

AGAINST AGGRESSION

AGAINST AGGRESSION

SPEECHES

by

MAXIM LITVINOV

Together with

**TEXTS OF TREATIES AND OF THE
COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS**

LONDON

LAWRENCE & WISHART LTD.

First published 1939

**Made and Printed in Great Britain
By The Camelot Press Ltd
London and Southampton (T.U.)**

Scanned / Transcribed by
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus - London Bureaux

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/intro.htm>
<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/english/home/index.php>



July-August 2012

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	10
PART ONE—SPEECHES.....	14
I. SPEECH DELIVERED ON THE OCCASION OF THE SIGNING OF THE PROTOCOLS FOR THE PROLONGATION OF THE PACTS OF NON- AGGRESSION BETWEEN THE U.S.S.R. AND THE BALTIC COUNTRIES UNTIL THE END OF 1945. April 4th, 1934.....	15
II. SPEECH DELIVERED AT AN EXTRAORDINARY SESSION OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF GERMANY’S VIOLATION OF THE VERSAILLES TREATY. April 17th, 1935.....	19
III. SPEECH ON THE PROBLEM OF CREATING REAL SECURITY IN EUROPE, DELIVERED AT THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS IN LONDON. March 17 th , 1936.....	23
IV. SPEECH ON THE INDIVISIBILITY OF PEACE AND THE STRENGTHENING OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY DELIVERED AT THE XVI PLENUM OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS. July 1 st , 1936.....	37

V. SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE XVII PLENARY SESSION OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS. September 28 th , 1936.....	49
VI. THE U.S.S.R. A POWERFUL BULWARK OF UNIVERSAL PEACE: SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE EXTRAORDINARY EIGHTH CONGRESS OF SOVIETS OF THE U.S.S.R. November 28 th , 1936.....	61
VII. SPEECH AT THE SESSION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS. May 28 th , 1937.....	85
VIII. EXTRACT FROM A SPEECH DELIVERED AT A RECEPTION IN HONOUR OF MR. SANDLER, FOREIGN MINISTER OF SWEDEN. July 9 th , 1937.....	91
IX. SPEECH AT PLENARY SESSION OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS. September 21 st , 1937.....	93
X. FROM A SPEECH AT A MEETING OF THE ELECTORS OF THE PETROGRAD AND VASSILI OSTROV DISTRICTS OF LENINGRAD. November 27 th , 1937.....	107
XI. SPEECH TO THE “COMMITTEE OF TWENTY-EIGHT”. February 1 st , 1938.....	115
XII. STATEMENT TO PRESS CORRESPONDENTS. March 17 th , 1938.....	120
XIII. SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING OF THE NINETEENTH	

ORDINARY SESSION OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS. September 21st, 1938.....	123
PART TWO—TEXTS OF TREATIES AND THE COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.....	138
I. TREATY BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND TURKEY.....	139
II. TREATY BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND LITHUANIA.....	141
III. TREATY OF GUARANTEE AND NEUTRALITY BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND IRAN (PERSIA).....	145
IV. TREATY OF NEUTRALITY AND NON- AGGRESSION BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND AFGHANISTAN.....	149
V. TREATY OF NON-AGGRESSION AND PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND FINLAND.....	154
VI. TREATY BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND LATVIA.....	159
VII. TREATY OF NON-AGGRESSION BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND POLAND.....	163

VIII. TREATY OF NON-AGGRESSION AND PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND ESTONIA	167
IX. PACT OF NON-AGGRESSION BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND THE FRENCH REPUBLIC.....	171
X. TREATY OF NON-AGGRESSION BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA.....	175
XI. DRAFT DECLARATION OFFERED BY COMMISSAR M. M. LITVINOV TO THE GENERAL COMMISSION OF THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE. February 6th, 1933.....	178
XII. CONVENTION FOR THE DEFINITION OF AGGRESSION.....	181
ANNEXE TO ARTICLE III OF THE CONVENTION RELATING TO THE DEFINITION OF AGGRESSION.....	184
XIII. CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND LITHUANIA FOR THE DEFINITION OF AGGRESSION.....	186
ANNEXE TO ARTICLE 3 OF THE CONVENTION RELATING TO THE DEFINITION OF AGGRESSION.....	188

XIV. TREATY OF MUTUAL ASSISTANCE BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND FRANCE.....	190
PROTOCOL OF SIGNING OF TREATY.....	193
XV. TREATY OF MUTUAL ASSISTANCE BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND THE CZECHOSLOVAK REPUBLIC.....	196
PROTOCOL OF SIGNING OF TREATY.....	199
XVI. PROTOCOL OF MUTUAL ASSISTANCE BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND THE MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC.....	202
XVII. THE COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.....	205

INTRODUCTION

THIS book is a collection of some of Maxim Litvinov's more important speeches and of documents characterising the struggle raised by the Soviet Union against aggression. These speeches of the People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. and the treaties entered into by the Soviet Union with the purpose of averting the danger of war constitute some of the most important elements in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union.

Speaking on March 17th, 1938, of the attitude of the Soviet Union to the new acts of aggression in Europe, Maxim Litvinov stated that the position of the U.S.S.R. with regard to any particular act of aggression was based on the general and unalterable principles of its foreign policy, which has the support of the whole population of the country.

The documents contained in this book present a picture of the consistent application in practice of the principles of Soviet foreign policy at various stages of international relations. The Soviet Government has always striven to strengthen peace relations between the Soviet Union and other countries by the conclusion of pacts of non-aggression and neutrality and treaties for the settlement of conflicts by conciliation. Such pacts and treaties have been concluded by the Soviet Union with nearly all its neighbours. The last pact of non-aggression was concluded by the Soviet Union with China in August, 1937, at the very moment when the Chinese Republic was attacked by the Japanese imperialists.

On the other hand, as we know, Japan has repeatedly rejected the offer of the Soviet Union for the conclusion of a pact of non-aggression, considering that such a pact would

constitute an obstacle to her unrestrained policy of aggression.

Even before the Soviet Union joined the League of Nations, she took part in international measures for the consolidation of peace. Since joining the League, she has taken an active part in the efforts to achieve collective security. Soon after joining the League, the Soviet Union was called upon to take part in the examination of acts of aggression by various Fascist states. Speaking in March, 1936, at the Session of the Council of the League of Nations in London, Maxim Litvinov pointed out that in the brief period of eighteen months that the Soviet Union had been a member of the League of Nations, this was the third time that her representative had occasion to speak on the subject of violation of international obligations: the first time was when Germany violated the military clauses of the Treaty of Versailles, the second time was in connection with the Italo-Abyssinian conflict, and the third time was in connection with Germany's unilateral violation both of the Versailles Treaty and the Locarno Pact.

The Soviet Union was the only Great Power that came out publicly against German and Italian intervention in Spain and demanded the observance of international rules with regard to the lawful Republican Government of Spain and the termination of the farce of "non-intervention."

When Japan started war on China, the Soviet Union was again to be found in the front ranks of the opponents of aggression and advocates of collective security.

Lastly, after the seizure of Austria by Germany and when Poland was uttering unmistakable threats against Lithuania, the Soviet Government was again the first to raise its voice on behalf of the struggle against aggression, as recorded in the pronouncement made by Maxim Litvinov to Press representatives on March 17th, 1938.¹

¹ This was written before the German occupation of Czechoslovakian

In addition to participating in the international organisation of peace, the Soviet Government has displayed quite considerable initiative on its own account in the search for the most effective methods of preventing aggression. One of these methods was the definition of the aggressor submitted by the Soviet Union and embodied in three conventions for defining aggression.

As the danger of war increased, the pacts of non-aggression, the conventions for the definition of the aggressor and the Covenant of the League of Nations proved to be an insufficient barrier against aggression. The Soviet Union therefore came forward as an active champion of the system of regional pacts of mutual assistance against aggressors. Such pacts, when concluded as part of the general system of collective security, constitute a substantial guarantee against aggression. The Soviet Union has concluded such pacts of mutual assistance with France, Czechoslovakia and the Mongolian People's Republic.

Such are the principal elements in the international struggle waged by the Soviet Union against aggression and on behalf of peace. But, obviously, the most effective factor in the struggle against Fascist aggression and in the defence of the Soviet Union is the might of the Land of Socialism, which ensures its ability to repulse any act of aggression at any moment. "We shall not only prevent the enemy from setting foot in our country, but shall castigate him in the territory from which he came" (Voroshilov).

The success of the Soviet Union's efforts to prevent foreign attack is due to the fact that the U.S.S.R. has at its

territory. The very important speech of M. Litvinov to the League Assembly on September 21st, 1938, defining the position of the Soviet Union, has therefore been included.

disposal “both reliable punitive institutions and a well-equipped Red Army, as well as a consistently conducted policy of peace in the sphere of foreign relations.” (*From the Election Address of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, December 6th, 1937.*)

PART ONE—SPEECHES

**I. SPEECH DELIVERED ON THE
OCCASION OF THE SIGNING OF THE
PROTOCOLS FOR THE PROLONGATION
OF THE PACTS OF NON-AGGRESSION
BETWEEN THE U.S.S.R. AND THE
BALTIC COUNTRIES UNTIL THE END OF
1945. April 4th, 1934**

MESSIEURS LES AMBASSADEURS,—We have to-day made arrangements for the future of pacts which expire only eighteen months hence. A promissory note redeemed before due date testifies both to the good-will and to the sound financial position of the drawer. In the present case, the premature concern of our Governments regarding the term of pacts which still have a prolonged period of existence testifies to their goodwill and abundant reserve of peaceful intentions. This is also testified to by the rapidity, unexampled in the history of diplomacy, with which the initiative of the Soviet Government has been transformed into practical action. It was only on March 20th that the proposal was made to your Governments that the term of the pacts should be extended; a few days later your Governments gave their reply, a frank, unreserved and favourable reply. And to-day, only two weeks later, the matter has been given practical formulation. This circumstance testifies also to the tremendous growth of confidence and mutual understanding between our States.

Allow me to take advantage of this occasion to express my gratitude to your Governments for their very responsive attitude to our proposal; and indeed it could not be otherwise.

Answers to proposals which are designed to consolidate peace achieve their full value and demonstrative force only when made rapidly, without excessive reflection, without mental reservations and unconditionally. Sincere supporters of peace cannot reflect too long on such proposals. The consolidation of peace is such an undoubted boon that in comparison with it any conditions on which the reply to peaceful proposals may be made contingent are of insignificant importance.

The existing pacts between our States have now been prolonged for more than ten years—a term which has been unsurpassed in any obligations of a like character. We first had the idea of proposing the prolongation of the pacts. for an indefinite period. But an indefinite period is an abstraction, a philosophical concept, and we feared that such a proposal might appear to be of a declarative character, whereas we had definite action in mind. At any rate, it should be clear to the whole world that our proposal is not of a temporary nature and is not inspired by a casual conjunction of circumstances, but is an expression of our constant and permanent policy of peace, an essential element of which is the preservation of the independence of the young States you represent.

The act that you and I have just jointly performed is coincident with the state of affairs in which the international situation is daily growing more acute. The threat of war that menaces all the five continents of the world is spoken about and written about daily, but we scarcely hear anything of the possibility and the means of averting this impending catastrophe. Governments and statesmen regard it with a sort of fatalism, as something that is absolutely inevitable. The only thing they can think about is a general rearmament, the race for armaments which in the past, far from averting wars, has only served as a stimulus for them. May the modest document signed by us to-day be a reminder to the world that there are

States who perceive their international duty to lie in the consolidation of peace, or its consolidation, at least, on that sector where its consolidation is to some extent dependent upon them.

I say to some extent, because there are States which are not signatories to to-day's protocol and whose policy may also influence the preservation of peace on the sector in question. The policy of the Soviet State will continue to be directed towards enlisting these States in the cause of the preservation of peace.

The political alarm and the threats of war in Europe to-day are caused by disputes between neighbouring States arising out of the transfer of provinces and sections of territory from one State to another owing to the formation of new political entities on these territories, or they are caused by dissatisfaction with the treaties implementing these territorial transfers. The Soviet State is a stranger to such disputes; it has never demanded the revision of existing treaties, and never intends to demand it. The Soviet State, which is a stranger to chauvinism, nationalism, or racial and national prejudice, perceives its State duties to lie not in conquest, not in expansion, not in expansion of territory; it considers that the honour of the nation demands that it should be educated not in the spirit of militarism and a thirst for blood, but in the fulfilment of the ideal for which the Soviet State was brought into existence and in which it perceives the whole meaning of its existence, namely, the building of a Socialist society. It intends, if not interfered with, to devote the whole forces of the State to this labour and this constitutes the inexhaustible source of its policy of peace. In the roll-call of States which are interested in the preservation and consolidation of peace, its reply is always "Present!" The readiness with which the States you represent replied to our proposal, realised in to-day's protocol, gives us the assurance

that in similar international roll-calls they will, in unison with the Soviet Government, be always prepared to answer, "Present!"

II. SPEECH DELIVERED AT AN EXTRAORDINARY SESSION OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF GERMANY'S VIOLATION OF THE VERSAILLES TREATY. April 17th, 1935

THE question we have to discuss as a result of the application of the French Government to the Council of the League of Nations is not of equal formal interest for all the members of the League of Nations. But it undoubtedly deserves the attention both of the Council of the League of Nations and of the League as a whole.

Yesterday we heard the representatives of the States signatory to the Treaty of Versailles and who are now directly affected by the violation of the obligations adopted towards them. I, however, speak on behalf of a country which not only bears no responsibility for the Versailles Treaty, but which never concealed its unfavourable attitude towards that Treaty in general and towards the disarmament of Germany in particular.

Our formal attitude towards the matter in hand consists in the fact that, as members of the League of Nations and of the Council of the League of Nations, we are faced with an act of violation of an international treaty by a State which is formally still a member of the League. In accordance with Article I, Par. 2, of the Covenant of the League of Nations, this act constitutes a violation of the Covenant and consequently a violation of obligations undertaken towards the other members of the League, constituting a menace to peace. The obligation of all States to observe their international undertakings occupies a prime place in the Covenant of the League, and this testifies to the tremendous importance attributed to this undertaking. And

it cannot be otherwise, for one of the foundations of peace is the observance of international obligations directly affecting the security of nations.

However I am more interested in the substance of the matter than in its formal aspect, on which other members of the Council have dwelt in sufficient detail. We hold by the equality of nations and their indisputable right to security and to the means which ensure their security. All peace-loving States have the right to arm for the defence of their security.

However, while calling for equality in armaments, we must base ourselves on the assumption that these armaments will be used exclusively for defensive purposes, for the protection of existing frontiers and for the security of the nation concerned.

But what is to be done if in some given circumstance this assumption is subject to doubt and when, on the contrary, there is reason to fear that a country is arming, not for defence, but for the violation of frontiers, with the idea of revenge by forcible methods, for the violation of the security of neighbouring or remote States, for the violation of universal peace with all its tragic consequences?

What is to be done if a country which demands or assumes the right to arm is exclusively led by people who have publicly announced as the programme of their foreign policy a policy which consists, not only in revenge, but in the unrestricted conquest of foreign territory and the destruction of the independence of whole States—under the leadership of people who have publicly announced such a programme and who, far from repudiating it, are ceaselessly disseminating it and educating their people in its spirit? What is to be done in cases when a State whose leaders have such a programme refuse to give any guarantee whatever that this programme will not be carried out, any guarantee of the security of their neighbours, near or remote—guarantees which other States, even those

which are above all suspicion of aggressive purposes, are prepared to give? Can we close our eyes to such facts? It is obvious that such cases demand very careful attention.

Permit me, in order to explain my thought, to give the following illustration. If in a city private citizens are allowed to carry arms, abstractly speaking, all the inhabitants of that city should be guaranteed that right. But let us suppose that a certain citizen openly attacks the inhabitants of neighbouring or remote streets and destroys their homes. The municipality would scarcely be in a hurry to issue to this citizen a licence to carry arms, or display indifference to the fact that he had secured his arms by illegal means. One could hardly accept on good faith the promise of the truculent citizen to spare certain city quarters and to reserve to himself and his weapons freedom of action only in the other parts of the city. It is the duty of the municipality to ensure tranquillity in all parts of the city. What is more, a citizen who is capable of breaking the law and attacking his fellow-citizens may permit himself the luxury of breaking his promises as regards the object of his threats. The city would at least demand of him first of all real guarantees of good conduct, and the inhabitants of those parts of the city in respect of which the truculent citizen demands freedom of action would be especially entitled to insist on such guarantees and of them least of all is it to be expected that they will come forward and justify his illegal acquisition of arms on the grounds of abstract principles of equality.

What I have said in relation to one city applies, of course, to international life. The League of Nations, as it was created to protect the tranquillity of international life in all parts of the world, cannot close its eyes to facts which constitute a menace to their tranquillity.

We would be very glad if we could discuss the question confronting us in the presence and with the participation of the

representative of the State concerned. We would be glad to hear him announce an official repudiation of the programme of forcible revenge and conquest, to hear him proclaim his readiness to share with us in collectively guaranteeing the security of all States, including his own, and to hear him give general and effective guarantees of non-violation of universal peace. Unfortunately, this is at present an unrealisable wish, from which we must draw our conclusions. And it is these conclusions, and not motives of a formal character, that determine my attitude towards the resolution submitted. This attitude in no way constitutes a justification of the Treaty of Versailles and its various provisions which have now been infringed. No! It is an expression of the anxiety of my Government to further the creation of an international state of affairs which would in the highest degree render difficult the violations of peace that result in such treaties.

**III. SPEECH ON THE PROBLEM OF
CREATING REAL SECURITY IN EUROPE,
DELIVERED AT THE COUNCIL OF THE
LEAGUE OF NATIONS IN LONDON.
March 17th, 1936**

**Defence of International Treaties is a Fundamental Duty of
the League of Nations**

IN the course of the brief period of eighteen months that the Soviet Union has been a member of the League of Nations, this is the third time that her representative on the Council of the League has had occasion to express himself in connection with the violation of international obligations. The first time was on the occasion of Germany's violation of the military clauses of the Versailles Treaty; the second time was in connection with the Italo-Abyssinian conflict; and to-day in connection with the unilateral violation by Germany both of the Versailles Treaty and the Locarno Pact. On all three occasions the Soviet Union was formally not an interested party, owing to the fact that it had no relation to the violated treaties, such as the Versailles Treaty or the Locarno Pact, or, as in the case of the Italo-Abyssinian conflict, its own interests were not in the least degree affected. This circumstance did not prevent the representative of the Soviet Union in the past, and does not prevent him in the present instance, from taking his place among those members of the Council who in the most decisive fashion record their indignation at the violation of international obligations, condemn it and associate themselves with the most appropriate means of preventing similar

violations in the future.

This position of the Soviet Union is determined by its general policy in the struggle for peace, for the collective organisation of security and for the preservation of one of the instruments of peace—the existing League of Nations. We consider that one cannot fight for peace without at the same time insisting upon the inviolability of international obligations, especially of those that directly concern the preservation of existing frontiers, armaments and political or military aggression. One cannot fight for the collective organisation of security without taking collective measures against the violation of international obligations. We, however, do not count among such measures collective capitulation to the aggressor, capitulation in face of the violation of treaties, or the collective encouragement of such violations, and still less collective consent to rewarding the aggressor by the adoption of a basis of agreement or other plans acceptable and beneficial to the aggressor. The League of Nations, which is based upon the sacredness of international treaties, including the Covenant of the League itself, cannot be preserved if we close our eyes to the violation of these treaties or confine ourselves to verbal protests without taking more effective measures for the protection of international treaties. The League of Nations cannot be preserved if it does not adhere to its own decisions and accustoms aggressors to ignore all its recommendations, all its warnings and all its threats. No one will take such a League of Nations seriously. The resolutions of such a League will just be ridiculed. We do not need such a League. I will say more: such a League might even be harmful, because it might lull the nations into a sense of false security, imbue them with illusions which would prevent them taking timely measures themselves for their self-defence.

The responsibility of the League of Nations and of its

guiding body—the Council—is all the greater the simpler the case of violation of international obligations under discussion. A characteristic feature of all the three cases I have just mentioned is their simplicity—simplicity in the sense that the establishment of the facts of violation of international obligations presented no difficulty and could not give rise to any disputes or differences. When I mention the absence of disputes and differences, I am not referring, of course, to the State itself which is accused of the violation of the Treaty, and which naturally will always, if not directly deny the violation, at least invent all sorts of arguments for the justification of its action. It is impossible to conceive a case in which such a State would frankly announce that it had no justification and that it alone was to blame and nobody else.

The case we are discussing at the present session of the Council even surpasses the previous cases in its simplicity in the sense mentioned. Here we have not only a violation of treaties in substance, but also the non-observance of a special point in the Treaty which lays down the method for settling disputes that might arise in case of an imagined or actual violation of the Treaty. But before expressing a final judgment of Germany's actions, I consider it fair to take note of all that has been said by Herr Hitler in justification of those actions or in mitigation of the offence.

The German Government asserts that France was the first to violate the Locarno Pact in letter and in spirit by concluding a pact of mutual assistance with the Soviet Union. It appealed for an opinion to the other Locarno Powers—namely, Great Britain and Italy. It must be assumed that if these Powers were in agreement with the German thesis that the Franco-Soviet Pact was incompatible with the Locarno Treaty, Germany would have made the fullest use of their conclusions. But as these Powers came to a different conclusion, Germany

categorically declares that France, Great Britain, Italy and Belgium—that is, the other Locarno Powers, have wrongly interpreted the Locarno Pact and that her own interpretation is the only correct one. It is undoubtedly an extremely convenient method of settling disputed international questions, when a country, convinced of the injustice of its cause, assumes the functions of judge and bailiff in its own case.

The Franco-Soviet Pact is Compatible with the Locarno Pact

How unfounded is the German assertion that the Franco-Soviet Pact is incompatible with the Locarno Pact is quite clearly shown by the fact that the former pact is of a purely defensive character. All the world knows that neither the Soviet Union nor France has any claims whatever to German territory or any intention of altering Germany's frontiers. As long as Germany does not commit an act of aggression either against France or against the Soviet Union, the pact will never be put into operation. If, however, the Soviet Union becomes the victim of attack on the part of Germany, the Locarno Pact accords France, as a member of the League, the undeniable right to come to the assistance of the Soviet Union. What renders the determination of the aggressor infallible in the present case is the absence of a common frontier between Germany and the Soviet Union. If German armed forces were to leave the confines of their own country, and traverse the States and seas dividing the two countries in order to invade the territory of the Soviet Union, German aggression would be quite obvious; and vice versa. This is quite clear to the German Government itself, and that is why it is in such a hurry to summon to its aid the hypothesis that the social system in France is being altered, which only emphasises the artificial and far-fetched character of the German argument that the

Franco-Soviet Pact is incompatible with the Locarno Pact.

The German Government, having no reliance upon the force and cogency of such arguments, itself advances another justification of its action. It declares that the demilitarisation of the Rhine Zone is in itself unjust, contrary to the principle of the equality of States, and constitutes a menace to the inviolability of the German frontier. This argument might sound more convincing and at any rate more sincere than the sophistry regarding the Franco-Soviet Pact. To examine this argument in detail. I would have to repeat what I said in the Council of the League on April 17th, 1935, during the discussion of the complaint of the French Government that the German Government had violated international obligations in reference to armaments. As a political institution whose aim it is to organise and consolidate peace, the League of Nations cannot decide questions, and still less justify violations of international obligations, from the standpoint of abstract principles. The chief criterion for the decisions of the League should be whether any particular decision contributes to the best organisation of peace. In 1919 and in 1925, a large number of members of the League, to which the Soviet Union at that time did not belong, considered that this aim would be furthered by the demilitarisation of the Rhine Zone. I do not think that the changes that have since taken place in the ideology and the foreign policy of Germany permit us to assert that peace in Europe would at present gain anything from the remilitarisation of the Rhine Zone, least of all when done unilaterally and in violation of obligations Germany had voluntarily assumed. Neither the foreign policy of the present German Government nor the ceaseless preaching during the past three years in Germany of aggression and international hatred and the glorification of the war spirit permit us to assert this.

I shall not take up your time by quoting passages in support of this from German periodicals, German text-books, German scientific works and German song-books. I shall only take the liberty of reminding you of the political testament of the present ruler of Germany which you will find on page 754 of the Second Volume of the Munich, 1934, German edition of the book *My Struggle*:

“The political testament of the German nation in the sphere of its foreign activity shall and must always declare: never permit the rise of two continental powers in Europe. You must regard every attempt to organise a second military power on the German frontiers, even in the form of a State likely to become a military power, as an attack on Germany and you must hold it not only your right but your duty to obstruct the rise of such a State with all means, including the use of the force of arms, and, if such a State has already arisen, you must destroy it.”

There, gentlemen, are the aims of Germany in behalf of which the remilitarisation of the Rhine Zone abutting on France is demanded. It is a question of establishing the hegemony of Germany throughout the whole European continent, and I ask: Should the League of Nations and will the League of Nations abet the achievement of these aims? It is not a casual newspaper article that I have read you, but a document which the author himself describes as the political testament of the present ruler of Germany, containing the quintessence of his whole foreign policy. Side by side with this document, what is the value of isolated political speeches and declarations made with a political object in view at some particular moment and adapted to the psychology of a part of some nation or other for the achievement of definite temporary aims? Such speeches

and declarations bear the same relation to the fundamental document I have just read as the temporary tactical cessation of firing on some sector of a theatre of war has to the fundamental strategical aims of the whole campaign.

No One is Threatening Germany

As for Germany's defence, if there is any country in the world that is not threatened by any danger from without, it is Germany. I do not know of a single country that has made any territorial claim on Germany, nor do I know of any literature in which a march against Germany is advocated. A State is not and cannot be subjected to attack without preliminary preparations, without the previous presentation of territorial or other claims, the substantiation of these claims, and without raising its people in a spirit of realising these claims. Such preparation is not going on in any country, and there is therefore no thought of encircling Germany. On the day when all doubt of Germany's love for peace, of her sincere readiness to collaborate with other European peoples in the organisation of peace, vanishes, when she will cease to refuse to give the very guarantees of her love of peace which other European peoples give so willingly, the representative of the Soviet Union, which has always defended the equality of rights of peoples both great and small, but equality of rights in peace, and which continues to entertain the profoundest respect and ardent sympathy with the great German people, would be the first to come out in protest against imposing upon it any inequality of rights, against depriving it of any means of armament at the disposal of other peoples.

I have analysed both arguments adduced by the German Government in justification of the committed violation of international obligations. It, however, did not confine itself to

these justifications. It evidently is itself not sure of their convincing nature. It is itself aware of the fact that it has made a breach in the existing system of the organisation of peace and therefore tries to create the impression that it is ready to mend the harm done by proposing a new and allegedly still better organisation of peace.

The question may therefore arise that, inasmuch as the organisation of peace, far from being impaired, will even benefit by it, ought we not to ignore a mere formal violation of international treaties, and is it worth our while in such an event to record the fact of such violation and pronounce our condemnation of it? In order to be impartial, I shall take the liberty of touching as briefly as possible upon this aspect of the question, too.

I know that there are people who really see a manifestation of particular love of peace on the part of Germany in her offer to France and Belgium of a pact of non-aggression for twenty-five years, to be guaranteed by England and Italy. Such people lose sight of the fact that the Locarno Treaty just torn up by Germany was precisely such a pact of non-aggression offering the same guarantees, not for twenty-five years, but for an unlimited term, with the only difference that the latter contained supplementary guarantees for France and Belgium in the form of the demilitarised Rhineland Zone. Thus Germany's pseudo-new proposal amounts to keeping in force the Locarno Treaty, but shortening its term of duration and lessening the guarantees enjoyed by Belgium and France by virtue of the old Locarno Treaty. But the limited guarantees which Herr Hitler now offers, the guarantors of the Locarno Treaty may, if they so choose, offer to France and Belgium even without Germany's consent. In this way the purport of Herr Hitler's proposal is to strip France and Belgium of certain guarantees granted them by the Locarno Treaty and to retain for Germany

unabridged the full benefit of this treaty.

