

Q # 63

35

THE CONFERENCE OF BRUSSELS

November 3-24, 1937

CONVENED IN VIRTUE OF ARTICLE 7  
OF THE  
NINE-POWER TREATY OF WASHINGTON OF 1922

THE CONFERENCE OF BRUSSELS

November 3-24, 1937

CONVENED IN VIRTUE OF ARTICLE 7  
OF THE  
NINE-POWER TREATY OF WASHINGTON OF 1922



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1938

DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
 PUBLICATION 1232  
 CONFERENCE SERIES 37

---

For sale by the  
 Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C.  
 Price 15 cents

## CONTENTS

	Page
The Nine-Power Treaty of Washington of February 6, 1922 . . . . .	1
Invitation of the Belgian Government to the Conference at Brussels, October 16, 1937 . . . . .	6
Acceptance by the American Government, October 16, 1937, of the Invi- tation of the Belgian Government . . . . .	7
Postponement of the Conference, October 27, 1937 . . . . .	8
Reply of the Japanese Government, October 27, 1937, to the Invitation of the Belgian Government . . . . .	9
Statement of the Japanese Foreign Office, October 28, 1937 . . . . .	11
Delegations Attending the Conference, November 3, 1937 . . . . .	16
Addresses Made at the Opening Meeting of the Conference, November 3, 1937, in General Discussion:	
Welcome Extended to the Delegations by His Excellency Paul-Henri Spaak, Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs . . . . .	21
Address by the Honorable Norman H. Davis, of the United States of America . . . . .	24
Address by the Right Honorable Anthony Eden, of the United King- dom . . . . .	27
Address by His Excellency Yvon Delbos, of France . . . . .	29
Address by Count Luigi Aldrovandi-Marescotti, of Italy . . . . .	31
Address by His Excellency Mr. Litvinov, of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics . . . . .	33
Address by His Excellency Dr. V. K. Wellington Koo, of China . . . . .	35
Address by His Excellency Mr. Augusto de Castro, of Portugal . . . . .	45
Comments of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, November 4, 1937, on the Japanese Reply to the Invitation to the Conference and the Statement of the Japanese Government of October 28, 1937 . . . . .	46
Communication from the Conference to the Japanese Government, November 7, 1937 . . . . .	51
Reply of the Japanese Government, November 12, 1937, to the Com- munication of November 7 from the Conference . . . . .	53
Declaration and Addresses Made at the Seventh Meeting of the Conference, November 13, 1937, in Considering the Reply of the Japanese Government:	
Declaration by His Excellency Dr. V. K. Wellington Koo, of China . . . . .	55
Address by His Excellency Yvon Delbos, of France . . . . .	58
Address by the Right Honorable Anthony Eden, of the United King- dom . . . . .	60
Address by the Honorable Norman H. Davis, of the United States of America . . . . .	61
Address by Mr. Potemkine, of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics . . . . .	63
Address by Count Luigi Aldrovandi-Marescotti, of Italy . . . . .	64
Declaration of the Conference, November 15, 1937 . . . . .	65

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

PUBLICATION 1232  
CONFERENCE SERIES 37

For sale by the  
Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C.  
Price 15 cents

CONTENTS

	Page
The Nine-Power Treaty of Washington of February 6, 1922 . . . . .	1
Invitation of the Belgian Government to the Conference at Brussels, October 16, 1937 . . . . .	6
Acceptance by the American Government, October 16, 1937, of the Invi- tation of the Belgian Government . . . . .	7
Postponement of the Conference, October 27, 1937 . . . . .	8
Reply of the Japanese Government, October 27, 1937, to the Invitation of the Belgian Government . . . . .	9
Statement of the Japanese Foreign Office, October 28, 1937 . . . . .	11
Delegations Attending the Conference, November 3, 1937 . . . . .	16
Addresses Made at the Opening Meeting of the Conference, November 3, 1937, in General Discussion:	
Welcome Extended to the Delegations by His Excellency Paul-Henri Spaak, Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs . . . . .	21
Address by the Honorable Norman H. Davis, of the United States of America . . . . .	24
Address by the Right Honorable Anthony Eden, of the United King- dom . . . . .	27
Address by His Excellency Yvon Delbos, of France . . . . .	29
Address by Count Luigi Aldrovandi-Marescotti, of Italy . . . . .	31
Address by His Excellency Mr. Litvinov, of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics . . . . .	33
Address by His Excellency Dr. V. K. Wellington Koo, of China . . . . .	35
Address by His Excellency Mr. Augusto de Castro, of Portugal . . . . .	45
Comments of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, November 4, 1937, on the Japanese Reply to the Invitation to the Conference and the Statement of the Japanese Government of October 28, 1937 . . . . .	46
Communication from the Conference to the Japanese Government, November 7, 1937 . . . . .	51
Reply of the Japanese Government, November 12, 1937, to the Com- munication of November 7 from the Conference . . . . .	53
Declaration and Addresses Made at the Seventh Meeting of the Conference, November 13, 1937, in Considering the Reply of the Japanese Government:	
Declaration by His Excellency Dr. V. K. Wellington Koo, of China . . . . .	55
Address by His Excellency Yvon Delbos, of France . . . . .	58
Address by the Right Honorable Anthony Eden, of the United King- dom . . . . .	60
Address by the Honorable Norman H. Davis, of the United States of America . . . . .	61
Address by Mr. Potemkine, of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics . . . . .	63
Address by Count Luigi Aldrovandi-Marescotti, of Italy . . . . .	64
Declaration of the Conference, November 15, 1937 . . . . .	65



	Page
Statements Made at the Closing Meeting of the Conference, November 24, 1937:	
Statement by His Excellency Dr. V. K. Wellington Koo, of China . . .	69
Statement by Count Luigi Aldrovandi-Marescotti, of Italy . . . . .	70
Statement by the Honorable Norman H. Davis, of the United States of America . . . . .	70
Statement by Viscount Cranborne, of the United Kingdom . . . . .	71
Statement by Mr. François de Tesson, of France . . . . .	72
Statement by the Honorable Raoul Dandurand, of Canada . . . . .	72
Statement by Mr. W. J. Jordan, of New Zealand . . . . .	73
Statement by Count Luigi Aldrovandi-Marescotti, of Italy . . . . .	73
Statement by His Excellency Dr. V. K. Wellington Koo, of China . . .	73
Statement by the Honorable Norman H. Davis, of the United States of America . . . . .	74
Closing Remarks by the President of the Conference, His Excellency Paul-Henri Spaak, of Belgium . . . . .	74
Declaration of the Conference, November 24, 1937 . . . . .	76
Report of the Conference, Dated November 24, 1937 . . . . .	78
Statement to the Press, Made by the Honorable Norman H. Davis, American Delegate, upon Arrival in New York, December 11, 1937 . . . . .	81
The Achievements of the Conference: Statement Made to the Secretary of State by the Honorable Norman H. Davis, American Delegate, December 16, 1937 . . . . .	82

## THE NINE-POWER TREATY OF WASHINGTON OF FEBRUARY 6, 1922 \*

### PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES TO BE FOLLOWED IN MATTERS CONCERNING CHINA

The United States of America, Belgium, the British Empire, China, France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands and Portugal:

Desiring to adopt a policy designed to stabilize conditions in the Far East, to safeguard the rights and interests of China, and to promote intercourse between China and the other Powers upon the basis of equality of opportunity;

Have resolved to conclude a treaty for that purpose and to that end have appointed as their respective Plenipotentiaries;

The President of the United States of America:

Charles Evans Hughes,  
Henry Cabot Lodge,  
Oscar W. Underwood,  
Elihu Root,

citizens of the United States;

His Majesty the King of the Belgians:

Baron de Cartier de Marchienne, Commander of the Order of Leopold and of the Order of the Crown, His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at Washington;

His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India:

The Right Honourable Arthur James Balfour, O.M., M.P.,  
Lord President of His Privy Council;

The Right Honourable Baron Lee of Fareham, G.B.E., K.C.B.,  
First Lord of His Admiralty;

The Right Honourable Sir Auckland Campbell Geddes, K.C.B.,

\* The ratifications of all the signatory powers of the treaty were duly deposited with the Government of the United States of America on Aug. 5, 1925. The following countries have adhered to the treaty: Norway, Nov. 18, 1925; Bolivia, Nov. 21, 1925; Sweden, Dec. 8, 1925; Denmark, Dec. 30, 1925; Mexico, Sept. 29, 1927. (Treaty Series, No. 723.)

