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I. INTRODUCTION.

The Pact for the Renunciation of War as an Instrument of National Policy, signed at Paris on August 27th by the United States and fourteen other nations, was frequently mentioned during the Debates of the Ninth Assembly of the League of Nations which sat at Geneva from September 2nd to 26th, 1928.

These references to the Pact were in no sense obligatory, as the Pact had not been concluded under the auspices of the League and was not, consequently, on the agenda of the Assembly session. On the contrary, there was both a feeling of delicacy towards the possibility of even appearing to intrude in a matter not directly part of the League's work and a decided hesitation against any expression which might in any way prove prejudicial to the future of the Pact.

Despite this, however, the Pact came up quite spontaneously throughout the session. It was mentioned by 23 out of 29 speakers in the opening General Debate on the work of the past year and the plans for the coming year; was discussed in the First Committee on Legal and Constitutional Questions and in the Third Committee on Arbitration, Security and Disarmament; and was mentioned in the closing debates, when the reports of these two Committees were presented. Suggestions had been made that it be formally cited in the Resolutions as contributing to the development of international law and the reduction of armaments; this was not, however, in the end done; notably for the reason that the Pact has not yet been ratified; that its value is rather more moral and psychological than strictly technical; and, at least in one case, that it is accompanied by reserves.

These frequent references, however, during a variety of discussions, were due to three principal causes: first, the Pact's fundamental importance to the whole movement for
international peace and co-operation; second, its specific effect on the technical discussions on international law, security and disarmament; and, finally, the personal but dramatic fact that it had been signed in Paris only six days before the Assembly and, in most cases, by the same national representatives as came to Geneva.

During the General Debate with which the Assembly always opens, the following twenty-three speakers, though, as stated, in no sense called upon to do so, took occasion to refer to the Pact in their general declarations:

- Mr. Huai-mar J. Procopé, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Finland, and Acting President of the Council, who opened the Assembly.
- Mr. Wang-King-Ky, Chinese Minister to Belgium.
- Jonkheer F. Beelaerts van Blokland, Foreign Minister of the Netherlands.
- Mr. B. Östen Undén, former Foreign Minister of Sweden.
- M. Joh. Ludwig Mowinckel, Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Norway.
- M. Paul hymans, Foreign Minister of Belgium.
- Mr. Nicolas Politis, former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Greece, now Minister in Paris.
- Mr. Hermann Müller, Chancellor of Germany.
- The Rt. Hon. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Canada.
- M. Guisépope Motta, Head of the Political Department of Switzerland.
- M. Ignaz Seipel, Federal Chancellor of Austria.
- Mr. Auguste Zaleski, Foreign Minister of Poland.
- Mr. A. Voldemaras, Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Lithuania.

Mr. Ernest Blythe, Vice-President of the Executive Council of the Irish Free State.
Mr. Aristide Briand, Minister for Foreign Affairs of France.
Dr. Ramón V. Caballero, Chargé d’Affaires of Paraguay in Paris.
Mr. Antone Balodis, Foreign Minister of Latvia.
Mr. J. S. Smit, High Commissioner for South Africa in London.
Dr. Augusto de Vasconcellos, former Prime Minister of Portugal.
The Rt. Hon. Lord Cushendun, Acting Secretary of State of Great Britain for Foreign Affairs.
His Highness Mohammad Ali Khan Foroughi, Ambassador of Persia in Turkey.

Six other speakers in the General Debate did not mention the Pact: H. E. the Nawab of Palanpur, who confined himself to Indian affairs; Mendez Pereira of Panama, who spoke mostly on an international university at the Isthmus; Mr. Guerrero of Salvador, who limited himself to the private manufacture of arms; Mr. Mehdi Frasheiri of Albania; Mr. Belloni of Italy, who concentrated on the League’s economic work; and Mr. Osusky, of Czechoslovakia, who made a statement on the protection of minorities.

The Assembly debates, plenary and commission, bear upon the Pact in several different ways, which, if somewhat overlapping, nevertheless present distinctive features and show the Pact in relation to:

1. General International Life.
2. The League of Nations.
3. The Codification of International Law.
5. The Future.
1. THE PACT AND INTERNATIONAL LIFE.