This, however, does not exhaust Herr Hitler's "love of peace." He is ready to conclude pacts of non-aggression, not only with France and Belgium, but also with others of his neighbours, without anybody's guarantee, it is true. The Soviet Union itself has concluded pacts of non-aggression with all its neighbours (with the exception of Japan, which to this day rejects such a pact). It has, however, always attached great importance to preventing these pacts from facilitating aggression against other countries. We therefore always include in such pacts a special article releasing the one party to it from all obligation under the pact in case the other party commits an act of aggression against a third country. Such an article, however, will be lacking in the pacts of the pattern indicated and proposed by Herr Hitler. And without such an article, the proposed system of pacts comes down to the principle of localising war preached by Herr Hitler. Every State signing such a pact with Germany is immobilised by her in case of Germany's attack on a third State.

This proposal of Herr Hitler creates in my mind the impression that we are dealing with a new attempt to partition Europe into two parts or into several parts so that by guaranteeing non-aggression against the one part freedom of action may be gained for attack against another part of Europe. As I have had to point out in Geneva each time such a system of pacts can only increase the safety of the aggressor and not the safety of peace-loving peoples.

Policy of Collective Security versus Policy of Sword-rattling

On the assumption, however, that the "peaceable" proposals enumerated by me will not be considered adequate compensation for the violation of international laws, Germany

declares her readiness to return to the League of Nations. We, as well as the other members of the League have always regretted the incompleteness of the League, the absence of several great countries, particularly Germany. We shall welcome the return of Hitler Germany to its bosom, too, if we be convinced that she will recognise the fundamental principles underlying the League, without which the latter would not only cease to be an instrument of peace, but might eventually be transformed into its opposite. First and foremost among these principles is the observance of international treaties, respect for and non-violation of existing boundaries, recognition of the equality of rights of all members of the League, support of the collective organisation of security, waiver of recourse to arms in the solution of international disputes.

Unfortunately, at the present moment the cases of unilateral violation by Germany of her international obligations and of her refusal to abide by the methods for solving conflicts prescribed by international treaties are too fresh in our minds. We have not yet forgotten that to the very last moment Herr Hitler fought most categorically against the idea of collective security. He propagates the principle, not only of race inequality, but also of the inequality of peoples. He unequivocally points to the lands that must be wrested from other peoples for German colonisation. We know that comparatively recently—to wit, on May 28th, 1931—Herr Goebbels, one of the chief companions-in-arms of Hitler, wrote in his newspaper *Angriff* that the sword was the one and only instrument with which one could carry on foreign policy, and that Herr Hitler wrote on December 9th, 1930, in the *Voelkisher Beobachter*, the official organ of his party, that in the long run the sword will decide everything. Finally, I must recur to Herr Hitler's political testament, which I have already quoted, in which the German people are recommended not to permit

strong States to exist alongside of Germany, and eventually to destroy them. We cannot disregard the danger that a member of the League of Nations preaching such principles will be in a position to sabotage the most valuable part of the activities of the League of Nations, directed toward the organisation of peace and the enhancement of the security of all its members. Only on the receipt of convincing proof that our fears and doubts are henceforth groundless will we consider Hitler Germany's return to the League an asset in the cause of peace.

After analysing Hen Hitler's proposals in their entirety, I come to the conclusion that, far from making good the harm that would be done to the organisation of peace by pardoning the violations of international treaties, they would themselves inflict a blow upon the organisation of peace, and in the first place upon the League of Nations.

Gentlemen, I have taken the liberty of speaking out with entire frankness. I felt more at ease in doing so than others of my colleagues, in view of the fact that the manner in which Hen Hitler permits himself to speak publicly of the Government I represent frees me of the obligation to resort to reticence and diplomatic convention. I am the more entitled to do so since Herr Hitler's pronouncements and proposals in the sphere of international politics amount to nothing more or less than the organisation of an expedition against the peoples of the country I represent—the organisation of an alliance of the whole of Europe, the whole world, against them. May his aggression be actually aimed in the immediate future against other countries, may his attacks against the Soviet Union be merely a smoke-screen behind which to prepare aggression against other States, yet the very fact that for this purpose he singles out the Soviet Union as the target for his incessant attacks, and that he did this once more on the occasion of the violation of the Locarno Treaty, gives me the right to speak

openly and with special emphasis of the essence of the aggressive foreign policy conducted by Herr Hitler. At the same time I express the firm conviction that the proposals now made by Herr Hitler and which spring from this foreign policy of his will never in their present form become the basis for an agreement among the other members of the League.

The U.S.S.R. will support the League's Measures

Before finishing, permit me to express the hope that I shall be correctly understood and that no one will conclude from what I have said that the Soviet Union proposes nothing but the statement of facts, censure, strict measures, and is opposed to any and every conversation and to a peaceful solution of the serious conflict that has arisen. Such conclusions would give an absolutely wrong idea of our conception. We are interested not less but more than others in the non-violation of peace both today and for a decade to come, and not only on one sector of Europe, but throughout the whole of Europe and the whole world. We are decidedly opposed to everything that could bring war nearer, if only by one month, but we are also opposed to hasty decisions dictated by fear and other emotions rather than a sober contemplation of reality, decisions which, while seemingly removing the causes of hypothetical war today, create every condition for actual war to-morrow.

We are for international agreement, which would not only fortify the present mainstays of peace, but would if possible set up new ones. We are for participation in such an agreement of all countries desirous of doing so. But we are opposed to granting to a State withdrawing from the League of Nations, grossly violating international treaties and engaged in sword-rattling, the privilege of dictating to all Europe its conditions of negotiation, of selecting, the parties to participate in these

negotiations at its discretion and of foisting upon others its scheme of agreement. We are opposed to having negotiations conducted on a basis which disorganises the ranks of the true partisans of peace and which must inevitably lead to the destruction of the only inter-governmental political organisation, the League of Nations. We believe that the true adherents of peace are entitled to submit their scheme for the organisation of European peace no less than those who violate treaties. We are in favour of establishing the security of all peoples of Europe as against the half-peace which is not peace, but war.

But whatever new international agreements we may wish to arrive at, we must first of all ensure that they will be loyally carried out by all those who participate in them, and the Council of the League must declare what is its attitude to unilateral violations of such agreements, and how it intends to and can react against them. From this angle, the complete satisfaction of the complaint of the French and Belgian Governments acquires paramount importance. Taking this into account, I declare on behalf of my Government that it is ready to take part in all measures that may be proposed to the Council of the League by the Locarno Powers and will be acceptable to the other members of the Council.

**IV. SPEECH ON THE INDIVISIBILITY OF
PEACE AND THE STRENGTHENING OF
COLLECTIVE SECURITY DELIVERED AT
THE XVI PLENUM OF THE LEAGUE OF
NATIONS. July 1st, 1936**

WE are gathered here to close a page in the history of the League of Nations, the history of international life, which it will be impossible to read without a feeling of bitterness. We

must terminate an action commenced in the performance of our duties as members of the League for the purpose of guaranteeing the independence of one of our co-members, but not carried through to the end. Each one of us must feel his degree of responsibility and guilt, which is not the same for all and depends not only on what each of us has actually done, but also on the degree of his readiness to support any common action that circumstances required.

The Standpoint of the U.S.S.R. in the Italo-Abyssinian Conflict

While expressing this opinion I must state that the Government I represent did from the outset of the Italo-Abyssinian conflict adopt a perfectly clear and firm standpoint, issuing by no means from its own interests or its mutual relations with the belligerents, but exclusively from its understanding of the principle of collective security, international solidarity, the League Covenant and the duties made incumbent upon it by this Covenant.

The peoples of the Soviet Union have nothing but high 35

esteem and regard for the Italian people. They are interested in an uninterrupted development and reinforcement of the existing political, economic and cultural relations with Italy. Nevertheless, the Soviet Government expressed its readiness to take part in common international action against Italy, in defence of a country with which it did not even have any relations—either formal or actual. It had to say to itself: Plato is my friend, but international solidarity, the principle of collective security, upon which peace at present reposes, loyalty to international obligations, must harden our hearts to the voice of friendship. Since then, at all stages of the discussion of the Italo-Abyssinian conflict, my Government has declared that it will take part in all actions provided for by the Covenant, accepted and jointly undertaken by the rest of the League members. All the decisions of the Co-ordination Committee have been operated by my Government without exception and with the utmost fidelity.

After the Occupation of Abyssinia

However, sooner than might have been expected, the moment arrived when it became perfectly clear that the measures adopted at Geneva had to be revised from the point of view of their further expedience—namely, when the resistance of the gallant Abyssinian troops was broken, when the Emperor and Government of Abyssinia left their territory and a considerable portion of the territory was occupied by the Italian army. It transpired beyond doubt that by economic sanctions alone there was no possibility of ousting the Italian army from Abyssinia and restoring the latter's independence, and that this aim could be achieved only by more drastic sanctions, military included. The question of such measures could have been raised only in case one or several States could

be found which by virtue of their geographical position and special interests would agree to bear the brunt of a military clash. No such States were to be found among us, and had there been any the rest of the States, before venturing to take any part in these serious measures, would have demanded guarantees that when other cases of suppressing an aggressor came up they could rely on similar common action being taken. These guarantees were the more necessary since certain moves and actions of a certain European State, whose aggressive intentions are quite beyond doubt and are even announced by that State itself indicated that aggression was being prepared at an accelerating rate in more than one direction. The attitude which certain States adopted to these actions and their gracious treatment of the authors shook the belief that the guarantees I have mentioned would be immediately forthcoming. In these circumstances, even during the May Session of the League Council, I came to the conclusion that it was useless to apply economic sanctions against Italy any longer and that it was impossible to give Abyssinia any practical help by this method. Apparently, practically all the League members have come to this conclusion.

I say that every member of the League must now realise his individual responsibility for the failure of the common action in defence of the independence of a co-member of the League, because there have been noticeable attempts in and outside the League to attribute this failure to the League Covenant, its imperfections and the present membership of the League. Hence far-reaching conclusions are being made which may have the result that the League itself will be buried together with the independence of Abyssinia. Such attempts and conclusions must be vigorously rebutted.

How the Sanctions were put into Operation

We have to face the fact that the League of Nations has not been able to secure territorial integrity and political independence for one of its co-members in accordance with Article X of the Covenant, and is now only in a position to express its platonic sympathy. We cannot pass by this outrageous fact quietly and indifferently. We must analyse it and draw the necessary lessons from it in order to prevent such cases in the future. Some, however, propose a too simple remedy, saying: Do away with Article X completely. Release yourselves from the obligation to guarantee members of the League territorial integrity and independence, and, then it will be impossible ever to accuse the League of Nations of bankruptcy. They also consider it a mistake that the League tries to stop aggression and protect its members at all. Such an argument can be put forward only by people who are against collective security on principle, who decry the main function of the League and the whole *raison d'être* of its formation and existence. There is no need to argue with people of this kind. But those who recognise the principle of collective security, who still regard the League Covenant as an instrument of peace, could attack the Covenant only in case they could prove that either the Covenant does not provide sufficiently effective measures for the support of Article X or that all such measures in the present specific case have been used to the full and have nevertheless failed to achieve their aim. But they cannot prove it.

I maintain that Article XVI has provided the League of Nations with such a powerful weapon that any aggression could be broken if it were brought into full play. Furthermore, the very belief that it may be brought into play may discourage the aggressor from putting his criminal plans into effect. Least of all does the sad experience of the Italo-Abyssinian war contradict this statement. In the present case, either because

this was the first experiment in applying collective measures, or because some people thought that this case had specific features, or because it coincided with the preparation for a more serious aggression elsewhere, to which Europe had to pay special attention, or because of other reasons, the fact remains that not only was the formidable machinery of Article XVI not brought into play, but the tendency to keep to minimum measures was displayed from the outset. Even the economic sanctions were limited in scope and action. And even in this limited scope the sanctions were not applied by all the members of the League.

Four members of the League refused from the outset to apply any sanctions whatever. One member of the League, contiguous with Italy, refused to apply the most serious sanction, I mean the embargo on imports from Italy. And of those countries which made no objections to sanctions on principle, some actually did not apply all the sanctions, but pleaded constitutional obstacles, the need to study the problem, etc. Thus, even the embargo on arms was not applied by seven members of the League, the financial measures were not applied by eight countries, the embargo on exports to Italy by ten countries, the embargo on imports from Italy by thirteen countries—in other words, 25 per cent. of the total membership of the League. It may be said that, with few exceptions, the countries of Latin America did not really apply the more effective sanctions. I say this by no means in reproach of anybody, but for the sole purpose of clinching my argument. Further, the proposal that certain non-members of the League should be deprived of, or limited in, the opportunity to counteract sanctions—a practical proposal—was not approved by the Co-Ordination Committee.

With all these limitations, the sanctions could have taken effect only in case their application had been more prolonged

and they had been combined with the military resistance of Abyssinia herself. The latter, however, was broken much sooner than our best-informed advisers expected. In these circumstances, we might say that, for one reason or another, the members of the League did not wish to bring Article XVI into full play, which by no means signifies that Article XVI itself has proved bankrupt.

Either International Solidarity or Encouragement of Aggression

Some are inclined to explain the failure of the action of the League as due to its inadequate universality, to the absence of certain countries from it. We see, however, that not all members of the League took part in the sanctions. There are no grounds to expect that those States which left the League because they were against the principles of the League and the presence of Articles X and XVI in the Covenant would have joined in the sanctions. Their presence in the League would have led only to greater confusion in our ranks and would have had a demoralising effect rather than anything else. On the other hand, we have seen in the example of the U.S.A. that, in the application of Article XVI, the League of Nations can sometimes count on the co-operation of non-members of the League and may do so the more confidently the more energetically it acts. So we see it is not in the imperfections of the League Covenant nor in the absence of universality that we must seek for the reasons of the inadequate assistance given to Abyssinia.

We have heard another argument at Geneva, too. Well, people say, let us admit that the League Covenant is quite flawless, that the blame does rest on members of the League, on certain persons. Does not this show that there is a dis-

sonance between the Covenant and the frame of mind of those who are supposed to keep it, and for this reason alone should not the Covenant be accommodated to that frame of mind, or, as some say, to “reality”? But this argument holds no water either. The fact is that people vary, too, and even in one and the same country not all statesmen are of the same mind on this score. To whose frame of mind must the Covenant be accommodated? Those who hold the standpoint of consistent collective defence of security, who see the best interests of all peoples in the preservation of world peace, who consider that in the last analysis the interests of each State require it and that it can be preserved only if temporary individual interests be sacrificed to the community of nations, and who are ready even to put part of their own armed forces at the disposal of this community? Or those who in principle swear by the principle of collective security, but in practice are ready to carry it out only when it coincides with the interests of their own country? Or those who deny collective security on principle, who substitute for international solidarity the slogan, “Every man for himself,” preach the localisation of war and declare that war itself is the highest manifestation of the human spirit? I am afraid that those who argue about the need for the adaptation, or, as I should put it, the degradation of the Covenant, have in mind this category of people, for they support this argument of theirs by pointing out that the members who have left the League might come back if this were done. We are told to get back into the League at all costs those States which left it just because they regarded the Covenant, Articles X and XVI, and sanctions as obstacles to their aggressive plans. And so we hear it said: Let us throw Article X out of the Covenant, let us throw out Article XVI, let us renounce sanctions, let us reject collective security and then the ex-members of the League might return to our fellowship and the League will become

universal. In other words, let us make the League safe for aggressors. I say we do not want a League that is safe for aggressors. We do not want that kind of League, even if it is universal, because it would become the very opposite of an instrument of peace. At best, if we relieved the League from the functions of collective defence, we would make it a debating society, a philanthropic institution; not worth calling a League of Nations; not worth its upkeep and at odds with the aspirations and hopes which are pinned on it.

On my part, I would propose that the Covenant be adapted not to the frame of mind of one or another category of people, one or another group of statesmen, one or another group of temporary rulers, but to the frame of mind of the millions, the masses in all countries and continents, those who are rightly called “mankind” and demand that peace be preserved at all costs and defended with all means.

We must educate and raise people up to its lofty ideas, not degrade the League. We must seek to make the League universal, but we must not by any means make it safe for the aggressor to this end. On the contrary, all new members and all ex-members wishing to return must read on its portals: “Abandon all hope of aggression and its impunity all ye who enter here.”

Make the League Covenant Explicit and Strengthen it

Let us be frank. The League is now experiencing by no means its first reverse. There have been cases of military attacks not less but more flagrant made by certain members of the League against others where the League did not react in the slightest and left the victim of aggression to face the aggressor alone in an unequal battle. However, the question of the unfitness of the Covenant or its revision was not raised then. If

there were no grounds for it then, there are even less now. As for myself, I would rather have a League of Nations that tries to render at least some assistance, even if it proves ineffective, to a victim of aggression than a League of Nations that closes its eyes to aggression and lets it pass unperturbed.

I consider that when, instead of doing nothing but bandying the discussion of the conflict from committee to sub-committee and sending committees of investigation as in other cases, the overwhelming majority of its members, undeterred by great material sacrifices, rendered assistance, though unavailing, to a co-member who had been attacked, the present League made a huge step forward in comparison with the past. In other words, as compared with the cases I have mentioned, the frame of mind of the members of the League moved a few steps higher. This permits us to hope that in the next case the frame of mind of the members of the League will rise to the high water-mark, the highest ideals of the League, and the victim will be rescued wholly from the clutches of the aggressor.

I am far from idealising the Covenant. Its imperfections lie not so much in its articles as in its reservations and obscurities. Therefore, the thing is not to talk of reforming the Covenant, but of making it explicit and stronger. Where the Covenant is greatly deficient, I think, is in its omission of a definition of aggression, which in the Italo-Abyssinian conflict made it easy for some members of the League to refuse to take part in the sanctions from the very outset. There is no clarity in the question as to which of the bodies of the League is to certify aggression. There is no clarity as to whether League decisions are binding in the matter of sanctions. An end must be put to the situation wherein pleas of sovereignty and constitutional formalities are an obstacle to the performance of international obligations.

Article XVI must remain intact. Economic sanctions must continue to be obligatory for all members of the League. Only if sanctions are obligatory will there be an end to mistrust; an end to the fears that if some States not affected directly by the conflict make considerable sacrifices in one case, other unaffected States will act less idealistically in another case. Assurance is needed that in all cases of aggression, irrespective of the degree of concern in the conflict, sanctions will be applied by all, and this can be achieved only if sanctions are made obligatory. In my opinion, this circumstance is the main reason why the League has failed in the Italo-Abyssinian conflict. We can imagine particular cases—rare, it is true—when aggression could be stopped by economic sanctions alone but I think that in most cases economic sanctions must run parallel with military sanctions. In an ideal League of Nations, military sanctions, too should be obligatory for all. But if we are yet unable to rise to such heights of international solidarity, we should make it our concern to have all continents and for a start, at least all Europe covered with a system of regional pacts, on the strength of which groups of States would undertake to protect particular sectors from aggression; and the performance of these regional obligations should be deemed equivalent to the performance of the covenanted obligations and should enjoy the full support of all members of the League of Nations. These regional pacts should not supersede the League Covenant, but supplement it, otherwise they would be nothing but pre-war groups of alliances. It is along these lines that I conceive the perfecting and strengthening of the League of Nations, and the Soviet Government is prepared fully to cooperate with the other members of the League. I welcome the programme unfolded here by the French Premier, with which my comments to a large extent coincide.

The League of Nations Must be Strong

If I say all this in the interests of strengthening peace, I cannot do otherwise than mention the measure which the Soviet Union has always considered the maximum guarantee of peace, I mean complete disarmament. I would like to believe that mankind will not have to undergo yet another Armageddon and that all peoples have come to the same conclusion. But while this radical measure is in abeyance, all we can do is to strengthen the League of Nations as an instrument of peace. To strengthen the League of Nations is to abide by the principle of collective security, which is by no means a product of idealism, but is a practical measure towards the security of all peoples, to abide by the principle that peace is indivisible! We must recognise that at the present time there is not one State, large or small, that is not open to aggression, and that even if the next war spares one State or another she must, sooner or later, attract the longing eyes of the victorious aggressor.

If these ideas be reinforced, broadened to the full and acted upon, we shall be spared new disappointments like those which are now our experience, new life will be put into the League of Nations and it will become equal to the great tasks which confront it. Now, more than ever before, the League of Nations is an international necessity. It must live. It must be stronger than ever.

V. SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE XVII PLENARY SESSION OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS. September 28th, 1936

The Chief Function of the League is to Strengthen Peace

FROM the commencement, I have to admit that the summing up of the League's operations for the past year does not by any means incline the Soviet Delegation to happy thoughts. This is partly due to the fact that the Soviet Delegation estimates the activity of the League from the point of view, not of the quantity, but the quality of the questions that have been settled, and it defines this quality according to the part these questions play in the problem of organising the reinforcement of peace, which is the main function of the League of Nations.

Among the eighty questions mentioned in the Annual Report of the General Secretary, we find only three questions pertaining to the problem of peace—to wit, the Italo-Abyssinian, the Locarno and the Danzig questions. None of us can recall the settlement of the Abyssinian question without a feeling of bitterness, the more so that it persists in asserting itself. The Locarno question, which was the subject of an abortive discussion at the April Session of the Council, has been put on the agenda and adjourned from one session to another and is on the agenda of the present session of the Council to be most probably adjourned again and ultimately written off as a bad debt. The same might be said of the Danzig question, too. Rather a poor balance.

When we turn to the agenda of the present session of the Assembly, we find but one question of the category that

interests us, which for the time being has been referred to the Bureau to decide its ultimate destiny. I mean the application of the principles of the Covenant. We believe that only a discussion of this question could put real body into the present session of the Assembly. I shall presume to disagree with the views of certain governments, presented in the Secretariat's abstract, to the effect that the business of interpreting and applying the Covenant should be postponed until the political atmosphere is clear of the present alarms and troubles. I shall hazard the opinion that the very fact of this uneasiness is the strongest argument in favour of having this question raised now. This uneasiness is due to the imminence of danger. Must we wait until this danger becomes a reality? On the other hand, I should think it unjustified optimism to believe that the political atmosphere will clear in the near future. Must the League of Nations ever remain a "waiting room"?

Allow me, gentlemen, to remind you that the question of the application of the principles of the Covenant did not arise academically, but was called for, was thrust upon us by the unhappy issue of the Italo-Abyssinian War, and likewise by the whole course of political events in the last few years.

This course of events has not changed its ominous trend, which, not only as we think, but as we know and feel, is leading to a sanguinary collision of the nations, with consequences that our imagination cannot even picture.

For four years now the ideas of peace, inviolability of treaties and international order, on the one hand, and the ideas of war, contempt of international obligations, and forcible repartition of the world, on the other hand, have crystallised more or less distinctly and are standing face to face. But while, on one side, the ideas are being organised, clothed in flesh and blood—or, better, in iron and lead—the forces of the other side, unfortunately, remain disembodied, scattered and passive.

But what, indeed, is the alignment of international forces?

I do not doubt that even a reader of newspapers who is quite uninitiated in politics knows, if only he has read the pronouncements and writings of their rulers, what countries are to be considered dangerously aggressive and the total number of these countries. There are also a few countries which are ready to seek salvation in neutrality. If they really believe that they themselves have only to write the word "neutrality" on their frontiers and the blaze will stop at these frontiers, if they have forgotten the fresh lessons of history, the violation of even internationally recognised neutralities, it is their business. However, we have the right to ask them to observe their neutrality here and now while some are making plans of aggression and others are making plans of self-defence. Unfortunately, even now, they often put their neutrality at the service of the aggressive forces. In addition to these pseudo-neutral countries, there are many others-and the most powerful States are among them-who undoubtedly see the cloud impending over Europe, understand its ominous nature, feel the inevitable danger to themselves and seem to recognise the need for common protection, and declare their devotion to the principle of collective security time and time again. Unfortunately, they go no further than these statements at present, and do nothing to invest the idea of collective security in proper form and give it effective force, in the vain hope that the aggressor might hearken to their exhortations, come to his senses and help them to restrain his own self from aggression. But the aggressor, who frames all his policy on a superiority of brutal, material force, who has only threatening demands, bluff or threats and the tactics of accomplished facts in the arsenal of his diplomacy, can be reached only through the voice of an equally firm policy and a cool calculation of the relation of forces. All exhortations and entreaties, and, especially,

concessions to his illegitimate and insensate demands, any economic indulgence, will only strike him as a sign of weakness, will strengthen his confidence in his own strength and encourage further defiance and the adoption of unlawful actions on his part. The legend of the invincible aggressor is being created even outside his country: it is engendering fatalistic and capitulatory sentiments in some countries, which gradually-sometimes even without their noticing it-are beginning to lose their independence and are becoming vassals of the aggressor. Thus begins the process of the formation of a hegemony which is to culminate in the crushing of all refractory countries by force of arms.

Yes, gentlemen, we must not close our eyes to the existing ambition for hegemony, the hegemony of the "chosen people" whom history is supposed to have appointed to dominate over all other peoples, who are proclaimed inferior.

I shall not even mention the ideological consequences of this hegemony, the forcible banishment of all the treasures of ideas and culture which have been the pride of humanity for the last few centuries, and the artificial revival of ideas that belong to the worst times of the Middle Ages. The total power of the peaceable countries, both in the economic and military respect, their aggregate resources in man-power and in the war industry, are far above the forces of any possible combination of countries that the aggressor could muster. I am profoundly convinced that these forces have only to unite to some extent, they have only to show' that joint actions are possible, and not only will the danger of war be averted, but sooner or later the aggressor will have to ask to be included in the general system of collective security.

Now, I consider it necessary to clear myself of any possible charge of inciting the nations to form *blocs*, because I know that the word *bloc* has become a bogey to many super-pacifists.

No, I am not asking for new *blocs*. I am willing to rest content with the already existing *bloc* which is called the League of Nations, the *bloc* of peaceable countries, united for mutual defence and mutual help. All we demand is that this *bloc* should really organise mutual assistance, that it should draw up plans of action beforehand, so as not to be taken unawares, that, in due proportion to the organisation of war proceeding outside this *bloc*, there should be effective action to organise a collective rebuff. And if all the countries at present forming the League of Nations *bloc* do not desire it, if there are countries among them who think that security is a connotation of the word "neutrality" or are hoping to go over to the aggressor at the last moment, this does not mean that the right of joint actions is forfeited by those who are desirous and capable of defending themselves and do not wish to be attacked one by one.

For Real Collective Security

In response to the recommendation of the last Assembly and the invitation of the General Secretary, the Soviet Government has submitted its ideas on what should be done to make the League Covenant explicit and to reinforce it. Paramount in the proposals of the Soviet Government is the idea of regional or, if necessary, bilateral pacts of mutual assistance. This implies regions of various geographical dimensions and contours, including whole continents, for the bigger the region covered by the pact, the greater the guarantees of security created. We do not know yet how many regional pacts of this kind will be concluded and what will be their scope. At the present stage, it is essential to define their place in the general system of collective security of the League of Nations and establish the interdependence of the separate

pacts, and it will also be necessary to make some arrangement for the security of countries which, for some reason or other, do not come under these pacts.

I shall not dwell here on this or any of the Soviet proposals, but shall reserve what I have to say until the question is discussed in the proper commission. There, too, we will express our opinion of the proposals submitted by other governments.

Besides the proposals sent by governments in written form, some proposals have been voiced here verbally. I think it necessary to say a few words about them.

The Soviet Delegation does not underestimate the significance of Article XI of the League Covenant, the purpose of which is to prevent possible military conflicts by means of an armistice. Much could be said in favour of suspending the unanimity rule in certain cases of this kind. Caution, however, is needed lest we open the sluices and inundate the League with all kinds of petty claims having no connection with the preservation of peace. We know from experience that only the unanimity rule has been a dam against them so far. However, we should bear III mind that the procedure prescribed by Article XI can give results only in cases where the danger of violating peace may be the consequence merely of an unexpected and accidental dispute, a settlement of which would restore the situation. Article XI will not be effective in averting breaches of peace which are caused by intentional aggression and annexationist aims for the sake of which disputes are deliberately provoked. The League of Nations has already had to do with cases where Article XI proved quite ineffective. In any case the recommendations of the Council concerning Article XI will have effect only when these recommendations are backed by the well-armed Article XVI. Therefore we consider it much more important to rescind the

unanimity rule in this last article.

