

Ten million souls had revolted determinedly, sincerely, and permanently from the idea that Governments, dictators or bureaux could, in the future, levy upon the individual lives of the country for their use as pawns in the settlement of what were generally technical differences between nations." Sir George referred to the gradual approach of the United States of America to participation in the Permanent Court of International Justice, to the conclusion of the Paris Pact, and to the progress being made at present in regard to the reduction of naval armaments. "These were some of the indications of the sentiment . . . which was now growing stronger throughout the world—an outgrowth of the awakened moral consciousness in the nations." Referring more particularly to Lord Cecil's proposal, he asked whether the Preparatory Commission was "so set upon what it had resolved two years ago, that it was not open to the impulse, spirit and information of the succeeding years, and would it not welcome this as something which would assist it in arriving at a better solution of its arduous labours? He did not think so. . . . If the Third Committee rejected the resolution and passed no other, it would go forth to the world that it was entirely satisfied with the results so far obtained by the Preparatory Commission, but he did not think that would interpret the world's opinion. There was an expectancy growing out of the wide dissatisfaction and discontent regarding the long road traversed without adequate and appreciable results, and, if nothing were said by the Committee or the Assembly, it would constitute an affirmation by these bodies that all that could be done had been done." He concluded by stating that "the atmosphere reigning in the Assembly gave every cause for optimism, and he was convinced that, if goodwill and courteous contacts were cultivated, the future peace of the world would be secured."

M. Lone Liang (China) strongly supported Lord Cecil. Referring to the question of the limitation of land war material regarding which the Commission had openly confessed its failure to reach any real agreement, he said that no practical results had been achieved, only something entirely illusory. He recalled that the Chinese Delegation had proposed the abolition of the system of compulsory military service, considering that this was the best solution to the question of trained reserves, and one likely to lead to a diminution in the spirit of national militarism throughout the world. Although public opinion in most countries had been in favour of that proposal, as indicated by the many telegrams and letters received by the Chinese Delegation, the Commission had seemed to regard it as a purely utopian idea, and had endeavoured to side-track it. He said it would be absurd to maintain that the decisions arrived at before the Preparatory Commission were to be recorded as final and not subject to revision.

As will be seen from the above synopsis of some of the views expressed by the various Delegations, opinion was divided on the question of Lord Cecil's resolution. It was difficult if not impossible to say how the final vote would have turned out. It was thought that, had Lord Cecil's resolution been put to the vote, it would have carried by a very small majority, but this is by no means sure.

M. Politis (Greece), who had not spoken previously, proposed a compromise resolution which met with general approval and was adopted with a few minor alterations. To obviate unnecessary repetition the text of the compromise resolution as finally adopted is given below:—

"The Assembly,

"Having taken cognizance with interest of the work of the last session of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference;

"Cordially welcoming the prospect of an early agreement between the naval powers with a view to the reduction and limitation of naval armaments, which agreement may enable the Preparatory Commission to secure general agreement on the methods to be adopted for the reduction and limitation of naval armaments;