

Lord Robert Cecil said that it was felt that the extreme measures contemplated in the Article should only be brought into force in an extreme case. He also pointed out that in the beginning it had been proposed that all the other Members of the League should be deemed to be at war with a covenant-breaking State, but that this had been altered and now the covenant-breaking State would be deemed to have committed an act of war against the other members of the League. The distinction was perhaps difficult to apprehend, but it had been made at the instance of the United States Delegation to meet the difficulties of their Constitution in respect of the war-making power of Congress. The Article now left it to Congress to declare war on the covenant-breaking State. It should further be pointed out that the economic penalties contemplated by the Article could be imposed without naval or military action.

...

#### Article 18

Sir Robert Borden enquired whether a State not being a member of the League might take advantage of Article 18 to evade an obligation entered into with a member.

Lord Robert Cecil admitted that this might be so, but said that the Commission had considered the provision as on the whole desirable.

...

#### Article 20

...

Sir Robert Borden suggested that, on the face of Article 20, there was some inconsistency between the first and second paragraphs.

Lord Robert Cecil replied that while this might be so, the second paragraph was intended to deal with cases where both parties were not Members of the League; under this paragraph a Member must get rid of all obligations not covered by the first paragraph.

#### Article 21

...

Lord Robert Cecil said that different members of the Commission had pressed the President very strongly for a clear definition of the Monroe Doctrine, but that even after long debate the position was not entirely clear. The general object of the Doctrine was to prevent European intrigue in America, and it had its genesis in a design to forestall the Holy Alliance from interfering in the Western Hemisphere. The Commission had, time after time, asked the President about the meaning of the Doctrine and had got his answers on record. The Czech Representative, for instance, had put the case of a war or threat of war between Chile and Peru and had enquired whether the effect of this article would be to prevent interference by the League. The President had said that this would not be so, since in such a case the interference would