Some of the speakers here put their hopes also in activating the League of Nations within the limits of Article XIX concerning the revision of international treaties. This revision is possible and expedient, in the opinion of the Soviet Delegation, provided all parties concerned agree to it. A brilliant example was the recent revision of the Straits Convention, which became possible just because the question was raised with the preliminary consent of the signatories to the Convention. Without this consent, the raising of the question of revision, for which the speakers here also admit the necessity of the unanimous vote, far from having good results, would only make the relations between the interested parties even more strained and add new burdens to the international situation. There are practically no countries which are absolutely satisfied with the existing international treaties concluded in the recent or in the more remote past, and it is doubtful if any good could be expected from swamping the League of Nations with such claims. Should it not be feared that moral support given to some such claims even by a minority of the Assembly would encourage the aggressor to break a treaty by forcible measures?

Of course, it is not for the Soviet Delegation to object to the French proposal to call a meeting of the Bureau of the Disarmament Conference. The Soviet Government has always considered that the most effective guarantee of peace is disarmament, particularly full, general disarmament, which, with goodwill, is easier to achieve than partial. But that is where universalism has really to be established, and not only on a European scale, as a necessary condition of any measure of disarmament. However, I shall reserve my opinion as to how far such universalism is feasible at the present time.

Matters are quite different when it comes to universalism

in respect of improving the League Covenant. In principle, we are wholly and entirely in favour of universalism. We desire nothing better than the speedy inclusion of all States in the League of Nations, but, naturally, a League which gives all its members real guarantees of security, a League founded on mutual assistance, a League which recognises the equality of peoples. If, however, it is a question of doing nothing to improve the Covenant until this universalism is achieved, if we are to be invited to the “waiting room” again, I cannot agree.

I would object still more emphatically if, in the name of universalism, the League of Nations were to set to work, erasing everything from the Covenant that makes it an instrument of peace and a danger to the aggressor, if, as I said at the last session of the Assembly, attempts are made to make the League safe for the aggressor. Of course, a State which openly sets the power of the sword against international obligations, does not hide its contempt of such obligations and cynically enjoins other States to adopt the same contemptuous attitude to their signatures on documents for the purpose of completely destroying international confidence, cannot feel at ease in the League of Nations which declares one of its chief aims to be the “preservation of justice and the scrupulous observance of covenanted obligations in the relations between organised nations.”

No Favours to the Aggressors

A State which is governed by men who have included the conquest of foreign soil in their programme of foreign policy, who before their own people and representatives of foreign States enumerate at their celebrations the vast territories which they are going to annex forcibly from other countries, cannot sincerely subscribe to Article X, which guarantees the

territorial integrity and political independence of all members. The State which preaches the legality of so-called localised wars can never reconcile itself to Article XVI, which declares that resorting to war against one member of the League is an act of war against all the other members of the League, and prescribes a scale of sanctions against the aggressor. A few days ago at Geneva, under the aegis of the League of Nations, a convention was signed which forbids even the broadcasting of incitements to breaches of the domestic peace of other States. How can such a convention be sincerely subscribed to by a State which, as is proved beyond doubt, has in all countries its agencies, composed of its own nationals, which actively interfere in the life of these countries, set one party against another, which, moreover, organise and finance mutinies and openly render military assistance to the mutineers. Is the ideology of a State which is based on racial and national inequality, and classes all nations but its own as sub-human, compatible with the League's basic principle of the equality of nations?

I ask the partisans of "universalism at any price," must we sacrifice all the main principles of the League in order to adapt it to the theories and practice of such a State, or should we tell this State to adapt itself to the existing ideology of the League? To this I reply that I prefer a League without universalism to universalism without the League principles.

The Soviet Delegation insists that the question of the application of the principles of the Covenant now on the agenda should be immediately submitted to the first commission without waiting for the advent of universalism. If this commission does not cope with its work in the course of the present session of the Assembly, the continuation of the work must be put in the hands of a special commission, which must work out and agree upon specific proposals without delay, so

that a special session of the Assembly can be called as soon as possible for the final adoption of these proposals.

While the theoretical work is proceeding, the members of the League who intend to take part in regional, or, when this is impossible, in bilateral pacts of mutual assistance will open diplomatic negotiations among themselves to achieve this aim.

I maintain that the more intensively and successfully this work is done, the easier it will be to come to terms even with the aggressive countries and thus achieve the desired universalism.

We by no means object to attempts at an agreement even with the most aggressive countries. On the contrary, we consider it necessary to invite them to take part in every international step. But we are against their dictating the terms of the negotiations or paying them premiums for being so kind as to negotiate. We consider it abnormal that such steps should be delayed or disrupted because of their refusal or deliberate procrastination of reply. We think that attempts to reach a universal agreement can be made by summoning the Peace Conference or the Pan-European Commission. Having no ties with the past and being free so far from any pacts, either of these organisations is the best place for the preliminary discussion of any question, whether political, including disarmament, or economic. If any State refuses to take part in these organisations either, then it will be clear to all that we must part company, that we must finally organise peace and international order without it.

Gentlemen, I have given you an outline of the policy and the measures which, if applied within and without the League of Nations, would be really effective in getting the organising of peace under way. They have the merit that they imply immediate action, unlike the present "waiting-room" policy, the speculations on the moods of the forces which are

antagonistic to peace, the focusing of all hopes on some particular conference, resembling the elusive blue-bird—a policy leading to fatalism and capitulation to the aggressor. We are sure and certain that action, not inaction, is the thing to clear the murky international atmosphere and avert catastrophe.

The Soviet Government is itself on guard and will not advise anybody to take steps which might increase the risk of war or bring it nearer one whit, no matter whether it is a question of war at one's own frontiers or in remoter places. The Soviet Government has given many proofs of its peaceableness, not only in words, but in deeds, in the face of a multitude of provocations and affronts. Relying on its enormous internal and external strength and proud of its achievements, it does not retaliate against these affronts with the traditional methods, not only because of its contempt and loathing for the sources of these affronts, but chiefly because it wants others, not itself, to take the responsibility for the consequences of the violation of the elementary rules of intercourse between the peoples. Recognising the right of every people to choose any political and social order for itself, the Soviet Government does not practise discrimination between States according to their internal regime.

While it considers National Socialism and racialism the mortal enemy of all working people and civilisation itself, the Soviet Government, far from preaching a crusade against the countries where these theories prevail, has attempted to preserve normal diplomatic and economic relations with them as with other countries. The Soviet Government has not increased its Army, its armaments, its air forces to combat the bacilli of these theories or to defend its frontiers against them.

The Soviet Government associated itself with the declaration on non-intervention in Spanish affairs only because a friendly country feared that an international conflict might

otherwise ensue. It did so in spite of its opinion that the principle of neutrality does not apply in a case where mutineers are fighting against the lawful government and contradicts the principle of international law, in which view it fully agrees with the statement made to us by the Spanish Minister of Foreign Affairs. It understands that the unjust decision referred to was thrust upon it by those countries which, though they consider themselves the mainstay of order, have created a new situation, fraught with incalculable consequences, as a result of which it is permitted openly to assist mutineers against their lawful Government. All these new proofs of the peaceableness of the Soviet Government, which possesses adequate means of self-defence, should convince you, gentlemen, that the proposals submitted to you by the Soviet Delegation are dictated by the desire to secure peace, not only on its own frontiers, but also on those of other countries, to create conditions of security for all peoples; they are dictated by a sincere desire to restore in all countries both self-confidence and confidence that others will help them in case of need and resurrect the belief in the ideal of international solidarity and justice.

**VI. THE U.S.S.R. A POWERFUL
BULWARK OF UNIVERSAL PEACE:
SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE
EXTRAORDINARY EIGHTH CONGRESS
OF SOVIETS OF THE U.S.S.R.
November 28th, 1936**

COMRADES and Delegates to the Congress—I have no intention of coming forward here with a survey of the international situation, as there is no such item on the agenda of the Congress. (*Laughter.*) I shall speak only on the report regarding the Draft Constitution.

Comrade Stalin commented on the interest which foreign public opinion concerning the Draft Constitution commands, and I, as a man who sits at the window which looks out abroad (*Laughter*), want to share some thoughts with you on this subject.

Comrade Stalin gave a brilliant and extremely Witty analysis of the foreign criticisms of the Draft Constitution. It must be admitted, however, that the Draft Constitution was met abroad, not only with criticism, not only with doubts and scepticism, but also with encouraging and laudatory comments. In some circles of foreign public opinion, a tendency has manifested itself to pat us patronisingly on the back as a penitent prodigal son who has returned to his family. The Soviet Union, you see, has returned to European democracy, to *bourgeois* liberties. I want to introduce some clarity on this subject.

Fascism, the Grave-Digger of Democracy and Liberty

We Marxists have always had our own opinion regarding the nature of democracy and *bourgeois* liberties. This opinion was expressed by Comrade Stalin when, in his report, he compared the liberties accorded by the Soviet Constitution with the bourgeois liberties which, although bearing the same names, are by no means synonymous.

But, taking these liberties even in the conditional, limited meaning in which they undoubtedly played a most important progressive role at the end of the eighteenth and during the nineteenth centuries, and of which the *bourgeoisie* has been justly proud since the French Revolution, we can now, it seems, speak of them as something which is becoming a thing of the past.

Indeed, among the twenty-six European *bourgeois* countries, so-called democracy and *bourgeois* liberties survive in hardly more than ten countries. The other sixteen countries—that is, two-thirds of *bourgeois* Europe—have a regime of a Fascist or semi-Fascist dictatorship.

Sometimes the difference between Fascist and semi-Fascist countries is not a qualitative, but a quantitative one. It is rather a difference of shades or even of appearances. Some countries openly declare themselves to be Fascist, while others, imitating in the whole of their political and social organisation the Fascist countries, prefer, for considerations of internal and sometimes of foreign policy, to avoid the Fascist name.

It is not necessary to dwell on the nature of democracy and liberty in the Fascist countries. Fascism itself boasts that it is a denial of democracy and of all liberties. For what is Fascism? I should like to give it, not a philosophical or scientific definition, but a simple, generally understood and at the same time correct definition.

We, comrades, know what contradictions are gnawing at *bourgeois* society. These contradictions not only cannot be eliminated, but they inevitably grow and multiply. They became particularly acute as a result of the World War and they found striking expression in the economic crisis which began in 1929.

In some countries not one of the *bourgeois* parties which succeeded each other to power managed to overcome this crisis. This gave rise to discontent among the citizens. And lo! a genius appears on the political scene or is “sent by Providence” and undertakes to lead the State out of its difficult situation without encroaching upon its foundations.

He resorts to an expedient which is as ingenious as it is simple. If it is impossible to remove the existing discontent and the causes breeding it, it is quite easy to remove the discontented. (*General Laughter.*) It is sufficient to forbid the citizens to express their discontent, to deprive them of all means of expressing their thoughts, desires, and demands, to deprive them of newspapers, meetings, unions, parties; and, for the more stubborn and those who had specially transgressed in the past, to build and equip a certain number of prisons and concentration camps as well as gallows and execution blocks; at the same time, one section of the population, because of its improper origin, is outlawed and turned over to another section of the population for attack and plunder. This is what is called Fascism. (*Laughter and applause.*) What room is there for democracy and liberty there?

But you may say, perhaps, that this method of bridling citizens cannot lay claim to originality, while those of you who have read the author Gleb Uspensky will recall, perhaps, that this method is fully covered by the classic rule of the policeman Mymretsov: “Nab ‘em and hold ‘em.” (*Laughter and applause.*) Some of you may say, perhaps, that the “Union

of the Russian People” or the “Union of Michael the Archangel,” well known to our older generation, should be regarded as the prototype of the Fascist party. (*Laughter and applause.*)

I shall not argue with you, comrades. (*Applause.*) I only wanted to give you an idea of the state of the liberties in a model Fascist State, to which other Fascist or semi-Fascist States approximate. One must consider as a distinguishing feature of some of these semi-Fascist countries the dominant influence of the military, who issue orders to the official government, threaten it with terror and sometimes practise terror, and are, indeed, the actual masters of the State. From being the servant of the State, such as any army is supposed to be in a democratic State, it actually becomes its master.

As I have already said, there still remain in Europe ten countries which as yet preserve the purity of democratic vestments. Have they preserved it? Yes. But whether they will preserve it for long is a question. At any rate, in these countries, under the influence of and thanks to an agitation lavishly paid for by the Fascist countries, elements which openly propagate the destruction of the remnants of democracy and democratic liberties have appeared and are gaining in strength.

In most of these countries the question of the prohibition of this or that party is already being raised as a practical issue; such parties are usually, of course, the parties of the working class and the peasantry, the parties of the discontented. The artificial suppression of the discontented and the deprivation of their opportunity to unite is, as we have seen, the beginning of Fascism.

It sometimes happens that a government which has the support of the vast majority of the population and a majority in parliament is literally terrorised and forced to listen mainly to

the voice of the minority, if only the latter has at its disposal a sufficient number of glib and vociferous organs of the Press. The voice of such newspapers is given out to be the public opinion of the country, and what truth there is in this we witnessed recently in the case of the elections in the United States of America.

Ninety per cent. of the Press of that country opposed President Roosevelt. It might have been thought, if the newspapers were to be taken as an expression of public opinion, that the whole country was against Mr. Roosevelt. Nevertheless, Mr. Roosevelt won a splendid victory in the elections, securing an overwhelming majority of the vote.

It is perfectly clear that the general voice of the Press, which pretends to be the mouthpiece of public opinion of a country, sometimes represents an insignificant minority or only the few newspaper magnates or the few industrial trusts which finance these newspapers. Nevertheless, such newspapers frequently exercise a tremendous influence upon the internal and foreign policy of the country, paralysing the actions of the democratic government.

Sometimes the upper crust of the military is an important factor and exercises pressure on policy, even in democratic countries. Such a situation hardly corresponds to the proper conception of democracy. If, however, there are in such a country honest radical elements who attempt, together with the workers and peasants, to preserve the democratic system and liberties, they are subjected to bitter attack by their own Fascist elements and are sometimes violently overthrown by their military with the assistance of the Fascist and semi-Fascist countries.

A striking example of this is to be seen in Spain, which had a Government elected by a general election conducted in accordance with all the rules of *bourgeois* democracy. But,

since this Government proclaimed a programme for the defence of democracy, the defence of liberties, the defence of parliamentarism, a handful of generals and officers, supported by foreign Fascist governments, revolted against it and is trying to overthrow it under the slogan of Fascism. But the most characteristic thing of all is that this open, organised struggle is meeting with sympathy and even with substantial support from democratic States.

The Security of West-European Countries Endangered

Such, comrades, is the fate of democracy and *bourgeois* liberties in Europe now, and that is why we cannot feel particularly flattered when we are told, in connection with the Draft Constitution, that we are returning to the bosom of European democracy, to the *bourgeois* liberties. It would be more correct to say that we are taking the banner of democracy, the banner of liberty, which is falling from the feeble hands of the decrepit *bourgeoisie*, and are filling these concepts with a new, rich, Soviet content. (*Applause.*)

In becoming the bulwark of democracy and freedom the Soviet Union does not, however, call for the creation of an international *bloc* to struggle against Fascism, which rejects democracy and freedom. We, as a State, are not concerned with the internal Fascist regime of this or that country. Our collaboration with other countries and our participation in the League of Nations are based on the principle of the peaceful co-existence of two systems—the Socialist and the capitalist—and we consider that the latter includes the Fascist system. But Fascism is now ceasing to be an internal affair of the countries which preach it.

There was a time when M. Mussolini, the founder of Fascism, declared that Fascism was not an article for export. In

Justice to M. Mussolini, it must be said that throughout many years he kept to this declaration, and a struggle for the spread of Fascism beyond the boundaries of Italy was no part of his foreign policy, but this lasted only so long as the Fascism of M. Mussolini had not passed through a course of improvement in Berlin, or, as we say in our country, of raising one's qualifications (*Laughter and applause*), and had not been impregnated by the theories of German so-called National Socialism.

In contradistinction to Italian Fascism, German National Socialism, as soon as it established itself within its own country, also extended its activity beyond its borders. It is documentarily established that the activity of the National Socialist Party, which has a wide and ramified network of agencies in almost all countries, is not limited in these countries to serving the members of these agencies socially and culturally, as the official representatives of Fascism would fain assure us.

It has been established that these agencies carry out extensive Fascist agitation among the citizens of the countries in which they are established: that they interfere actively in the domestic politics of these countries; that they set party against party; establish and finance organs of the Press; that they are not averse to secret service activities and do not stop even at terrorist activities, taking no account of the laws of the countries which have given them hospitality. Such an agency was recently unearthed here in our Soviet Union.

However, we are not in the least intimidated by this foreign activity of Fascism. It represents a real and a great danger for other countries, for their very existence, but not for us. We can easily cope with it on Soviet territory (*Applause*) with our own forces, and we are not going to ask for foreign assistance to combat it or conclude international alliances and agreements

for this purpose. (*Laughter and applause.*)

The War Waged fry the Rebel Generals and the Interventionists against Republican Spain

The foreign activity of Fascism is more serious when it takes such forms as, for example, in Spain. At the present time there can be no doubt that after the rout of the Right parties at the democratic elections in Spain, which revealed that the Spanish people had confidence in and were loyal to the Government formed as a result of these elections, the insurgent generals would not have dared to have risen against this Government had they not been promised in advance the support of German or Italian Fascism, or both. And this assistance was not only promised, but rendered.

The call of the generals for revolt did not find a response among the soldiers and sailors in the Spanish armed forces, and the generals were compelled. to resort to the assistance of the Moroccans and the Foreign Legion; that is, a legion which is recruited from international adventurers and criminal elements. It is with these forces that General Franco attacked the people of Spain; it is with them he is attacking the capital of Spain.

But even these forces, which were quartered in Morocco, could not have been transported to Spain if German and Italian aeroplanes and warships had not been placed at the disposal of General Franco. Observe that Germany and Italy at that time still maintained diplomatic relations with the Spanish Government, and their intervention in the domestic struggle in Spain was a glaring' violation of the most elementary international obligations. German Fascism, draped in the toga of the defender of the Aryan race, does not apparently feel any qualms of conscience when bringing non-Aryan Moors to fight against the Aryan people of Spain. (*Applause and laughter.*)

Germany and Italy declare without a blush that they support General Franco because they do not want to have a democratic government in Spain, a government of the United Front, and want to see there the government promised by General Franco, based on Fascist principles. It is self-evident that Germany and Italy by no means need Fascism in Spain for the sake of Fascism as such or for the declaration of any ideological doctrine. Fascism is in this case a means of achieving entirely different and by no means ideological aims.

The Farce of “Non-Intervention”

On the initiative of France and England, with the aim of preventing possible international complications threatening peace, an international agreement was signed not to intervene in Spanish affairs by supplying any war materials whatsoever to the Government or the Insurgents

This proposal was undoubtedly contrary to the usual conceptions in international relations, which permit the supply of any arms by one government to another government recognised by it, and prohibit such supplies to insurgents in any country with which diplomatic relations are maintained.

Nevertheless, considering the official motives on which this proposal was based, the Soviet Government joined in it. Moreover, we considered that if this Agreement were loyally observed by all it would have done no harm to the Spanish Government, for, if left to himself, General Franco could not have prevented the suppression of the insurrection. I repeat that the obvious condition for our joining this Agreement was its loyal fulfilment by all the participants.

Germany and Italy, and also Fascist Portugal, for a long time delayed their answer to the proposal to join the Non-Intervention Agreement; under various pretexts they obstructed

the negotiations on this subject and utilised the time thus gained for rapidly and plentifully supplying General Franco with aircraft, tanks, artillery and other arms. They needed this so that, should arms of German and Italian make be found in Spain later, this could be justified by saying that they had been sent to Spain before the signing of the Agreement.

At length, the Agreement was signed by the Fascist countries also. Weeks followed weeks and the U.S.S.R., France and Britain and other States loyally and scrupulously fulfilled their obligations, while Germany and Italy, with that disregard of international obligations characteristic of them, secretly continued to supply General Franco with all manner of military and naval arms, utilising chiefly the Portuguese vantage ground for this purpose.

This supply became a matter of common knowledge. It was written about by the correspondents of foreign newspapers of all political tendencies, not excluding the extreme Right. It was the common talk of numerous observers and eye-witnesses. Undoubtedly it was also known to foreign consuls in the respective ports, whose reports, unfortunately, have not yet been published. Finally, the Spanish Government made formal representations, both to the League of Nations and in notes to individual States, regarding the military supplies furnished to General Franco, which were doubly illegal, both from the point of view of common law and in view of the existing international agreement.

The Soviet Government then applied to the London Committee, which we thought had been formed to ensure the observance of their obligations by all the participants of the Agreement and to investigate cases of infringement. However, we were mistaken. The London Committee understood the word "non-intervention" in the sense that it itself was not to intervene in the intervention in Spanish events. (*Laughter.*) The

London Committee understood its task in the sense that it was only to ensure that States which had undertaken definite obligations with regard to the Agreement on Non-Intervention should themselves not acknowledge their infringement, and that, as long as they denied all guilt on their part, their explanations were to be regarded as satisfactory, and, this done, the functions of the Committee were at an end. (*Laughter.*)

Such a decision of the Committee sanctioned in advance all future infringements of obligations on the part of the Fascist States. There remained nothing else for the Soviet Government to do than loyally to inform the London Committee, although it was by no means obliged to do this, that it did not consider itself morally bound by the Agreement to any greater extent than the other participants.

The result of German and Italian war supplies was that General Franco, with his Moroccan troops, succeeded in capturing most important strategic points and in approaching close to Madrid. In consequence of this, for some weeks now hundreds and thousands of kilograms of explosives, incendiary bombs and artillery shells have been daily and nightly raining upon the fine capital of the Spanish people; hundreds and thousands of peaceful civilians, women and children, are being killed and maimed; the greatest monuments of architecture, painting, and sculpture, ancient monuments which are the treasures of the whole of humanity, are being destroyed. And this devastation is carried on from German and Italian aeroplanes with the hands of German and Italian pilots. (*A voice: "Shame."*)

This destructive, Herostratian work of the first united German-Italian Fascist international active co-operation will remain for ever the most shameful page in the history of international relations, in the history of Europe. (*"Quite right." Applause.*) I am convinced, comrades, that I am expressing the

sentiments of the whole Congress in saying that at this moment, when speaking of Spain, our thoughts, our feelings, full of ardent sympathy and admiration, go out to the heroic defenders of Madrid, to the brave fighters of the Spanish Republican Army on the other fronts, in their bitter battles with the forces of barbarism and vandalism. (*Stormy and prolonged applause. All rise. The delegates of the Congress give an ovation to the Ambassador of the Spanish Republic, M. Pascua, seated in the Diplomatic Box. Shouts of "Long live the heroic Spanish people!"*)

Solidarity of the Soviet People with the Spanish People

Wherein lies the interest of our Soviet State in Spanish events?

The population of our Union, by its generous contributions for the relief of the Spanish women and children, by its collective resolutions and greetings to Spain, and by other manifestations, has demonstrated the keen sympathy with which it is watching, from the most democratic and the freest country, the courageous and bitter struggle of the people of a remote country for its democracy, for its freedom, against Fascist barbarism, against Fascist enslavement.

The same is testified by the manifestation which you yourselves have just made. But this is only the emotional aspect of the matter; there is also a political aspect, a State aspect, which I wish to make clear. Our enemies claim that we are seeking to create in the Iberian Peninsula a Communist Soviet State which we even intend to incorporate in the Soviet Union. (*Laughter and applause.*) If there are naive people who believe these foolish assertions, they must be rather surprised that we have not postponed the Eighth Congress in the expectation of including in the Constitution a twelfth republic,

the Spanish Socialist Republic. (*Laughter and prolonged applause.*)

To be sure, they are being told now that we no longer expect to conquer the whole of Spain for Communism and are prepared to be content with its Catalan corner, With the creation of an independent Catalan republic in order to launch thence a crusade against the whole of Europe. (*Laughter.*) Such fairy tales for little children and big fools (*Laughter and stormy applause*) are spread, of course, with the object of obscuring the meaning of our real interest in the Spanish events.

In the case of Spain, we have the first sally of Fascism beyond its borders. Here is an attempt at a forcible implantation in Spain from without of a Fascist system, an attempt to force upon the Spanish people a Fascist government with the aid of bayonet, hand-grenade and bomb. If this attempt were to succeed, there would be no guarantees against its repetition on a wider scale in relation to other States.

Again, if it were a case of Fascism merely as a special internal political and social regime, our attitude towards it would be calmer. Has there not already existed in Spain a corrupt monarchy? Was there not recently the dictatorship of General Primo de Rivera? Yet this disturbed us comparatively little. But now we are dealing with a different phenomenon, with a phenomenon of an international character, with a real aggravation of the menace to peace, and this alone is sufficient to justify our interest.

The Programme of the Fascist States is Aggression

It is necessary to bear in mind that Fascism is not only a specific internal State regime, but that it represents at the same time preparation for aggression, preparation for war against

other States. This is not our characterisation of Fascism, but its own. Fascism shouts about its aggressiveness from the house-tops, and not only shouts about it but in certain areas is already practising it. I ask you, comrades, to recall what I said here earlier about the substance and methods of Fascism. I told you about the suppression of discontent among the population of a Fascist country, but this is a negative programme, so to speak. Fascism also has a positive programme.

By mechanical police measures alone, by muzzles, the mouths of the discontented can be gagged only temporarily; but since the causes of discontent are not removed thereby, and since Fascism is incapable of removing them by other measures, they resort to other, spiritual means, so to speak, to influence or, I would say, to befuddle the discontented citizens.

By monopolising the Press, the book-publishing houses, the radio, and all other means of agitation, Fascism endeavours to impress on the citizens that their people is the chosen, the best of all peoples, destined to dominate all other, inferior peoples. Stories are told them about remarkable ancestors, about their belonging to some special, higher race.

Just as primitive people and little children used to be frightened by the alleged existence of goblins, Beelzebub, Satan, devils, imps and other evil spirits, just so are the citizens of a Fascist country frightened by the bogey of Communists, Marxists, democrats, Jew Masons, who must be defeated and destroyed by all means in order to gain happiness. Tempting pictures of flourishing territories such as the Ukraine, the Urals, and Siberia are being painted (*Laughter*), as well as colonies rich in raw materials.

The only trouble is, they are told, that these tempting territories and colonies belong to other peoples. Hence, they must be conquered, taken by force; and this requires arms, this requires a big army, a huge navy, great and varied armaments.

It is clear that the citizens must strain all their efforts, must suffer privations, and give up everything to the Fascist State for the creation of military might. Thus, a whole nation is imbued from day to day with the spirit of aggression, and aggression openly becomes the programme of the Fascist State, while Fascism itself becomes the function of the most reckless chauvinism and imperialism.

What I have said would seem to be quite sufficient to justify the interest with which we, as a State that unflinchingly stands for inviolable peace between the peoples, are watching the attempt at the forcible implantation in other countries of Fascism as the bearer of the idea of aggression. But this is not all.

Fascism carries out its preparations for the achievement of its aggressive aims not only by increasing its armaments at an incredible rate, but also by releasing itself unilaterally from all international obligations binding it or by simply violating them when it suits it; by avoiding all international co-operation for the strengthening of peace; by attempting to undermine the international organisations which are called upon to protect peace; by waging a campaign for disuniting other countries and preventing the collective organisation of security.

The same object is served by spreading false reports about other countries, for which purpose a special State institution has been set up called the Ministry for Propaganda, at the head of which stands a man who, to do him justice, as the author and circulator of the most absurd inventions and the most lying reports is, as the English say, the right man in the right place. (*Applause and laughter.*)

Fascism directs its fiery arrows particularly against the Soviet State, ostensibly because the ideas of Communism are professed there, but in reality because it is the object of the predatory aims of Fascism, and also an obstacle to its aims of

conquest in other directions.

Although, when it came to power, Fascism announced that it aimed at preserving the best of relations with the Soviet Union and even ratified the prolongation of the Berlin Soviet-German Agreement on friendship and neutrality, the Soviet Government lost Fascist favour particularly after we proposed that, together with us, Germany should guarantee the security and integrity of our common neighbours. It became still more furious after we signed the Pact of Mutual Assistance with France, which it declared to be Germany's hereditary foe, and after we had entered the League of Nations and developed our peace programme there.