His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United States of America;

and

for the Dominion of Canada:  
The Right Honourable Sir Robert Laird Borden, G.C.M.G., K.C.;

for the Commonwealth of Australia:  
Senator the Right Honourable George Foster Pearce, Minister for Home and Territories;

for the Dominion of New Zealand:  
The Honourable Sir John William Salmond, K.C., Judge of the Supreme Court of New Zealand;

for the Union of South Africa:  
The Right Honourable Arthur James Balfour, O.M., M.P.;

for India:  
The Right Honourable Valingman Sankaranarayana Srinivasa Sastri, Member of the Indian Council of State;

The President of the Republic of China:  
Mr. Sao-Ke Alfred Sze, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Washington;  
Mr. V. K. Wellington Koo, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at London;  
Mr. Chung-Hui Wang, former Minister of Justice.

The President of the French Republic:  
Mr. Albert Sarraut, Deputy, Minister of the Colonies;  
Mr. Jules J. Jusserand, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United States of America, Grand Cross of the National Order of the Legion of Honour;

His Majesty the King of Italy:  
The Honourable Carlo Schanzer, Senator of the Kingdom;  
The Honourable Vittorio Rolandi Ricci, Senator of the Kingdom, His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at Washington;  
The Honourable Luigi Albertini, Senator of the Kingdom;

His Majesty the Emperor of Japan:  
Baron Tomosaburo Kato, Minister for the Navy, Junii, a member of the First Class of the Imperial Order of the Grand Cordon of the Rising Sun with the Paulownia Flower;  
Baron Kijuro Shidehara, His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at Washington, Joshii, a member of the First Class of the Imperial Order of the Rising Sun;  
Mr. Masanao Hanihara, Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs, Jushii, a member of the Second Class of the Imperial Order of the Rising Sun;

Her Majesty the Queen of The Netherlands:

Jonkheer Frans Beelaerts van Blokland, Her Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary;  
Jonkheer Willem Hendrik de Beaufort, Minister Plenipotentiary, Chargé d'Affaires at Washington;  
The President of the Portuguese Republic:  
Mr. José Francisco de Horta Machado da Franca, Viscount d'Alte, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Washington;  
Mr. Ernesto Julio de Carvalho e Vasconcelos, Captain of the Portuguese Navy, Technical Director of the Colonial Office.

Who, having communicated to each other their full powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

## ARTICLE I.

The Contracting Powers, other than China, agree:

- (1) To respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China;
- (2) To provide the fullest and most unembarrassed opportunity to China to develop and maintain for herself an effective and stable government;
- (3) To use their influence for the purpose of effectually establishing and maintaining the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations throughout the territory of China;
- (4) To refrain from taking advantage of conditions in China in order to seek special rights or privileges which would abridge the rights of subjects or citizens of friendly States, and from countenancing action inimical to the security of such States.

## ARTICLE II.

The Contracting Powers agree not to enter into any treaty, agreement, arrangement, or understanding, either with one another, or, individually or collectively, with any Power or Powers, which would infringe or impair the principles stated in Article I.

## ARTICLE III.

With a view to applying more effectually the principles of the Open Door or equality of opportunity in China for the trade and industry of all nations, the Contracting Powers, other than China, agree that they will not seek, nor support their respective nationals in seeking—

- (a) any arrangement which might purport to establish in favour of their interests any general superiority of rights with respect to commercial or economic development in any designated region of China;

His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United States of America;

and

for the Dominion of Canada:

The Right Honourable Sir Robert Laird Borden, G.C.M.G., K.C.;

for the Commonwealth of Australia:

Senator the Right Honourable George Foster Pearce, Minister for Home and Territories;

for the Dominion of New Zealand:

The Honourable Sir John William Salmond, K.C., Judge of the Supreme Court of New Zealand;

for the Union of South Africa:

The Right Honourable Arthur James Balfour, O.M., M.P.;

for India:

The Right Honourable Valingman Sankaranarayana Srinivasa Sastri, Member of the Indian Council of State;

The President of the Republic of China:

Mr. Sao-Ke Alfred Sze, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Washington;

Mr. V. K. Wellington Koo, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at London;

Mr. Chung-Hui Wang, former Minister of Justice.

The President of the French Republic:

Mr. Albert Sarraut, Deputy, Minister of the Colonies;

Mr. Jules J. Jusserand, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United States of America, Grand Cross of the National Order of the Legion of Honour;

His Majesty the King of Italy:

The Honourable Carlo Schanzer, Senator of the Kingdom;

The Honourable Vittorio Rolandi Ricci, Senator of the Kingdom, His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at Washington;

The Honourable Luigi Albertini, Senator of the Kingdom;

His Majesty the Emperor of Japan:

Baron Tomosaburo Kato, Minister for the Navy, Junii, a member of the First Class of the Imperial Order of the Grand Cordon of the Rising Sun with the Paulownia Flower;

Baron Kijuro Shidehara, His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at Washington, Joshii, a member of the First Class of the Imperial Order of the Rising Sun;

Mr. Masanao Hanihara, Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs, Jushii, a member of the Second Class of the Imperial Order of the Rising Sun;

Her Majesty the Queen of The Netherlands:

Jonkheer Frans Beelaerts van Blokland, Her Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary;

Jonkheer Willem Hendrik de Beaufort, Minister Plenipotentiary, Chargé d'Affaires at Washington;

The President of the Portuguese Republic:

Mr. José Francisco de Horta Machado da Franca, Viscount d'Alte, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Washington;

Mr. Ernesto Julio de Carvalho e Vasconcelos, Captain of the Portuguese Navy, Technical Director of the Colonial Office.

Who, having communicated to each other their full powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

#### ARTICLE I.

The Contracting Powers, other than China, agree:

(1) To respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China;

(2) To provide the fullest and most unembarrassed opportunity to China to develop and maintain for herself an effective and stable government;

(3) To use their influence for the purpose of effectually establishing and maintaining the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations throughout the territory of China;

(4) To refrain from taking advantage of conditions in China in order to seek special rights or privileges which would abridge the rights of subjects or citizens of friendly States, and from countenancing action inimical to the security of such States.

#### ARTICLE II.

The Contracting Powers agree not to enter into any treaty, agreement, arrangement, or understanding, either with one another, or, individually or collectively, with any Power or Powers, which would infringe or impair the principles stated in Article I.

#### ARTICLE III.

With a view to applying more effectually the principles of the Open Door or equality of opportunity in China for the trade and industry of all nations, the Contracting Powers, other than China, agree that they will not seek, nor support their respective nationals in seeking—

(a) any arrangement which might purport to establish in favour of their interests any general superiority of rights with respect to commercial or economic development in any designated region of China;



His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United States of America;

and

for the Dominion of Canada:

The Right Honourable Sir Robert Laird Borden, G.C.M.G., K.C.;

for the Commonwealth of Australia:

Senator the Right Honourable George Foster Pearce, Minister for Home and Territories;

for the Dominion of New Zealand:

The Honourable Sir John William Salmond, K.C., Judge of the Supreme Court of New Zealand;

for the Union of South Africa:

The Right Honourable Arthur James Balfour, O.M., M.P.;

for India:

The Right Honourable Valingman Sankaranarayana Srinivasa Sastri, Member of the Indian Council of State;

The President of the Republic of China:

Mr. Sao-Ke Alfred Sze, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Washington;

Mr. V. K. Wellington Koo, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at London;

Mr. Chung-Hui Wang, former Minister of Justice.

The President of the French Republic:

Mr. Albert Sarraut, Deputy, Minister of the Colonies;

Mr. Jules J. Jusserand, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United States of America, Grand Cross of the National Order of the Legion of Honour;

His Majesty the King of Italy:

The Honourable Carlo Schanzer, Senator of the Kingdom;

The Honourable Vittorio Rolandi Ricci, Senator of the Kingdom, His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at Washington;

The Honourable Luigi Albertini, Senator of the Kingdom;

His Majesty the Emperor of Japan:

Baron Tomosaburo Kato, Minister for the Navy, Junii, a member of the First Class of the Imperial Order of the Grand Cordon of the Rising Sun with the Paulownia Flower;

Baron Kijuro Shidehara, His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at Washington, Joshii, a member of the First Class of the Imperial Order of the Rising Sun;

Mr. Masanao Hanihara, Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs, Jushii, a member of the Second Class of the Imperial Order of the Rising Sun;

Her Majesty the Queen of The Netherlands:

Jonkheer Frans Beelaerts van Blokland, Her Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary;

Jonkheer Willem Hendrik de Beaufort, Minister Plenipotentiary, Chargé d'Affaires at Washington;

The President of the Portuguese Republic:

Mr. José Francisco de Horta Machado da Franca, Viscount d'Alte, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Washington;

Mr. Ernesto Julio de Carvalho e Vasconcelos, Captain of the Portuguese Navy, Technical Director of the Colonial Office.