All speakers in the Assembly who mentioned the Pact gave it a high place in international life. The keynote was struck in the speech with which the Assembly was opened by the Acting President of the Council, Foreign Minister Procopé of Finland. "I feel sure", he said, "that we must all regard this Pact as a lofty manifestation of the will to bring about an international understanding... a triumph for the cause of peace... a new and precious help to us in our work, a new encouragement to press forward to success."

The first speaker in the General Debate, Mr. Wang-King-Ki of China, gave it the sweeping title of "the first instrument for the outlawry of war". It means, according to the Foreign Minister Beclaerts van Blokland of Holland, that war as an instrument of national policy "is now finally divested of its most dangerous feature—its legality". Former Foreign Minister Undén of Sweden felt that "if", as he hoped, "all States, both members and non-members of the League, accede to the Pact, it will serve as an expression of the growing spirit of solidarity among nations and of their collective will to consolidate peace." Prime Minister Mowinckel of Norway greeted it "as the prelude of a brighter future, when popular conviction and the authority of the League shall cause war to be regarded as a crime as heinous as murder." Foreign Minister Hymans of Belgium went into more detail:

"The Pact", he said, "is of inestimable value in that it brings together politics and morality, it introduces into the code of international diplomacy a moral law, the principle that war shall henceforth be condemned and with it the unjustified use of force. It is a categorical imperative, a moral obligation, the positive value of which lies in the international public opinion which it will create, regarding the consequences to which those who might violate it will be exposed."

Mr. Adatei, Permanent Representative of Japan to the League of Nations, welcomed it warmly as an "important instrument of international peace..." and as a "world peace pact". Former Foreign Minister Politis of Greece made the sweeping statement: "For the first time in the history of mankind States have agreed to renounce war... to abandon what had hitherto been regarded as the essential prerogative attaching to sovereignty... which "represents something more than a great innovation in international relations; it represents a veritable revolution, a revolution the untold consequences and manifold repercussions of which on the life of the nations cannot yet be estimated."

Chancellor Müller of Germany, taking as his starting point "the great international event which we have just witnessed at Paris", said that the governments should not feel "the slightest doubt of the importance in practical politics of this act by which the nations have subscribed to a solemn and binding contract renouncing war for all time as an instrument of national policy, thereby eliminating it as a legitimate means of shaping international relations." Prime Minister Mackenzie King of Canada, taking as his text the hundred years of peace between his country and the United States, saw the Pact as "an historic and enduring contribution to the development of world opinion against war and of mutual confidence between nations" and as "essentially an endeavour to develop and focus world opinion against war."

Foreign Minister Zaleski of Poland, author of last year's Assembly resolution by which all States renounced wars of aggression, which may in part, at least, be called the spiritual precursor of the present document, felt that the Pact "may form the moral foundation on which we can build the noble
edifice of peace." Prime Minister Voldemaras of Lithuania, a country for years in "a state of war" with Poland, claimed that the Pact went beyond the Covenant, for "formerly", he said, "it was legally impossible to proscribe war; the Paris Pact has now made this possible."

Mr. Blythe, Vice-President of the Irish Free State Executive Council, believed that the entry into force of the Pact will mean that henceforth "it becomes the law of civilized society that resort to war is an outrage; that a State has no more right than a private individual to attack and kill its neighbours." Mr. Briand, co-author of the Pact, in a speech interweaving the Pact, Franco-German relations and general security, made a plea for faith and public support: "The Pact was signed, it is true, before a small group of onlookers, but the streets were full of people. You should have seen the enthusiasm it evoked; and the radiant faces, not only of women—that was to be understood—but of strong men, men who, if called upon, would once again prove their valour on the battlefield."

Mr. Smit, South African High Commissioner in London, felt that, by actions like the Pact, the world may ultimately, step by step, "reach the goal which to many in the past have appeared extremely problematical." Former Prime Minister de Vasconcellos of Portugal hoped the Pact would prove "a most powerful contribution to the cause of peace through the high authority and the number of its signatories," and Acting Foreign Minister Lord Cusshendun of Great Britain hailed it as "a great venture of faith... an instrument that proclaims a new era and creates a new outlook."

