obtained either as the outcome of negotiations between great Powers leading to a resumption of the Conference or—since it was at present proposed to adopt other means as a temporary expedient—by some other method.

It was needless to enlarge upon the danger incurred by Austria on account of her military inferiority, through her inability to avail herself freely of her means of defence in the circumstances which at present existed in Europe and which the other countries took into account, and to insist upon the duties imposed upon her by her international obligations which redounded her national interest in what was her most vital possession.

There was also no need to dwell upon the long time which must elapse before the work of the Conference could be resumed. That was the reason that had led to the proposals which the Bureau had just heard regarding the adoption of such conventions as might be feasible outside the scope of a general convention.

Without overlooking the desirability of adopting conventions of that kind, which would form a first step towards a general settlement of the question, the Austrian Government regretted that it could not see in the new development any sign of an advance towards what, in its opinion, based on the pressing interests of its country, formed the counterpart of other conventional obligations—namely, equality of rights to defence.

M. Pfliigl was therefore instructed to state that, although it would in no way refuse its collaboration, the Austrian Government could not see its way to sign such other conventions until an agreement was reached in regard to the claim which M. Pfliigl had just set forth.

Mr. Eden (United Kingdom) said that he was happy to be able to support, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, the procedure suggested to the Bureau in the Chairman's statement of November 5th and confirmed in his speech that morning. It was all the easier for him to do so, since Sir John Simon himself, as long ago as May 30th last, had suggested the possibility of making progress by drawing up a number of protocols on specific subjects. In the circumstances of the present time, that seemed, indeed, to be the only procedure that the Conference could follow. The course of its work must inevitably be affected by political events taking place outside those walls, and it was scarcely possible at that time to make definite plans for the future course of the work of the Conference beyond the three subjects set out in the Chairman's statement—namely, the regulation of the manufacture of and trade in arms, budgetary publicity and the setting-up of the Permanent Disarmament Commission.

In that connection, Mr. Eden desired to say that he appreciated the force of the remarks made that morning by M. Litvinoff on the subject of universality. It might be that failure to achieve universality would affect the efficacy of the Conference's work; but, all the same, he was glad to find that it was M. Litvinoff's view, as it was his own, that that fear should not stop the Conference from working on those three subjects. In that respect, he particularly welcomed the statement made by the representative of the United States Government. The United Kingdom delegation had been very glad to hear of the proposals which were to be circulated. He was sure that, taken together with the draft articles which were the outcome of the work of the Committee of the Conference, to which he had no doubt they were related, they would greatly assist the work on that subject.

He cordially agreed with the Chairman and Mr. Wilson that it was highly desirable to deal with those subjects, even apart from and in advance of the main problems of the Conference. Whenever the Committees to deal with them were called together, the United Kingdom delegation would be happy to do its utmost to further their work and to assist them to arrive at agreed results with the least possible delay. He himself was sufficiently optimistic to believe that once they got to work their labours would not be either too prolonged or too difficult.

At the same time, he would like to utter one word of warning. The work of the Committees was no doubt important. His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, as he had already made clear, wished to see it brought to a successful conclusion, but at the same time it was very far from regarding work upon one, or even all, of the three subjects as an adequate result for nearly three years' effort by the Disarmament Conference. Those objectives were useful, but they were not the main objective, and it was that main objective that the Conference must keep continuously before it: that was to say, the conclusion, possibly by stages, of a convention for the reduction and limitation of armaments. Only by the conclusion of such a convention could it hope to meet some of the most stubborn of the political difficulties of the present time and only thus could appeasement finally be brought to the nations of the world.

Mr. Eden therefore repeated that, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, he cordially endorsed the proposed programme. The United Kingdom delegation would help to the best of its ability to further the work of the three Committees, but the great problems with which the Conference was confronted remained and must be solved. The lesser could be no substitute for the greater, as the Chairman, in the last paragraph of his statement, had wisely reminded the Conference. It seemed necessary to remind the Bureau of that at the present time, for in
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three years of work the Conference had been too near to success more than once to lose hope utterly even at this hour. While the stubborn reality of the political problems that beset the Conference was only too well known, those difficulties did not, even now, justify despair.

With those few comments, he warmly endorsed the procedure suggested by the Chairman.

M. Litvinoff (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, while it would be premature for him to move amendments to the proposal of the United States delegation until he had seen it, he desired to raise one matter so that delegations might bear it in mind and perhaps pass it on to their Governments in order that they might be in a position to discuss it at the next meeting.

What he desired to suggest was the extension of publicity, not only to the manufacture of and trade in arms, but also to the transit of arms. That might be a very efficacious means of control, not only over the manufacture of arms, but also over the enforcement of embargoes, which were assuming great importance at present.

Turning to the proposals before the Bureau, he expressed satisfaction that they would be dealt with by one and the same body. Whether that body was the Committee on Miscellaneous Provisions or the Bureau did not matter. There would seem, however, to be some inconsistency with what had been said about the Permanent Disarmament Commission, and he hoped that, if it were set up, a permanent name would be found for it.

Mr. Henderson appeared to assume that it would take some time to ascertain the opinions of the Governments on M. Litvinoff's proposal, but they had already had sufficient time to consider it, and he was sure they had already formed an opinion. It was not necessary for them to send in a written reply to the Secretariat; they could express their views to their delegations in order that the latter might place them before a subsequent meeting.

He agreed with the Chairman that the Conference should not be allowed to die. But he wanted it not only to live, but to be infused with fresh and vigorous life.

M. Litvinoff added that he had no intention of proposing that anything should be done outside the framework of the League of Nations.