Who, having communicated to each other their full powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

#### ARTICLE I.

The Contracting Powers, other than China, agree:

(1) To respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China;

(2) To provide the fullest and most unembarrassed opportunity to China to develop and maintain for herself an effective and stable government;

(3) To use their influence for the purpose of effectually establishing and maintaining the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations throughout the territory of China;

(4) To refrain from taking advantage of conditions in China in order to seek special rights or privileges which would abridge the rights of subjects or citizens of friendly States, and from countenancing action inimical to the security of such States.

#### ARTICLE II.

The Contracting Powers agree not to enter into any treaty, agreement, arrangement, or understanding, either with one another, or, individually or collectively, with any Power or Powers, which would infringe or impair the principles stated in Article I.

#### ARTICLE III.

With a view to applying more effectually the principles of the Open Door or equality of opportunity in China for the trade and industry of all nations, the Contracting Powers, other than China, agree that they will not seek, nor support their respective nationals in seeking—

(a) any arrangement which might purport to establish in favour of their interests any general superiority of rights with respect to commercial or economic development in any designated region of China;

(b) any such monopoly or preference as would deprive the nationals of any other Power of the right of undertaking any legitimate trade or industry in China, or of participating with the Chinese Government, or with any local authority, in any category or public enterprise, or which by reason of its scope, duration or geographical extent is calculated to frustrate the practical application of the principle of equal opportunity.

It is understood that the foregoing stipulations of this Article are not to be so construed as to prohibit the acquisition of such properties or rights as may be necessary to the conduct of a particular commercial, industrial, or financial undertaking or to the encouragement of invention and research.

China undertakes to be guided by the principles stated in the foregoing stipulations of this Article in dealing with applications for economic rights and privileges from Governments and nationals of all foreign countries, whether parties to the present Treaty or not.

#### ARTICLE IV.

The Contracting Powers agree not to support any agreements by their respective nationals with each other designed to create Spheres of Influence or to provide for the enjoyment of mutually exclusive opportunities in designated parts of Chinese territory.

#### ARTICLE V.

China agrees that, throughout the whole of the railways in China, she will not exercise or permit unfair discrimination of any kind. In particular there shall be no discrimination whatever, direct or indirect, in respect of charges or of facilities on the ground of the nationality of passengers or the countries from which or to which they are proceeding, or the origin or ownership of goods or the country from which or to which they are consigned, or the nationality or ownership of the ship or other means of conveying such passengers or goods before or after their transport on the Chinese Railways.

The Contracting Powers, other than China, assume a corresponding obligation in respect of any of the aforesaid railways over which they or their nationals are in a position to exercise any control in virtue of any concession, special agreement or otherwise.

#### ARTICLE VI.

The Contracting Powers, other than China, agree fully to respect China's rights as a neutral in time of war to which China is not a party; and China declares that when she is a neutral she will observe the obligations of neutrality.

#### ARTICLE VII.

The Contracting Powers agree that, whenever a situation arises which in the opinion of any one of them involves the application of the stipulations of the present Treaty, and renders desirable discussion of such application, there shall be full and frank communication between the Contracting Powers concerned.

#### ARTICLE VIII.

Powers not signatory to the present Treaty, which have Governments recognized by the Signatory Powers and which have treaty relations with China, shall be invited to adhere to the present Treaty. To this end the Government of the United States will make the necessary communications to nonsignatory Powers and will inform the Contracting Powers of the replies received. Adherence by any Power shall become effective on receipt of notice thereof by the Government of the United States.

#### ARTICLE IX.

The present Treaty shall be ratified by the Contracting Powers in accordance with their respective constitutional methods and shall take effect on the date of the deposit of all the ratifications, which shall take place at Washington as soon as possible. The Government of the United States will transmit to the other Contracting Powers a certified copy of the procès-verbal of the deposit of ratifications.

The present Treaty, of which the French and English texts are both authentic, shall remain deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States, and duly certified copies thereof shall be transmitted by that Government to the other Contracting Powers.

In faith whereof the above-named Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty.

Done at the City of Washington the Sixth day of February One Thousand Nine Hundred and Twenty-Two.

[Here follow signatures.]



INVITATION OF THE BELGIAN GOVERNMENT TO  
THE CONFERENCE AT BRUSSELS

HANDED TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE BY THE BELGIAN  
AMBASSADOR, OCTOBER 16, 1937

*Invitation adressée par le Gouvernement Belge aux Gouvernements signataires du Traité des IX Puissances, Signé à Washington le 6 février 1922*

Donnant suite à une demande du Gouvernement de Grande-Bretagne, faite avec l'approbation du Gouvernement des Etats-Unis d'Amérique, le Gouvernement du Roi propose aux Etats signataires du Traité du 6 février 1922, de se réunir à Bruxelles le 30 de ce mois, à l'effet d'examiner, conformément à l'article 7 de ce Traité, la situation en Extrême-Orient et d'étudier les moyens amiables de hâter la fin du conflit regrettable qui y sévit.

(Translation)

*Invitation addressed by the Belgian Government to the Governments Signatory to the Nine-Power Treaty Signed at Washington, February 6, 1922*

In compliance with the request by the Government of the United Kingdom made with the approval of the Government of the United States of America, His Majesty's Government proposes to the states signatory to the treaty of February 6th, 1922 that they should meet at Brussels on the 30th of the month, in order to examine the situation in the Far East, in conformity with article 7 of this treaty, and to consider friendly methods for expediting the end of the present regrettable conflict in that part of the world.

ACCEPTANCE BY THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT  
OF THE INVITATION OF THE BELGIAN  
GOVERNMENT

NOTE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE TO THE BELGIAN  
AMBASSADOR, OCTOBER 16, 1937

The Secretary of State presents his compliments to the Royal Belgian Ambassador and has the honor to acknowledge receipt of his note of October 16, 1937, stating that the Royal Belgian Government, at the request of the British Government and with the approval of the Government of the United States, proposes to the states signatory to the treaty of February 6, 1922, that they meet in Brussels on October 30 for the purpose of examining, in conformity with article VII of that treaty, the situation in the Far East, and of studying peaceable means of hastening an end of the regrettable conflict which prevails there.

The Government of the United States is glad to accept this invitation and the President has designated the Honorable Norman H. Davis as the delegate of the United States. The American Delegation will sail from New York on the steamship *Washington* on October 20th next.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
WASHINGTON, October 16, 1937.

POSTPONEMENT OF THE CONFERENCE  
NOTE OF THE BELGIAN AMBASSADOR TO THE SECRETARY OF  
STATE, OCTOBER 27, 1937

(Translation)

WASHINGTON, October 27, 1937.

MR. SECRETARY OF STATE:

By order of my Government, I have the honor to advise Your Excellency that the date of the opening of the Nine-power Conference which was to take place at Brussels October 30, next, has been postponed to November 3.

I avail myself of this opportunity, Mr. Secretary of State, to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

R. V. STRATEN

8

REPLY OF THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT, OCTOBER 27, 1937, TO THE INVITATION OF THE  
BELGIAN GOVERNMENT

The Japanese Government have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the *note verbale* under the date of the 20th instant, by which the Royal Government, in accordance with the request of the Government of Great Britain, and with the approbation of the Government of the United States of America, propose to the powers signatory to the treaty of February 6, 1922, to meet at Brussels on the 30th of this month in order to examine, in conformity with the article VII of the said treaty, the situation in the Far East and to study amicable means of hastening the end of the regrettable conflict which is taking place there.

The League of Nations, in a report adopted on October 6th, has declared, on the basis of the declarations of only one of the two parties, that the military operations carried out by Japan in China are in violation of the Nine-power Treaty. The action of Japan in China is a measure of self-defense which she has been compelled to take in the face of China's fierce anti-Japanese policy and practice, and especially by her provocative action in resorting to force of arms; and consequently it lies as has been declared already by the Imperial Government, outside the purview of the Nine-power Treaty.

The Assembly of the League of Nations has even gone to the length of assuring China of its moral support, and of recommending its members to abstain from any action that might weaken that country's power of resistance and add to its difficulties in the present conflict, and also to study how they might actively give aid to China. This seems to take no account of the just intention of the Imperial Government, who propose to bring about a sincere cooperation between Japan and China, to assure enduring peace in East Asia, and to contribute thereby to the peace of the world. This is to take sides with one of the parties and to encourage its hostile disposition, but in no way to contribute to an early settlement.