2. THE PACT AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

But what, it may be asked, were the feelings of those who, working for years through the League of Nations and often denied the co-operation of the United States, suddenly saw an entirely new and outside proposal injected into international life? Would they welcome it for itself and irrespective of all other considerations, or would they feel a certain reserve or even opposition? And would they judge that it helped the League or weakened it, that it followed its general lines or opened up new and possibly divergent ones?

Here, again, a lead was given in Mr. Procopé's opening speech, which greeted the Pact "as an act in keeping with the principles of the Covenant of the League arising out of the same desire for universality and for united action to maintain peace..." and "as a triumph... for our faith in the future of the League."

Mr. Wang-King-Ki of China found the Pact, like Locarno, to have been concluded "if not under the direct inspiration, at all events in the spirit of the League." Mr. Undén of Sweden amplified this view somewhat when he said: "Even to members of the League who have, in various connections assumed still wider undertakings to prevent war and to resort to peaceful methods for the settlement of international disputes, the new Pact represents an additional safeguard, and one entirely in keeping with the spirit of the Covenant."

Mr. Politis of Greece then made a detailed analysis of the relations of the Pact and the League in saying: "We can claim with legitimate pride that the Paris treaty is both the product of our own work here and the natural corollary of that work... The treaty serves to strengthen the League and opens up immense possibilities for the extension of its authority... Its great merit as compared with the Covenant
is that it fills the chief gap in the last-named instrument: it fills in the notorious "issue" in Article 15, paragraph 6. It realises a reform which for the last five years we have sought in vain... the prohibition of what we have always called here wars of aggression... The effect of the delay prescribed in Article 12 of the Covenant is thus immensely strengthened, since, according to that article, after the expiration of the prescribed period war becomes legitimate, whereas under the terms of the Paris Pact, whatever the period allowed, a war of aggression will in any case be illicit and prohibited.

Chancellor Müller of Germany found the Pact "intimately associated with the aims we are seeking to pursue in Geneva... If any proof were necessary that the Paris Pact was begotten of the vital needs of our age or that it constitutes an organic element in evolution today, that proof must be found in the fact that the new tasks arising out of that Pact are entirely in harmony with the very subjects which are given the greatest prominence in the agenda of this Assembly."

Mr. Mackenzie King of Canada agreed with this view in describing the principles of the Pact as "completely in harmony with the main objects for which the League was founded." "It marks," said Mr. Zaleski of Poland, "a logical and necessary stage in the League's development, and the latter should, as it were, adopt it." Mr. Procopé, speaking as Finnish Foreign Minister, held that "it will in no way affect the rights or obligations of States Members of the League." On the contrary, thought Mr. Blythe of the Irish Free State: "This pact is of signal importance in relation to the primary task of the League, namely the preservation of international peace and the establishment of a rule of order and justice among nations."

It remained, however, for Mr. Briand of France, co-author of the Pact, to go the furthest of all the speakers in this connection, when he said: "But for the League and the spirit it has created, there would never have been a Locarno. More recently still, there would never have been a Paris Pact."

Mr. Vasconcellos of Portugal reiterated the view that the Pact "fills the biggest gap in the Covenant." Finally, Lord Cusshendun felt that the Pact, "in complete harmony with the work of the League of Nations, is at once our proclamation of purpose and our testament to posterity. It is the faith of today and the hope of tomorrow."

Only one speaker took a different line, Mr. Voldemaras of Lithuania, who, in pointing out that "the Covenant allows the possibility of war", submitted a formal resolution that, as "the acceptance of the Pact for the renunciation of war by the members of the League goes further than their obligations in this respect contained in the Covenant and supplements them, thus necessitating changes in the fundamental provisions of the Covenant", the Council should "initiate an enquiry into the amendments which should be introduced into the Covenant on the above-mentioned lines and submit these amendments to the Assembly at its next session." The Agenda Committee of the Assembly recommended, however, and the Assembly and the Lithuanian delegation concurred, that the matter be not included in this Assembly, for the double reason, first that the Pact is not yet effective, and, second, that the delegates had no instructions for the discussion of this vital problem.
3. THE PACT AND INTERNATIONAL LAW.