By furious agitation, with the help of paid agents and political friends in other countries, Fascism attempts to use to the utmost the prejudices existing in these countries against the country which is building Socialism, with the object, firstly, of destroying the ties that exist between these countries and the Soviet Union as members of the League of Nations, and, secondly, with the object of receiving financial assistance for strengthening its armaments, which can be directed against other countries, not necessarily against the Soviet Union.

I may be asked why we are so perturbed by the military preparations of Fascism if actually they may be directed not necessarily against the Soviet Union. Permit me to answer this with an anecdote. When a man who was attacked by barking dogs was asked why, seeing that barking dogs do not bite, he was afraid, he replied that he knew this all right, but he was not sure whether the dogs knew it. (*General laughter.*) We Bolsheviki are not afraid of barking dogs, but still we are not going to rely on the consciousness of the dogs (*Laughter and applause*), and will arm ourselves with a stronger and a longer cudgel. (*General laughter and applause.*)

Blocs of the Warmongers

Unable to find allies among the members of the League of Nations, who still stand on the basis of the idea of collective security, Fascism, finding itself isolated, in order to camouflage its isolation, has appealed to the few countries which stand equally isolated, which share its dislike of the League of Nations and the organisation of peace and also pursue aggressive aims; it has concluded a bloc with them, ostensibly for a struggle against the “international Communist menace.”

To be exact, I must point out that it is not a general *bloc* which has been concluded between the three States, but one between Germany and Italy and another separately between Germany and Japan.

Incidentally, we have exact information that Italy, anxious to follow at all costs in the footsteps of her new mentor, Germany, has proposed to Japan that she conclude an agreement with her similar to the published part of the Japanese-German Agreement.

M. Mussolini, who maintained highly proper relations with the Soviet Union for more than ten years, became convinced of the existence of an international Communist danger only after the Soviet Union had loyally and consistently taken part in the League measures against Italy when the latter violated the League of Nations Covenant by committing aggression and seizing Abyssinia, and after the U.S.S.R. had made a stand against Fascist military intervention in Spain.

The authors of these international agreements for fighting Communism apparently do not notice what a ridiculous position they place themselves in when they ask that people should really believe in the ideological character of these agreements. If the ostensible aim were genuine, these

agreements would mean that German Fascism, after four years of Homeric exertions to exterminate by all conceivable means, not only Communism and Marxism, but even democracy in its country, is again faced with a great Communist menace within its country, with which it is not in a position to cope, and is compelled to seek foreign assistance.

Likewise, Italian Fascism, after fourteen years of rule, and after raising the country to the rank of an empire, would seem to find itself confronted with a Communist menace, which it can overcome only in alliance with German and Japanese Fascism!

The Japanese Government, which has waged an untiring struggle in order to eradicate “dangerous thoughts” in the country, would seem not to have achieved its object and is compelled to ask for the assistance of foreign police! It would thus seem that the Fascists are panic stricken at the victorious growth of Communism in their countries.

No less ridiculous are the alleged aims which these agreements set themselves and which seem to consist only in the following. The Japanese Government probably undertakes inform the German Government in the event of a Japanese Communist deciding to find sanctuary in free Germany, and *vice versa*. If there is not enough room for a Communist in a German concentration camp or prison, the Japanese and Italian Governments apparently undertake to find living quarters for him in their own prisons and camps (*Laughter*) and *vice versa*. It must be assumed that the High Contracting Parties undertook to lend one another copies of *The Communist International* and similar publications, or that possibly, on a collective basis, they will found a newspaper to prove the superiority of Fascist ideas over Communist ideas.

It is difficult to imagine what other practical objectives these peculiar international treaties could pursue. It is not

surprising that, judging by the comments in the Press, the announcement of these treaties in all non-Fascist countries met with polite laughter that was restrained with difficulty.

Well-informed people refuse to believe that in order to draw up the two meagre articles which have been published of the German-Japanese Agreement it was necessary to conduct negotiations for fifteen months; that these negotiations should necessarily have been entrusted to a Japanese general and a German super-diplomat, and that these negotiations should have been conducted in the greatest secrecy and kept secret even from German and Japanese official diplomacy.

It is not surprising that it is assumed by many that the German-Japanese Agreement is written in a special code in which anti-Communism means something entirely different from the dictionary meaning of this word, and that people decipher this code in different ways.

The Japanese militarists in Manchuria, for example, understood the code in their own way and disturbed the quiet which had reigned on the Soviet-Manchurian border for some considerable time by making two raids on Soviet territory with pretty considerable forces in the course of two days. They did not take into account the fact that the Berlin Agreement by no means prevents the Red Banner Far-Eastern Army giving the same reply as it gave to similar raids in the past.

(Ovation by the whole hall, all rise, shouts of "Long live the Far-Eastern Red Army!" "Hurrah!" and "Long live Comrade Bluecher.")

We rather think that they realised this when after the raid they counted the number of wounded they brought back with them and the number of corpses and arms they left behind on Soviet territory. We hope that, in spite of the Berlin Agreement, the Japanese militarists in Manchuria will not forget the earnest request of the Far-Eastern Red Army "to

choose for their strolls nooks somewhat farther away.”
(*Laughter and applause.*)

The Hypocrisy and Mendacity of the Enemies of Peace

As for the Japanese-German Agreement which has been published, I would recommend you not to seek for any meaning in it, since it really has no meaning, for the simple reason that it is only a cover for another agreement which was simultaneously discussed and initialled, probably also signed, and which was not published and is not intended for publication.

I declare with all sense of the responsibility of my words that it was precisely to the working out of this secret document, in which the word Communism is not even mentioned, to which were devoted the fifteen months of negotiations between the Japanese military attaché and the German super-diplomat.

The aggressive character of the recently concluded agreement follows if only from the fact that participating in it are three States which withdrew from the League of Nations. It is true that Italy formally still participates in the League of Nations, but her participation consists in the fact that, as M. Mussolini himself publicly declared recently, she solicitously desires its speediest possible death.

All the three States, well known for their aggressiveness and their attempts against the territories of others, are fighting against the principles of collective security and the indivisibility of peace. This in itself lends a sinister character to these agreements and indicates their menace to universal peace, security and the interest of many countries.

The activity of the Fascist countries in recent times has revealed, incidentally, all the hypocrisy and mendacity of some of their political so-called programme declarations and slogans.

German Fascism, for example, asserted that it is opposed in principle to all international alliances and combinations, with the exception of non-aggression pacts, and only with border neighbours.

It concluded an agreement with Japan, situated at a distance of tens of thousands of kilometres and separated from it by several States, and which is by no means a non-aggression agreement. German Fascism vowed its adherence to principle of the localisation of war. The agreement with Japan will tend to spread a war which breaks out on one continent to at least two if not more continents.

Italian Fascism declared after the Abyssinian expedition that its territorial appetites had been fully satisfied and that from then on it was ready to collaborate in the work of stabilising peace; but now it has joined in a system of aggressive agreements.

Nor will the reputation for sincerity of the Japanese Government be enhanced: this Government assured us of its desire for the establishment of peaceful relations with the Soviet Union and urged us for the sake of this to meet it in the settlement of several questions in dispute in which it was interested. Now, however, it has concluded a secret aggressive agreement with Germany. The Japanese Government also assured us that it was still considering the non-aggression pact we proposed to it and that such a pact might be concluded after the settlement of all questions in dispute; now, however, it has made the conclusion of such pacts dependent upon Germany's consent, lessening thereby the independence of its own foreign policy.

The anti-democratic, aggressive Fascist countries have had their say. They have stated that they do not want to participate in general international co-operation for the organisation of peace, for guaranteeing security to all nations. They issue one

challenge after another to peace-loving and, in the first place, to the democratic nations. It now rests with these nations to speak.

Our Policy Was, Is and Will Be a Policy of Peace

The Soviet Union sees no grounds for changing her policy, which was, is, and will be a policy for peace. (*Prolonged applause.*) She wants this peace for herself and for other nations and, therefore, offered them her co-operation. She expects, not mere words about peace from others, but actions in organising this peace.

The Soviet Union, however, does not beg to be invited to any unions, any *blocs*, any combinations. She will calmly let other States weigh and evaluate the advantages which can be derived for peace from close co-operation with the Soviet Union, and understand that the Soviet Union can give more than receive. (*Applause.*)

The signed agreements which we dealt with to-day do not alter anything in the actual state of affairs. The danger lies, not in the agreements, not in their signatures, whatever their value, but in the existence of States with governments which build their foreign policy on contempt for peace, on principles of aggression and plunder, and which aim at grabbing everything which is unprotected.

This, however, does not scare us because we have nothing here so unprotected. (*Applause.*) Other States, other territories, are menaced most. Our security does not depend upon paper documents or upon foreign-policy combinations,

The Soviet Union is sufficiently strong in herself. She is strong in her unity, in the way all her parts are welded together, in the harmonious way they all work together, and her strength will be still further enhanced when she will have been

cemented by the new excellent mortar represented by the new Constitution which is being adopted by our Congress. The Soviet Union is strong in the unity of aspirations of all the peoples inhabiting her and the singleness of purpose inspiring them. She is strong in her true democracy. She is strong in the steadily growing spirit of active patriotism of her entire population. She is strong in the great sympathy and love felt for her by the millions and tens of millions of toilers beyond her borders. She is strong in the centralisation of governmental power and the authority of the Communist Party that leads it. (*Applause.*) She is strong in her Stakhanovites, her aviation heroes and champions in all fields of sport. She is strong in the boundless devotion to the State and its ideals on the part of the large membership of the Young Communist League and the entire enthusiastic younger generation. She is strong in her boundless natural riches, in the steady continuous growth and power of her gigantic industry. She is strong in her collective system of farming. She is strong in the consciousness of her might and invincibility. (*Applause.*) She is strong, finally, in her glorious Red Army and Red Navy, headed by the universally beloved army leader Comrade Voroshilov. (*Stormy applause. All rise and give a warm ovation to Voroshilov. A mighty "Hurrah" rings through the hall.*)

We are sure that should the day come when our Army and Navy would be compelled to come to the defence of the fatherland, then military Stakhanovism, multiplied by the enthusiasm born in such cases, will show to the world an example of self-sacrificing courage, heroism, prowess and Bolshevik ability to fight unprecedented in the history of all times. (*Applause.*)

I am confident, and all of you, comrades, are confident, that our Soviet Union will proudly stand, like an invincible fortress against which the turbid waves of the raging Fascist

sea will break in vain. (*Stormy applause.*) This confidence is still further strengthened in us by the consciousness that the administration of this fortress and its keys are in the hands of such a commandant as our glorious, great leader, Comrade Stalin. (*Stormy prolonged applause. All rise, a storm of applause, enthusiastic cries of "Hurrah!" "Long live the Leader of the Peoples, the great Stalin!"*)

VII. SPEECH AT THE SESSION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS. May 28th, 1937

THE speech of the honourable representative of Spain and the documents circulated by him have exhaustively elucidated the actual aspect of the case, on which there is scarce need to dwell. Here we have a perfectly clear case, which does not require any further verification or investigation. Here we have an indisputable case of the forcible introduction of foreign armed forces on the territory of one of the members of the League of Nations, a case of aggression in the grossest form.

Certain international actions on practical proposals undertaken during the past year, the agreement on non-intervention in Spanish affairs, the establishment of control, the proposal for an armistice, the appeal to the belligerents undoubtedly distort and obscure the formal aspect of the case, because they create an impression that it is a question of

belligerents equal in status. But in actual fact we have, on the one hand, a Government lawfully recognised by all States without exception and by the League of Nations, formed on the basis of the Spanish constitution and a democratic election law, which not long before the event under discussion received a vote of confidence from the Spanish people, a Government which is responsible for the observance of the laws of the country, for order, for discipline in the army and fleet, and is obliged to suppress, by force if necessary, any attempt to change the existing order, any attempt upon the interests of the broad masses and every kind of rebellion and disorder. On the other hand we have a handful of generals and officers who violated their duty as soldiers, who rebelled against the lawful Government and the constitution of the country, who began hostilities mainly with the help of Moorish troops. I venture to remind you of these simple, indisputable facts because some people are beginning to forget them. They are beginning to forget that in the present case there can be no talk of the sides having equal rights. Foreign governments have the right to enter into relations with the Spanish Government, conclude with them any commercial transactions, including the sale of munitions, without violating any international principles and obligations. But relations with mutinous generals, and supplying them with war material even more, constitute a classic example of intervention in the internal affairs of another State.

If the Spanish events were confined to internal disorders, to a struggle between the Government and the mutineers, not only would the League of Nations have nothing to do with the question, but these events would have come to an end long ago. Any impartial person who knows the relation of forces must admit that the lawful Spanish Government could have coped with the mutiny long ago, Madrid and other Spanish cities

would not have been subjected to devastation and destruction, and the Spanish people would not have had to mourn the deaths of tens of thousands of men, women and children and the extinction of the best representatives of Spanish art and science. Matters would not have assumed an international character, and order would not only have been restored in Spain long ago, but international order itself would not have been disturbed.

Unfortunately, the published documents prove beyond all doubt that the very mutiny of the generals was prepared and organised at foreign instigation and with foreign assistance. Moreover, the mutineers began to get arms and aircraft from abroad with military instructors and aviators from the very first day of the mutiny. With the development of events, this supply has been increasing more and more, and now the mutineers are being assisted with human material as well as military. The agreement of non-intervention in Spanish affairs has not put an end to this assistance. Tens of thousands of foreigners, well-trained and well-armed, many of them lately in the military service of foreign States, poured into Spain to help the mutineers, and formed a considerable military force on the territory of Spain. In some cases big battles have been fought with the Spanish Republican army exclusively by these foreign military units, under the command of foreign generals. Spanish cities are being bombarded by foreign war planes piloted by foreigners. One quarter of Madrid, the whole city of Guernica and many other towns and villages have been destroyed by foreign aircraft. It may be said that at the present time the Spanish Republican army has to wage an armed struggle, not so much against the mutineers as against foreign invaders. Thus, one of the members of the League has been subjected to foreign invasion and the danger of violation of its territorial integrity and political independence.

But it is not only the question of Spain. The events in Spain have created one of the greatest dangers to European and world peace. This menace arises in consequence of an attempt at armed intervention in the internal affairs of a European State, an attempt to thrust upon the people of this State an internal regime and, mainly, a foreign policy orientation alien to it, and under the cover of this intervention deprive this country of her independence and subject her to the sceptre of other States. If this attempt succeeded and went unpunished, there would be no guarantee that it would not be repeated in other countries. There is no guarantee that in the very near future there will not be a new attempt to start a mutiny in another country and recognise the leader of the mutineers as the head of the Government, bring in foreign troops and foreign arms to the assistance of the mutineers there and thus commit aggression in realisation of the national policy of the intervening State. There is a tendency in intervention to begin, after the example of the religious wars of the past, a series of new wars and, under cover of the rivalry of ideologies and political regimes, carry out a policy of aggression and expansion. It should not be forgotten that, at the moment of the outbreak of the mutiny, Spain had a Government which in its programme resembled governments existing in many other countries.

The Government of the country which I represent has its ideology; it would, of course, be very glad if other countries were imbued with this ideology. However, it has never tried and will never by any methods, let alone forcible ones, try to thrust its ideology on other States. We, as a State, were little concerned with the order existing in Spain, a country with which, when the mutiny broke out, we did not even have diplomatic or consular relations, a country where there was not a single Soviet citizen at that time. All we want is that when the present events come to an end, the Spanish people may, as

before the mutiny, have the government which they want and which they voluntarily elected on the basis of a constitution established by themselves. Therefore, from the outset, the Government I represent stated that it would support any action designed to remove all non-Spanish elements from the ranks of the belligerents in Spain, so that the struggle taking place there could be decided by the forces of the Spaniards themselves.

The circumstances of the case fully justify the appeal of the Spanish Government to the League of Nations. We know that in some countries this appeal is criticised and even condemned. There are some people who consider themselves supporters of the League of Nations and who think that the League of Nations can be kept alive only on condition that nothing will be asked of the League and nothing expected, and that any appeal to the League in any serious international affair is an attempt upon the existence of the League. These people would like to change the League into a "universal" mummy and admire its inertness and imperturbable calm. The Spanish Government apparently does not think so, but, on the contrary, presumes that the League of Nations will be finally doomed to moral, if not physical, death if it will be completely ignored and will stand aside in the development of events like those now proceeding on the Iberian Peninsula.

Spain belongs to the number of the first members of the League and has taken an active part in all the transactions of the League. She has loyally performed all her duties as a member of the League. She occupies a semi-permanent place in the Council of the League and has never abused her privilege in order to dissociate herself from the joint decisions and actions of the League of Nations or set her individual opinion against the public opinion of the rest of the members of the League. Therefore it is impossible not to be surprised at the modesty and moderation of Spain who, in spite of the

misfortune which befell her in a hard time, did not burden the League with appeals, although she had the full formal and moral right to do so. And if, with this modesty, knowing how limited the assistance which she may expect from the League, without invoking any articles of the Covenant applicable to the present case, she has nevertheless now appealed to us, I would like to express the confidence that the League Council, not only in the interests of Spain, but in the interests of international justice and the preservation of peace, and also in the interests of the League itself, will throw its word into the scale and render all possible support to the Spanish people.

**VIII. EXTRACT FROM A SPEECH
DELIVERED AT A RECEPTION IN
HONOUR OF MR. SANDLER, FOREIGN
MINISTER OF SWEDEN. July 9th, 1937.**

THE number of these countries is great.¹ The forces they represent in material and man-power are enormous and considerably exceed the united forces of States which are openly bent on unleashing war, and those which are helping them half-transparently in this. Unfortunately, the forces which stand for peace are less resolute, less energetic and less united than the forces opposing them, which, as they stop at nothing—neither bluff, blackmail, deception nor the risk of open adventures—have now been keeping the whole world in a state of growing alarm and pre-war fever for some years.

It is not a question of forming military alliances and leagues for the purpose of pitting the force of one side against the force of another on the field of battle. The task of the moment, in our opinion, is to consolidate, if the term may be used, the potential of peace. This potential consists not only of the defensive capacity of the peaceable States, but to a large extent of such elements as the League Covenant, the Briand-Kellogg Pact, the regional pacts of mutual assistance, the ideas of collective security and the indivisibility of peace, the manifesting of the solidarity of the peaceable countries and their ability to find a common language.

The potential of peace in its entirety plays a great part in

¹ Meaning the countries fighting against the idea of perpetuating war as an institution, for the settlement of international disputes by peaceable means only.

delaying aggression. The lessening of any element in this potential means encouraging and unleashing aggression and consequently increasing the risk of war. The thing is, not only that the League of Nations, for instance, should fully discharge its duties in each case without fail and employ sanctions against the aggressor to the full extent, which, of course, is extremely desirable, but also that it should formally, at least, preserve the whole potential of the measures which eventually may be applied against the aggressor. That is why it seems to us that to weaken the League Covenant even theoretically, to lower its theoretical possibilities to some imaginable low practical level, would mean weakening the potential of peace. The same applies to other pacts designed to serve the cause of world peace and security of various States.

There is now no more urgent and noble task for any country great or small, than to do all it can to promote the organisation, strength and integrity of the whole potential of world peace.

IX. SPEECH AT PLENARY SESSION OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS. September 21st, 1937

MR. PRESIDENT, Gentlemen,—I must admit that I hesitated somewhat before speaking here, and I think that other delegations were not strangers to this feeling. I ask myself: does not all we said and proposed from this place a year ago concerning the report submitted to the Seventeenth Assembly hold good, and does it need any addition? Indeed, the evil which we discussed at that time continues to poison the international atmosphere and corrode the League of Nations. Aggression, in theory and practice, far from disappearing, has, on the contrary, raised its head even higher. It is showing its hideous face still more shamelessly and is finding ever new and ever more frequent manifestations in a more and more pronounced form.

In addition to masked aggression in the south-west of Europe, there has been undisguised aggression on the Asiatic continent. Two States, two members of the League and of the Council, are being subjected to the invasion of alien armed forces by land, sea and air. Mercantile as well as naval vessels of other countries are being made victims of all kinds of attacks. Vital trade routes have become unsafe from piracy by sea and air. International trade is being injured, valuable cargoes are being unlawfully confiscated or sent to the bottom, ships' crews are being taken prisoner or killed, utter lawlessness and piracy are ruling the seas, the most elementary standards of international law are being trampled underfoot. A few days ago an international naval police force had to be formed and rules made to humanise peace-time warfare.

On the Asiatic continent, one State without declaration of war, without occasion or excuse whatever, falls upon another China floods it with armies one hundred thousand strong, blockades its coasts, paralyses trade in one of the greatest centres of world commerce. And we are apparently only at the beginning of these actions, the continuation and end of which are yet incalculable. In Europe, another State, Spain, continues to be subjected to the invasion of organised foreign armies for the second year; its beautiful capital, Madrid, and other towns are being day after day subjected to ferocious bombardment, which is destroying tens of thousands of human lives, enormous material and cultural treasures. Another town, Almeria, is bombarded by foreign warships; and all these actions are committed by foreign States which should have no concern whatsoever in the Spanish Civil War.

Collaboration with Violators of Peace is Impossible

We would search in vain for any echo of these events in the report of the League Secretariat to the present session. The League of Nations, whose purpose is to guarantee the integrity of the States which are members of it, to preserve peace and international order, to see that international treaties are observed inviolate and international law is respected, stands aloof from these events, without reacting to them. What is worse, there is a growing opinion that the main thing is to shield and isolate the League of Nations like some blushing damsel, lest the odour of these shocking events should reach it.

At the back of this tender solicitude for the League of Nations is the erroneous opinion that the League of Nations cannot combat aggression, disorder, lawlessness and international piracy because the culprits are absent from the League. It is supposed that the aggressor may be combated

successfully only . . . in collaboration with the aggressor himself. An experiment has already been made in this fruitful collaboration. The Spanish question was withdrawn from the League of Nations and submitted to the specially formed London Committee of so-called non-intervention in order to gain the collaboration of the chief culprits of the Spanish tragedy, who cannot bear the atmosphere of Geneva. This experiment has had its results, and they are known to all. Agreements have been signed and violated immediately, resolutions adopted and disregarded, schemes and plans devised only to be sabotaged and frustrated, all to the accompaniment of door-slamming on the part of certain concertedly capricious members of the Committee who keep leaving it and returning. Of course, the London Committee has not achieved even one of its purposes. While the export of arms to Spain is formally forbidden, the supplying of the mutineers on a State scale with all kinds of arms for actions by land, sea and air has not ceased. In spite of the obligation to forbid foreign citizens to go to Spain and take part in the operations, tens of thousands of men in military formations, whole divisions in full armament led by officers and generals, have been sent to the assistance of the Spanish mutineers in full view of all from the ports of countries which undertook the formal obligations I have mentioned. These are not conjectures, but facts, which are not concealed by the very violators of these obligations, but are mentioned openly in their Press, facts which we know from official orders, from printed lists of wounded and killed, from the exchange of official telegrams. Add to this the fact that foreign warships are cruising round Spain helping the mutineers by scouting, bombarding Spanish ports (the case of Almeria) and even sinking neutral commercial vessels—that is, taking part in a blockade of Republican Spain—and you will understand why non-

intervention in Spanish cannot be spoken of any longer without irony.

Such are the results of the activity of an organisation free from the spirit of Geneva and corresponsive to universality.

I recommend these results to the attention of the apologists of universality. Let them take thought on the cause of these results, and they will see how illusory are the hopes that collaboration can be successful between States which pursue different aims which have contrary conceptions of international life and the mutual rights and duties of nations; the hopes for collaboration between those who sincerely uphold non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States, those who champion the right of every people to decide their internal regime independently of those who no less sincerely and openly uphold intervention in other people's affairs and the imposition of one regime or another on other States with bayonets and bombs. There can be no synthesis between aggression and non-aggression, between peace and war.

On the other hand we have had the experience of two conferences in Montreux and another held quite recently in Nyon, which fulfilled their tasks favourably and swiftly in spite of the absence of universalism—that is, the absence of the States whose enlistment is generally understood here as universalism. The conclusion is self-evident. It is not universalism that matters, but what is required is that participants in any international organisation or conference, however different their national interests, should be united by a common universal idea, such as the idea of peace, the idea of respecting the independence and autonomy of all people, the idea of outlawing force as a weapon of national policy, an idea underlying the League Covenant and the Briand-Kellogg Pact.

We know three States which have dissociated themselves from this idea and have been committing attacks on other

States for the last few years. However diversified the regimes, ideology, the material and cultural level of the objects of the attacks, all three States advance one and the same motive to justify aggression: the struggle against Communism. The rulers of these states naively think or rather, pretend to think, that they have only to pronounce the word “anti-Communism” and all their international wrong-doings and crimes will be forgiven. Although they boast that they have managed to extirpate Communism in their own countries and have become totally immune from it, they declare in a fit of fathomless love for nations near and far that their mission is to deliver these nations from Communism. With ideological combat? Oh, no! With the help of all the air, land and sea forces at their command. In their voluntary mission of philanthropy to all peoples, they are ready to spare no expense of the forces and resources of their own people, they are ready to curtail their elementary needs to a minimum and put them on a hunger ration, just to have enough arms for the purpose of extirpating Communism in other countries. This, of course, is an open ideology of armed intervention in the internal affairs of other people, full of contempt for their autonomy and independence. I ask you what would the world look like if other nations were infected with this ideology and went on the warpath to impose one or another internal regime on each other?

By the way, sometimes the founders of this ideology themselves begin to doubt its cogency and acceptability as a leading international idea. Then they come down from their ideological heights and give us a more prosaic explanation of their anti-Communist slogans. Then we learn—which we will not find in the encyclopaedia—that anti-Communism has also a geological meaning and denotes a craving for tin, zinc, mercury, copper and other minerals. When even this explanation proves inadequate, anti-Communism is interpreted

as a longing for profitable trade. We are told that this trade might be lost if Spain is tarred with the Communist brush. I doubt, of course, that these are the very last, exclusive explanations of anti-Communism. But we know the example of one Communist State, rich in minerals and other raw material, which has not refused to export these minerals and raw material to other countries, to trade with them on a very wide scale whatever the regime ruling in these countries, including even the Fascist and National Socialist regimes. Moreover, these very countries have been only too pleased to get minerals and other raw material from the Communist State, and, far from refusing to trade with it, have striven to augment this trade to the utmost, proposing the most highly favourable terms. So we see that Communism is not a hindrance to international trade with any State, on condition, of course, that the latter observes at least elementary international proprieties, does not indulge in Billingsgate, does not play the hooligan or announce openly that the proceeds will be spent in increasing armaments to attack the country it is trading with.

But no explanation of anti-Communism can apply to Republican Spain for the simple reason that there has been no Communist order there and there is none, and, as far as we know, the Spanish people are fighting to preserve their republican democratic regime against the forces of reaction and a military dictatorship. That is why we cannot help thinking that in future we will have a new or supplementary explanation of anti-Communism, perhaps in the sphere of politics, strategy or something else.

Fascist Barbarians in the Role of Saviours of Civilisation

It must be added that the anti-Communist slogan is being applied on an ever-widening plane. Nowadays, when people

speaking of the Bolshevik regime and the need to destroy it, they often add the words "and such-like regimes." Now, we often hear it said that all democratic parliamentary countries are on the eve of Bolshevisation, This is but a step away from saying that they must be philanthropised and saved from their impending doom by means of armed intervention and attack, as was the case with Spain. We have the example of China, which can scarcely even be put in the category of countries with a parliamentary regime in the strict sense of the term. Nevertheless, the attack against her is also being made under the slogan of "fighting Communism." We also see in Europe itself how countries which by general opinion are earmarked for the next aggression are beforehand declared to be Bolshevised or fallen under Bolshevik influence for the purpose of subsequent justification of the intended aggression. Any country which falls under the longing eyes of aggressive States might be declared suspect of Bolshevism, because no proofs are demanded, and it is enough to repeat the same thing day after day in the unified Press and official speeches, on the assumption that a falsehood might sound true if repeated often enough.