The Royal Government make in their invitation no mention of this connection between the proposed Conference and the League of Nations. However, in view of the fact that in its resolution the League of Nations suggested a meeting of those of its members who were party to the Nine-power Treaty, and that the Government of the United States, who have acquiesced in the request of the Government of Great Britain for the convocation of the Conference, have declared,

9

on October 6, their approval of the resolution, the Imperial Government cannot but conclude that the convocation of the Conference is linked to the resolution of the League of Nations.

Now the League of Nations, as mentioned above, has expressed its view casting reflection upon the honor of Japan, and it has adopted a resolution which is incontestably unfriendly towards her. In these circumstances the Imperial Government are constrained to believe that frank and full discussion to bring about a just, equitable and realistic solution of the conflict between Japan and China cannot be expected between the powers concerned at the proposed Conference.

Moreover the present Sino-Japanese conflict, arising from the special situation of East Asia, has a full bearing upon the very existence of the two countries. The Imperial Government are firmly convinced that an attempt to seek a solution at a gathering of so many powers whose interests in East Asia are of varying degree, or who have practically no interests there at all, will only serve to complicate the situation still further, and to put serious obstacles in the path of a just and proper solution.

For the reasons explained above the Imperial Government regret their inability to accept the invitation of the Royal Government.

The present conflict has been caused by none other than the Chinese Government, who for these many years have been engaged as a matter of national policy in disseminating anti-Japanese sentiments and encouraging anti-Japanese movements in China, and who, in collusion with Communist elements, have menaced the peace of East Asia by their virulent agitation against Japan.

Consequently, what is most urgently needed for a solution of the conflict is a realization on the part of the Chinese Government of the common responsibility of Japan and China respecting the stability of East Asia, a revision of their attitude, and a change of their policy to that of cooperation between the two countries. What Japan asks of the powers is that they comprehend fully this need. Such cooperation, based upon such comprehension, can alone, she believes, contribute effectively towards the stabilization of East Asia.

## STATEMENT OF THE JAPANESE FOREIGN OFFICE OCTOBER 28, 1937

The Japanese Government, having replied to the invitation of the Belgian Government to the Conference signatories of the Nine-power Treaty, 1922, take this opportunity of making public at home and abroad a statement of their views.

1. China has witnessed the rise and fall of countless regimes since the revolution of 1912, but her foreign policy has been consistently one of anti-foreignism. Especially since 1924, when the Kuomintang set up the Nationalist Government in Canton and entered into an alliance with the Communists as a means of winning control of the central administration, the anti-foreign policy then began to be pursued with unprecedented vigor and ruthlessness, and anti-foreign sentiments were kindled ablaze among the populace. The memory is still fresh of the way in which foreign powers, one after another, were victimized and deprived of their vested rights and interests. It happens that Japan has been made for the past 10 years the principal target of this anti-foreign policy of China.

Japan has always striven to promote friendship and cooperation among the nations of East Asia, in the firm conviction that therein lies the key to the stability of that region. Japan welcomed the deepening of Chinese national consciousness which followed upon the revolution, believing that it would conduce to intimate Sino-Japanese collaboration, and she adopted the policy of meeting the legitimate national aspirations of China to the utmost possible extent.

For instance, in 1926 Japan took the lead in assisting China to recover her customs autonomy, and took a firm stand in favor of China on the question of the abolition of extraterritoriality. Japan, so cultivating Chinese good-will, looked patiently and eagerly forward to a favorable response that would consort with her ideal of friendship and cooperation. However, China showed no signs of appreciation of this sympathetic attitude on the part of Japan. On the contrary, she hoisted still higher the banner of anti-Japanism, and seemed resolved to annihilate all Japanese rights and interests in China.

The Nanking Government employed anti-Japanism as a convenient tool in domestic politics for the mobilization of public opinion in support of their regime, and resorted to the unheard-of tactics of making it the foundation of moral education in the army and in the schools, so that even innocent children and youths were taught to



look upon their friendly neighbor country as an enemy. As a result, not only were the peaceful trade and economic activities of Japan interrupted, but even the very lives of Japanese nationals were jeopardized.

This anti-Japanese campaign finally took the form of organized terrorism as in the cases of the killing of a Japanese bluejacket at Shanghai in November 1935 and of the subsequent murderous attacks upon Japanese subjects at Swatow, Chengtu, Pakhoi, Hankow and Shanghai, and the bombing of Japanese residents at Changsha and Swatow.

In the face of the alarming situation, Japanese Government remained calm and forbearing. Urgent demands were repeatedly made upon the Nanking Government for the reversal of their disastrous policy, but to no avail. Then, towards the end of last year, there occurred the Sian incident, in which General Chiang Kai-shek was held captive for some days. Though the exact circumstances surrounding that sensational incident remain a mystery, it is an indisputable fact that shortly afterwards Communist elements, gaining the ascendancy in the Nanking Government, began to conduct campaigns of disturbance in North China and Manchukuo under the banner of the "Anti-Japanese People's Front", which finally led to the Lukouchiao incident of July 7 of this year, in which Japanese soldiers were unlawfully fired upon by Chinese troops in the outskirts of Peking.

2. Upon the occurrence of the Lukouchiao incident the Japanese Government, desirous of averting possible Sino-Japanese crisis, immediately formulated a policy of non-aggravation and local settlement, and devoted their best efforts towards bringing about an amicable solution, in spite of the intolerable situations that were created, one after another, by the Chinese on the spot.

On the other hand the Nanking Government, in violation of the Umezū-Ho agreement, moved north the vast forces under their direct command, to threaten the Japanese garrisons, and also instigated local Chinese armies against Japan. The situation was thus aggravated until a general clash between the two countries became inevitable.

It should be recalled that the Nanking Government, which employ anti-Japanism as an instrument of internal unification, had been conducting for some years a militaristic propaganda aimed at Japan, and that at the same time, by importing vast quantities of munitions, constructing fortifications, and giving intensive training to the troops, she had succeeded in building up strong armaments, so that their military men grew overconfident of their own strength and the people themselves were deluded into putting an exaggerated estimate upon their country's fighting-power.

A belligerent spirit towards Japan came to prevail throughout the land. Long before the present outbreak, Chinese newspapers and magazines were accustomed to call Japan the "enemy country" and the Japanese their enemies. At the time of the Lukouchiao incident—the Nanking Government being driven to action against Japan by the internal situation they themselves had created—Japan's cautious attitude and her policy of local settlement were both doomed to utter failure.

With aggravation of the situation all Japanese residents, not only in North China but also in Central and South China, became exposed to imminent danger, and were compelled to evacuate *en masse*, abandoning the enterprises that they had toilsomely built up during long years in the past. At the same time, the Chinese in Shanghai, in contravention of the 1932 truce agreement, secretly set out to construct military works in the demilitarized zone and to perfect their war preparations. Accordingly in June last the Japanese Government made a request for a special conference of the powers concerned, and called the attention of the Chinese Government to the matter.

The Chinese refused to alter their attitude, and upon the outbreak of the armed conflict in North China, they moved troops into the prohibited zone in flagrant violation of the truce agreement, and finally following upon the murder of an officer and a man belonging to the Japanese landing party, on August 9, they launched an attack upon the International Settlement. While the Japanese authorities were still engaged in negotiation with the representatives of the powers concerned, in a desperate attempt to prevent hostilities with extreme patience and forbearance and bearing serious strategical disadvantages, the Chinese began to shell and bomb the Japanese quarter of the Settlement as well as the Japanese garrison defending it, with a view to annihilating the 30,000 Japanese residents as well as the Japanese forces, who were hopelessly outnumbered by the Chinese Army. Thereupon Japan was compelled to take counter measures in self-defense.

As is clear from the foregoing accounts, the fundamental cause of the aggravation of the present affair is to be found in the policy of the Nanking Government, who moved large, threatening forces into North China in contravention of the Umezū-Ho agreement, and also tore up the truce agreement by marching troops on the International Settlement. Japan was compelled to take up arms in self-defense, and she has chosen this opportunity to make the Nanking Government revise their attitude for the sake of the permanent peace of East Asia. Therefore, the present affair can never be settled until the Nanking Government mend their ways, abandon once for all their anti-Japanese policy, and accept Japan's policy of cooperation and collaboration between the two countries.

look upon their friendly neighbor country as an enemy. As a result, not only were the peaceful trade and economic activities of Japan interrupted, but even the very lives of Japanese nationals were jeopardized.