While, of course, the Pact, when ratified, will in itself constitute a fundamental element of international law, there were naturally many references as to its other effects, both general and specific, on that phase of international life. Many speakers emphasized the importance of the Pact from the double viewpoint, first, of creating a vital addition to already existing international law, and, second, of illuminating the necessity for still further additions if the renunciation of war is to be made really effective.

Mr. McLachlan of Australia, in pointing out this need, said: "Arbitration is a suitable method for disputes of a juridical nature, and some form of conciliation is necessary for disputes which do not lend themselves to settlement by arbitration or by decision of the Permanent Court." Mr. Politis of Greece claimed that while, on the one hand, the Pact accepts the principle of the "prohibition of what we have always called here wars of aggression", that prohibition is not accompanied by the supplementary guarantees necessary for a complete system of peace, notably because "it does not make arbitration compulsory... there is no guarantee of a definitive decision in the event of serious disputes between the Contracting States, and in extreme cases there is a risk that the undertaking not to resort to war may for that reason prove very difficult of fulfilment."

Apart from the General Debate, more specific references were made when the question of the Progressive Codification of International Law came before the First Committee on Legal and Constitutional Questions. There Mr. Erich of Finland suggested the inclusion in the final resolutions of a reference to the Pact, which, he said, is "of the highest importance for the whole future of pacific settlement."

"That Pact", he said, "contains the statement that the High Contracting Parties recognize that in the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of any description which might arise between them recourse was only to be had to pacific means of settlement... The development and determination of international law are, then, of the highest importance."

Mr. Rolin, of Belgium, accepted this reference, though he felt that logically it was implied in the general statement, and that, moreover, the Pact had not given, but had promised, extension of arbitration.

Mr. d’Oliveira, of Portugal, did not favour any resolution which might give the impression of limiting the scope and effect of the Pact.

Mr. Scialoja, of Italy, Chairman of the Committee, then expressed doubt as to the desirability of such a reference for various reasons: that the Pact "has not yet been ratified" and is still, juridically, in the form of a draft; that it was already included in the general phraseology; that "though of immense moral and psychological importance, it was of less legal importance because it was not provided with sanctions which could only be furnished by the Covenant of the League." The Pact required, from the viewpoint of positive international law, "to be completed by the provisions of the Covenant", and implied very largely the solution of disputes by diplomatic means rather than those legal steps which the Committee was considering.

Mr. Guerrero, of Salvador, in supporting this view, gave expression to what seemed to be a general feeling amongst the Latin-American delegates, that the Pact is "a very much more delicate instrument than Mr. Erich appeared to suppose"; and that "it is not yet in force, nor even ratified"; and that "among the States which have adhered to it are some which have done so only under certain reserves"... Accordingly, he said he was unable "to accept any form of words containing a reference to that Pact."
Mr. Dandurand, of Canada, agreed in the circumstances that it would be preferable not to mention the Pact; Mr. Cassin, of France, felt it might be inopportune; Mr. Rolin agreed that, as it had not been ratified, it would be better not to insist upon mentioning it; and Mr. Politis, of Greece, felt that it would not be quite exact to say that the Pact had given a remarkable extension to the methods of peaceful settlement, for it was precisely one of its weaknesses that it made a rather vague and too timid reference to the pacific procedures which it prescribed.

For these reasons, then, which affect the technical aspects of the Pact rather than its broad principles, the Committee decided against reference to it.

Here might also be noted a related declaration made by Mr. d'Oliveira of Portugal before the Third Committee, in connection with press reports as to Mr. Kellogg's advocating conciliation in preference to arbitration as the truly effective method for peacefully settling international disputes. Mr. Kellogg had raised objections against the arbitration method which they could not share but which must not be disregarded; on the contrary, he held that the method of conciliation was the ideal one for the peaceful settlement of all international disputes. In conclusion, he felt, at the moment when States had signed or were about to sign the multilateral Pact for the renunciation of war, that there seemed to be at hand when they should at least sign general conciliation conventions.

