

might judge to be the victim of aggression. "It is a question," M. Schanzer had said, "of reconciling the liberty and independence of the States in their determination of a breach of the Covenant. . . . with the obvious necessity of arriving at an agreement between Members of the League as to the existence of a breach and of co-ordinating their action on the basis of a joint plan." Still less is the position affected in the continued absence of any operative amendment. "It has been suggested," wrote M. de Brouckère in 1926, "that States should not be allowed to intervene until the League itself has given its opinion. This would be questioning a right which Members clearly derive from the Covenant." Last October neither the Council as such nor the Assembly as such denounced Italy, albeit it was at the Council table and in the Assembly that the Member States put on record their several opinions on Italy's action. The recognising of aggression in a Russo-German war is something with which Locarno has no concern. And the duty of assistance to Russia by France in such a war is, I think, officially spoken of limited to cases in which France has never, either as the Covenant, or in Locarno, or in the Kellogg Pact, promised not to resort to war against Germany.

A propos of the arrangement whereby, as suggested in 1921, the Council would circulate an opinion, together with the minutes of the meetings at which that opinion was formed, it is slightly pathetic to recall how naive was the faith expressed in those days in the potency of world criticism. "The Council's opinion," said the I.B.C.,

¹ 2nd Assembly, primary meetings, p. 428.

² League of Nations Publications V, Legal. 1927. V. 14, p. 69.

"should be accompanied by a statement of reasons. It will be advisable to give it the widest possible publicity, so that not only may the governments acquire that conviction which is essential for common action but that the peoples themselves may also be clearly convinced that there are really sufficient grounds to justify the application of Article 16." So far so good, but "This publicity would also be beneficial in another way, namely, that public opinion in the country which has been declared a Covenant-breaker will also be aroused and that in consequence a new political orientation may be adopted, thus making a return to a normal situation possible. The result will be that the conflict will be brought to an end without it becoming necessary to put the sanctions in force." Perhaps it is the censorship that has falsified these beliefs. At all events, after our experience of the movement of Italian and Japanese opinion in certain relevant situations, no one would nowadays be quite so sanguine as regards the effect, at least in non-democratic countries, of unfavourable comment towards a change of heart, such comment seems liable rather to unify, if not to exasperate, national sentiment in support of the delinquent government.

A word now in regard to the best known difficulty of all—and one which lies perhaps at the root of most of the others. I refer to the potentially unsympathetic attitude of non-Member countries—in particular, the United States.

"Every possible effort," said the I.B.C., "should be made to arrive at arrangements which will at least ensure their passive co-operation with the

³ League of Nations Publications V, Legal. 1927. V. 14, p. 18.

hope that
would opinion
would justify
govt + its people

experience
has disproved
this +
instead
solidify co
opponents

Key issue:
attitude of
non-members,
esp. U.S.

League of Nations
Council
this would be
undesirable
Council

League of Nations
Council
this would be
undesirable
Council

League of Nations
Council
this would be
undesirable
Council

League of Nations
Council
this would be
undesirable
Council