This anti-Japanese campaign finally took the form of organized terrorism as in the cases of the killing of a Japanese bluejacket at Shanghai in November 1935 and of the subsequent murderous attacks upon Japanese subjects at Swatow, Chengtu, Pakhoi, Hankow and Shanghai, and the bombing of Japanese residents at Changsha and Swatow.

In the face of the alarming situation, Japanese Government remained calm and forbearing. Urgent demands were repeatedly made upon the Nanking Government for the reversal of their disastrous policy, but to no avail. Then, towards the end of last year, there occurred the Sian incident, in which General Chiang Kai-shek was held captive for some days. Though the exact circumstances surrounding that sensational incident remain a mystery, it is an indisputable fact that shortly afterwards Communist elements, gaining the ascendancy in the Nanking Government, began to conduct campaigns of disturbance in North China and Manchukuo under the banner of the "Anti-Japanese People's Front", which finally led to the Lukouchiao incident of July 7 of this year, in which Japanese soldiers were unlawfully fired upon by Chinese troops in the outskirts of Peking.

2. Upon the occurrence of the Lukouchiao incident the Japanese Government, desirous of averting possible Sino-Japanese crisis, immediately formulated a policy of non-aggravation and local settlement, and devoted their best efforts towards bringing about an amicable solution, in spite of the intolerable situations that were created, one after another, by the Chinese on the spot.

On the other hand the Nanking Government, in violation of the Umezu-Ho agreement, moved north the vast forces under their direct command, to threaten the Japanese garrisons, and also instigated local Chinese armies against Japan. The situation was thus aggravated until a general clash between the two countries became inevitable.

It should be recalled that the Nanking Government, which employ anti-Japanism as an instrument of internal unification, had been conducting for some years a militaristic propaganda aimed at Japan, and that at the same time, by importing vast quantities of munitions, constructing fortifications, and giving intensive training to the troops, she had succeeded in building up strong armaments, so that their military men grew overconfident of their own strength and the people themselves were deluded into putting an exaggerated estimate upon their country's fighting-power.

A belligerent spirit towards Japan came to prevail throughout the land. Long before the present outbreak, Chinese newspapers and magazines were accustomed to call Japan the "enemy country" and the Japanese their enemies. At the time of the Lukouchiao incident—the Nanking Government being driven to action against Japan by the internal situation they themselves had created—Japan's cautious attitude and her policy of local settlement were both doomed to utter failure.

With aggravation of the situation all Japanese residents, not only in North China but also in Central and South China, became exposed to imminent danger, and were compelled to evacuate *en masse*, abandoning the enterprises that they had toilsomely built up during long years in the past. At the same time, the Chinese in Shanghai, in contravention of the 1932 truce agreement, secretly set out to construct military works in the demilitarized zone and to perfect their war preparations. Accordingly in June last the Japanese Government made a request for a special conference of the powers concerned, and called the attention of the Chinese Government to the matter.

The Chinese refused to alter their attitude, and upon the outbreak of the armed conflict in North China, they moved troops into the prohibited zone in flagrant violation of the truce agreement, and finally following upon the murder of an officer and a man belonging to the Japanese landing party, on August 9, they launched an attack upon the International Settlement. While the Japanese authorities were still engaged in negotiation with the representatives of the powers concerned, in a desperate attempt to prevent hostilities with extreme patience and forbearance and bearing serious strategical disadvantages, the Chinese began to shell and bomb the Japanese quarter of the Settlement as well as the Japanese garrison defending it, with a view to annihilating the 30,000 Japanese residents as well as the Japanese forces, who were hopelessly outnumbered by the Chinese Army. Thereupon Japan was compelled to take counter measures in self-defense.

As is clear from the foregoing accounts, the fundamental cause of the aggravation of the present affair is to be found in the policy of the Nanking Government, who moved large, threatening forces into North China in contravention of the Umezu-Ho agreement, and also tore up the truce agreement by marching troops on the International Settlement. Japan was compelled to take up arms in self-defense, and she has chosen this opportunity to make the Nanking Government revise their attitude for the sake of the permanent peace of East Asia. Therefore, the present affair can never be settled until the Nanking Government mend their ways, abandon once for all their anti-Japanese policy, and accept Japan's policy of cooperation and collaboration between the two countries.



It should be remembered that one of the important factors underlying Nanking's feverish agitations of more recent years against Japan is the action taken by the League of Nations at the time of the Manchurian incident. That body then adopted a resolution framed in utter disregard of the realities of the situation in East Asia, which strongly stimulated China in her anti-Japanese policy.

Now the League has once more taken up the appeal of the Nanking Government. Without going fully into the real causes of the present affair, it has concluded, on the basis of false report, that the bombing of the military works in the strongly fortified Nanking and Canton was an attack upon defenseless cities, and adopted the resolution of September 27 condemning Japan.

Again on October 6 the General Assembly of the League not only concluded that Japan's action constituted a violation of the Anti-war Pact and the Nine-power Treaty but also adopted a resolution which openly calls for assistance to China. Such proceedings on the part of the League only fall in with the cunning scheme of the Nanking Government to exert pressure upon Japan by inviting the intervention of third powers, and serves no useful end but to encourage China in her resolve to oppose Japan to the last and to render a settlement of the affair more difficult than ever.

It must be said that the League of Nations is repeating the error that it committed only a few years ago. Japan's action is a measure of self-defense taken in the face of China's challenge, and obviously there can be no question of violation of the Nine-power Treaty. Moreover, as compared with the time when the treaty was concluded, the situation in East Asia today has been rendered totally different, owing to the infiltration of Communist influence and the changes of internal conditions prevailing in China.

In any case, as regards the Conference that has been convened by the signatories of the Nine-power Treaty, it is a foregone conclusion that a majority of the participants will hold themselves bound by the above-mentioned resolutions of the League of Nations, and even if Japan took part in its deliberations, no fair and just result could ever be expected therefrom as in the case of the League of Nations meeting at the time of the Manchurian incident. Especially as this conference is to be attended by powers which are not directly interested in East Asia, it is calculated to arouse popular feeling both in Japan and China, thereby complicating the situation still further but contributing nothing towards a solution. The Japanese Government have therefore decided to decline the invitation.

The Japanese nation, rising as one man, is united in the determination to surmount all obstacles for the purpose of effecting a speedy settlement. Japan is by no means indifferent towards international cooperation. But the Sino-Japanese difficulties can be

solved only through direct negotiations between the two powers on whom falls the common burden of responsibility for the stability of East Asia. What is needed is the elimination of Nanking's anti-Japanese policy and the Communist elements which are identified with it, so that there may be established an enduring peace based upon Sino-Japanese unity and cooperation.

Japan never looks upon the Chinese people as an enemy, nor does she harbor any territorial designs. It is rather her sincere wish to witness the material and spiritual advancement of the Chinese nation. And it is her desire to promote cultural and economic cooperation with foreign powers regarding China, while at the same time she will respect fully their rights and interests there.

Accordingly, as soon as the powers understand the true intention of Japan, and take suitable steps to make the Nanking Government reconsider their attitude and policy, then, and only then, a way will have been paved for their cooperation with Japan respecting the settlement of the present conflict.

DELEGATIONS ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE  
NOVEMBER 3, 1937

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

- His Excellency Dr. S. F. N. GIE, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Union of South Africa at Berlin and Stockholm;
- His Excellency Dr. H. D. VAN BROEKHUIZEN, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Union of South Africa at Brussels and The Hague;
- Dr. H. M. STOKER, Secretary of the Union of South Africa Legation at Berlin;
- Mr. G. P. JOOSTE, Secretary of the Union of South Africa Legation at Brussels;
- Mr. B. J. JARVIE, Attaché to the Union of South Africa Legation at Brussels.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

- The Honorable NORMAN H. DAVIS, Delegate;
- Mr. STANLEY K. HORNBECK, Adviser on Political Relations, Department of State: Adviser;
- Mr. PIERREPONT MOFFAT, Chief of the Division of European Affairs, Department of State: Adviser;
- Mr. ROBERT T. PELL, Divisional Assistant, Department of State: Press Officer;
- Mr. CHARLES E. BOHLEN, Second Secretary of the American Embassy at Moscow: Secretary.

AUSTRALIA

- The Right Honorable S. M. BRUCE, C.H., M.C., High Commissioner for Australia;
- Mr. ALFRED STIRLING, Counselor;
- Major O. C. W. FUHRMAN, O.B.E., Secretary.