4. THE PACT AND ARBITRATION, SECURITY AND DISARMAMENT.

Inevitably, too, the effect of the Pact on disarmament and security had its repercussion in the Assembly. A widely shared view seemed to be expressed at the beginning of the General Debate by Foreign Minister Beelaerts van Blokland of Holland when he said: “The circumstances attending the opening of the Ninth ordinary session of the Assembly would seem more favourable for the reduction of armaments than those at the beginning of last year's session when a feeling of anxiety and a mood of scepticism were predominant in the public mind.”

Mr. Politis, of Greece, however, was more cautious, saying that “the individual contracting States can in the main only count for their defence on their own forces, so that they cannot at once agree to reduce those forces as they might have done had they received a promise of assistance in case of aggression.”

Chancellor Müller, of Germany, however, took the Pact as another justification for the plea his country made throughout the Assembly for disarmament, saying: “If we are genuinely resolved to renounce war, that resolve cannot fail to excise a decisive influence on our conception of armaments.”

The broadest statement, however, of the pacifying value of the Pact came from the Prime Minister of Lithuania, M. Voldemaras, who declared: “Much has been said concerning the reduction of armaments. Of course, before the signature of the Paris Pact, the problem appeared almost insoluble... But what could be simpler now? If all the countries in the world agree by treaty not to resort to war, armies, those national guardians of peace, become obsolete. Once this has been brought about, disarmament will come
of itself. Nations do not lightly assume heavy financial burdens; they submit to them only because they feel themselves threatened. Once confidence in peace has been restored, disarmament will follow as an economic necessity."

This simplistic view was not, however, accepted by M. Briand, who took quite an opposite line: "When speaking of disarmament, it is easy enough to say: 'What prevents us from disarming? We have set our faces towards peace; we have reconciled at Locarno, we have just made friends at Paris. Why should these events not lead us to an immediate manifestation whereby the peoples of the world would cast away their weapons?' If it were only so! But what statesman, I ask, what delegate in this Assembly, would desire——would hope, rather—for such a dramatic demonstration? It could be done in words; great proclamations could be made, and I can readily imagine the enthusiasm such an outburst would arouse throughout the world. But once the purely emotional side of the question were settled, there would still be the practical realities——painful, difficult realities—which could ruthlessly cast the dreamer from his pinnacle down into the abyss."

"Yet", said Lord Cushendun, after expressing caution against over-optimism, "I have very little doubt but that this Treaty will give a very wholesome stimulus to the process of international disarmament."

When the question came before the Third Committee, the discussions necessarily became more specific. At the opening session, Mr. Lange of Norway cited the Pact as one of the factors pointing to the possibility of a new meeting of the Preparatory Disarmament Commission. While this treaty "contains, it is true, disquieting reservations", it had already had an important result, in that "the United States had foregone an important increase to their fleet", reducing the original proposal from 71 new ships to 16 and even adjourning the discussion to the next Congress.

Mr. Benes, of Czechoslovakia, agreed that "considerable progress had been made as regards moral disarmament" and the increase of mutual confidence by agreements such as the Paris Pact, and that therefore a meeting of the Preparatory Commission might usefully be arranged.

Mr. Loudon, of the Netherlands, President of that Commission, agreed that the atmosphere was at present "particularly good in view of the Paris Pact."

Hereupon, Count Bernstorff, of Germany, in commenting on the French draft resolution and pointing out that no reference had been made either to the Covenant or to the Pact, suggested a formal reference to the Pact as one of the elements creating "the present conditions of security" which allow of a first step being taken forthwith for the framing of a general convention on disarmament.

Mr. Paul-Boncour, of France, said he "had the highest respect for the Covenant and the Pact, and had nothing to say against their being mentioned."

Mr. Guerrero, of Salvador, however, while "not in any way opposed to the Pact, which morally was of extraordinary value", recalled that a similar proposal had been submitted to the First Committee concerning the possible relations between the Pact and the present position of arbitration, and that the Committee had decided that "the Pact could not legally be regarded as existing since it had not yet been ratified."

Mr. Motta, of Switzerland, "without wishing to underestimate the value of the Pact from the moral and legal points of view", felt that the Third Committee would do well to follow the example of the First Committee. Mr. Palacios, of Spain, however, felt the situation in this Committee was "quite different", in that, while the First Committee felt that in the specific field of the settlement of disputes by pacific procedure the Pact made no change, the Third Committee was working in the quite different field of politics.