M. di Soragna (Italy), noting that the arguments previously adduced were based on the essential engagements undertaken by the Conference in virtue of the resolution of June 8th, 1934, thought it desirable to recall the fact that the Italian delegation had not voted for that resolution.1 It intended to retain the freedom it had reserved for itself then, as indeed was natural, since in the meantime nothing had taken place which could justify Italy in changing her decisions. Moreover, the independence of judgment which the Italian delegation claimed seemed to it particularly necessary, since the work of the Bureau appeared to be tending, not only towards recommendations for the work of certain Committees, but also towards the completion of protocols which would ultimately have to be adopted. It was primarily on that point, which naturally connoted the acceptance to a certain extent of an undertaking by the delegations associating themselves with the instructions given for that purpose, that M. di Soragna intended to claim freedom of judgment for the Italian delegation.

He felt bound to add that, as regards the protocols, the Italian Government felt very definite doubts, in view of the impossibility of ignoring, even for a time, the fact that all the elements of disarmament were completely interdependent. Moreover, in carrying on the work, the aim was to achieve something final, which, however, would be calculated to increase the difficulty of accession on the part of certain States for which the treaties of peace had created a special situation, whether or not these States were now present at Geneva.

As to the constitution of the Permanent Disarmament Commission, M. di Soragna had been struck by M. Litvinoff's observations on the uselessness of such a Commission. Such a body might be either of an investigatory or of a supervisory character. If it were an investigatory body called upon to do the work because the organs of the Conference could no longer do it, what could such a Commission do, composed as it would be of the same persons representing the same States? If it were a supervisory body, M. di Soragna begged to point out that the Italian delegation had always expressed on that point its clear conviction that any kind of supervision was inseparable from a general disarmament convention, and it still adhered to that principle.

As regarded the question of the manufacture of arms, the Italian case had been already indirectly formulated at the time when Italy unreservedly accepted the MacDonald plan, which did not comprise the manufacture of arms. That attitude meant—unlike the view held by M. de Madariaga—that a disarmament convention could be drawn up without a special convention on the manufacture of arms. Indeed, the provisions of a convention of that kind duplicated certain clauses relating to the qualitative and quantitative limitation of armaments. M. di Soragna could not say that the Italian delegation would not eventually be prepared to consider the manufacture of arms also, but it would have to be in close connection with the quantitative and qualitative limitation of armaments and, indeed, would have to be subordinated to the latter.

In conclusion, M. di Soragna stated that the Italian delegation would of course not assume any responsibility for such decisions as the Bureau might take in regard to the instructions to be given to the Committees.
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M. UNDEN (Sweden) simply wished to state that the Swedish delegation associated itself with the Chairman's proposals and that it also accepted the suggestions put forward by the United States delegation concerning the plan of work—suggestions which seemed to it to come quite within the scope of the Chairman's communication.

The Chairman had wisely resigned himself to the inevitable in proposing that the Conference should confine itself, for the present, to a limited number of special and very important questions, until political circumstances should make it possible for it to take up the main work again.

He added that his Government attached special importance to the three questions mentioned in the Chairman's statement, particularly the regulation of the manufacture of and trade in arms, and that he hoped that it might be possible quickly to achieve positive results in that sphere on the basis of the United States proposals.

M. MASSIGLI (France) observed that the Chairman had himself pointed out the connection between his proposals and the resolution of June 8th, 1934, and it was, moreover, a well-known fact that the three questions submitted to the Bureau for examination were those on which the French delegation had always insisted as constituting important features in any Convention that might be established. The French Government was in full agreement, as regarded the programme, and thought that good work might be done on those lines. True, the delegate of Italy, with that somewhat brutal frankness to which he had accustomed his colleagues—and which M. Massigli, for his part, very much appreciated as a token of friendship—had just uttered a warning and voiced a somewhat sceptical opinion. M. Massigli felt, however, that experience would show that the Conference could do very valuable work in that way, and the Italian delegation's collaboration would, he felt sure, not be lacking.

The CHAIRMAN desired to clear up what was, he thought, a little misunderstanding on the part of M. di Soragna. He appeared to claim, as a point in his favour, that the United Kingdom delegation had not included in its draft a chapter on the traffic in arms. The reason for that was that a Committee had been sitting at that very time, and its report had not been received; it was not that the United Kingdom delegation was not in favour of taking any action. He ventured to say that, if Mr. Eden were asked, he would reply that his Government was strongly in favour of some action being taken.

M. DI SORAGNA (Italy) thanked M. Massigli for his friendly words and assured him that it was chiefly from him that he had learnt that frankness was the best form of diplomacy. To avoid any misunderstanding, he desired to point out that he had spoken not of traffic in arms but of manufacture.

He wished to take advantage of that opportunity to inform the Chairman that he had had no intention of compromising the United Kingdom delegation in any way. He remembered quite well that it had been said at the time that certain things could be added to the draft presented to the Conference; he had not intended to engage the responsibility of any but the Italian delegation.

The CHAIRMAN expressed satisfaction at the spirit in which the discussion had taken place that morning. He thought there was general agreement that action should be taken on the lines indicated in his note of November 5th, his speech that morning, and the subsequent suggestions he had made for dealing with both Mr. Wilson's document and M. Litvinoff's statement. He ventured to express the hope that that spirit might be continued, that all the members, whatever position they had felt compelled to take at that meeting, would work for the speedy execution of the programme just discussed, with the definite intention—and he wanted to emphasise that point—to make a start and never to be satisfied until something had been achieved in the way of the larger Convention upon which the Conference had set its mind at its opening nearly three years previously.

The Chairman's proposals were adopted.