BELGIUM

- Mr. PAUL-HENRI SPAAK, Member of Chamber of Representatives; Minister for Foreign Affairs;
- Mr. VAN LANGENHOVE, Ambassador for Belgium; Secretary General of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs;
- Baron VAN ZUYLEN, Ambassador for Belgium; Director General of the Political Department at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs;
- Mr. DELVAUX DE FENFFE, First Secretary of Embassy;
- Mr. IWEINS D'ECKHOUTTE, First Secretary of Legation;
- Mr. P. POSWICK, Secretary of Legation;

Count FRÉDÉRIC DE BORCHGRAVE D'ALTENA, Attaché to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

BOLIVIA

His Excellency M. COSTA DU RELS, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary.

CANADA

The Honorable RAOUL DANDURAND, Minister of State and Government Representative in the Senate;

Mr. HUME WRONG, Canadian Counselor accredited to the League of Nations;

Mr. P. DUPUY, Secretary to the Canadian Legation at Paris.

CHINA

His Excellency Dr. V. K. WELLINGTON KOO, Ambassador at Paris;

His Excellency Mr. QUO TAI-CHI, Ambassador at London;

His Excellency Dr. TSIEN TAI, Ambassador at Brussels;

His Excellency Mr. WUNSZ KING, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at The Hague;

His Excellency Mr. HOO CHI-TSAI, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Berne; Director of the Secretariat of the Chinese Delegation;

Dr. KUANGSON YOUNG, Envoy Extraordinary in Europe of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs; Director of the Press Office of the Chinese Delegation;

Dr. YOUNG YIN-PU, Technical Counselor to the Permanent Bureau of the Chinese Delegation at the League of Nations;

Mr. C. K. SZE, Counselor to the Embassy at Paris;

Mr. LIU CHIEH, First Secretary to the Embassy at London;

Mr. WANG LEI-GHI, First Secretary to the Embassy at Brussels;

Mr. YU KIEN-WEN, Third Secretary to the Embassy at London.

DENMARK

His Excellency Mr. HENRIK DE KAUFFMANN, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary;

Mr. HANS BERTELSEN, Secretary to the Legation of Denmark.

FRANCE

His Excellency Mr. YVON DELBOS, Deputy; Minister for Foreign Affairs;

Mr. FRANÇOIS DE TESSAN, Deputy; Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs;

Mr. GASTON MONNERVILLE, Deputy; Under Secretary of State for the Colonies;

His Excellency Mr. ERNEST LAGARDE, Minister Plenipotentiary;

Mr. HOPPENOT, Counselor of Embassy; Assistant Director of the Asiatic Department;  
 Mr. GASTON JOSEPH, Director of Political Affairs at the Ministry for the Colonies;  
 Mr. ROCHAT, Minister Plenipotentiary; Director of Cabinet of the Minister for Foreign Affairs;  
 Mr. DE BOISANGER, Secretary of Embassy; Chief of Cabinet of the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs;  
 Mr. HOFFHER, Chief of Cabinet of the Under Secretary of State for Colonies;  
 Mr. BENECH, Chief of Cabinet;  
 Mr. CLAUZEL, Secretary of Embassy;  
 Mr. CHAMBON, Secretary Interpreter in the Far East;  
 Mr. GILBERT, Secretary Interpreter in the Far East;  
 Mr. GUÉRIN, Attaché at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

## UNITED KINGDOM

The Right Honorable ANTHONY EDEN, M.C., M.P., Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs;  
 The Right Honorable MALCOLM MACDONALD, M.P., Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs;  
 Viscount CRANBORNE, M.P., Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, Foreign Affairs;  
 The Honorable Sir ALEXANDER CADOGAN, K.C.M.G., C.B., Deputy; Under Secretary of State, Foreign Affairs;  
 Sir J. T. PRATT, K.B.E., C.M.G.;  
 Mr. C. B. PEAKE, M.C.;  
 Mr. R. P. HEPPEL;  
 Mr. R. C. SKRINE STEVENSON;  
 Mr. B. COCKRAM, Representative of Dominions Office;  
 Mr. O. C. HARVEY, C.M.G., Private Secretary to Mr. Eden;  
 Mr. J. P. L. THOMAS, M.P., Parliamentary Secretary to Mr. Eden;  
 Mr. W. C. HANKINSON, O.B.E., M.C., Private Secretary to Mr. MacDonald;  
 Sir EDMUND BROCKLEBANK, M.P., Parliamentary Secretary to Mr. MacDonald;  
 Mr. P. N. LOXLEY, Private Secretary to Viscount Cranborne;  
 Mr. MARK PATRICK, M.P., Parliamentary Secretary to Viscount Cranborne.

## INDIA

Sir RAMASWAMI MUDALIAR;  
 Mr. A. F. MORLEY.

## ITALY

His Excellency Count LUIGI ALDROVANDI-MARESCOTTI, Ambassador of Italy;  
 Commander Dr. LEOPOLDO PICCARDI, Counselor of State;  
 Count VITTORIO BONARELLI DI CASTELBOMPIANO, Counselor of Legation;  
 Commander GIUSEPPE COSMELLI, Counselor of Legation;  
 Dr. DE MICHELIS, Attaché of Embassy.

## MEXICO

His Excellency Mr. PRIMO VILLA MICHEL, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at London;  
 Mr. MARTINEZ-BACA, Attaché, Brussels Legation.

## NORWAY

His Excellency Mr. L. AUBERT, Secretary General of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs; Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary;  
 Mr. R. B. SKYLSTAD, Director at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs;  
 Mr. NYGAARD, Attaché to the Legation of Norway at Brussels.

## NEW ZEALAND

Mr. W. J. JORDAN, High Commissioner for New Zealand;  
 Mr. R. M. CAMPBELL, Counselor for Economic Affairs;  
 Mr. G. W. CLINKARD, Trade Commissioner for New Zealand;  
 Mr. C. A. KNOWLES, Secretary.

## NETHERLANDS

His Excellency Jonkheer Dr. A. C. D. DE GRAEFF, former Minister for Foreign Affairs; former Governor General of the Netherlands Indies;  
 Prof. Dr. B. J. O. SCHRIEKE, former Director of Education and Public Worship in the Netherlands Indies; Professor at the University of Amsterdam;  
 Mr. A. J. LIEVEGOED, Press Officer;  
 Baron Dr. A. W. C. BENTINCK VAN SCHOONHEETEN, Deputy; Chief of the Political Department, Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

## PORTUGAL

His Excellency Mr. AUGUSTO DE CASTRO, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Brussels;  
 His Excellency Mr. JOAO ANTONIO DE BIANCHI, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Washington;



Mr. MANUEL NUNES DA SILVA, Secretary of the Legation of Portugal at Paris.

## SWEDEN

His Excellency Mr. G. DE DARDEL, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Brussels;  
Count F. WACHTMEISTER, Secretary to the Legation of Sweden.

## UNION OF SOCIALIST SOVIET REPUBLICS

His Excellency Mr. LITVINOV, Minister for Foreign Affairs;  
Mr. POTESKINE, Deputy; Commissioner for Foreign Affairs;  
His Excellency Mr. ROUBININE, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Brussels;  
Mr. HOERSCHELMAN, Secretary General of the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs.

## ADDRESSES MADE AT THE OPENING MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE, NOVEMBER 3, 1937, IN GENERAL DISCUSSION

WELCOME EXTENDED TO THE DELEGATIONS BY HIS EXCELLENCY PAUL-HENRI SPAAK, BELGIAN MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(Translation)

## YOUR EXCELLENCIES:

On behalf of His Majesty's Government I have the honor to extend to you a cordial welcome to Brussels.

I wish to express to each of you [its] country's esteem, its satisfaction at being able to receive you here and its hope that our work will produce many happy results.

In agreeing to convene the present Conference, the Belgian Government's sole aim has been to cooperate in a work of peace.

The world, already so troubled by the tragedy which has been drenching Spain in blood for the last eighteen months, sees its anxiety greatly increased by the terrible war now raging in the Far East. Everyone is wondering whether these sporadic outbreaks are the preliminary signs of a universal cataclysm compared with which the horrors of 1914 will appear to be mere child's play.

At such times, everyone must do his duty and shoulder his responsibility. Peace throughout the world depends on the great powers, on their agreement, on the trend they give to international policy and on the outlook they adopt. The smaller countries can only offer their moral support in the service of humanity, hoping for conciliation and mutual understanding.

Belgium has never shirked her duty in this respect. My Government therefore has agreed that Brussels shall be the seat of this Conference.