This question, however, was referred, with others, to a small drafting committee which decided to follow the general lines of the original French resolution, and not, therefore, to refer specifically to the Pact.
In connection with security, several speakers pointed out that the Pact, while constituting a great advance in some directions, lacked the enforcement clauses necessary to ensure States a complete guarantee of peace. In addition to previous citations may be mentioned the statement of Mr. Zaleski, of Poland, that "we realise, of course, that it does not absolutely guarantee peace". Also Mr. Seilajärvi's remark may be recalled that the Pact, "though of immense moral and psychological importance, was of less importance from the legal point of view because it was not provided with sanctions".

But the most complete statement of this viewpoint came during the Final Debate when Mr. Politis, of Greece, presented the report of the Third Committee on Arbitration, Security and Disarmament. In discussing the General Act on the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes and the various Model Treaties of Non-Aggression and Mutual Assistance, he said, "The Treaty signed a month ago at Paris marks an important date in the history of mankind. It lays down the principle of non-aggression, and we firmly trust that this principle will before long become a universal law. When this comes to pass, it may at first sight appear that the texts which we have just prepared will lose some of their usefulness. This is true, but it will be only in appearance — it will seem useless in future to reiterate in an agreement between three, four or five States an undertaking which has been universally assumed by the fact of adhering to the Paris Pact."

"It will be so only in appearance. The efficacy of mutual assistance and non-aggression will only be diminished by the Paris Pact in a very slight degree. We must not forget that the prohibition to resort to force laid down in the Paris Pact is attended by a number of exceptions. These are understood in the Pact. They should be clearly defined and explained in some text, and this is the purpose of the models submitted to you, since, after establishing the principle of non-aggression, they indicate the exceptions to the principle, namely, in the case of legitimate defence, the application of Article 15, paragraph 7, or Article 16 of the Covenant, or action authorized by the League.

"The Paris Pact, however, is far from complete from the standpoint of the organization of peace.

"It speaks of submitting disputes to pacific procedure, but it does not provide for the organization of such procedure, nor does it stipulate any obligation to have recourse to it, and the guarantee of assistance which is considered by a great many States as essential for the definite establishment of peace is entirely absent from the Paris Pact.

"This double omission can be made good by means of the model treaties, which are open for the acceptance of all States actuated by goodwill. If the pacts, treaties of non-aggression and treaties of mutual assistance are accepted by the States, this will undoubtedly be an added factor of security, it will mean additional guarantees of the greatest practical importance in facilitating the solution of that vast and most serious problem — the reduction and limitation of armaments."
5. THE PACT AND THE FUTURE.

But, if many orators welcomed the Pact, they also took care to express the view that it was a step and not a goal. Early in the debate Mr. McLachlan of Australia said: “If nations renounce war as the mode for settling their disputes, some other means must be provided.” Mr. Mowinckel, Prime Minister of Norway, elaborated this somewhat in saying: “We must no longer live under the old dictum: ‘Si vis pacem, para bellum.’ We must replace these words with those engraved on the pen presented by the City of Havre to Mr. Kellogg for the signature of the Pact against war: ‘Si vis pacem, para pacem.’”

Chancellor Müller of Germany prophesied: “The Pact has thus created new tasks for the statesmen as well as for others. If we are genuinely resolved to renounce force as a means of solving international differences, we shall be compelled to devote ourselves more intently to the search for means of achieving the pacific settlement of international disputes.” Mr. Motta of Switzerland brought the matter to the League when he said: “To proclaim the desire for peace is not enough: this desire must be fostered and peace must be properly organized. The League, by preparing, fostering and organizing the world’s will for peace has become a supremely important institution, and the significance, efficacy, and merit of its efforts in the campaign against war are, indeed, unrivaled.”

“Nevertheless”, said Chancellor Seipel of Austria, “it must be confessed that much hard work still remains to be done to banish the feeling of disquiet and insecurity which is harassing the whole world and particularly Europe.”