I am sure that everybody with common sense understands the absurdity of the anti-Communist slogan and the aggressive motives behind it. But out of politeness, scarcely appropriate in the present case, they listen to this bosh and read it without saying anything. The danger is that the aggressor might construe this silence as acceptance of the excuses he gives for his aggressive intentions or actions, with all the sad consequences involved to the cause of peace. I think it is time to put an end to this dangerous agitational weapon of aggression, it is high time those who really cherish the interests of peace told the State parrots in high places that nonsense does not cease to be nonsense from daily repetition, that aggression

must be called “aggression,” whatever its ornamental slogan, that, whatever the meaning of anti-Communism, mineralogical, commercial, strategic or anything else camouflaging aggressions, armed interventions, the invasion of other States and the violation of international treaties cannot receive international exoneration. So too is it time to say that they, preachers of rabid misanthropy, dare not fight for the interests of mankind, that they, resurrectors of the most savage, outworn theory of pagan times and the Middle Ages, dare not speak on behalf of modern Europe, that they, who consigned to the flames some of the best works of the human spirit, persecutors of the most brilliant representatives of science, art and literature, and despised for it by the whole cultured world, make themselves ludicrous when they speak of saving civilisation and invoke crusades against other people for this purpose.

The cause of peace would be done an invaluable service by statements to this effect.

The Stand of the U.S.S.R. in the Spanish Question

A few days ago the campaign to justify the aggression in Spain was capped with a new absurdity to the effect that the Soviet Union is intent on the conquest of Spain or, at least, is out to secure political influence over Spain and thereby disturb the equilibrium in the Mediterranean. The truth was spoken here a few days ago by the Spanish Premier, Senor Negrin, who said that, throughout the Spanish conflict, the Soviet Union has requested nothing from Spain, has not tried to get anything and is making no attempt. The Soviet Union has neither mineralogical, economic, nor strategic interests in Spain, nor even interests in the so-called equilibrium. She is interested exclusively in maintaining the right of every people

to decide their internal regime for themselves, without the intervention of foreign States, let alone foreign troops, and in preventing the formation of a new base of operations in Spain for aggression against all Europe. Although from the outset the Soviet Government did not recognise and still does not recognise that the sides in the Spanish conflict are of equal status, it nevertheless subscribed to all the agreements of non-intervention and to the proposal that all non-Spanish elements should be withdrawn from the military operations. In concluding an international agreement, the Soviet Government, naturally, has the right to see to it that it is not deceived in such a manner that the obligations, while being adhered to by some, will in practice not be binding on others.

Strengthen the League of Nations, Heighten its Authority

Gentlemen, there is now no need to speak of the dangers to peace, because peace has already been violated. An undeclared war is being waged on two continents and it is difficult to foresee its echoes and reflections. And now that we are gathered here in the only international organisation for the defence of peace and ask ourselves what can be done to put an end to international insecurity, stop aggression, give effective help to its victims, avert the aggression threatening other countries and make the international atmosphere more wholesome, we hear the reply: Our salvation is universalism. There are States which were never members of the League of Nations, there are other States which were members, but resigned. It is necessary to ask the former and the latter whether they would not like to join us or return to us and upon what conditions and what in their opinion is to be the function of the League. This in the opinion of some delegates is the task of to-day.

We discussed this question at last year's plenary session of the League, and I pointed out even then that there were no opponents of universalism among us on principle. The only questions are: Can it be achieved? At what price? Can it in the present conditions give positive results? And is the League really helpless without it? Not for one minute do we forget or cease to sincerely regret the absence of a Great Power as mighty as the United States of America from the League. We know the American people's profound love of peace, their sincere aversion to war. We know how devoted the present President of the United States and the Secretary of State are to the ideals of the League of Nations. We know what enormous additional strength the League would gain in this State. However, I would consider it discourteous to her to think that she is ready to become a member of the League, but is merely waiting for our solicitation or invitation rather than make the first step herself. A great State aware of her power cannot be influenced by such trivial reasons of prestige. I am sure that if the American Government found it possible to join the League of Nations on any conditions at all it would not wait for our solicitation or invitation, and would find a way to let us know. There can be no other attitude to this question on the part of any other great State cherishing the interests of peace and international collaboration.

The honourable representative of Chile here has given us the names of several South American States—Honduras, Guatemala, Salvador, Nicaragua and Paraguay—which left the League only a year or two ago. We regret their resignation, because we value the collaboration of all countries, large or small. I do not think, however, that even the honourable representative of Chile could think that the return of these few States to the bosom of the League of Nations would be a key to the solution of the problems before us and that the supposed

helplessness of the League is due to their absence. I am inclined to think that when some people speak of universalism they are thinking mainly of those same three Great Powers who used to be members of the League but slammed the door and whose policy have just described to you. On the question how the League can best combat aggression, make secure the independence of all members of the League, we are recommended to ask those States who have openly preached, are preaching and practising, aggression and armed intervention in the affairs of other States and the non-obligatoriness of international treaties. Is not their whole policy an eloquent reply to the proposed question? Do they conceal their disapproval of collective measures of struggle against aggression? Do they not propose to leave every State to its own fate, and recognise mutual assistance only in the case of general aggression? Does not the history of the London Committee of Non-Intervention give us a sufficiently clear idea of how they understand collective obligations and their observance? Finally, we are sufficiently well acquainted with the correspondence and negotiations of the last few years concerning the violation of the Locarno Treaty to know that the inquiry recommended to us as to the possibility of returning to the League and even as to the terms has been sent to them long ago. I do not remember if any answer was given to this inquiry. I do not know if there will be any answer to an eventual inquiry on the League's behalf. But, even so, however it be worded, it will have only the one import: "We shall not return to the League" or "We are ready to return on condition that you do not interfere with our aggressive plans, that the League will repudiate the defence of its members, will recognise the racial hierarchy of peoples, the right of some to domination over others and to impose their own regime on them." Is universalism needed in such conditions? I do not doubt what

the answer of the majority of the members of the League will be to this question.

The question of universalism has arisen in connection with our task of reforming the League. According to the resolution adopted by the Special Plenum, the reform must be effected in the direction of strengthening the League and heightening its effectiveness in combating aggression. In the replies received from the members of the League to the questionnaire, there are enough valuable comments and proposals on the basis of which we may proceed to work immediately and complete it, assuming, of course, there is the goodwill. But if strengthening the League of Nations is not what all its members desire—and there seems to be evidence of this in the proposals to consult the non-members of the League I have described—it will be useless and inexpedient to continue the work begun. Better postpone it till better times, for in its present form the League is still an important element in the potential of peace.

The Task of the League is to Bridle the Aggressors

In any case, the reform of the League requires a lot of time and the present plenum has great urgent problems to solve. We have received a call for help from two members of the League, victims of aggression. This call puts the League to a great test. The League cannot wield any authority whatsoever, cannot maintain its bare existence, if it goes on without end shirking its obligations and registering its own helplessness. I am sure that, even with its present membership, the League of Nations can give Spain as well as China stronger aid than these countries so modestly ask, and in so doing it would lessen, not increase, the chances of new international complications. All we risk is to give rise to discontent, perhaps even tremendous discontent, on the part of the authors of the present

international chaos, and be attacked by their madcap newspapers. I know that many people are highly sensitive to the opinion of these newspapers, which are just as provocative and aggressive in their methods as the governments which give them their orders. But I prefer to do something to spare the lives of the tens and hundreds of thousands of victims of eventual expansion or continuation of the aggression rather than spare the self-esteem of the aggressors.

Gentlemen, what can, what must the League do in the face of aggression? We know the aphorism of an English writer: the best way to get rid of temptation is to yield to it. I know that there are political wiseacres who think that aggression too can be got rid of best by concessions. They reproach the Spanish people for their heroic resistance to the mutinous generals and the States behind them. They think that China, too, would behave wisely if she yielded to the ultimatum of the aggressor without a fight and become his vassal voluntarily. But the League of Nations does not exist for the purpose of giving such advice; neither is the League's existence justified if, while abstaining from such advice it remains passive itself, pleading weakness insufficient universality, the non-participation in its discussions of the authors of aggression, who do not wish to submit to its decisions. This course has already been tried and has led to a situation which all the speakers here have deplored. It has led to some States, members of the League, losing enormous territories with tens of millions population, and others their very existence as States. It may now be considered an axiom that the passivity of the League during the Manchurian conflict had its consequences a few years later in the attack on Abyssinia. The League's insufficient activity in the case of Abyssinia encouraged the Spanish experiment. The League's failure to take any measures in aid of Spain encouraged the new attack on China. Thus, we have had four

cases of aggression in the course of five years. We see how aggression, if unchecked, spreads from one continent to another, assuming greater and greater dimensions each time. On the other hand, I firmly believe that a resolute policy of the League will in one case of aggression would have spared us all the other cases. And then, and only then, all States would see that aggression does not pay, that aggression is not worthwhile. Only as a result of such policy will the ex members of the League knock at our doors, and we shall say to them gladly: "Come in." We shall not ask them about their philosophy, and their domestic regimes, because the League of Nations recognises the peaceful co-existence of any regimes in existence. And then our common ideal of a universal league, preserved as a weapon of peace, will be realised. But we shall reach this ideal, not by circulating questionnaires, but only by giving aggression a collective rebuff, by a collective defence of peace which we all need and the benefits of which we shall all enjoy.

X. FROM A SPEECH AT A MEETING OF THE ELECTORS OF THE PETROGRAD AND VASSILI OSTROV DISTRICTS OF LENINGRAD. November 27th, 1937

OUR policy of peace is embodied in draft schemes for full and partial disarmament presented to the League of Nations in pacts of non-aggression which we have concluded with ten of the eleven states on our borders (the eleventh—Japan—refuses to conclude such a pact), in the definition of aggression presented by us and adopted by eleven states and in our other

proposals of the same order. As we are concerned that peace be maintained not only near our frontiers, but that the security of all peoples be ensured, and as we act on the principle that peace is indivisible, we have agreed to take part in regional pacts of mutual assistance, we have concluded such pacts with France and Czechoslovakia; we have joined the League of Nations to test it as an instrument of peace, we take part in all international conferences and conventions called towards the better organisation of peace and collective security. Unfortunately, not all States, not even all leading States, display the same sincerity, the same consistency, and the same readiness to carry out existing or sometimes even projected measures for the organisation of peace as the Soviet Government. All these States seem to recognise that there is a grave danger emanating from several Fascist and aggressive States, threatening peace and their own interests. They accept on principle the idea of collective security upon which the League of Nations was founded, but they go no further than words and declarations, and words and declarations cut no ice with the aggressor.

You know comrades, that imperialism—that is, the craving to widen frontiers, to seize foreign territories, colonies, and enslave other peoples—is inherent in almost all *bourgeois* States. Some of them, however, at the present historical stage, since the World War, are content with the “acquired” assets and seem to have no designs of new conquests. There are some who have designs but for the time being do not venture to speak out loud and clear on the subject. However, there are three States which, without any embarrassment, publicly, vociferously, day after day, announce their determination to disregard all international laws all international treaties, even those they are signatory to their determination to seize other people's territories wherever they get the chance, and for that

reason reject any collective collaboration in the organisation of peace. They declare this aggressive policy of theirs as plain as can be, even with the utmost cynicism, and not only declare it, but are actually putting it into practice in some places. Nevertheless there are States which do not believe their declarations of aggressiveness and exert all their diplomacy to obtain confirmation and explanation of these perfectly explicit statements. Now and again they buttonhole the aggressors with inquiries like these: "We hear you have declared that you do not recognise international treaties and, what is more, actually violate them, that you do not intend to respect the security and integrity of other States and have actually deprived some people of their security and integrity. You reject collaboration with us and actually refuse to take part in international organisations, conferences and conventions. We want to know if we have understood you rightly and if you think what you say. Be so kind as to confirm this and make it explicit." (*Laughter.*) The receipt of confirmation does not put a stop to further inquiries. Not content with verbal inquiries, sometimes they send the aggressors written questionnaires to fill up: "Confirm that you are aggressors." (*General laughter in the hall.*) When the aggressors throw these questionnaires into the waste-paper basket with contempt, they send official and unofficial emissaries, ministers and other statesmen, along to receive new confirmation and explications. Sometimes replies to these questions are received in an unmistakably insulting form. But then they ask them to confirm the insult and make it explicit. Unfortunately, the aggressors do not confine themselves to sending verbal or written confirmation, but for greater clarity they tread on the corns of all who put their feet near and, little by little, carry out their programme of aggression. And so on the international arena the result is a division of labour where some States take the offensive while

others ask questions and wait for confirmation and explanation. (*Laughter.*)

Take, for example, the events in Spain. Two States—Germany and Italy—have taken advantage of an officers' and generals' revolt in Spain which, by the way, they themselves prepared and organised, and are beginning to send the mutineers open military assistance in men and material. And these other States, whose vital interests are menaced by this unceremonious intervention in the internal affairs of Spain on the part of Italy and Germany, say to the latter: "You, probably, do not want to interfere in Spanish affairs, and so far you have done so inadvertently. We ask for your confirmation (*Laughter*), and in the meantime we shall not intervene and we shall not help the lawful Spanish Government, although we have the full right to do so. Let us sign a paper and form a committee for observation." The paper is signed, the committee observes, but the intervention of Germany and Italy increases every day. On the demand of the Soviet Government, control is established on the frontiers and coasts of Spain, but the control immediately springs a leak and whole divisions and army corps, with proportionate military equipment, penetrate to the Spanish mutineers. The committee observes all this and again demands confirmation from Italy and Germany, addressing them once more: "You, of course, did not wish to send your huge armies to Spain. You probably sent them inadvertently. You do not need them there, and you are ready to recall them. So confirm this, and we are ready to give you some recompense, by making it easier for the mutinous generals under your patronage to blockade the lawful Spanish Government." Germany and Italy send confirmation after confirmation and inadvertently" continue to send new contingents of armed men and war cargoes to Spain. As a result, the internal Spanish conflict, which the Spanish

Government could have settled in a few weeks, grows into a huge armed conflict which has lasted now for more than a year and to which no end is yet in sight and which is assuming an international character. The aggressive countries are gaining new positions for further aggression, and the feeling that international law can be broken with impunity and that the so-called Great Powers are helpless gives rise to new acts of aggression in other parts of the world.

Take another example—the Far East. Japan is flooding China with her troops, occupying one province after another, shelling and bombing Chinese towns—in short, is doing everything that used to be called “war.” She declares authoritatively, loudly and repeatedly, that she intends to continue her offensive until she carries out her aims and China opens negotiations with her, with the object of capitulating, of course. At the same time, she warns us that she will not brook anybody’s mediation. China applies to the League of Nations for protection, referring to the corresponding points in the League Covenant. The League forms a committee, the committee appoints a sub-committee, and the latter elects an editorial committee. A paper is drafted and addressed to Japan: “We do not approve of your offensive. Probably it is based on a misunderstanding. Please come to confirm this, and, lest you feel lonely among us, we are inviting your kindred spirit and friend, Germany.” From Japan comes confirmation that there is no misunderstanding at all, that she is on the warpath quite deliberately and agrees to discuss matters only with China and only on terms of the latter’s surrender. Disarmed by this reply, the League decides to refer the question to the Powers most concerned in Far-Eastern affairs, signatories to the so-called Washington Treaty, which is violated by Japan for the second time (it was violated the first time by the occupation of Manchuria). And so the Brussels Conference is called and the

Soviet Union is also invited, although she is not a signatory to the Washington Treaty. What does this Conference do? Its activity was very neatly hit off in a cartoon which I saw in a foreign newspaper. This shows the honourable delegates of eighteen states, not without great effort and strain, dragging a letter to the post-box for Japan. In this letter, as you know, they again demand Japan's confirmation whether she is deliberately committing her aggression in China and request her to stop and accept mediation. Confirmation is not long in coming. Japan, even with an inflection of resentment, replies that there is no need to bother her; she has repeatedly stated that she is attacking China quite deliberately and for quite definite aims. She does not need anybody's mediation; she is ready to negotiate only with China—about capitulation, of course—and the only thing the Conference can do is to make China agree to this capitulation. This reply disarmed the Brussels Conference, just as the first reply disarmed the League of Nations, and the Conference was closed.

I see it is a puzzle to you how experienced *bourgeois* diplomats could fail to understand the meaning of the aggressor's tactics. You think they are only pretending to disbelieve the aggressor's statements, and, under cover of negotiations for confirmations and explanations, they are groping for a deal with the aggressor. You can think so if you like, but my position does not allow me to express such doubts, and I must leave them to your responsibility. I can speak only about the official position of other States. (*Laughter and applause.*)

Such, comrades, is the picture of recent international diplomacy. I have no need to tell you what part Soviet diplomacy plays. It should be known to you from our Press. In all fit and proper cases and even when the interests of the Soviet Union were quite unaffected, we have expressly

announced our readiness to take part in a collective action to rebuff the aggressor jointly with other great States, and small States too. But there is no collective for the rebuff yet. As far as we are concerned, we believe the statements of the aggressive States. We are inclined to allow that aggression is a fact even when it is not spoken of publicly, but if the aggressor himself shouts it from the house-tops, while granting there may be some element of intimidation and blackmail, we do, for all that, regard such statements as a great threat to peace which needs no confirmation or explanation. Of course, the aggressor will not always exactly indicate the next target of aggression. He will mention many sectors, to make it difficult to adopt proper measures at the sector most endangered. Sometimes, for the purpose of disorientation when he is getting ready to attack one sector, he diverts attention to a totally different one, and even descends to such naive tricks as announcing that certain States have united their land, sea and air forces to peacefully shoot down the ideas of the Communist International. However, the whole truth is that the eyes of some aggressive countries, as the saying goes, are bigger than their bellies, and that in war preparations alone and the adventures already begun, they have so exhausted their economic resources, they have become so weak internally, that they cannot venture on a long serious war and in their further aggression they will have to look for a line of least resistance. We know, and they know, that they will not find this line of least resistance on our frontiers. (*Applause.*) They know that the defensive capacity of the Soviet Union does not depend on international combinations, but is grounded on the unfailing, growing power of the Red Army, Red Navy and Red Air Force. They know that our leader, Comrade Stalin, in his numerous cares for the proper functioning of the whole State machine, devotes most attention to questions of defence, to the questions of defending

every foot of our ground, which no one must or can take from us. (*Applause.*)

Comrades, the preparation of war begins in peace-time. It consists, among other things, in the formation of a web of espionage on foreign territory and numerous agencies to carry out all kinds of instructions—in short, what is now commonly called the “fifth column.” You read a few days ago that about 1,000 spies were arrested recently in Czechoslovakia and that a serious conspiracy has been hatched against the French Republic. Our likely enemies should know by now that they will not find the line of least resistance on Soviet territory in this respect either. They know that the creation of ammunition dumps, fortifications, dugouts and the organisation of internal squads to man those enterprises and use them might be possible in some places, but certainly not in the Soviet Union. They know that our People’s Commissariat of Internal Affairs is very unwilling to let such plans come to fruition and that it is vigilant and strong enough to destroy the Trotsky-Fascist organisations of spies and wreckers in embryo. (*Applause.*)

XI. SPEECH TO THE “COMMITTEE OF TWENTY-EIGHT”.¹ February 1st, 1938

IN connection with the reform of the Covenant, a great number of proposals have come in from members of the League concerning almost all the articles in the Covenant. It is not surprising nor fortuitous that the discussion begins and revolves exclusively around Article XVI because it is indeed the League’s most Vital nerve. By carelessly injuring this nerve, the whole organism might be paralysed.

What the Opponents of the Covenant are Guided by

I have heard and read with great attention the arguments of those who are in favour of completely abolishing Article XVI, or toning it down or making it a kind of will-o’—the—wisp

¹ The “Committee of Twenty-Eight” was formed under the auspices of the League of Nations. Its purpose is to put the League Covenant into practice.

which would disappear and reappear at will. The most consistent opponents of Article XVI are those who hold that international intervention is not necessary at all to protect the security of a member of the League, to avert or terminate aggression: those who would like to change the League into a universal committee of non-intervention, leaving the aggressor a free hand in all cases; they would like to regard the League as something between an academy of diplomacy and a philanthropic society—in short, an organisation having nothing in common with the defence of peace, and imposing no obligations on its members. Although they are members of the organisation, they say they do not wish to undertake any obligations that are not borne by non-members of this organisation. The absence of obligations naturally obliterates all distinction between members and non-members of the society. It is useless to argue with them about the rules of the society, if they deny the very necessity of the society. It is also useless to wrangle over the meaning of Article XVI with people who have already come to the conclusion that collective security does not exist; that it is impossible; that it is a case of every man for himself and God for all. Geneva is not the only holy place to offer up prayers to God.

We have heard here opponents of Article XVI of the Covenant, who say: We are against Article XVI altogether, but however you decide the question, we have followed the dictates of our own interests and have decided to release ourselves from it as far as we are concerned, because we want to be absolutely neutral. Such a case is worth a special discussion also in another place. All that is not clear to me is whether they are thinking of unilateral or bilateral neutrality. In other words, must their neutrality be protected by the League or must the League remain neutral in case their neutrality is violated?

Further, I should like to know if, after releasing themselves from all part in any obligations arising from Article XVI, they refuse to take part in the discussion and vote on questions connected with the application of this article?

The League of Nations is Strong Enough to Bridle the Aggressor

However, I am most interested by the arguments of those reformers of the Covenant, who admit, and have told us here, that peace cannot be secured only by promises, by pacts of non-aggression or by arbitration, and that without measures of compulsion the League of Nations cannot maintain its internal cohesion or have any influence on international politics. They object to Article XVI, not in principle, but only because in some cases it has not functioned adequately enough, and in other cases has not functioned at all. It has been properly pointed out here that a case of law-breaking does not by any means prove that the law should be abolished. In addition to this, I should like to remind you that, if sanctions unfortunately were not applied at all in some cases, in others incompletely applied or unfortunately discontinued, this was done with the consent of the majority of the members of the League, and in every case we were referred to those same “realities” for which we are now expected to completely abolish the obligatory nature of Article XVI. It would be more logical, I think to combat constant references to realities and special circumstances, by insisting that the mechanism of Article XVI be brought into play in all cases of aggression. Reference to realities is made because there are doubts about the success of sanctions, but if Article XVI is fully operated by the great majority of the League members, if not by all, the success of sanctions is assured. There are no States nor any bloc of States

that could defy the united forces of the members of the League even in its present composition.

Article XVI is a Warning to the Aggressor

It should not be forgotten that the purpose of Article XVI is not only to arrest inchoate aggression, but, what is more important, to serve as a warning to the aggressor, deterring him from aggression. Of course, the non-application of Article XVI in certain cases has weakened the League in this respect, but still, while it keeps its present character or remains automatic, the aggressive countries cannot ignore it. Indeed, they reckon with it.

This is the only explanation of the stubborn struggle which the aggressive countries and their secret allies alike are waging against the League in general and against Article XVI in particular. Consequently, this Article has value, and to throw it out would be irrational. A limited company with stock hard to realise at any particular moment does not destroy this stock, but counts it an asset as before. Article XVI, with its intrinsic possibilities, is the League's most valuable asset and is a potential of peace.

Let us suppose that, by following the proposals tendered here, we made Article XVI optional, active only from case to case. It would immediately lose its formidable character in the eyes of the aggressor, who in each particular case would calculate on intimidating the weaker members of the League to deter them from voting for sanctions. We saw how such intimidation was employed against certain States, even though Article XVI is automatic, in spite of the fact that every member of the League could point out to the aggressor that she was using sanctions, not out of hostility to him, not because she was on bad terms with him, but exclusively on the strength of her

duty, on the strength of a covenanted obligation. The situation of the members of the League will be much worse when they cannot plead this duty, when they will have a free choice of voting for the application of sanctions or against them. It will be much easier to intimidate them then. The aggressor will use bribery as well as intimidatory measures, and a situation might arise where League votes for or against sanctions will become the object of barter between the aggressor and various countries. We have only to visualise this possibility for one moment to understand to what risk of demoralisation and corruption the League of Nations will be exposed then.

For the Organisation of Collective Security

The talk of abolishing or toning down Article XVI has, of course, been engendered by an ebb of confidence in collective security and international solidarity and by fear of rampant aggression. This rampant aggression, I think, must act partly in another direction, too. It is beginning to remind of threatening dangers States which a few years ago could have been considered quite sequestered and secured against them. Rampant aggression spreading over all continents is confronting all States, large and small, with this danger. Political and military autarchy, with all its burdensome increase in home armaments, is not the only or, in any case, is not the most reliable, method of safeguarding individual security. The collective character of the committed aggression must inevitably impel the States towards collective security. Collective security is Article XVI, and we must preserve it, and, when it is possible, make it stronger.

XII. STATEMENT TO PRESS CORRESPONDENTS. March 17th, 1938

ON March 17th, at the request of certain foreign journalists, Comrade M. M. Litvinov, People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs, received representatives of the foreign Press in Moscow, as well as representatives of the Soviet Press, and stated the Soviet Government's point of view concerning the international situation which had arisen as the result of new acts of aggression in Europe.

In his introductory remarks, Comrade Litvinov said that he did not propose to tell the Press representatives anything new or sensational, because the foreign policy of the Soviet Government was well known and immutable and that the Soviet Government had no grounds to revise its policy of peace, which enjoyed the support of the whole Soviet people. "But it is just now, in our time," added Comrade Litvinov, "that confirmation of firmness and constancy in policy constitutes a sensation in European conditions, inasmuch as frequent wave rings, drastic changes and inconsistencies are to be observed in the policies of some governments."

Then Comrade Litvinov proceeded to state the standpoint of the U.S.S.R.

"After joining the League of Nations for the purpose of organised collaboration with other peaceable States, the Soviet Government did not neglect a single suitable opportunity for recommending the most effective guarantees of peace such as it saw in organising a system of collective security within the League of Nations, and also regional pacts of mutual assistance against aggressors. The Soviet Government took practical steps in this direction by concluding such a pact with France and

Czechoslovakia, a pact which threatens no State if there be no aggression.

“The violations of international obligations in the League Covenant and of the pact signed in Paris by Briand and Kellogg which have taken place in the last four years, the attacks of some States on others, entitled the Soviet Government to display, not only its disapproval of these international crimes, but also its readiness to take an active part in all measures designed to organise a collective rebuff to the aggressor, even regardless of the inevitable injury to its relations with the aggressor. At the same time, the Soviet Government gave warning that international passivity and the impunity of aggression in one case would fatally lead to the repetition and multiplication of such cases. Unfortunately, the events of international life confirm the correctness of these warnings. They have been reconfirmed by the military invasion of Austria and the forcible deprivation of the Austrian people of their political, economic and cultural independence.

“While previous cases of aggression took place in continents more or less remote from Europe or on the outskirts of Europe, where the interests of only a few of the nearest countries were affected along with the interests of the victim of aggression, the outrage on this occasion has been committed in the centre of Europe and has created an undoubted danger, not only to the eleven countries now bordering the aggressor, but for all European States, and not only European. So far this has created a danger to territorial integrity or, in any case, the political, economic and cultural independence of small nations, the inevitable enslavement of which, however, will create prerequisites for pressure and even attack on big States.

“First and foremost arises the threat to Czechoslovakia and then, as aggression is infectious, the danger promises to grow into new international conflicts and is already having its effect

In the alarming situation which has been created on the Polish-Lithuanian border.

“The present international situation puts before all peaceable States, and big States in particular, the question of their responsibility for the subsequent destinies of the peoples of Europe, and not only of Europe. The Soviet Government is aware of its share in this responsibility; it is aware of the obligations incumbent upon it under the League Covenant, the Briand-Kellogg Pact and the treaties of mutual assistance it has concluded with France and Czechoslovakia, and I can say on behalf of the Government that, on its part, it is ready as before to join in collective actions which, decided jointly with it, would have the purpose of arresting the further development of aggression and removing the accentuated danger of a new world shambles. It agrees to proceed immediately to discuss practical measures, dictated by the circumstances, with other Powers in the League of Nations or outside it. To-morrow might be too late, but to-day there is time yet, if all States, particularly great States, take up a firm unambiguous standpoint on the problem of the collective salvation of peace.”

In reply to questions from the Press representatives, Comrade Litvinov informed them that the ambassadors of the U.S.S.R. had been instructed to acquaint foreign governments with the point of view of the Government of the U.S.S.R. as stated in Comrade Litvinov's pronouncement above.

