1932.IX.28	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments  Co-ordinating table of the draft convention and of the propositions referred to the General Commission	Co-ordinating table showing for every article the question of principle raised by the article or by the corresponding proposals.
1932.IX.31 and 1932.IX.31.add.	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments  Air Commission  Collection of replies to the questionnaires concerning the organization of national civilian forces	1. Organization of the national civilian air forces. Replies of 33 countries (including France, USSR, United Kingdom and United States).  2. Effectives and budgets of the national civilian air forces  Replies of 25 countries (including United Kingdom and United States).
1932.IX.46	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments  Chemical and bacteriological weapons - Special Committee  Report to the General Commission	1. Report of 31 May 1932 on the qualitative principle of disarmament with regard to chemical, bacteriological and incendiary weapons  2. Draft resolutions
1932.IX.55	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments  Report to the Bureau on the Prohibition of Chemical Warfare and violations of the Prohibition to use Chemical, Bacteriological and Incendiary Weapons	Report of 25 October 1932 1. Character of the prohibition. 2. Prohibition of preparations for chemical, incendiary and bacteriological warfare. 3. Supervision of the observance of the Prohibition. 4. Sanctions: (a) Establishment of the infringement (b) Effect. 5. Conclusions.

SYMBOL	TITLE	CONTENT
1932.IX.60	Records of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments  Series A. Verbatim Records of Plenary Meetings  Volume I. 2 February - 23 July 1932	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction: (a) Origin of, and steps leading up to, the Conference (b) Opening of the Conference (c) Organization of the Conference (d) List of members of the delegations.</li> <li>2. Opening speech by the President.</li> <li>3. Constitution of the Bureau.</li> <li>4. Constitution of the General Commission.</li> <li>5. General discussion, Statements by every delegation.</li> <li>6. Renewal of the Armaments Truce.</li> <li>7. Hearings of representatives of non-governmental organizations.</li> </ol>
1932.IX.63	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments  Conference documents  Volume I	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Draft convention of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference.</li> <li>2. Report by the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference.</li> <li>3. Moral disarmament: (a) Memorandum from the Polish Government (b) Material forwarded by the International Organization on Intellectual Co-operation.</li> <li>4. French proposals of 5 February 1932.</li> <li>5. USSR proposals of 18 February 1932.</li> <li>6. United States proposals of 19 February 1932.</li> <li>7. United Kingdom</li> </ol>



SYMBOL TITLE

CONTENT

1932.IX.64

Records of the Conference  
for the Reduction and  
Limitation of Armaments

Series B. Minutes of the  
General Commission

Volume I, 9 February -  
23 July 1932

7. United Kingdom proposals of  
22 February 1932.
  8. USSR memorandum on the principle  
of reduction of armaments.
  9. Chemical and bacteriological  
weapons.  
Special Committee.  
Report of 31 May 1932.
  10. Report of the Naval Commission  
of 28 May 1932.
  11. Report of the Land Commission  
of 28 May 1932.
  12. Report of the Air Commission of  
8 June 1932.
  13. Report of the President of the  
Committee on Effectives of  
9 June 1932.
  14. President Hoover's proposals of  
22 June 1932.
  15. United Kingdom statement of  
views on President Hoover's  
proposals.
  16. Resolution adopted by the  
General Commission on 23 July  
1932.
- 
1. Rejection of the USSR draft  
resolution on the principle of  
general and complete disarmament.
  2. Adoption of the United Kingdom  
draft resolution to carry out  
the discussion on the basis of  
the draft convention of the  
Preparatory Commission.
  3. Constitution of the Land, Naval,  
Air, National Defence  
Expenditure and Political  
Commissions.
  4. United States draft resolution  
related to the abolition of  
aggressive weapons of 11 April  
1932.
  5. USSR draft resolution on  
progressive proportional  
reduction of armaments.
  6. Adoption of a draft resolution  
on the principle of reduction  
of armaments by stages  
(19 April 1932).

/7. Adoption

SYMBOL	TITLE	CONTENT
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adoption of a draft resolution on the criteria for the reduction of armaments (20 April 1932).</li> <li>Adoption of two draft resolutions on qualitative disarmament (22 April 1932).</li> <li>Constitution of a Special Committee on Chemical and Bacteriological Weapons and of a Committee on Effectives.</li> <li>General discussion on President Hoover's proposals of 22 June 1932.</li> <li>Conclusion of the first phase and preparation of the second phase of the Conference: resolution of 23 July 1932.</li> </ol>
1932.IX.65	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments  Chemical, incendiary and bacterial weapons - Special Committee  Reply to the questionnaire submitted by the Bureau	Report dated 13 December 1932 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prohibition and supervision of the prohibition.</li> <li>Establishment of the fact of the use of chemical, incendiary or bacterial weapons.</li> <li>Penalties for the use of chemical, incendiary or bacterial weapons.</li> </ol>
1933.IX.2	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments  Draft convention submitted by the United Kingdom delegation and addendum	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security.</li> <li>Disarmament: (a) Effectives (b) Land, naval and air armaments.</li> <li>Exchange of information.</li> <li>Chemical warfare.</li> <li>Supervision.</li> </ol>
1933.IX.3 Vol. I	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments  National Defence Expenditure Commission  Report of the Technical Committee  Volume I	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National defence expenditure (definition, complete account, verification, separation for the three forces, publicity).</li> <li>Preparation, adoption, execution and supervision of the budgets.</li> <li>Supervision.</li> <li>Model statements.</li> </ol>