“We realise, of course”, warned Mr. Zaleski of Poland, “that the Pact does not absolutely guarantee peace, since it provides no sanctions against the crime of violating peace.”

Mr. Blythe of the Irish Free State urged that “it is the duty of all governments which have signed the Kellogg Pact to endeavour to bring about the conditions under which it can most surely achieve its object. They must work for the establishment of goodwill and the removal of mistrust among nations. The new agreement demands of the members of the League which accept it that the work of all peace organisations shall be intensified. It is a new summons to the nations to bestir themselves in solving their greatest problems.”

Even M. Briand of France, co-author of the Pact, emphasised that, “as Mr. Kellogg himself and others after him have said, these instruments are worth precisely what the nations choose to make of them.” Mr. Balodis of Latvia took the same line when he said: “With no driving force behind them, these drafts will become a dead letter.”

Mr. Smit of South Africa put it that “to us the Kellogg Pact is not a goal, it is only another milestone on the road which started at Locarno.” Lord Cusshendun warned: “But do not let us be discouraged or disappointed if we find out that the full effect turns out to be neither immediate nor spectacular. It will not necessarily be of less value on that account, for rapid, demonstrative action, if due to emotional impulse, often brings about reaction.”

Very naturally there were many expressions of appreciation for the initiative taken by the United States in this matter. American diplomacy undoubtedly secured great credit for this sweeping move towards world peace, which could not but be heightened at Geneva by the fact that the United States had not joined in this other co-operative effort for international organisation and co-operation. Indeed, the Pact was accepted, not as committing the United States to new and specific obligations, but as a guarantee that she ranged herself positively, even if by a method different from that of the other nations, on the side of active efforts for avoiding war.

In the speech opening the Assembly, Mr. Procopé of Finland expressed this feeling as follows: “I may avail myself of this opportunity to send a cordial greeting to that great Republic, the United States of America, which, as you are aware, was chiefly responsible for preparing that Treaty. I feel sure you will wish to congratulate warmly the authors of this Pact, and above all those who primarily conceived it, Mr. Kellogg and M. Briand.”

Here, perhaps, may be noted a natural but amusing uncertainty as to what name to give the Pact. Some of the speakers ponderously avoided any abbreviation by giving it its full title. Some called it “the Briand-Kellogg Pact”, as Mr. Wang-King-Ki of China, Mr. Mackenzie King and Mr. Daudrandard of Canada, Mr. Voldemar of Lithuania, Mr. Procopé and Mr. Erich of Finland, Mr. Caballero of Paraguay, Mr. d’Oliveira of Portugal and Mr. Lange of Norway. Others called it “the Kellogg Pact”, Monsignor Seipel of Austria, Mr. Zaleski of Poland, Mr. Balodis of Latvia, Mr. Smit of South Africa, and Mr. Rolin of Belgium. Others called it “the Paris Pact”, Mr. Politis of Greece, Mr. Müller and Count Bernstorff of Germany, Mr. Motta of Switzerland, Dr. Vasconcellos of Portugal, Lord Cusshendun of Great Britain, Mr. Foroughi of Persia, Mr. Scialoja of Italy, Mr. Guerrero of Salvador, Mr. Loudon of Holland, Mr. Paul-Boncour of France, and Mr. Palacios of Spain. Some avoided the difficulty by giving the Pact two names, as Mr. Blythe of the Irish Free State, who once called it “the Paris Pact” and later “the Kellogg Pact”.

Irrespective of that detail, however, the speakers throughout the debate emphasised their appreciation of America’s activity and of her joint authorship, sometimes differently divided, with France. Jonkheer Beelaerts van Blokland of Holland spoke of “the action taken by the French Government, which met with a ready response from the Government of the United States of America”, and of “the invitation addressed to his Government by the United States Government”. Mr. Undén of Sweden expressed his Government’s “keen satisfaction at the action so nobly taken by the President of the United States and the French Minister of Foreign Affairs”. Mr. Mowinckel of Norway described the Pact as “the initiative of M. Briand and Mr. Kellogg”, and Mr. Hymans of Belgium spoke of signing it “at the instance of the United States following upon the noble proposal put forward by M. Briand”.