XIII. SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING OF THE NINETEENTH ORDINARY SESSION OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS. September 21st, 1938

THE subject before us is the annual report of the Secretary-General on the League's work during the past twelve months. Quite naturally and rightly, however, the speakers so far have dealt, not with what the League has done during this year, but with what it has not done this year or in previous years. Evidently everyone recognises that the League of Nations was not set up for the activity recounted in the report presented by the League's Secretary-General. It must not be forgotten that the League was created as a reaction to the world war and its countless horrors; that its object was to make that the last war, to safeguard all nations against aggression, and to replace the system of military alliances by the collective organisation of assistance to the victim of aggression. In this sphere the League has done nothing. Two States—Ethiopia and Austria—have lost their independent existence in consequence of violent aggression. A third State, China, is now a victim of aggression and foreign invasion for the second time in seven years, and a fourth State, Spain, is in the third year of a sanguinary war, owing to the armed intervention of two aggressors in its internal affairs. The League of Nations has not carried out its obligations to these States.

At the present time, a fifth State, Czechoslovakia, is suffering interference in its internal affairs at the hands of a neighbouring State, and is publicly and loudly menaced with attack. One of the oldest, most cultured, most hardworking of

European peoples, which acquired its independence as a State after centuries of oppression, to-day or to-morrow may decide to take up arms in defence of that independence. I am sure that the sympathies, if not of all Governments, then at any rate of all peoples represented at the Assembly, go out to the Czechoslovak people in this its terrible hour of trial; that we all remember the most active part played by Czechoslovakia and its present President, M. Benes, in the organisation and development of the League of Nations; and that all our thoughts are so occupied with the events in Czechoslovakia and around it that we delegates find it difficult to give the necessary attention to the Assembly's agenda—in which Czechoslovakia is not mentioned. There is nothing surprising, therefore, in the fact that the general discussion has centred on what the League of Nations ought to have done, but did not do.

Unfortunately, our discussion has not been limited to the recording and explanation of the League's blunders and mistakes, but has included attempts retrospectively to justify them, and even to legalise them for the future. Various arguments have been used, among them the most favoured being a reference to the absence of universality. The shallowness of this argument has been pointed out more than once. The League of Nations was not any more universal during the first twelve years of its existence than it is to-day. From the outset it lacked three of the largest Powers and a multitude of smaller States. Furthermore some States left it; others joined it; and up to the time of the first case of aggression it never crossed anyone's mind—or, at all events, no one expressed such views in the League—that the League could not fulfil its principal functions, and that therefore its Constitution should be altered and those functions, the functions of guardianship of peace, withdrawn.

No one has yet proved, and no one can prove, that the

League of Nations refused to apply sanctions to the aggressor in this case or in that because States were absent from its ranks, and that this was the reason why sanctions, applied in one case, were prematurely brought to an end. Even composed as it is today, the League of Nations is still strong enough by its collective action to avert or arrest aggression. All that is necessary is that the obligatory character of such actions be confirmed, and that the machinery of the League of Nations be at least once brought into action in conformity with the Covenant. This requires only the goodwill of the States Members, for there are no objective reasons of such a character as to prevent the normal functioning of the League: at any rate, no such reasons as could not be foreseen by the founders of the League and by those States which later joined it.

If the complaints of lack of universality be carefully examined, they will be found to reveal considerations of quite a different nature. When the League was being set up, or when it was receiving new accessions, no one seriously anticipated that any State would defy Articles X and XVI of the Covenant and undertake aggression, and that there would arise the necessity of applying those articles in practice, thereby disturbing one's own tranquillity as a State, and sacrificing one's immediate interests.

Now that aggression has become a reality, it is apparently necessary to eliminate collective methods of combating aggression in order to avert it from oneself. A fire-brigade was set up in the innocent hope that, by some lucky chance, there would be no fires. Things turned out differently, however. Fires have broken out in defiance of our hopes, but luckily not in our immediate vicinity: so let us dissolve the fire-brigade—of course not forever, but merely temporarily. Directly the danger of any fire disappears, we shall reassemble the fire-brigade without a moment's delay.

Careful study of the case presented by the opponents of sanctions will reveal yet another argument. Aggression has raised its head too high; its forces have been multiplied and are growing daily. The exponents of aggression to-day are several, and fairly powerful: moreover, they have joined forces in mutual defence (true, so far principally with the help of printing ink and radio). These facts cannot be contested. The aggressor States have grown immensely during the last three years. They have formed a *bloc* in order to defend the principle of aggression. For the triumph of that principle they defend and justify one another, even when one of them is infringing the vital interests of another. There are cases, too, of their joint aggression.

But the responsibility for this regrettable fact lies with those States which restrained the League from resistance to the aggressors when they were still weak and divided, and were still making only their first timid attempts to break the peace. They have grown stronger thanks to the fact that these attempts were allowed to reach a successful conclusion; thanks to the tolerance, and indeed impunity, of one breach of international treaties after another, and of the propaganda of aggression; thanks to the policy of concessions, fruitless negotiations and backstairs intrigues with them. They are still weaker, even yet, than the possible bloc of peaceable States. But the policy of non-resistance to evil and of humouring the aggressors, which we are being recommended to adopt by the opponents of sanctions, will have no other end than the further strengthening and expansion of the forces of aggression, the further extension of the scope of their activities. Then the moment may really arrive at which they have grown so strong that the League of Nations—or what remains of the League of Nations—will be unable to deal with them, even should it desire.

We have heard here the naive suggestion that we should

renounce sanctions and instead take up afresh the study of the question of disarmament. Is it not clear that the less the hopes of collective action, the more attention every State will be forced to give to strengthening its own armaments? Is it not clear that, as the aggressor States will not lag behind, the unrestrained armaments race now going on will reach quite Homeric dimensions, and that one of the reasons of this will have been the abandonment of sanctions? But success in this armaments race is open only to the Great Powers, while the smaller States will have nothing left but to prepare for suicide, chloroforming themselves as a preliminary with the new narcotic-neutrality.

There are inside and outside the League two tendencies, two conceptions of how best to preserve peace. There exists an opinion that when some State announces a foreign policy based on aggression, on the violation of other people's frontiers, on the violent annexation of other people's possessions, on the enslavement of other nations, on domination over entire continents, the League of Nations has not only the right, but also the duty of declaring, loudly and clearly, that it has been set up to preserve universal peace; that it will not permit the realisation of such a programme; and that it will fight that programme by every means at its disposal. Within the framework of such declarations, individual Members of the League can and must constitute special groups for the joint defence of individual sectors of the threatened peace front.

It is presumed that States which openly denounce the principles underlying the League Covenant and the Briand-Kellogg Pact, which extol aggression and ridicule international obligations, are inaccessible to persuasion or argument—save the argument of force—and that there is no room for bargaining or compromise with them. They can be restrained from carrying their evil designs into effect only by a

demonstration of the force which they will encounter, should they make the attempt.

Naturally, at the least attempt to carry out aggression in practice, there should be brought into play in appropriate measure, and according to the capacities of each Member of the League, the collective action provided by Article XVI of the Covenant. In other words, the aggressor should be met with the programme laid down by the League Covenant, resolutely, consistently and without hesitation. Then the aggressor himself will not be led into temptation and peace will be preserved by peaceful means.

There is, however, another conception, which recommends as the height of human wisdom under cover of imaginary pacifism that the aggressor be treated with consideration, and his vanity be not wounded. It recommends that conversations and negotiations be carried on with him that he be assured that no collective action will be undertaken against him, and no groups or *blocs* formed against him—even though he himself enters into aggressive *blocs* with other aggressors—that compromise agreements be concluded with him, and breaches of those very agreements overlooked; that his demands, even the most illegal, be fulfilled; that journeys be undertaken, if necessary, to receive his dictates and ultimatums; that the vital interests of one State or another be sacrificed to him and that if possible, no question of his activity be raised at the League of Nations—because the aggressor does not like that, takes offence, sulks. Unfortunately, this is just the policy that so far has been pursued towards the aggressors; and it has had as its consequence three wars, and threatens to bring down on us a fourth. Four nations have already been sacrificed, and a fifth is next on the list.

In view of such lamentable results of this policy, we had the right to expect that there would be recognition of its

mistaken character, and of the necessity of replacing it by some other policy. Instead we have heard proposals here to make the old policy permanent. Hitherto the aggressor reckoned with the possible reaction of the League of Nations, and showed a certain hesitation in preparing his aggression, carrying it out gradually and in proportion to his growing certainty that there would be no reaction at all. But now we are asked to reassure him beforehand that he need fear nothing at the hands of the League, and that the League henceforward will not apply to him either military or even economic and financial sanctions. At the very worst, he is threatened with moral condemnation, and that, in all probability, clothed in appropriately courteous diplomatic forms.

I have already had the occasion to point out in another place that Articles X and XVI, with the latent threat of international sanctions contained in the latter, constitute a powerful potential of peace. It is now suggested that we destroy that potential. Hitherto, in spite of the paralysis of the League, in spite of its non-fulfilment of its obligations in many cases, the aggressor still might fear that a moment would come when the League would nevertheless do its duty and rap him over the knuckles. He therefore carried on a tireless campaign against Article XVI through his friends, inside and outside the League. But henceforth he need not worry: he need fear no obstacles, at all events so far as Geneva is concerned.

If anyone should wish to realise the importance for the aggressive countries of the proposed nullification of Article XVI, let him study the comments of the Press of those countries on the speeches made at the Assembly on the subject, and the praise lavished on the speakers. Furthermore, we know that certain small countries have been subjected to direct pressure by one aggressive State, which by threats and promises was endeavouring to persuade them to join the

movement for the abolition of Article XVI.

I shall probably hear the reply that no one has any designs on Article XVI, or even on sanctions, and that all that is proposed is to eliminate their obligatory and automatic character. I hope my colleagues will forgive me if I tell them that such a reply can be intended only for very naive people.

Is it not obvious that the whole value of Article XVI lies in its obligatory character, that is, in the objective character of sanctions, which enables every Member of the League to rely on universal aid if it is attacked? But if such aid is to depend on a separate decision in each individual case, if assistance is to be granted to some States and not to others, there can be no question of a feeling of security. And who will agree to make sacrifices and to grant altruistic aid to another State, if the latter declares beforehand that it is under no obligation of reciprocity? Will anyone pay premiums to an insurance company if he is not guaranteed the automatic payment of benefit in cases provided beforehand, and if that payment depends on the quite arbitrary decision of the management of the company?

Yet we are flatly told that every Member of the League is to judge for itself whether its participation in sanctions coincides with its interests. But to grant aid to another State in one's own interests requires no League of Nations. It was the practice long before the League existed: Did not twenty-five States combat the Central Empires during the world war because their interests coincided? Did not pre-war *blocs* and alliances serve the same end of the joint defence of their common interests by groups of States? But we were told that the League of Nations was to put an end to the system of private alliances and agreements, and to replace them by the principles of collective security, based on the common interest of all peoples in the maintenance of peace!

We are also put off with assurances that the measures proposed will be of a purely temporary character, and that in some indeterminate future it will be possible once again to return to the obligatory and automatic character of sanctions. No indication is given, however, of what conditions will be necessary for such a change.

If the reason for the *modus Vivendi* now proposed is the absence of universality, why must we think that a League of Nations completely withered away as to its contents and retaining a mere shell outside will present any attraction to new Members, or that those States which remained outside the League on account of the compulsory character of sanctions will enter it in order to restore that compulsory character once it has been abolished? If, on the other hand, the obligatory application of sanctions is considered impossible because aggressions have appeared on the political horizon, what grounds have we for believing that that phenomenon will disappear? If it does disappear, there will be no need of sanctions.

Are we, perhaps, being told that the present masters of world destiny cannot yet rise to the heights of international solidarity, but that in the future they themselves, or their successors, will reach that elevated level? We know, however that those heights were already reached by the founders and first leaders of the League of Nations, and that the people who have replaced them are calling us back to a revision of the original intentions of those who founded the League. Here too, consequently, it is rather a case of retrogression. I fear we must draw the conclusion that it is not a question of a moratorium for the League, but of a radical change in its character.

The bitter taste of the remedy we are offered seems to be realised by the doctors themselves, since they propose to dilute it with syrup, in the shape of the suggestion that the unanimity

rule be abolished in respect of the first paragraph of Article XI, dealing with what the League must do in the event of war or threat of war. Such a suggestion might have been welcomed if Article XVI were maintained, with its list of practical measures which the League can take. But when we are asked to nullify Article XVI, the aggressor will not be frightened of Article XI, which makes it possible only morally to condemn him.

One of those who spoke here against Article XVI had the courage to tell us that his statement applied to Article X as well. That position seems to me to be entirely logical. After all if we are to renounce collective measures for combating aggressors, Article X, which speaks of the undertaking "to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League," remains an empty declaration, deprived of all practical significance.

The supporters of what amounts to the abolition of Article XVI, in their speeches from this tribune, assured us of their loyalty and devotion to League principles. I may be permitted to ask: if the principles of collective security and joint struggle against attacks on the territorial integrity and political independence of League Members are eliminated from the League, to what other principles of the League are they pledging their loyalty? Is it, possibly, to League decisions regarding the drug traffic, assistance to refugees, establishment of an international system of signalling at level-crossings, or to the results of the statistical and other researches of our various commissions? But what have all these questions, important as they are in themselves, in common with the maintenance of peace, with that main object for which the League was set up? Could they not be considered by some organisation with a more modest and less pretentious title? Is it for this that the taxpayers of various countries have to spend vast sums, totalling

thirty million francs a year? If we are to be realists, and to declare the idea of the League of Nations to be a “great illusion,” then there is no need to create new illusions—the more so because they will deceive nobody.

I am not saying this at all in order to try to convince those Governments and statesmen who have adopted decisions reflected in some of the speeches we have heard here. The mistakenness and harmfulness of those decisions for the whole of humanity, and first and foremost for those States which have attempted to defend them, will be shown by history.

At a moment when the mines are being laid to blow up the organisation on which were fixed the great hopes of our generation, and which stamped a definite character on the international relations of our epoch; at a moment when, by no accidental coincidence, decisions are being taken outside the League which recall to us the international transactions of pre-war days, and which are bound to overturn all present conceptions of international morality and treaty obligations; at a moment when there is being drawn up a further list of sacrifices to the god of aggression, and a line is being drawn under the annals of all post-war international history, with the sole conclusion that nothing succeeds like aggression—at such a moment, every State must define its role and its responsibility before its contemporaries and before history. That is why I must plainly declare here that the Soviet Government bears no responsibility whatsoever for the events now taking place, and for the fatal consequences which may inexorably ensue.

After long doubts and hesitations, the Soviet Union joined the League in order to add the strength of a people of a hundred and seventy millions to the forces of peace. In the present hour of bitter disillusionment, the Soviet Union is far from regretting this decision, if only because there would undoubtedly have otherwise been attempts to attribute the alleged impotence and

collapse of the League to its absence.

Having entered the League, the Soviet Union has been unflinchingly loyal to the League obligations which it undertook, and has faithfully carried out, and expressed its readiness to perform, all the decisions and even recommendations of the League which were directed to preserving peace and combating the aggressors, irrespective of whether those decisions coincided with its immediate interests as a State.

Such was its attitude during the attack on Ethiopia. The Soviet delegation invariably insisted that the League should do its duty to Spain, and it is not the fault of the Soviet Union that the Spanish problem was withdrawn from the League of Nations and transferred to the so-called London Non-Intervention Committee, which, as we now all know, considers its object to be to avoid intervening in the intervention of the aggressive countries in Spanish affairs. The activity of the Soviet Government in relation to the Spanish events, both in the London Committee and outside it, has been permeated with the spirit of League of Nations principles and the established standards of international law. The same can be said likewise of the Chinese question. The Soviet delegation always insisted that the League of Nations should afford the maximum support to the victim of Japanese aggression, and those modest recommendations which the League of Nations adopted are being fulfilled more than loyally by the Soviet Government.

Such an event as the disappearance of Austria passed unnoticed by the League of Nations. Realising the significance of this event for the fate of the whole of Europe, and particularly of Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Government, immediately after the Anschluss, officially approached the other European Great Powers with a proposal for an immediate collective deliberation on the possible consequences of that event, in order to adopt collective preventive measures. To our

regret, this proposal, which, if carried out, could have saved us from the alarm which all the world now feels for the fate of Czechoslovakia, did not receive its just appreciation.

Bound to Czechoslovakia by a pact of mutual assistance, the Soviet Union abstained from any intervention in the negotiations of the Czechoslovak Government with the Sudeten Germans, considering this to be the internal business of the Czechoslovak State. We abstained from all advice to the Czechoslovak Government, considering quite inadmissible that it should be asked to make concessions to the Germans, to the detriment of its interests as a State, in order that we should be set free from the necessity of fulfilling our obligations under the treaty bearing our signature. Neither did we offer any advice in the contrary direction. We valued very highly the tact of the Czechoslovak Government, which did not even enquire of us whether we should fulfil our obligations under the pact, since obviously it had no doubt of this, and had no grounds for doubt. When, a few days before I left for Geneva, the French Government for the first time enquired as to our attitude in the event of an attack on Czechoslovakia, I gave in the name of my Government the following perfectly clear and unambiguous reply.

We intend to fulfil our obligations under the pact and, together with France, to afford assistance to Czechoslovakia by the ways open to us. Our War Department is ready immediately to participate in a conference with representatives of the French and Czechoslovak War Departments, in order to discuss the measures appropriate to the moment. Independently of this, we should consider desirable that the question be raised at the League of Nations if only as yet under Article XI, with the object, first, of mobilising public opinion and, secondly, of ascertaining the position of certain other States, whose passive aid might be extremely valuable. It was necessary, however, to

exhaust all means of averting an armed conflict, and we considered one such method to be an immediate consultation between the Great Powers of Europe and other interested States, in order if possible to decide on the terms of a collective *demarche*.

This is how our reply was framed. It was only two days ago that the Czechoslovak Government addressed a formal enquiry to my Government as to whether the Soviet Union is prepared, in accordance with the Soviet-Czech pact, to render Czechoslovakia immediate and effective aid if France, loyal to her obligations, will render similar assistance, to which my Government gave a clear answer in the affirmative.

I believe it will be admitted that both were replies of a loyal signatory of an international agreement and of a faithful servant of the League. It is not our fault if no effect was given to our proposals, which, I am convinced, could have produced the desired results, both in the interests of Czechoslovakia, and in those of all Europe and of general peace. Unfortunately, other steps were taken, which have led, and which could not but lead, to such a capitulation as is bound sooner or later to have quite incalculable and disastrous consequences.

To avoid a problematic war to-day and receive in return a certain and large-scale war to-morrow—moreover, at the price of assuaging the appetites of insatiable aggressors and of the destruction or mutilation of sovereign States—is not to act in the spirit of the Covenant of the League of Nations. To grant bonuses for sabre-rattling and recourse to arms for the solution of international problems—in other words, to reward and encourage aggressive super-imperialism—is not to act in the spirit of the Briand-Kellogg Pact.

The Soviet Government takes pride in the fact that it has no part in such a policy, and has invariably pursued the principles of the two pacts I have mentioned, which were approved by

nearly every nation in the world. Nor has it any intention of abandoning them for the future, being convinced that in present conditions it is impossible otherwise to safeguard a genuine peace and genuine international justice. It calls upon other Governments likewise to return to this path.

**PART TWO—TEXTS OF TREATIES AND
THE COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF
NATIONS**

I. TREATY BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND TURKEY¹

THE Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the Turkish Republic, recognising that it is in the interest of the two Contracting Parties to define the exact conditions which would contribute to the strengthening of the durable normal relations and sincere friendship which unite them, have appointed for that purpose

[Here follow the names of the plenipotentiaries.]

who have agreed on the following provisions:

Article 1

In the case of military action being taken against either Contracting Party by one or more other Powers, the other Contracting Party undertakes to maintain neutrality towards the first Contracting Party.

NOTE— The expression “military action” shall not be held to include military manoeuvres, since they do not cause any prejudice to the other Party.

Article 2

Each Contracting Party undertakes to abstain from any aggression against the other; it likewise undertakes not to participate in any alliance or agreement of a political character

¹ The validity of the Treaty was prolonged till November 7th, 1945, on November 7th, 1935.

with one or more other Powers directed against the other Contracting Party, or in any alliance or agreement with one or more other Powers directed against the military or naval security of the other Contracting Party. Furthermore, each of the two Contracting Parties undertakes not to participate in any hostile act by one or more other Powers directed against the other Contracting Party.

Article 3

The present Treaty shall come into force as soon as it is ratified and shall remain in force for three years. After that period the Treaty shall be regarded as extended automatically for a period of one year, unless one of the Contracting Parties notifies its desire to terminate the Treaty six months before its expiry.

Done at Paris on the 17th day of December, 1925.

[Here follow the signatures.]

II. TREATY BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND LITHUANIA¹

THE Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the one side and the President of the Lithuanian Republic on the other side, persuaded that the interests of the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Lithuania demand permanent co-operation founded on confidence and with a view to assisting, as far as in them lies, the maintenance of universal peace, have agreed to conclude a treaty for the development of the friendly relations existing between them, and with this object have appointed as their plenipotentiaries

[Here follow the names.]

who, having met in Moscow and examined their full powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon the following provisions:

Article 1

The peace treaty between Russia and Lithuania concluded in Moscow on July 12th, 1920, all the provisions of which preserve their full force and integrity, remains the basis of relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Lithuanian Republic.

Article 2

¹ The validity of the Treaty was prolonged till December 31st, 1945, on April 4th, 1934.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Lithuanian Republic mutually undertake to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other.

Article 3

Each of the two contracting parties undertakes to refrain from any aggressive action whatsoever against the other party.

In the event of one of the contracting parties, notwithstanding its peaceable conduct, being subjected to an attack on the part of one or several third Powers, the other contracting party undertakes not to afford support to the said third Power or Powers against the contracting party attacked.

Article 4

If the political agreement directed against one of the contracting parties is concluded between third Powers, or if, on the occasion of a conflict of the nature, mentioned in Article 3, paragraph 2, or when neither of the contracting parties is engaged in warlike operations, a coalition is formed between third Powers with a view to the subjection of one of the contracting parties to an economic or financial boycott, the other contracting party shall not adhere to such agreement or coalition.

Article 5

In the event of a conflict arising between them, the contracting parties, should it prove impossible to settle the conflict by diplomatic means, agree to appoint conciliation

commissions.

The composition of the said commissions, their rights and the procedure which they will follow will be defined by a separate agreement to be concluded.

Article 6

The present treaty is subject to ratification, which shall take place within 6 weeks of the date of its signature.

The exchange of ratifications shall take place in the town of Kaunas.

The treaty is drawn up in the Russian and Lithuanian languages.

For its interpretation both texts shall be regarded as authentic.

Article 7

The present treaty shall enter into force on the date of the exchange of ratifications and shall remain in force for 5 years, with the exception of articles 1 and 2, whose period of validity is not limited.

The validity of the present treaty shall be prolonged automatically, on each occasion for one year, unless one of the contracting parties, at least 6 months before the date of expiration of the treaty, expresses a desire to open negotiations regarding the future form of political relations between the two States.

In witness whereof the plenipotentiaries have affixed their autograph signatures and their seals to the present treaty.

The original has been drawn up and signed in duplicate at Moscow on September 28th, 1926.

[Here follow the signatures.]

III. TREATY OF GUARANTEE AND NEUTRALITY BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND IRAN (PERSIA)

THE Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and His Majesty the Shah of Persia, recognising that it is in the interests of the two Contracting Parties to define the exact conditions which would contribute to the strengthening of the durable normal relations and sincere friendship which unite them, have appointed for that purpose as their plenipotentiaries

[Here follow the names of the plenipotentiaries.]

who, having presented their full powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon the following provisions:

Article 1

The Treaty of February 26th, 1921, all the articles and all the provisions of which preserve their force and the effect of which shall apply to the whole territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, remains the basis of relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Persia.

Article 2

Each of the Contracting Parties undertakes to refrain from any aggression and any aggressive action against the other Party and not to introduce their military forces into the territory

of the other Party.

In the event of one of the Contracting Parties being the object of aggression on the part of one or more third Powers the other Contracting Party undertakes to maintain neutrality throughout the duration of the conflict, the Party attacked, having no right, on its part, to violate this neutrality, notwithstanding the strategical, tactical or political considerations or advantages which can result from it.

Article 3

Each of the Contracting Parties undertakes not to participate, actually or formally, in any political alliance or treaty directed against the security of the territory or waters of the other Contracting Party or against its integrity, independence or sovereignty.

Furthermore, each of the Contracting Parties shall refuse to participate in economic boycott or blockade organised by third Powers against one of the Contracting Parties.

Article 4

Taking into consideration the obligations as fixed by the Articles 4 and 5 of the Treaty of February 26th, 1921, each of the Contracting Parties, with the intention of refraining from any interference in the internal affairs of the other Party and from carrying on propaganda or a struggle against the Government of the other Party, will strictly forbid its officials perpetrating such acts on the territory of the other Party.

Should the citizens of one of the Contracting Parties, during their sojourn on the territory of the other Party, engage in propaganda and struggle prohibited by the authorities of this Party, the Government of this territory shall have the right to

stop the activity of these citizens and mete out to them the statutory punishments.

Similarly, the two Parties undertake, in virtue of the above-mentioned articles, not to encourage and not to permit on their respective territories the formation or the activity: (1) of organisations or groups whatever their denomination, which have as their object the struggle against the Government of the other Contracting Party by means of violence, insurrection and attempts; (2) of organisations or groups assuming the role of the Government of the other Party or of part of its territory likewise with the object of fighting by the above-mentioned means against the Government of the other Contracting Party, of prejudicing its peace and security or making attempts on its territorial integrity.

Similarly, in virtue of the aforesaid principles, the two Contracting Parties undertake to prohibit the recruitment and the importation into its territory of armed forces, arms, ammunition or any kind of war material destined for abovementioned organisations.

Article 5

The two Contracting Parties undertake to settle by pacific means, suiting the circumstances, all disputes which may arise between them and which cannot be settled through the ordinary diplomatic channels.

Article 6

Beyond the limits of the obligations assumed by the Contracting Parties in virtue of the present Treaty, the two Parties retain their entire freedom of action as regards their international relations.

Article 7

The present Treaty is concluded for a period of three years and is to be approved and ratified in the shortest time by the legislative bodies of both Parties, whereupon it shall come into force.

The exchange of the instruments of ratification shall take place at Teheran within a month after ratification.

On the expiry of the original period the Treaty shall be automatically prolonged, each time for one year, until one of the Contracting Parties inform the other Party of its denunciation. In this case the present Treaty shall remain in force six months after the denunciation of the Treaty is communicated to the other Party.

Article 8

The present Treaty is drawn up in Russian, Persian and French in three original copies for each of the Contracting Parties.

In respect of its interpretation all texts are regarded as authentic. In case of divergence by interpretation the French text shall be considered as basic.

In witness whereof the above-mentioned plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and affixed their seals.

Done at Moscow on the 1st October, 1927.

[Here follow the signatures.]

IV. TREATY OF NEUTRALITY AND NON-AGGRESSION BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND AFGHANISTAN¹

THE Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and His Majesty the King of Afghanistan, being desirous of strengthening the friendly and good neighbourly relations happily existing between the two countries on the basis of the Treaty signed at Moscow on February 28th, 1921, and being convinced that these relations will continue to develop in future, thus contributing to the lofty aims of world peace, have decided to conclude the present Treaty, which is inspired by the same principles as the Treaty concluded at Pagman on August 31st, 1926, and have appointed for this purpose:

[Here follow the names of the plenipotentiaries.]

who, having presented their full powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed on the following provisions:

Article 1

In case of war or of hostilities between either of the Contracting Parties and one or more third Powers, the other Contracting Party undertakes to observe neutrality with regard to the former.

¹ The validity of the Treaty was prolonged till March 29th, 1946, on March 29th, 1936.

Article 2

Each of the Contracting Parties undertakes to abstain from any aggression against the other Party or against territories in its possession, and not to undertake or to tolerate on the part of anybody whatsoever any act which might inflict political or military damage on the other Contracting Party. Similarly, each Contracting Party undertakes not to be a Party to any alliances or agreements of a military or political character with one or more Powers which might be directed against the other Contracting Party or in any financial or economic boycott or blockade directed against the other Contracting Party. Furthermore, in the event of a hostile attitude being adopted by one or more third parties towards either of the Contracting Parties, the other Contracting Party undertakes not only not to encourage such attitude but is under an obligation on its territory to oppose it as well as any hostile acts and undertakings arising there from.