I think it may be well, at the outset, to remind you of the Conference's origin, and to endeavor to define its inner meaning.

On October 10th last, the United Kingdom Government, acting on an agreement reached with the Government of the United States, requested the Belgian Government to convene in Brussels those countries which had signed the treaty known as the Nine-power Treaty, adding at the same time, that it might be desirable to request Germany and the U.S.S.R., two countries which have considerable

interests in the Far East, to join the other countries convened, if they so desire.

On October 15th, the Royal Government sent to the countries which had signed the Nine-power Treaty the following note:

In compliance with the request by the Government of the United Kingdom made with the approval of the Government of the United States of America, His Majesty's Government proposes to the states signatory to the treaty of February 6th, 1922 that they should meet at Brussels on the 30th of the month, in order to examine the situation in the Far East, in conformity with article 7 of this treaty, and to consider friendly methods for expediting the end of the present regrettable conflict in that part of the world.

By common agreement the meeting was adjourned from October 30th, the date originally fixed, until November 3d.

The text of the invitation defines the limits within which our discussions must be confined and the aim of these discussions.

The United Kingdom, Canada, France, United States of America, China, Australia, New Zealand, Portugal, the Netherlands, Mexico, Norway, Sweden, Bolivia, Italy, the Union of South Africa, Denmark and India, one after another accepted the invitation addressed to them.

On October 27th, Japan declined the invitation.

All the accepting states agreed that the invitation should be sent to Germany and to the U.S.S.R., and accordingly the Belgian Government sent an invitation to these two countries. The invitation was accepted by the U.S.S.R. and refused by Germany.

This refusal on the part of Germany and Japan is of importance, and, alas, regrettable from the point of view of the progress of our work. On October 28th, the German Government sent to the Royal Belgian Legation in Berlin the following *note verbale*:

The German Government has the honor to acknowledge receipt of the *note verbale* sent by the Royal Belgian Legation on October 28th, inviting the German Government to take part in the meeting of the signatories of the Nine-power Treaty which has been convened for November 3rd.

The German Government fully appreciates the effort expressed in the note to bring to an end as soon as possible, by friendly methods, the regrettable conflict in East Asia.

It understands from the invitation, however, that the discussions are to take place at Brussels on the basis of article 7 of the Nine-power Treaty and that their object must therefore be the application of this treaty. As Germany is not a party to the treaty, the German Government feels that it cannot take part in discussions regarding its application.

The German Government desires, however, to point out that it is prepared at any moment to take action for the pacific settlement of the dispute, as soon as it has been proved that conditions indispensable for achieving this object exist.

May I venture, in interpreting this text, to express the hope that Germany's refusal is not absolute, but is based on certain

particular circumstances and that these circumstances may undergo modification?

The reply of the Japanese Government is a long and extremely important document which will be distributed to all the members of the Conference and will doubtless call for attentive examination.

I do not think that this is the moment for me to make any comments on this text.

I must say, however, that Japan's abstention places the Conference in a distinctly difficult position. This fact cannot be dissembled. Certain misunderstandings seem to exist. A frank explanation might probably dispel them. It would in any case be very useful.

I think—and I believe all those present share my view—that the present Conference should not regard itself as a sort of international tribunal, before which Japan would, so to speak, be summoned to appear and explain her action in conditions incompatible with her dignity and honor.

What we wish is to accomplish a work of conciliation and peace without prejudice or passion, taking into account all the various legitimate but conflicting interests.

Our aim is to stop the war if possible because we are thinking of the soldiers who are being killed, of the women, children and old persons who are suffering and dying, of the ruins which are accumulating and of a whole people passing through a terrible period of trial. Our desire is to reestablish peace and law.

We believe that there are no difficulties and no conflicts between nations which cannot be settled by conciliation, mediation or arbitration. A nation which states its case before the other nations of the world, which foregoes the use of its strength and has confidence in its cause, does not humiliate itself; on the contrary, it sets a splendid example.

In all the nations of the world the most noble minds have helped to develop these ideas in which mankind places so much hope and faith. Met together today in grave and impressive circumstances, we must make every effort to insure that this hope shall not be in vain.

Let us set to work, therefore, forgetting all that separates us and rising above our personal feelings, thinking only of the happiness and gratitude of the nations of the world if we can achieve our common aim—the restoration of peace.



ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE NORMAN H. DAVIS, OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

In rising to address this Conference, I wish first of all to express appreciation of the hospitality of the Royal Belgian Government in inviting us to meet for our deliberations in Brussels. We are beholden to them for many courtesies; we have been impressed by the timely and efficient preparations they have made; and we have the consciousness that no effort will be spared by our hosts toward making our meeting a success.

It is a felicitous moment at which we meet, this day being the birthday of His Majesty King Leopold. I feel certain that all my colleagues will wish me, as the first speaker, to pay His Majesty a sincere tribute, and to extend to him our warmest congratulations.

We have come to this Conference to collaborate in efforts toward an objective for which all peoples and all governments should strive. That objective is peace.

Sixteen years ago there assembled at Washington the delegates to a conference which had been called for the limitation of armaments and to find a solution of Pacific and Far Eastern problems of international concern, and thereby to safeguard peace in the Far East. After a few months of careful consideration of the problems involved, those delegates signed a number of interrelated agreements and resolutions which, it was believed, would assure the legitimate rights and interests of all the countries represented, which provided various common and reciprocal concessions, and which committed the signatories to pursue policies of peace.

In that group of agreements was a treaty relating to principles and policies to be followed in matters concerning China. That treaty dealt with questions which are fundamental; it reaffirmed principles to which most of the signatories had already—some repeatedly—committed themselves; it specified not only what should be the obligations of the powers, but what should be the obligations of China; it was ratified by all of the nine powers present at the conference, and it has since been adhered to by five other powers. In that treaty there was a provision that, whenever a situation should arise which, in the opinion of any of the parties, involved the application of the stipulations of the treaty and rendered desirable the discussion of such application, there should be full and frank communication between the contracting parties concerned.

It is in accordance with that express provision that we meet here today. Our present interest, however, would be real even if there were no such treaty and no such provision. The hostilities now being waged in the Far East are of serious concern not only to Japan and China, but to the entire world.

For several decades, the nations of the world have been seeking to evolve methods to achieve the twofold objective of preventing resort to armed force and, if unhappily it has been resorted to, finding means to bring the conflict to an end. Various methods have been proposed. Various instruments have been signed. In all of these there has appeared one common feature, namely, that where controversy develops, solution must be sought by pacific means. To this process sixty-three nations committed themselves by the Pact of Paris of 1928.

Peace once envisaged only by idealists has become a practical matter of vital self-interest to every nation.

The day has long since gone by when the effects of an armed conflict are confined to the participants. It is all too apparent that, under modern conditions, the human and material sacrifices and the moral and spiritual costs exacted by the use of armed force not only fall as a heavy and oftentimes crushing burden upon the nations directly involved in the conflict, but have grave repercussions upon all the nations of the world.

Armed conflict, wherever it may occur, impairs everywhere the immeasurable value of freely negotiated treaties and agreements as effective and reliable safeguards of national security and international peace. The resulting loss of confidence in such instruments leads nations to seek safety in competitive armaments and to devote a disproportionate share of their resources thereto, thus impoverishing some nations and inexorably lowering the standards of life of all.

Not only does resort to armed force result in needless loss of human life and shock every humane instinct of mankind, but its disorganizing effects fall upon all phases of constructive human activity, national as well as international.

Owing to the amazing developments in science and industry, there has come about such an interdependence among nations that the effects of any major disturbance are felt everywhere. As our modern civilization has evolved, as it has developed new methods and processes, as it has raised the standard of living of hundreds of millions of human beings all over the world, it has become increasingly sensitive to shock. A dislocation in any part of its interrelated mechanism throws other parts out of gear. It creates need for prompt and skilful attention at the point of dislocation in order to prevent further disturbance and possible break-down of the whole machinery.

International trade and financial relations, which are indispensable to human welfare, immediately suffer from the disorganizing effects of resort to armed force. It is through these channels that some of the most direct and most painful repercussions of any major armed conflict spread to the uttermost corners of the earth. Once mutually beneficial international economic relations are impaired or break down, nations are forced into varying degrees of reliance upon their own

resources and, consequently, into a further lowering of their living standards.