SYMBOL	TITLE	CONTENT
1933.IX.3 Vol. II	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments National Defence Expenditure Commission Report of the Technical Committee Volume II	1. Information on the defence expenditure of various States. 2. Recapitulatory tables of the model statements of various countries.
1933.IX.4	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments Analogies between the problem of the traffic in narcotic drugs and that of the trade in and manufacture of arms	Memorandum by the Secretariat. 1. The notion of illicit traffic. 2. Publicity of traffic. 3. Restrictions on the freedom of 4. Control.
1933.IX.7	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments Committee for the Regulation of the Trade in and the Private and State Manufacture of Arms and Implements of War Progress report to the General Commission	1. Progress report. 2. Report on the abolition of private manufacture of arms. 3. Replies to the questionnaire on the manufacture of arms. 4. Summary of those replies. 5. Report by the Sub-Committee on the Manufacture of Arms. 6. Report by the Technical Committee on Categories of Arms. 7. Report by the Sub-Committee on the Trade in Arms. 8. French proposal regarding the manufacture of and trade in arms.
1933.IX.8	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments Report of the Special Committee on Effectives to the General Commission	1. Police forces and similar formations; 2. Naval effectives to be assimilated to land effectives. 3. Pre-military training.
1933.IX.10	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments Series B. Minutes of the General Commission Volume II. 14 December 1932 - 29 June 1933	1. Discussion on the French proposals of 19 November 1932. 2. Questionnaire on standardization of the European continental armies. 3. Discussion on the United Kingdom draft convention of 16 March 1933.

SYMBOL	TITLE	CONTENT
		4. Message from President Roosevelt of 16 May 1933.
		5. Report of the Committee on Security Questions: definition of the aggressor.
1933.IX.11	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments  Instruments necessary for the application of a system of publicity of national defence expenditure	Draft prepared by the Technical Committee of the National Defence Expenditure Commission.
1935.IX.1	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments  National Defence Expenditure Commission  Report of the Technical Committee.  Volume III	1. Complementary report. 2. Information supplied by several States on their national defence expenditure. 3. Recapitulatory tables of the model statements.
1935.IX.2	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments  Series C. Minutes of the Bureau  Volume I	1. Action taken by the President since 23 July 1932. 2. French statement on the French plan of 14 November 1932. 3. United Kingdom statement on a programme of work. 4. Five-Power agreement on the Equality of Status.
1935.IX.3	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments  Publicity of national defence expenditure  Draft convention prepared by the Technical Committee	1. Text of the draft convention. 2. Annexes: (a) List of items of national defence expenditure (b) Transmission of documents (c) Compilation of statements and reconciliation tables (d) Compilation of summary statements (e) Models: statements, summary statements and reconciliation tables.
		/1935.IX.4

SYMBOL	TITLE	CONTENT
1935.IX.4	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments  Volume II. Conference documents	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. French memorandum on the internationalization of civil air transport.</li> <li>2. Renewal of the Armaments Truce. Replies from governments.</li> <li>3. French plan for the organization of peace of 14 November 1932.</li> <li>4. United Kingdom draft convention of 16 March 1933.</li> <li>5. Draft Convention adopted in first reading. Provisional text with amendments, 2 September 1933.</li> <li>6. Report of the Committee on Security Questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Definition of aggressor</li> <li>(b) Establishment of the fact of aggression</li> <li>(c) European Security Pact.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
1935.I.6	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments  Special Committee for the Regulation of the Trade in and Private and State Manufacture of Arms and Implements of War  Report on the progress of the work of the Committee	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Draft conventions.</li> <li>2. Observations and reservations.</li> <li>3. Report by the Committee of Jurists.</li> <li>4. Report by the Transit Committee.</li> <li>5. Replies from the National Defence Expenditure Commission to the questionnaire submitted by the Committee for the Regulation of the Trade in and Private and State Manufacture of Arms and Implements of War.</li> </ol>
1935.IX.8	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments  Series D - Volume 4  Minutes of the National Defence Expenditure Commission (27 February 1932 - 3 June 1933)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Uniform presentation of figures for national defence expenditure.</li> <li>2. Strength of armaments and expenditure.</li> <li>3. Model statement.</li> <li>4. Report of the Commission.</li> </ol>