The Japanese delegate went into more detail: “We hasten”, he said, “to applaud the determination and generous spirit with which the great North American Republic has striven for the conclusion of this important instrument for international peace. By this great act the United States have shown their firm intention of contributing to world peace. I should like also to take this opportunity of paying a special tribute to the genius of our distinguished French colleague, M. Briand, who first took the initiative of proposing this world peace pact to the United States.”

Mr. MacKenzie King of Canada expressed his appreciation “because of the immediate association of the Treaty in its inception more particularly with France and the United
States and the relationship which Canada bears to each of these countries ". Monsignor Seipel of Austria recalled that though the Pact had not been concluded directly under the League, it was "on the joint initiative of one of its most famous protagonists, M. Briand, the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, and of Mr. Kellogg, Secretary of State of the United States". Mr. Zaleski of Poland, in urging its adoption by the League, said: "That does not mean, of course, that we dispute the undeniable rights of the great American democracy to its paternity". Mr. Voldemaras of Lithuania put it that: "It was at the bold initiative of M. Briand that Mr. Kellogg, Secretary of State of the United States of America, proposed a treaty which, after much negotiation and many amendments, was signed at Paris", and further on, that post-war France took "the initiative of enlarging the field wherein war will henceforth become impossible by suggesting to the greatest power in the world, the United States of America", the anti-war pact.

Mr. Blythe of the Irish Free State expressed a common view when he said: "Members of the Assembly will not attempt to minimize the importance of the Pact because it was formulated by the Government of a great country which has declined to enter the League. I am sure that we all welcome this great and impressive effort to save humanity from a possible renewal of the horrors of war.... My country is bound by close ties to the people of the United States, and as one of the original signatories of the Pact, which it accepted unreservedly, my Government is anxious to avail itself of the opportunity to express its high appreciation of the work of the United States Government in the cause of universal peace".

Another Dominion representative, Mr. Smit of South Africa, speaking of "the initiative of that great country across the Atlantic willingly assisted and supported by France", said his own country had gladly co-operated "because we believe in the genuineness of the feelings which have animated the people of the United States of America". Mr. Vasconcellos of Portugal paid "a heartfelt tribute of homage and respect to Mr. Briand, who first launched the idea, and to Mr. Kellogg who expanded and developed it ". Lord Cusshendun of Great Britain concluded with the prophecy: "When this new page is turned, we may be sure that we shall find the names of those who initiated the Paris Pact inscribed among the greatest benefactors of mankind".
CONCLUSION.

The Ninth Assembly of the League of Nations, bringing together in Geneva the representatives of 50 nations six days after the signature in Paris of the Pact for the Renunciation of War as an Instrument of National Policy, welcomed that Pact as of vital import to the development of international peace and co-operation.

The two-score statesmen who referred to it either in General Debate or in technical discussions on international law or disarmament made no claim that it was a complete or final effort; on the contrary, they pointed out certain places where the Pact is either weak or does not claim to be complete; for instance, that the renunciation of war is not all-inclusive but is accompanied by exceptions; that the peaceful methods to which recourse is to be had are not defined or prescribed; that no system, though ardently desired by many States, is elaborated for the assistance of States victims, or for the punishment of States guilty of aggression; and finally, in some cases, that the Pact is accompanied by disquieting reservations.

Despite these obvious difficulties, to which could be subjected almost any treaty, especially one aiming to enunciate a principle rather than to elaborate a whole system, it seemed universally agreed that the Pact introduces a new principle into international life; that for the first time it definitely illegalises war and removes it from the accepted methods of international intercourse; that the Pact is both a corollary of, and a stimulant to, the work and effort of the League; that it goes further than the Covenant in the renunciation of war but not so far in detailed means of prevention; that it makes essential a highly quickened development of international law, particularly of arbitration and conciliation; and that it constitutes a definite contribution to that sense of international security from which reduction in armaments is most likely to eventuate.

Finally, American prestige abroad gained through the fact that the Pact was accepted as a generous American effort demonstrating that the United States, though she may not be prepared to join in specific obligations for the prevention of war, is, nevertheless, willing and eager to lead in accepting a self-denying agreement to renounce war and regulate national action in the interest of world peace.