Article 3

The High Contracting Parties, having recognised each other's sovereignty, undertake to abstain from any armed or unarmed interference in the internal affairs of the other Contracting Party and shall categorically abstain from giving assistance to and taking part in any intervention whatsoever on the part of one or more third Powers which might take action against the other Contracting Party. The Contracting Parties shall not tolerate and shall prevent on their territory the organisation and activities of groups and the activities of private persons that might be prejudicial to the other Contracting Party or prepare the overthrow of its form of

government or make an attempt on the integrity of its territory or proceed to the mobilisation or recruitment of armed forces to be used against it. Similarly, neither Party shall authorise or permit the passage and transport through their territories of armed forces, arms, ammunition, implements of war and any kind of war material directed against the other Contracting Party.

Article 4

In accordance with the above provisions of the present Treaty, each of the High Contracting Parties declares that it has not had and has not at present any secret or public obligations in relation to one or more States which would be incompatible with the present Treaty and that, during the entire period of validity of this Treaty, it will not enter into any treaties and agreements which are incompatible with the present Treaty.

Article 5

Similarly, each of the Contracting Parties declares that no obligations exist between itself and other States in the immediate neighbourhood of the land or sea frontiers of the other Party except such as arise out of instruments which have already been made public.

Article 6

Beyond the limits of the obligations the conditions of which are laid down in the present Treaty, each of the Contracting Parties retains entire freedom of action as regards steps to be taken to establish all kinds of relations and alliances with third Powers.

Article 7

The Contracting Parties recognise that the settlement of all disputes or conflicts which may arise between them of whatever character or origin must always be sought solely by pacific means. With a view to amplifying the provisions of this Article, special agreements may be concluded between the Contracting Parties.

Article 8

The present Treaty is concluded for a period of five years and shall come into force at the moment of its ratification which shall take place not later than two months after the date of signature. The exchange of the instruments of ratification shall take place at Kabul within one month after ratification of the Treaty.

On the expiry of the period of five years, the present Treaty shall be automatically prolonged from year to year, each Contracting Party being entitled to denounce it at six months' notice. In case of denunciation of the Treaty as provided for in this Article, the Contracting Parties shall at the same time enter into negotiations regarding the renewal of the present Treaty.

Article 9

The present Treaty is drawn up in the Russian and Persian languages. In respect of its interpretation, both texts are regarded as authentic.

Done at Kabul, the 24th day of June, 1931.

[Here follow the signatures.]

V. TREATY OF NON-AGGRESSION AND PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND FINLAND¹

THE Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the one part, and

The President of the Republic of Finland, on the other part, actuated by the desire to contribute to the strengthening of general peace;

being convinced that the adoption of the obligations mentioned below and the pacific settlement of any dispute whatsoever that may arise between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of Finland is in the interests of both High Contracting Parties and will contribute towards the development of friendly and neighbourly relations between the two countries;

declaring that none of the international obligations which they have hitherto assumed can hinder the pacific development of their mutual relations or is incompatible with the present Treaty;

being desirous of confirming and completing the General Pact of August 27th, 1928, for the Renunciation of War;

have resolved to conclude the present Treaty and have for that purpose appointed:

[Here follow the names of the plenipotentiaries.]

¹ The validity of the Treaty was prolonged till December 31st, 1945, on April 7th, 1934.

who, having exchanged their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following provisions:

Article 1

1. The High Contracting Parties mutually guarantee the inviolability of the existing frontiers between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of Finland, as fixed by the Treaty of Peace concluded at Dorpat on October 14th, 1920, which shall remain the firm foundation of their relations, and reciprocally undertake to refrain from any act of aggression directed against each other.

2. Any act of violence infringing the integrity and inviolability of the territory or the political independence of the other High Contracting Party shall be regarded as an act of aggression, even if it is committed without declaration of war and avoids warlike manifestations.

Protocol to Article 1

In conformity with the provisions of Article 4 of the present Treaty, the Agreement of June 1st, 1922, regarding measures ensuring the inviolability of the frontiers shall not be affected by the provisions of the present Treaty and shall continue to remain fully in force.

Article 2

1. Should either High Contracting Party be the object of aggression on the part of one or more third Powers, the other High Contracting Party undertakes to maintain neutrality throughout the duration of the conflict.

2. Should either High Contracting Party resort to

aggression against a third Power, the other High Contracting Party may denounce the present Treaty without notice.

Article 3

Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes not to become a party to any treaty, agreement or convention which is openly hostile to the other Party or is contrary, either formally or in substance, to the present Treaty.

Article 4

The obligations mentioned in the preceding Articles of the present Treaty may in no case affect or modify the international rights or obligations of the High Contracting Parties under agreements concluded or undertakings assumed before the coming into force of the present Treaty, in so far as such agreements contain no elements of aggression within the meaning of the present Treaty.

Article 5

The High Contracting Parties declare that they will always endeavour to settle in a spirit of justice any disputes of whatever nature or origin which may arise between them, and will resort exclusively to pacific means of settling such disputes. For this purpose, the High Contracting Parties undertake to submit any disputes which may arise between them after the signing of the Present Treaty, and which it may not be possible to settle through the usual diplomatic channels within a reasonable time, to a procedure of conciliation before a joint conciliation commission whose powers, composition and working shall be fixed by a special supplementary

Convention, which shall form an integral part of the present Treaty and which the High Contracting Parties undertake to conclude as soon as possible and in any event before the present Treaty is ratified. Conciliation procedure shall also be applied in the event of any dispute as to the application or interpretation of a Convention concluded between the High Contracting Parties, and particularly the question whether the mutual undertaking as to non-aggression has or has not been violated.

Article 6

The present Treaty shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Moscow.

Article 7

The present Treaty shall come into force on the exchange of the instruments of ratification.

Article 8

The present Treaty is concluded for three years. If it is not denounced by either of the High Contracting Parties after previous notice of not less than six months before the expiry of that period, it shall be deemed to be automatically renewed for a further period of two years.

Article 9

The present Treaty is drawn up in duplicate in French, in the town of Helsinki, the 21st day of January, 1932.

In witness whereof the plenipotentiaries have signed the

present Treaty and have thereto affixed their seals.

[Here follow the signatures.]

VI. TREATY BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND LATVIA¹

THE Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the President of the Latvian Republic;

having in view the Peace Treaty concluded on August 2nd, 1920, between the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic, and Latvia, the effect of which extends to the entire territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and all the provisions of which remain invariably and permanently the firm foundation of the relations between the High Contracting Parties;

being convinced that it is in the interests of both High Contracting Parties to adopt certain provisions which may contribute to the development and consolidation of the friendly relations between the two States;

being firmly resolved to respect mutually and unreservedly each other's sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and inviolability;

being guided by the desire to contribute to the consolidation of world peace;

declaring that none of the obligations so far assumed by either of the Parties hinders the peaceful development of their mutual relations or is incompatible with the present Treaty;

being desirous of confirming and supplementing in their relations the General Pact of Renunciation of War of August 27th, 1928, which as heretofore continues to retain its effect

¹ The validity of the Treaty was prolonged till December 31st, 1945 on April 4th, 1934.

between the High Contracting Parties, independently of the duration or the normal expiry of the present Treaty or its possible denunciation before the date provided for;

have decided to conclude the present Treaty, and have for that purpose appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

[Here follow the names of plenipotentiaries.]

who, having communicated their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

Article 1

Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes to refrain from any act of aggression directed against the other, and also from any acts of violence directed against the territorial integrity and inviolability of the political independence of the other Contracting Party, regardless of whether such aggression or such acts are committed separately or together with other Powers, with or without a declaration of war.

Article 2

Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes not to be a party to any military or political treaties, conventions or agreements directed against the independence, territorial integrity or political security of the other Party, or to any treaties, conventions, or agreements aiming at an economic or financial boycott of either of the Contracting Parties.

Article 3

The obligations provided for in the present Treaty may not in any way limit or change the international rights and obligations devolving on the High Contracting Parties from

treaties concluded by them before the coming into force of the present Treaty and duly published in the official publications of each Party, in so far as such treaties do not include any elements of aggression within the meaning of the present Treaty.

Article 4

In view of the obligations assumed in virtue of the present Treaty, the High Contracting Parties undertake to submit all disputes, whatever their nature or origin, which may arise between them after the signing of the present Treaty and which cannot be settled within a reasonable time through the ordinary diplomatic channel, to a procedure of conciliation in a mixed conciliation commission whose composition, powers, and procedure shall be fixed by a special Convention which the two Parties undertake to conclude as early as possible and which shall come into force at the same time as the present Treaty.

Article 5

The present Treaty is drawn up in duplicate in the Russian and Latvian languages, both texts being equally authentic. It shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged between the High Contracting Parties in Moscow.

Article 6

The present Treaty shall come into force at the moment of the exchange of the instruments of ratification and shall remain in force for three years from that date. Each of the High Contracting Parties shall be entitled to denounce the Treaty by giving notice six months before the expiry of this period, or

without giving notice if the other Contracting Party commits an aggression upon any third State. If the Treaty is not denounced by either of the High Contracting Parties, its period of validity shall be automatically prolonged for two years; in the same manner, the Treaty shall be deemed to be prolonged on each occasion for a further period of two years, if it is not denounced by either of the Contracting Parties in the manner provided in the present Article.

In witness whereof the above-mentioned plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have thereto affixed their seals.

Done at Riga, in duplicate, in the Russian and Latvian languages, February 5th, 1932.

[Here follow the signatures.]

VII. TREATY OF NON-AGGRESSION BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND POLAND¹

THE Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the one part, and the President of the Polish Republic, on the other part,

desirous of maintaining the present state of peace between their countries, and convinced that the maintenance of peace between them constitutes an important factor in the cause of preserving universal peace;

considering that the Treaty of Peace of March 18th, 1921, constitutes, now as heretofore, the basis of their reciprocal relations and undertaking;

convinced that the peaceful settlement of international disputes and the exclusion of all that might be contrary to the normal condition of relations between States are the surest means of arriving at the goal desired;

declaring that none of the obligations hitherto assumed by either of the Parties stands in the way of the peaceful development of their mutual relations or is incompatible with the present Treaty;

have decided to conclude the present Treaty with the object of amplifying and completing the Pact signed at Paris on

¹ The validity of the Treaty was prolonged till December 31st, 1945, on May 5th, 1934.

Similar treaties were concluded with Germany and Italy. A Neutrality Treaty was concluded with Germany on April 24th, 1926, which was prolonged on June 24th, 1931. A Friendship, Non-Aggression and Neutrality Treaty was concluded with Italy on September 2nd, 1933.

August 27th, 1928, and put into force by the Protocol signed at Moscow on February 9th, 1929, and for that purpose have designated as their plenipotentiaries:

[Here follow the names of the plenipotentiaries.]

who, after exchanging their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed on the following provisions:

Article 1

The two Contracting Parties, recording the fact that they have renounced war as an instrument of national policy in their mutual relations, reciprocally undertake to refrain from any aggressive action against or invading the territory of the other Party, separately or together with other Powers.

Any act of violence prejudicing the integrity and inviolability of the territory or the political independence of the other Contracting Party shall be regarded as contrary to the undertakings contained in the present Article, even if such acts are committed without declaration of war and avoid all possible warlike manifestations.

Article 2

Should one of the Contracting Parties be attacked by a third State or by a group of other States, the other Contracting Party undertakes not to give aid or assistance, either directly or indirectly, to the aggressor State during the whole period of the conflict.

In the event of one of the Contracting Parties committing an aggression against a Third State the other Party shall be entitled to denounce the present Treaty without giving any notice.

Article 3

Each of the Contracting Parties undertakes not to be a party to any agreement openly hostile to the other Party from the point of view of aggression.

Article 4

The undertakings provided for in Articles 1 and 2 of the present Treaty shall in no case limit or modify the international rights and obligations of each Contracting Party under agreements concluded by it before the coming into force of the present Treaty, so far as the said agreements contain no aggressive elements.

Article 5

The two Contracting Parties, desirous of settling and solving, exclusively by peaceful means, any disputes and differences, of whatever nature or origin, which may arise between them, undertake to submit questions at issue, which it has not been possible to settle within a reasonable period by diplomatic channels, to a procedure of conciliation, in accordance with the provisions of the Convention for the application of the procedure of conciliation, which constitutes an integral part of the present Treaty and shall be signed separately and ratified as soon as possible simultaneously with the Treaty of Non-Aggression.

Article 6

The present Treaty shall be ratified as soon as possible, and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Warsaw

within thirty days following the ratification by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Poland, after which the Treaty shall come into force immediately.

Article 7

The Treaty is concluded for three years. If it is not denounced by one of the Contracting Parties six months before the expiry of that period, it shall be automatically renewed for a further period of two years.

Article 8

The present Treaty is drawn up in Polish and Russian, both texts being authentic.

In witness whereof the above-mentioned plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have thereto affixed their seals.

Done at Moscow, in two copies, July 25th, 1932.

[Here follow the signatures.]

VIII. TREATY OF NON-AGGRESSION AND PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND ESTONIA¹

THE Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the one part, and the President of the Estonian Republic, on the other part,

being convinced that it is in the interests of the two High Contracting Parties to lay down definite conditions contributing to the strengthening of the friendly relations existing between them,

animated by the desire to contribute in that manner to the maintenance of universal peace,

considering that the Peace Treaty of February 2nd, 1920, constitutes, now as heretofore, the unshakable foundation of their mutual relations and obligations,

declaring that none of the international obligations previously assumed by either of the High Contracting Parties is incompatible with the peaceful development of their mutual relations or is in contradiction with the present Treaty,

being desirous of supplementing and defining, so far as it concerns their mutual relations, the Pact for the Renunciation of War signed at Paris on August 27th, 1928,

have decided to conclude the present Treaty, and to this end have appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

¹ The validity of the Treaty was prolonged till December 31st, 1945, on April 4th, 1934.

[Here follow the names of plenipotentiaries.]

who, having communicated their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following provisions:

Article 1

Both High Contracting Parties mutually guarantee the inviolability of the frontiers existing between them, as defined by the Peace Treaty signed on February 2nd, 1920, and undertake to refrain from any act of aggression or any violent measures directed against the integrity and inviolability of the territory or against the political independence of the other Contracting Party, whether such act of aggression or such violent measures are undertaken separately or together with other Powers, with or without a declaration of war.

Article 2

Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes not to take part in political agreements manifestly directed in an aggressive sense against the other Party, nor in coalitions of the same nature having as their object to subject the other Party to an economic or financial boycott.

Article 3

The obligations mentioned in the preceding Articles of the present Treaty shall in no case affect or modify the rights and international obligations devolving on the High Contracting Parties from treaties concluded or obligations assumed prior to the entry into force of the present Treaty, so far as the said rights and obligations contain no elements of aggression within

the meaning of the present Treaty.

Article 4

In view of the obligations assumed in virtue of the present Treaty, the High Contracting Parties undertake to submit all disputes, whatever their nature or origin, which may arise between them subsequent to the coming into force of the present Treaty, and which it may not be possible to settle within a reasonable time through the ordinary diplomatic channel, to a procedure of conciliation in a mixed Conciliation Commission, whose composition, powers, and procedure shall be fixed by a special Convention, which the two Parties undertake to conclude within the shortest possible time, and which shall come into force simultaneously with the present Treaty.

Article 5

The present Treaty is drawn up in duplicate in Russian and Estonian, both texts being authentic. It shall be ratified within the shortest possible time and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged between the High Contracting Parties at Tallinn within forty-five days from the date of the ratification of the present Treaty by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Estonia.

Article 6

The present Treaty shall come into force on the date of the exchange of the instruments of ratification, and shall remain in force for three years from that date.

Either of the High Contracting Parties shall have the right to denounce the Treaty by giving notice of its intention six

months before the expiry of the said period, or without giving such notice in the event of an act of aggression being committed by the other High Contracting Party against any third Power.

If the Treaty is not denounced by one or other of the High Contracting Parties, its validity shall be tacitly prolonged for a period of two years; similarly, the Treaty shall be deemed to be prolonged on each occasion for a further period of two years if it is not denounced by either of the High Contracting Parties, in the manner provided in the present Article.

In witness whereof the above-mentioned plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have thereto affixed their seals.

Done at Moscow, in duplicate, May 4th, 1932.

[Here follow the signatures.]

IX. PACT OF NON-AGGRESSION BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND THE FRENCH REPUBLIC

THE Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the President of the French Republic, animated by the desire to consolidate peace,

convinced that it is in the interests of both High Contracting Parties to improve and develop relations between the two countries,

mindful of the international undertakings which they have previously assumed and none of which, they declared, constitutes an obstacle to the pacific development of their mutual relations or is inconsistent with the present Treaty,

desirous of confirming and defining, so far as it concerns their respective relations, the general Pact of August 27th, 1928, for the renunciation of war,

have resolved to conclude a Treaty with this object and have appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

[Here follow the names of the plenipotentiaries.]

who, having exchanged their powers~ found in good and due form, have agreed on the following provisions:

Article 1

Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes with regard to the other not to resort in any case, whether alone or jointly with one or more third Powers, either to war or any aggression by land, sea or air against that other Party, and to

respect the inviolability of the territories under that Party's sovereignty or the territories which it represents in external relations and administration of which it controls.

Article 2

Should either High Contracting Party be the object of aggression by one or more third Powers, the other High Contracting Party undertakes not to give aid or assistance, either directly or indirectly, to the aggressor or aggressors during the period of the conflict.

Should either High Contracting Party resort to aggression against a third Power, the other High Contracting Party may denounce the present Treaty without notice.

Article 3

The undertakings set forth above in Articles 1 and 2 shall in no way limit or modify the rights or obligations of each Contracting Party under agreements concluded by it before the coming into force of the present Treaty, each Party hereby declaring further that it is not bound by any agreement involving an obligation for it to participate in aggression by a third State.

Article 4

Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes, for the duration of the present Treaty, not to become a party to any international agreement of which the effect in practice would be to prevent the purchase of goods from or the sale of goods or the granting of credits to the other Party, and not to take any measure which would result in the exclusion of the other Party

from any participation in its foreign trade.

Article 5

Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes to respect in every connection the sovereignty or authority of the other Party over the whole of that Party's territories as defined in Article 1 of the present Treaty, not to interfere in any way in its internal affairs, and to abstain more particularly from action of any kind calculated to promote or encourage agitation, propaganda or attempted intervention designed to prejudice its territorial integrity or to transform by force the political or social regime of all or part of its territories.

Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes in particular not to create, protect, equip, subsidise or permit on its territory either military organisations which have as their aim armed combat with the other Party or organisations which assume the role of government or representative of all or part of its territories.

Article 6

The High Contracting Parties having already recognised, in the general Pact of August 27th, 1928, for the renunciation of war, that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts, of whatever nature or origin which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means, confirm that provision, and, in order to give effect to it, annex to the present Treaty a Convention relating to conciliation procedure.

Article 7

The present Treaty, of which the Russian and French texts shall both be authentic, shall be ratified, and the ratification

thereof shall be exchanged at Moscow.

It shall enter into effect on the date of the said exchange, and shall remain in force for the period of one year as from the date on which either High Contracting Party shall have notified the other of its intention to denounce it. Such notification may not, however, be given before the expiry of a period of two years from the date of the entry into force of the present Treaty.

In witness whereof the plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have thereto affixed their seals.

Done at Paris, in duplicate, the 29th day of November, 1932.

[Here follow the signatures.]

X. TREATY OF NON-AGGRESSION BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

THE Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the National Government of the Republic of China, animated by the desire to contribute to the maintenance of general peace, to consolidate the amicable relations now existing between them on a firm and lasting basis, and to confirm in a more precise manner the obligations mutually undertaken under the Treaty for the Renunciation of War signed in Paris on August 27th, 1928, have resolved to conclude the present Treaty and have for this purpose appointed as their plenipotentiaries, that is to say:

[Here follow the names of the plenipotentiaries.]

who, having communicated their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:

Article 1

The two High Contracting Parties solemnly reaffirm that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies and that they renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with each other, and in pursuance of this pledge, they undertake to refrain from any aggression against each other either individually or jointly with one or more other Powers.

Article 2

In the event that either of the High Contracting Parties should be subjected to aggression on the part of one or more third Powers, the other High Contracting Party obligates itself not to render assistance of any kind, either directly or indirectly, to such third Power or Powers at any time during the entire conflict, and also to refrain from taking any action or entering into any agreement which may be used by the aggressor or aggressors to the disadvantage of the Party subjected to aggression.

Article 3

The provisions of the present Treaty shall not be so interpreted as to affect or modify the rights and obligations arising, in respect of the High Contracting Parties, out of bilateral or multilateral treaties or agreements of which both High Contracting Parties are signatories and which were concluded prior to the entering into force of the present Treaty.

Article 4

The present Treaty is drawn up in duplicate in English. It comes into force on the day of signature by the abovementioned plenipotentiaries and shall remain in force for a period of five years. Either of the High Contracting Parties may notify the other, six months before the expiration of the period, of its desire to terminate the Treaty. In case both Parties fail to do so in time, the Treaty shall be considered as being automatically extended for a period of two years after the expiration of the first period. Should neither of the High

Contracting Parties notify the other, six months before the expiration of the two year period, of its desire to terminate the Treaty, it shall continue in force for another period of two years, and so on successively.

In witness whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty, and have affixed thereunto their seals.

Done at Nanking, the twenty-first day of August, 1937.

[Here follow the signatures.]

**XI. DRAFT DECLARATION OFFERED BY
COMMISSAR M. M. LITVINOV TO THE
GENERAL COMMISSION OF THE
DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE.**

February 6th, 1933

THE General Commission,

considering that, in the interests of general security and in order to facilitate the attainment of an agreement for the maximum reduction of armaments, it is necessary, with the utmost precision, to define aggression, in order to remove any possibility of its justification;

recognising that all States have an equal right to independence, security and self-defence;

animated by the desire of ensuring to each nation, in the interests of general peace, the right of free development according to its own choice and at the rate that suits it best, and with this object in view and of fully safeguarding the security, independence and complete territorial inviolability of each State and its right to self-defence against attack or invasion from outside, but only within its own frontiers; and

anxious to provide the necessary guidance to the international organs which may be called upon to define the aggressor,

Declares:

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

- (a) Declaration of war against another State;
- (b) The invasion by its armed forces of 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 organisation 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 mal-administration;

(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 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 mobilisation 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.

The General Commission decides to embody the above principles in the Convention on security and disarmament, or in a special agreement to form an integral part of the said Convention.

XII. CONVENTION FOR THE DEFINITION OF AGGRESSION

THE Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, His Majesty the King of Romania, the President of the Republic of Czechoslovakia, the President of the Republic of Turkey and His Majesty the King of Yugoslavia;

being desirous of consolidating the peaceful relations existing between their countries;

mindful of the fact that the Briand-Kellogg Pact, of which they are signatories, prohibits all aggression;

deeming it necessary, in the interest of general security, to define aggression as explicitly as possible in order to obviate any pretext whereby it might be justified;

noting that all States have an equal right to independence, security, the defence of their territories and the free development of their institutions;

animated by the desire to ensure to all peoples in the interest of general peace the inviolability of the territory of their countries;

judging it expedient, in the interest of general peace, to bring into force, as between their countries, precise rules defining aggression, until such time as those rules shall become universal,

have decided to this end to conclude the present Convention and have duly authorised for the purpose:

[Here follow the names of the plenipotentiaries.]

who have agreed upon the following provisions:

Article 1

Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes to accept in its relations with each of the other Parties, from the date of the entry into force of the present Convention, the definition of aggression as explained in the Report, dated May 24th, 1933, of the Committee on Security Questions (Politic Report) to the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, which Report was made in consequence of the Soviet delegation's proposal.

Article 2.

Accordingly, the aggressor in an international conflict shall, without prejudice to the agreements in force between the Parties to the dispute, be considered to be that State which is the first to commit any of the following actions:

1. Declaration of war upon another State;
2. Invasion by its armed forces, with or without a declaration of war, of the territory of another State;
3. Attack by its land, naval or air forces, with or without a declaration of war, on the territory, vessels or aircraft of another State;
4. Naval blockade of the coasts or ports of another State;
5. Provision of support to armed bands formed on its territory which have invaded the territory of another State, or refusal, notwithstanding the request of the invaded State, to take on its own territory all the measures in its power to deprive those bands of all assistance or protection.

Article 3

No political, military, economic or other considerations

may serve as an excuse or justification for the aggression referred to in Article 2. (For examples, see Annexe.)

Article 4

The present Convention is open for the accession of all other nations. Accession shall confer the same rights and impose the same obligations as initial signature. Such accession shall be notified to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which shall forthwith inform the other signatories.

Article 5

The present Convention shall be ratified by each of the High Contracting Parties in conformity with its laws.

The instruments of ratification shall be deposited by each of the High Contracting Parties with the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

As soon as the instruments of ratification have been deposited by two of the High Contracting Parties, the present Convention shall come into force as between those two Parties. It shall come into force as regards all the other High Contracting Parties according as the latter deposit in their turn their instruments of ratification.

Each deposit of instruments of ratification shall immediately be notified by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to all the signatories of the present Convention.

Article 6

The present Convention has been signed in five copies, of

which each of the High Contracting Parties has received one.

In witness whereof the above-mentioned plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention and have thereto affixed their seals.

Done in London, July 4th, 1933.

[Here follow the signatures.]

ANNEXE TO ARTICLE III OF THE CONVENTION RELATING TO THE DEFINITION OF AGGRESSION

The High Contracting Parties signatories to the Convention relating to the definition of aggression,

desiring, subject to the express reservation that the absolute validity of the rule laid down in Article 3 of that Convention shall be in no way restricted, to furnish certain indications for determining the aggressor,

declare that no act of aggression within the meaning of Article 2 of that Convention can be justified on either of the following grounds, among others:

A. The internal condition of a State, for example:

its political, economic or social structure; alleged defects in its administration; disturbances due to strikes, revolutions, counter-revolutions or civil war.

B. The international conduct of a State, for example:

the violation or threatened violation of the material or moral rights or interests of a foreign State or its nationals; the rupture of diplomatic or economic relations; economic or financial boycotts; disputes relating to economic, financial or other obligations towards foreign States; frontier incidents not

forming any of the cases of aggression specified in Article 2.

The High Contracting Parties further agree to recognise that the present Convention shall under no conditions legitimate any violations of international law that may be implied in the circumstances comprised in the above list.

[Here follow the signatures.]

XIII. CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND LITHUANIA FOR THE DEFINITION OF AGGRESSION

THE Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the President of the Republic of Lithuania;

being desirous of consolidating the peaceful relations existing between their countries;

mindful of the fact that the Briand-Kellogg Pact, of which they are signatories, and likewise the Pact of Non-Aggression concluded between them at Moscow on September 28th, 1926, prohibit all aggression;

deeming it necessary, in the interest of the general security, to define aggression as specifically as possible in order to obviate any pretext whereby it might be justified;

noting that all States have an equal right to independence, security, the defence of their territories and the free development of their institutions;

animated by the desire to ensure to all peoples in the interest of general peace, the inviolability of the territory of their countries;

judging it expedient, in the interest of general peace, to bring into force as between their countries precise rules defining aggression, until such time as those rules shall become universal;

Have decided to this end to conclude the present Convention and have duly authorised for that purpose:

[Here follow the names of the plenipotentiaries.]

who have agreed upon the following provisions:

Article 1

Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes to accept in its relations with the other Party, from the date of the coming into force of the present Convention, the definition of aggression as framed by the Committee on Security Questions of the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, following on the Soviet delegation's proposal.

Article 2

Accordingly, the aggressor in an international conflict shall, without prejudice to the agreements in force between the parties to the dispute, be considered to be that State which is the first to commit any of the following actions:

1. Declaration of war upon another State;
2. Invasion by its armed forces, with or without a declaration of war, of the territory of another State;
3. Attack by land, naval or air forces, with or without a declaration of war, on the territory, vessels or aircraft of another State;
4. Naval blockade of the coasts or ports of another State;
5. Provision of support to armed bands formed on its territory which have invaded the territory of another State, or refusal, notwithstanding the request of the invaded State, to take on its own territory all the measures in its power to deprive those bands of all assistance or protection.

