

thinking mainly of the American States, including Brazil, which no longer belong to the League. At any rate, he made his position quite clear in his brief analysis of the functions of the League—whether they should be coercive, non-coercive, or limitatively coercive. He thought that the third hypothesis was more in line with the desires, anxieties, and hopes of the majority of States, especially since it was in agreement with his conception of regional ententes.

Early in the session of the Assembly the delegation of Chile had made two proposals :—

- (1) That the Committee appointed to study the question of the principles of the Covenant should be required to submit its reports to States members of the League instead of to the Assembly : and
- (2) That that Committee should be empowered to consult non-member States with a view to ascertaining the observations and suggestions they might desire to make on the problems connected with the application of the principles of the Covenant (see Documents A. 37, 1937, VII : A. 42, 1937, XII ; A. 49, 1937).

The proposals were sent to the Special Committee, which was then in session, and examined, with the result that the Assembly had before it at its meeting on the 4th October a letter from the Chairman of the Special Committee stating that, on the first point, the Special Committee would not fail to examine the proposal with all the care which it deserved, and, as to consultation with States non-members, setting out a draft resolution, which the Assembly was invited to pass. This resolution reads :—

“ The Assembly—

“ In consideration of the Chilean delegation’s proposal :

“ Appreciating the fact that it has been inspired by the desire to strengthen the authority of the League of Nations :

“ In consideration of the opinion expressed by the Special Committee appointed to study the application of the principles of the Covenant :

“ Whereas it would be eminently desirable for the League of Nations to associate the greatest possible number of States with the application of the principles on which it is based :

“ Whereas, being anxious to neglect nothing which would promote such a development of international co-operation, the Special Committee would be glad to know the observations and suggestions which the non-member States and the States that have announced their withdrawal from the League might think fit to make in order to assist it in its studies ;

“ Requests the Council to examine the conditions in which such information should be obtained as and when opportunity offers, in order to be placed at the said Committee’s disposal.”

Immediately the item had been announced by the President of the Council, M. Edwards mounted the platform. During the Seventeenth Assembly M. Edwards had been very insistent on the desirability of the universality of the League, and had spoken on several occasions both in the Assembly and in the Special Committee, whilst M. Litvinoff, on the other hand, viewed the question with great caution, voicing an opinion, held in many quarters, that a League as at present constituted, but without universality, was better than a League universal in membership but emasculated in constitution. It would seem that on this question M. Edwards set out to show that M. Litvinoff had himself once been an advocate of a universal League, for he quoted the Soviet statesman as having said, when the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was received into the League in 1934 : “ Can there be a nobler aim than the organization of peace, or one that calls for the co-operation of all nations in a more practical or more urgent manner ? ” M. Litvinoff, however, would not let that pass. He followed M. Edwards, and stated categorically that his country would be the first to invite any nation now outside the League to become a member if it were known that that nation was ready to join without conditions. He, however, was not prepared to invite nations to enter on their terms, and he added that the work of the Special Committee had been much hampered during its last session by the time spent in a discussion on universality, which, I might mention, remained a discussion and led nowhere. M. Litvinoff indicated that he would not stand in the way of the Council’s considering the conditions under which information might be obtained from non-member States for the use of the Special Committee, but he would certainly abstain from voting. The resolution was adopted, with the abstention of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

A proposal which is connected with the much-debated question of universality, but conceived on a different plane, is that of the Argentine delegation regarding the co-operation, in given circumstances, of non-member States with member States. The proposal was embodied in the form of a draft declaration in a letter sent by the first delegate of the Argentine Republic to the Chairman of the Special Committee for the Application of the Principles of the Covenant (see Document A. 55, 1937). The proposal was duly considered by the Special Committee, which drafted a resolution for submission to the Assembly. The resolution, which is as under, speaks for itself. It was passed by the Assembly at its meeting on the 4th October. It was supported by one of the delegates of Chile in a short speech, and, after it had been passed, M. Cantilo, the first Argentine delegate, spoke a few words of thanks.

Resolution :—

“ Whereas the covenants of a universal tendency aiming at the pacific settlement of international disputes, by which the States members and non-members of the League of Nations are mutually bound, such as the Treaty for the Renunciation of War signed at Paris on 27th August, 1928, and the Treaty of Non-Aggression and Conciliation signed at Rio de Janeiro on 10th October, 1933, on the initiative of the Argentine Republic, are designed, like the League Covenant, and in accordance with Article 21 thereof, to ensure the maintenance of peace ;