SYMBOL	TITLE	CONTENT
1935.IX.9	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments Series D. Volume I. Minutes of the Land Commission (27 February - 6 June 1932)	1. Offensive weapons: (a) Artillery (b) Tanks. 2. Report of the Technical Committee on the Definitions of Effectives. 3. Report to the General Commission on qualitative disarmament.
1936.IX.1	Records of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments Series B - Minutes of the General Commission Volume III, 16 October 1933 - 11 June 1934	1. Decision of the German Government to leave the Conference (16 October 1933). 2. Future work of the Conference. Adoption of the French draft resolution of 8 June 1934. 3. Appointment and composition of committees for carrying out the programme of work.
1936.IX.2	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments Series C. Minutes of the Bureau Volume II. 9 October 1933 - 20 November 1934	1. Negotiations undertaken by the President to find a compromise on an acceptable text for a draft convention (July - August 1933). 2. Decision of the German Government to leave the Conference (16 October 1933).
1936.IX.3	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments Preliminary report on the work of the Conference prepared by the President, Mr. Arthur Henderson	1. Chronological record of the Conference. 2. Security. 3. Effectives. 4. Land material. 5. Naval material. 6. Air material. 7. National defence expenditure. 8. Chemical incendiary and bacterial warfare. 9. Control of the manufacture of and trade in arms. 10. Exchange of information. 11. Permanent Disarmament Commission. 12. Moral disarmament. 13. Annex. Draft convention: provisional text (22 September 1933).

SYMBOL	TITLE	CONTENT
1936.IX.4	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments Documents of the Conference Volume III	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Documents concerning the resumption of the work of the Conference (January-April 1934).</li> <li>2. United States draft proposal on the regulation and control of the manufacture of and trade in arms.</li> <li>3. Programme of work of the Conference (8 June 1934).</li> <li>4. Report by the President of the Special Committee on Security Questions (5 July 1934).</li> <li>5. Note on the question of guarantees of execution (5 July 1934).</li> </ol>
1936.IX.7	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments Series D - Volume 3 Minutes of the Air Commission (27 February - 24 June 1932)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Internationalization of civil aviation.</li> <li>2. Qualitative principle of air armaments.</li> <li>3. Annexes: (a) Objective study on the internationalization of civil aviation (b) Replies to the questionnaire on qualitative air armaments (c) Report of the Air Transport Co-operation Committee on its second session (9 - 12 May 1932).</li> </ol>
1936.IX.8	Documents of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments Records of the Political Commission (27.2.1933 - 10.3.1933) Series D. Volume 5	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Moral disarmament.</li> <li>2. Security questions.</li> <li>3. Declaration on the non-recourse to the use of force.</li> <li>4. Pact of Mutual Assistance.</li> <li>5. Definition of aggression: Soviet Union proposal.</li> <li>6. Annex. European pact of mutual assistance: Belgian proposal on the establishment of facts constituting aggression.</li> </ol>

SYMBOL	TITLE	CONTENT
1937.IX.1	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments Series D. Volume 2 Minutes of the Naval Commission (27 February - 20 July 1932)	1. Discussion of the naval provisions of the Draft Convention prepared by the Preparatory Commission. 2. Qualitative disarmament with regard to naval demands. 3. Report of the Commission of 28 May 1932.
1937.IX.2	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments Publicity of national defence expenditure	Action taken on the resolution of the Bureau of 31 May 1937.
1938.IX.1	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments National control of the manufacture of and the trade in arms	Information on the existing situation collected by the Secretariat pursuant to the resolution of the Bureau of 31 May 1937.
1938.IX.2	Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments. National supervision of the manufacture of and the trade in arms	Action taken on the resolution of the General Assembly of 30 September 1937.



## F. STATISTICAL INQUIRIES

SYMBOL	TITLE	CONTENT
A.21.1922.IX	Statistical Inquiry on Armaments (First Series of Data)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Natural elements of military strength               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Territory of countries</li> <li>(b) Population (total, relative, sex and age).</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Technical military data..</li> </ol>
A.31.a.1922	Budget expenditure on national defence - 1913 and 1920-1922	Tables giving the global defence expenditures, defence expenditure reduced to pre-war price level, defence expenditure as percentages of total budget expenditure, for the financial years 1913, 1920, 1921 and 1922 of 21 countries.
A.20.1923.IX	Statistical inquiry into national armaments	<p><u>Part I</u> Peace-time military, naval and air forces (1923)</p> <p><u>Part II</u> Budget expenditure on national defence (1921-1923)</p>

## G. ANNUAL YEAR-BOOKS

TITLE	CONTENT
Armaments Year-Book	Annual publication from 1924 to 1939/40. General and statistical information on the military organization and armaments of all countries.
Statistical Year-Book on the Trade in Arms, Ammunition and Implements of War	Annual publications from 1925 to 1939. Tables for all countries on the trade in arms.