Article 3

No political, military, economic or other considerations may serve as an excuse or justification for the aggression

referred to in Article 2. (For examples, see Annexe.)

Article 4

The present Convention shall be ratified by the High Contracting Parties in conformity with their national laws.

It shall come into force immediately after the exchange of the instruments of ratification, which shall take place in Moscow.

In witness whereof the above-mentioned plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention and have thereto affixed their seals.

Done in London in two copies, in French, July 5th, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-three.

[Here follow the signatures.]

ANNEXE TO ARTICLE 3 OF THE CONVENTION RELATING TO THE DEFINITION OF AGGRESSION

The High Contracting Parties signatories of the Convention relating to the definition of aggression,

desiring, subject to the express reservation that the absolute validity of the rule laid down in Article 3 of that Convention shall be in no way restricted, to furnish certain indications for determining the aggressor,

declare that no act of aggression within the meaning of Article 2 of that Convention can be justified on either of the following grounds, among others:

A. The internal condition of a State:
e.g., its political, economic or social structure; alleged defects

in its administration; disturbances due to strikes, revolutions, counter-revolutions or civil war.

B. The international conduct of a State:

e.g., the violation or threatened violation of the material or moral rights or interests of a foreign State or its nationals; the rupture of diplomatic or economic relations; economic or financial boycotts; disputes relating to economic, financial or other obligations towards foreign States; frontier incidents not forming any of the cases of aggression specified in Article 2.

The High Contracting Parties further agree to recognise that the present Convention shall under no conditions legitimate any violations of international law that may be implied in the circumstances comprised in the above list.

[Here follow the signatures.]

XIV. TREATY OF MUTUAL ASSISTANCE BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND FRANCE

THE Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the President of the French Republic, animated by the desire of strengthening peace in Europe and of guaranteeing its benefits to their respective countries by securing a fuller and stricter application of those provisions of the Covenant of the League of Nations which are designed to maintain the national security, territorial integrity and political independence of States;

determined to devote their efforts to the preparation and conclusion of a European agreement for that purpose, and in the meantime to promote, as far as it lies in their power, the effective application of the provisions of the Covenant of the League of Nations;

have resolved to conclude a Treaty to this end and have appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

[Here follow the names of the plenipotentiaries.]

who, having exchanged their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following provisions:

Article 1

In the event of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or France being threatened with or in danger of aggression on the part of any European State, France and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics respectively undertake mutually to proceed to an immediate consultation as regards the measures to be taken for the observance of the provisions of Article X of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Article 2

Should, in the circumstances specified in Article XV, paragraph 7, of the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or France be the object, notwithstanding the sincerely peaceful intentions of both countries, of an unprovoked aggression on the part of a European State, France and reciprocally the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics shall immediately come to each other's aid and assistance.

Article 3

In consideration of the fact that under Article XVI of the Covenant of the League of Nations any member of the League which resorts to war in disregard of its obligations under Articles XII, XIII or XV of the Covenant is *ipso facto* deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the League, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and reciprocally France undertake, in the event of one of them being the object, in these conditions and notwithstanding the sincerely peaceful intentions of both countries, of an unprovoked aggression on the part of a European State, immediately to come to each other's aid and assistance in application of Article XVI of the Covenant.

The same obligation is assumed in the event of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or France being the object of an aggression on the part of a European State in the circumstances specified in Article XVII, paragraphs 1 and 3, of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Article 4

The obligations stipulated above being consonant with the obligations of the High Contracting Parties as members of the League of Nations, nothing in the present Treaty shall be interpreted as restricting the duty of the latter to take any action that may be deemed effective to safeguard the peace of the world or as restricting the obligations resulting for the High Contracting Parties from the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Article 5

The present Treaty, both the Russian and the French texts whereof shall be equally authentic, shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Moscow as soon as possible. It shall be registered with the Secretariat of the League of Nations.

It shall take effect as soon as the ratifications have been exchanged and shall remain in force for five years. If it is not denounced by either of the High Contracting Parties giving notice thereof at least one year before the expiry of that period, it shall remain in force indefinitely, each of the High Contracting Parties being at liberty to terminate it at a year's notice by a declaration to that effect.

In witness whereof the plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have thereto affixed their seals.

Done at Paris, in duplicate, this 2nd day of May, 1935.

[Here follow the signatures.]

PROTOCOL OF SIGNING OF TREATY

Upon proceeding to the signing of the Franco-Soviet Treaty of Mutual Assistance of to-day's date, the

plenipotentiaries have signed the following Protocol, which shall be included in the exchange of ratifications of the Treaty.

I

It is agreed that the effect of Article 3 is to obligate each Contracting Party immediately to come to the assistance of the other by immediately complying with the recommendations of the Council of the League of Nations as soon as they have been issued in virtue of Article XVI of the Covenant. It is further agreed that the two Contracting Parties will act in concert to ensure that the Council shall issue the said recommendations with all the speed required by the circumstances and that, should the Council nevertheless, for whatever reason, issue no recommendation or fail to reach a unanimous decision, effect shall none the less be given to the obligation to render assistance. It is also agreed that the undertakings to render assistance specified in the present Treaty refer only to the case of an aggression committed against either Contracting Party's own territory.

II

It being the common intention of the two Governments in no way to prejudice, by the present Treaty, obligations previously assumed towards third States by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and by France in virtue of published treaties, it is agreed that effect shall not be given to the provisions of the said Treaty in a manner which, being incompatible with treaty obligations assumed by one of the Contracting Parties, would expose that Party to sanctions of an international character.

III

The two Governments, deeming it desirable that a regional agreement should be concluded aiming at organising security of the Contracting States, and which might moreover embody or be accompanied by pledges of mutual assistance, recognise the right of each of them to become parties by mutual consent, should occasion arise, to similar agreements in any form, direct or indirect, that may seem appropriate, the obligations under these various agreements to take the place of those assumed under the present Treaty.

IV

The two Governments place on record the fact that the negotiations which have resulted in the signing of the present Treaty were originally undertaken with a view to supplementing a Security Agreement embracing the countries of North-Eastern Europe, namely, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Poland and the Baltic States which are neighbours of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; in addition to that Agreement, there was to have been concluded a Treaty of Assistance between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, France and Germany, by which each of those three States was to have undertaken to come to the assistance of anyone of them which might be the object of aggression on the part of any other of those three States. Although circumstances have not hitherto permitted of the conclusion of those Agreements, which both Parties continue to regard as desirable, it is none the less the case that the undertakings stipulated in the Franco-Soviet Treaty of Assistance are to be understood as intended to apply only within the limits contemplated in the three-party Agreement

previously planned. Independently of the obligations assumed under the present Treaty, it is further recalled that, in accordance, with the Franco-Soviet Pact of Non-Aggression signed on November 29th, 1932, and moreover, without prejudicing the universal character of the undertakings assumed in that Pact, in the event of either Party becoming the object of aggression by one or more third European Powers not referred to in the above-mentioned three-party Agreement, the other Contracting Party is bound to abstain, during the period of the conflict, from giving any aid or assistance, either direct or indirect, to the aggressor or aggressors, each Party declaring further that it is not bound by any Assistance Agreement which would be contrary to this undertaking.

Done at Paris, this 2nd day of May, 1935.

[Here follow the signatures.]

XV. TREATY OF MUTUAL ASSISTANCE BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND THE CZECHOSLOVAK REPUBLIC

The Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the President of the Czechoslovak Republic,

animated by the desire of strengthening peace in Europe and of guaranteeing its benefits to their respective countries by securing a fuller and stricter application of those provisions of the Covenant of the League of Nations which are designed to maintain the national security, territorial integrity and political independence of States,

determined to devote their efforts to the preparation and conclusion of a European agreement for that purpose, and in the meantime to promote, as far as it lies in their power, the effective application of the provisions of the Covenant of the League of Nations,

have resolved to conclude a Treaty to this end and have appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

[Here follow the names of the plenipotentiaries.]

who, having exchanged their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following provisions:

Article 1

In the event of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or the Czechoslovak Republic being threatened with or in danger of aggression on the part of any European State, the Czechoslovak Republic and respectively the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics undertake mutually to proceed to an immediate consultation as regards the measures to be taken for the observance of the provisions of Article X of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Article 2

Should, in the circumstances specified in Article XV, paragraph 7, of the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or the Czechoslovak Republic be the object, notwithstanding the sincerely peaceful intentions of both countries, of an unprovoked aggression on the part of a European State, the Czechoslovak Republic and reciprocally the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics shall immediately come to each other's aid and assistance.

Article 3

In consideration of the fact that under Article XVI of the Covenant of the League of Nations any member of the League which resorts to war in disregard of its obligations under Articles XII, XIII or XV of the Covenant is *ipso facto* deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the League, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and reciprocally the Czechoslovak Republic undertake, in the event of one of them being the object, in these conditions and notwithstanding the sincerely peaceful intentions of both countries, of an unprovoked aggression on the part of a European State, immediately to come to each other's aid and assistance in application of Article XVI of the Covenant.

The same obligation is assumed in the event of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or the Czechoslovak Republic being the object of an aggression on the part of a European State in the circumstances specified in Article XVII, paragraphs 1 and 3, of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Article 4

Without prejudice to the preceding provisions of the present Treaty, it is stipulated that should either of the High

Contracting Parties become the object of an aggression on the part of one or more third Powers in conditions not giving ground for aid or assistance within the meaning of the present Treaty, the other High Contracting Party undertakes not to lend, for the duration of the conflict, aid or assistance, either directly or indirectly, to the aggressor or aggressors. Each Party further declares that it is not bound by any other agreement for assistance which is incompatible with the present undertaking.

Article 5

The undertakings, stipulated above being consonant with the obligations of the High Contracting Parties as members of the League of Nations, nothing in the present Treaty shall be interpreted as restricting the duty of the latter to take any action that may be deemed effective to safeguard the peace of the world or as restricting the obligations resulting for the High Contracting Parties from the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Article 6

The present Treaty, both the Russian and the Czechoslovak texts whereof shall be equally authentic, shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Moscow as soon as possible. It shall be registered, with the Secretariat of the League of Nations.

It shall take effect as soon as the ratifications have been exchanged and shall remain in force for five years. If it is not denounced by either of the High Contracting Parties giving notice thereof at least one year before the expiry of that period, it shall remain in force indefinitely, each of the High Contracting Parties being at liberty to terminate it at a year's

notice by a declaration to that effect.

In witness whereof the plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have thereto affixed their seals.

Done at Prague, in duplicate, this 16th day of May, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-five.

[Here follow the signatures.]

PROTOCOL OF SIGNING OF TREATY

Upon proceeding to the signing of the Treaty of Mutual Assistance between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Czechoslovak Republic of to-day's date, the plenipotentiaries have signed the following Protocol, which shall be included in the exchange of ratifications of the Treaty.

I

It is agreed that the effect of Article 3 is to obligate each Contracting Party immediately to come to the assistance of the other by immediately complying with the recommendations of the Council of the League of Nations as soon as they have been issued in virtue of Article XVI of the Covenant. It is further agreed that the two Contracting Parties will act in concert to ensure that the Council shall issue the said recommendations with all the speed required by the circumstances and that, should the Council nevertheless, for whatever reason, issue no recommendation or fail to reach a unanimous decision, effect shall none the less be given to the obligation to render assistance. It is also agreed that the undertakings to render assistance specified in the present Treaty refer only to the case of an aggression committed against either Contracting Party's own territory.

II

The two Governments declare that the obligations laid down in Articles 1,2 and 3 of the present Treaty, concluded with a view of promoting the establishment in Eastern Europe of a regional system of security, inaugurated by the Franco-Soviet Treaty of May 2nd, 1935, will be restricted within the same limits as were laid down in paragraph 4 of the Protocol of the Signing of the said Treaty. At the same time, the two Governments recognise that the obligation to render mutual assistance will operate between them only if, under the conditions set out in the present Treaty, assistance will be rendered by France to the Party which is a victim of the aggression.

III

The two Governments, deeming it desirable that a regional agreement should be concluded aiming at organising security of the Contracting States, and which might moreover embody or be accompanied by pledges of mutual assistance, recognise the right of each of them to become parties by mutual consent, should occasion arise, to similar agreements in any form, direct or indirect, that may seem appropriate, the obligations under these various agreements to take the place of those resulting from the present Treaty.

Done at Prague, in duplicate, this 16th day of May, 1935.

[Here follow the signatures.]

XVI. PROTOCOL OF MUTUAL ASSISTANCE BETWEEN THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND THE MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

THE Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and of the Mongolian People's Republic, taking into consideration the unalterable friendship existing between their countries since the liberation of the territory of the Mongolian People's Republic with the support of the Red Army, in 1921, from the White Guard detachments, connected with the military forces, which invaded the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,

and desirous to maintain peace in the Far East and to contribute to the further strengthening of the existing friendly relations between them,

have decided to formulate in the shape of the present Protocol the gentlemen's agreement, which exists between them since November 27th, 1934, which stipulates mutual assistance by all possible means for the cause of averting and preventing the menace of aggression, and to give to each other aid and assistance in the case of aggression on the part of any third party against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or the Mongolian People's Republic, and to this end to sign the present Protocol.

Article 1

In the event of menace of aggression on the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or the Mongolian People's Republic on the part of a third State, the Governments of the

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Mongolian People's Republic undertake immediately to consider jointly the situation that has arisen and to take all measures which should be necessary for the protection and security of their territories.

Article 2

The Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and of the Mongolian People's Republic undertake in the event of military aggression against one of the Contracting Parties to give each other every assistance, including military assistance.

Article 3

The Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and of the Mongolian People's Republic regard it as understood, that the troops of one of the parties stationed by mutual agreement on the territory of the other Party by way of fulfilment of the obligations set forth in Articles 1 or 2, will be withdrawn from the territory concerned immediately the necessity for it ceases—similarly to what took place in 1925 with regard to the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of the Mongolian People's Republic.

Article 4

The present Protocol is drawn up in duplicate in the Russian and Mongolian languages, both texts being equally authentic.

It shall come into force from the date of its being signed and shall remain in force for ten years.

Done at Ulan Bator, March 12th, 1936.

[Here follow the signatures.]

XVII. THE COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

IN order to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security

by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war,

by the prescription of open, just and honourable relations between nations,

by the firm establishment of the understanding of international law as the actual rule of conduct among Governments, and

by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect of all treaty obligations in the dealings of organised peoples with one another,

agree to this Covenant of the League of Nations.

Article I

1. The original members of the League of Nations shall be those of the signatories which are named in the Annexe to this Covenant and also such of those other States named in the Annexe as shall accede without reservation to this Covenant. Such accession shall be effected by a declaration deposited with the Secretariat within two months of the coming into force of the Covenant. Notice thereof shall be sent to all other members of the League.

2. Any fully self-governing State, Dominion or Colony not named in the Annexe may become a member of the League if its admission is agreed to by two-thirds of the Assembly, provided that it 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.

3. Any member of the League may after two years' notice of its intention so to do, withdraw from the League, provided that all its international obligations and all its obligations under this Covenant shall have been fulfilled at the time of its withdrawal.

Article II

The action of the League under this Covenant shall be effected through the instrumentality of an Assembly and of a Council, with a permanent Secretariat.

Article III

1. The Assembly shall consist of representatives of the members of the League.

2. The Assembly shall meet at stated intervals and from time to time as occasion may require at the seat of the League or at such other place as may be decided upon.

3. The Assembly may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the League or affecting the peace of the world.

4. At meetings of the Assembly each member of the League shall have one vote and may have not more than three representatives.

Article IV

1. The Council shall consist of representatives of the principal allied and associated Powers, together with representatives of four other members of the League. These four members of the League shall be selected by the Assembly

from time to time in its discretion. Until the appointment of the representatives of the four members of the League first selected by the Assembly, representatives of Belgium, Brazil, Spain and Greece shall be members of the Council.

2. With the approval of the majority of the Assembly, the Council may name additional members of the League whose representatives shall always be members of the Council; the Council with like approval may increase the number of members of the League to be selected by the Assembly for representation on the Council.

2 *bis*. The Assembly shall fix by a two-thirds majority the rules dealing with the election of the non-permanent members of the Council, and particularly such regulations as relate to their term of office and the conditions of re-eligibility.

3. The Council shall meet from time to time as occasion may require, and at least once a year, at the seat of the League, or at such other place as may be decided upon.

4. The Council may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the League or affecting the peace of the world.

5. Any member of the League not represented on the Council shall be invited to send a representative to sit as a member at any meeting of the Council during the consideration of matters specially affecting the interests of that member of the League.

6. At meetings of the Council, each member of the League represented on the Council shall have one vote, and may have not more than one representative.

Article V

1. Except where otherwise expressly provided in this

Covenant or by the terms of the present Treaty, decisions at any meeting of the Assembly or of the Council shall require the agreement of all the members of the League represented at the meeting.

2. All matters of procedure at meetings of the Assembly or of the Council, including the appointment of Committees to investigate particular matters, shall be regulated by the Assembly or by the Council and may be decided by a majority of the members of the League represented at the meeting.

3. The first meeting of the Assembly and the first meeting of the Council shall be summoned by the President of the United States of America.

Article VI

1. The permanent Secretariat shall be established at the seat of the League. The Secretariat shall comprise a Secretary-General and such secretaries and staff as may be required.

2. The first Secretary-General shall be the person named in the Annexe; thereafter the Secretary-General shall be appointed by the Council with the approval of the majority of the Assembly.

3. The secretaries and staff of the Secretariat shall be appointed by the Secretary-General with the approval of the Council.

4. The Secretary-General shall act in that capacity at all meetings of the Assembly and of the Council.

5. The expenses of the League shall be borne by the members of the League in the proportion decided by the Assembly.

Article VII

1. The seat of the League is established at Geneva.
2. The Council may at any time decide that the seat of the League shall be established elsewhere.
3. All positions under or in connection with the League, including the Secretariat, shall be open equally to men and women.
- 4- Representatives of the members of the League and officials of the League when engaged on the business of the League shall enjoy diplomatic privileges and immunities.
5. The buildings and other property occupied by the League or its officials or by representatives attending its meetings shall be inviolable.

Article VIII

1. The members of the League recognise 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 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 conditions of such of their industries as are adaptable to warlike purposes.

Article IX

A permanent Commission shall be constituted to advise the Council on the execution of the provisions of Articles I and VIII and on military, naval and air questions generally.

Article X

The members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

Article XI

1. Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the League or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League, and the League shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations. In case any such emergency should arise the Secretary-General shall on the request of any member of the League forthwith summon a meeting of the Council.

2. It is also declared to be the friendly right of each member of the League to bring to the attention of the Assembly or of the Council any circumstance whatever affecting international relations which threatens to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends.

Article XII

1. The members of the League agree that if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, they will submit the matter either to arbitration or judicial settlement or to inquiry by the Council, and they agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the judicial decision or the report by the Council.

2. In any case under this Article the award of the arbitrators or the judicial decision shall be made within a reasonable time, and the report of the Council shall be made within six months after the submission of the dispute.

Article XIII

1. The members of the League agree that whenever any dispute shall arise between them which they recognise to be suitable for submission to arbitration or judicial settlement, and which cannot be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole subject-matter to arbitration or judicial settlement.

2. Disputes as to the interpretation of a treaty, as to any question of international law, as to the existence of any fact which if established would constitute a breach of any international obligation, or as to the extent and nature of the reparation to be made for any such breach, are declared to be

among those which are generally suitable for submission to arbitration or judicial settlement.

3. For the consideration of any such dispute, the court to which the case is referred shall be the Permanent Court of International Justice, established in accordance with Article XIV, or any tribunal agreed on by the parties to the dispute or stipulated in any convention existing between them.

4. The members of the League agree that they will carry out in full good faith any award or decision that may be rendered, and that they will not resort to war against a member of the League which complies therewith. In the event of any failure to carry out such an award or decision, the Council shall propose what steps should be taken to give effect thereto.

Article XIV

The Council shall formulate and submit to the members of the League for adoption plans for the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice. The Court shall be competent to hear and determine any dispute of an international character which the parties thereto submit to it. The Court may also give an advisory opinion upon any dispute or questions referred to it by the Council or by the Assembly.

Article XV

1. If there should arise between members of the League any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, which is not submitted to arbitration or judicial settlement in accordance with Article XIII, the members of the League agree that they will submit the matter to the Council. Any party to the dispute may effect such

submission by giving notice of the existence of the dispute to the Secretary-General who will make all necessary arrangements for a full investigation and consideration thereof.

2. For this purpose the parties to the dispute will communicate to the Secretary-General, as promptly as possible, statements of their case with all the relevant facts and papers, and the Council may forthwith direct the publication thereof.

3. The Council shall endeavour to effect a settlement of the dispute, and if such efforts are successful, a statement shall be made public giving such facts and explanations regarding the dispute and the terms of settlement thereof as the Council may deem appropriate.

4. If the dispute is not thus settled, the Council either unanimously or by a majority vote shall make and publish a report containing a statement of the fact of the dispute and the recommendations which are deemed just and proper in regard thereto.

5. Any member of the League represented on the Council, may make public a statement of the facts of the dispute and of its conclusions regarding the same.

6. If a report by the Council is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof other than the representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the members of the League agree that they will not go to war with any party to the dispute which complies with the recommendations of the report.

7. If the Council fails to reach a report which is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof, other than the representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the members of the League reserve to themselves the right to take such action as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice.

8. If the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them, and is found by the Council, to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the Council shall so report, and shall make no recommendation as to its settlement.

9. The Council may in any case under this Article refer the dispute to the Assembly. The dispute shall be so referred at the request of either party to the dispute, provided that such request be made within fourteen days after the submission of the dispute to the Council.

10. In any case referred to the Assembly, all the provisions of this Article and of Article XII relating to the action and powers of the Council shall apply to the action and powers of the Assembly, provided that a report made by the Assembly if concurred in by the representatives of those members of the League represented on the Council and of a majority of the other members of the League, exclusive in each case of the representatives of the parties to the dispute, shall have the same force as a report by the Council concurred in by all the members thereof other than the representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute.

Article XVI

1. Should any member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants under Articles XII, XIII or XV, it shall *ipso facto* be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the League, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking State,

and the prevention of all financial, commercial or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a member of the League or not.

2. It shall be the duty of the Council in such case to recommend to the several Governments concerned what effective military, naval or air force the members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League.

3. The members of the League agree, further, that they will mutually support one another in the financial and economic measures which are taken under this Article, in order to minimise the loss and inconvenience resulting from the above measures, and that they will mutually support one another in resisting any special measures aimed at one of their number by the covenant-breaking State, and that they will take the necessary steps to afford passage through their territory to the forces of any of the members of the League which are co-operating to protect the covenants of the League.

4. Any member of the League which has violated any covenant of the League may be declared to be no longer a member of the League by a vote of the Council concurred in by the representatives of all the other members of the League represented thereon.

Article XVII

1. In the event of a dispute between a member of the League and a State which is not a member of the League, or between States not members of the League, the State or States not members of the League shall be invited to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, upon such conditions as the Council may deem

just. If such invitation is accepted, the provisions of Articles XII to XVI inclusive shall be applied with such modifications as may be deemed necessary by the Council.

2. Upon such invitation being given the Council shall immediately institute an inquiry into the circumstances of the dispute and recommend such action as may seem best and most effectual in the circumstances.

3. If a State so invited shall refuse to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, and shall resort to war against a member of the League, the provisions of Article XVI shall be applicable as against the State taking such action.

4. If both parties to the dispute when so invited refuse to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, the Council may take such measures and make such recommendations as will prevent hostilities and will result in the settlement of the dispute.

Article XVIII

Every treaty of international engagement entered into hereafter by any member of the League shall be forthwith registered with the Secretariat and shall as soon as possible be published by it. No such treaty or international engagement shall be binding until so registered.

Article XIX

The Assembly may from time to time advise the reconsideration by members of the League of treaties which have become inapplicable and the consideration of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world.

Article XX

1. The members of the League severally agree that this Covenant is accepted as abrogating all obligations or understandings *inter se* which are inconsistent with the terms thereof, and solemnly undertake that they will not hereafter enter into an engagement inconsistent with the terms thereof.

2. In case any member of the League shall, before becoming a member of the League, have undertaken any obligations inconsistent with the terms of this Covenant, it shall be the duty of such member to take immediate steps to procure its release from such obligations.

Article XXI

Nothing in this Covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace.

Article XXII

1. To those colonies and territories which as a consequence of the late war have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world, there should be applied the principle that the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilisation and the securities for the performance of this trust should be embodied in this Covenant.

2. The best method of giving practical effect to this principle is that the tutelage of such peoples should be

entrusted to advanced nations who by reason of their resources, their experience or their geographical position can best undertake this responsibility and who are willing to accept it, and that this tutelage should be exercised by them as mandatories on behalf of the League.

3. The character of the mandate must differ according to the stage of development of the people, the geographical situation of the territory, its economic condition and other similar circumstances.

4. Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognised subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a mandatory until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the mandatory.

5. Other peoples, especially those of Central Africa, are at such a stage that the mandatory must be responsible for the administration of the territory under conditions which will guarantee freedom of conscience and religion, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, the prohibition of abuses such as the slave trade, the arms traffic and the liquor traffic, and the prevention of the establishment of fortifications or military and naval bases and of military training of the natives for other than police purposes and the defence of territory, and will also secure equal opportunities for the trade and commerce of other members of the League.

6. There are territories, such as South-West Africa and certain of the South Pacific Islands, which, owing to the sparseness of their population, or their small size, or their remoteness from the centres of civilisation, or their geographical contiguity to the territory of the mandatory, and other circumstances, can be best administered under the laws of

the mandatory as integral portions of its territory, subject to the safeguards above mentioned in the interests of the indigenous population.

7. In every case of mandate, the mandatory shall render to the Council an annual report in reference to the territory committed to its charge.

8. The degree of authority, control, or administration to be exercised by the mandatory shall, if not previously agreed upon by the members of the League, be explicitly defined in each case by the Council.

9. A permanent Commission shall be constituted to receive and examine the annual reports of the mandatories and to advise the Council on all matters relating to the observance of the mandates.

Article XXIII

Subject to and in accordance with the provisions of international conventions existing or hereafter to be agreed upon, the members of the League:

(a) will endeavour to secure and maintain fair and human conditions of labour for men, women, and children, both in their own countries and in all countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend, and for that purpose will establish and maintain the necessary international organisations;

(b) undertake to secure just treatment of the native inhabitants of territories under their control;

(c) will entrust the League with the general supervision over the execution of agreements with regard to the traffic in women and children, and the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs;

(d) will entrust the League with the general supervision of

the trade in arms and ammunition with the countries in which the control of this traffic is necessary in the common interest;

(e) will make provision to secure and maintain freedom of communications and of transit and equitable treatment for the commerce of all members of the League. In this connection, the special necessities of the regions devastated during the war of 1914-1918 shall be borne in mind;

(f) will endeavour to take steps in matters of international concern for the prevention and control of disease.

Article XXIV

1. There shall be placed under the direction of the League all international bureaux already established by general treaties if the parties to such treaties consent. All such international bureaux and all commissions for the regulation of matters of international interest hereafter constituted shall be placed under the direction of the League.

2. In all matters of international interest which are regulated by general conventions but which are not placed under the control of international bureaux or commissions, the Secretariat of the League shall, subject to the consent of the Council and if desired by the parties, collect and distribute all relevant information and shall render any other assistance which may be necessary or desirable.

3. The Council may include as part of the expenses of the Secretariat the expenses of any bureau or commission which is placed under the direction of the League.

Article XXV

The members of the League agree to encourage and promote the establishment and co-operation of duly authorised

voluntary national Red Cross organisations having as purposes the improvement of health, the prevention of disease and the mitigation of suffering throughout the world.

Article XXVI

1. Amendments to this Covenant will take effect when ratified by the members of the League whose representatives compose the Council and by a majority of the members of the League whose representatives compose the Assembly.

2. No such amendment shall bind any member of the League which signifies its dissent therefrom, but in that case it shall cease to be a member of the League.