

decision was reached and the State Department are going to discuss the question further.

Our proposal to make a drafting change to use the exact language of the Charter in paragraph 3 and to say "the measures necessary to maintain and to restore international peace and security" was discussed. It was pointed out, however, that this Article was concerned with measures taken as a result of Article 5, which presumably means that an armed attack will have taken place. In the circumstances, it was thought that it was more appropriate to say only "to restore international peace and security".

#### *Article 7*

Our suggestion that Article 7 should carry an obligation as well as state a fact did not meet with general favour. The United States representatives in particular disagreed with it on the grounds that it would create difficulties with Congress.

The United Nations experts in the State Department would prefer the elimination of Article 7. If this is not considered advisable they then suggest that the order of the wording should be changed and some text accepted along the following lines:

"The parties declare, each so far as he is concerned, that none of the provisions of this Treaty is in conflict with or affected by any of the international engagements now in force between him and any other of the parties or any third State."

#### *Article 8*

The French suggested substituting for the words "which shall recommend measures", the words "which shall prepare the plans and recommend the steps".

The United States wished to amend the present text by inserting the word "general" before the word "measures". They said that the French amendment would be quite unacceptable to the United States military authorities. They thought that in order to go part way to meet the French wishes they might persuade the military authorities not to insist on the inclusion of the word "general". In explaining the matter Hickerson said that the United States concept of the Military Committee set up under this Pact was that it would be an organization on which all signatories would be represented, that it would meet, say, once a quarter to consider available facilities, etc., and that the real planning would be done by the smaller organization now operating in London under the Brussels Treaty with United States and Canadian representatives participating. He could not see that a "rival" organization could be set up by the present Treaty, nor could he see the French Chiefs of Staff, for instance, agreeing that, say, Iceland should have a say in their over-all strategic planning.

The French had a different concept of the Military Planning Group set up under the present Treaty. They envisaged perhaps a large Group on which all signatories would be represented, and a smaller Group which would concern itself with the defence of the whole area covered by the Treaty, whereas the Military Committee sitting now in London concerned itself more specifically with the defence of Western Europe as provided for in the Brussels Pact.