Unfortunately, the break-down of the processes of international trade and financial reserves may occur as a result of other causes than armed conflict. For reasons which I need not enumerate here, nations may elect to embark upon policies directed toward economic self-sufficiency or toward reaping immediate though narrow advantages, thus foregoing the broad and cumulative benefits which trade released from excessive restraint will yield. Such policies in the world create conditions conducive to a threat to peace. The world has witnessed during the past few years the emergence of such conditions and the unfolding of the vicious spiral of economic warfare, political tension, competitive armaments, and actual armed conflict.

In the particular circumstances with which we are confronted at the present Conference, our objective is the restoration of peace and stability in an extraordinarily important region of the world; but as we seek earnestly the means of attaining these objectives, let us keep in our minds also the pressing need for constructive effort directed toward the creation of conditions which will make unthinkable the use of armed force. There should be no place for resort to arms in an orderly and prosperous world.

In the Far East, probably to a greater extent than in any other part of the world, there are taking place great changes in the thought and the activities of vast groups of human beings. Within a few generations, Japan has undergone a great transformation and both occident and orient have witnessed and been impressed by admirable achievements effected by the Japanese people. During the past generation China has been struggling with momentous problems of transition from an old to a new regime and the world has observed her efforts with sympathetic interest. At the Washington Conference the governments there represented, after careful consideration of the situation in the Far East, adopted the view that the Chinese people possessed the capacity to establish a new order. The Nine-power Treaty was based on that concept. In agreeing to its provisions, the governments which became parties to that treaty affirmed their belief in the capacity of the Chinese to evolve and carry out a program of political and economic reconstruction. The signatories to the treaty undertook to regulate their relations with China and with one another in a manner which would not interfere with this hoped-for development, but would indeed encourage and support it. During the years which have since elapsed, especially the more recent years, the Chinese have made rapid progress along a course which tends to confirm the faith on which the Nine-power Treaty was founded.

Unfortunately, Japan and China have come into conflict and have resorted to hostilities. These hostilities have steadily increased in

scope and intensity. Not only have they destroyed many Chinese and Japanese lives and much Chinese and Japanese property, but they have at some places taken and at many places endangered lives of nationals of other countries; they have destroyed property of nationals of other countries; they have disrupted communications; they have disturbed and interfered with the commerce of practically all nations that are engaged in international trade; and they have shocked and aroused the peoples of all nations. Such hostilities are of concern not only to countries engaged in them; they have affected and they are detrimentally affecting the whole world.

We are here with a common concern and a common purpose and our effort to deal with the situation must be constructive.

We come to this Conference to study with our colleagues the problems which concern us. We have come not with the expectation of working miracles, but with the intention of appealing to reason. We expect to join with other nations in urging upon Japan and China that they resort to peaceful processes. We believe that cooperation between Japan and China is essential to the best interests of those two countries and to peace throughout the world. We believe that such cooperation must be developed by friendship, fair play and reciprocal confidence. If Japan and China are to cooperate, it must be as friends and as equals and not as enemies. The problems underlying Sino-Japanese relations must be solved on a basis that is fair to each and acceptable to both. It is not only in the interests of China and Japan that hostilities be promptly terminated and that the differences between them be peacefully composed, but it is in the interest of the community of nations as a whole. The longer the present hostilities continue, the more difficult will a constructive solution become, the more harmful will be their effects upon Sino-Japanese relations and upon the world and the more will general peace and stability be endangered. It is important that equitable adjustment be found.

We come to this Conference with no commitments except those to treaty provisions and to principles which the Government of the United States has repeatedly and emphatically affirmed. The Government of the United States is prepared to share in the common efforts to devise, within the scope of these treaty provisions and principles, a means of finding a pacific solution which will provide for terminating hostilities in the Far East and for restoring peace in that area.

#### ADDRESS BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE ANTHONY EDEN, OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

My first sentiments must be to join in the thanks already expressed to the Royal Belgian Government for their hospitality to us—a hos-



pitality so characteristic of the Belgian people. We are all truly grateful to them for the admirable arrangements which they have made at such short notice. It is a happy augury that we meet on the birthday of your sovereign, King Leopold. As a representative of His Majesty's Government and the people of the United Kingdom, I associate myself with the respectful wishes already expressed by Mr. Norman Davis. Most sincerely, we wish to His Majesty long life and happiness.

I have listened with close attention to the speech made by the representative of the United States, and the Government I represent is in full agreement with every word that he has said. He has so well defined our task and the conditions in which our work is to be carried out that I have little to add, especially since I feel sure that the Conference will agree that the very difficulty of our task makes it desirable that we should embark upon it at the earliest moment. No one will consider that this is an appropriate occasion for long speeches.

We are met to discharge an urgent duty which requires no explanation. Indeed the whole world will understand that the reason and the justification for our meeting here are not far to seek. The maintenance of peace is of vital interest to every country. War is a contagion that may spread, but, even if its direct effects are confined to the peoples actually at war, the profound distress and loss of national prosperity, which must inevitably ensue, adversely affects all countries. We in this Conference have come together by virtue of the fact that we represent those powers which are more directly interested in the Far East. It is natural that we should wish to consult together, even if there were no treaty basis for consultation, to see whether there be any way in which we can assist towards an early cessation of hostilities and the restoration of stable conditions. Actually, however, not only the moral, but also the treaty obligation is there. We are met under the provisions of the Nine-power Treaty to which at Washington, fifteen years ago, our nations have all set their names. It is well that we should recall that fact. We are none of us disinterested spectators; we are bound signatories of an instrument which we signed together.

We much regret the absence of one of the parties to the dispute; we feel that this absence must hamper our efforts for peace, but we cannot on that account lessen our endeavors. We are confident that we shall demonstrate by our attitude the sincerity of our intention to promote peace in the Far East. In this attempt we feel justified in asking for the collaboration of all, whether present or absent.

If our right to meet or the wisdom of our meeting is questioned in any quarter, we need have no hesitation about our reply. If we are told that our prospects of achieving our object are slender, that is no reason why we should shirk our duty, both to ourselves and to the

world. If we were afraid to face possible failure, we should certainly not be deserving of success.

This assurance at least I can give the Conference at its first session. His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom are prepared to offer their fullest collaboration to promote the success of the work of the Conference. For our part, we believe that the very difficulty of our enterprise should stimulate our energies. We hope that, with the least possible delay, the Conference will resolve itself into a working committee and so get to grips with its task.

#### ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY YVON DELBOS, OF FRANCE

(Translation)

I desire whole-heartedly to associate myself with the expression of thanks offered to Belgium, to her Sovereign and her Government. I warmly appreciate everything which was said in the speech of her distinguished Foreign Minister, Mr. Spaak. After him, the delegates of the United States of America and of the United Kingdom have so well defined the object of this Conference, and the spirit and methods which should ensure its success, that I should be taking up your attention unnecessarily were I to re-echo their words. I am the less inclined to do so since, as Mr. Eden has observed, our aim is not to indulge in rhetoric but to make a positive and rapid effort to achieve the result we all desire.

We are concerned with the possibilities of putting an end to a conflict which imposes upon us imperative duties—in the first place, a duty to humanity, because we cannot remain impassive before the atrocities now accumulating in the Far East. We should become accomplices if we did not, by every means, seek to put an end to merciless massacres which revolt both heart and mind. Ours is a duty, also, of conservation, because we have to defend not merely legitimate interests but, above all, peace in general, which is threatened by any war wherever it may break out. No one is secure from the possible extensions of a conflict and, if, in a spirit of inexcusable selfishness, we were to turn our eyes away from the fields of carnage we should increase the risk of becoming involved in those very complications we desire to avoid. Ours is also a duty of justice, because we are all interested in the protection of the rules on which the existence of civilization depends.

Undoubtedly, the most essential of those rules is that obligations which have been assumed and contracts which have been signed must be honored. That is the reason for our meeting, based as it is upon the Nine-power Treaty. I firmly hope that, taking our stand on that treaty, we may find the peaceful issue we are seeking. That treaty was devised by its signatories at a time when no menace threatened

pitality so characteristic of the Belgian people. We are all truly grateful to them for the admirable arrangements which they have made at such short notice. It is a happy augury that we meet on the birthday of your sovereign, King Leopold. As a representative of His Majesty's Government and the people of the United Kingdom, I associate myself with the respectful wishes already expressed by Mr. Norman Davis. Most sincerely, we wish to His Majesty long life and happiness.

I have listened with close attention to the speech made by the representative of the United States, and the Government I represent is in full agreement with every word that he has said. He has so well defined our task and the conditions in which our work is to be carried out that I have little to add, especially since I feel sure that the Conference will agree that the very difficulty of our task makes it desirable that we should embark upon it at the earliest moment. No one will consider that this is an appropriate occasion for long speeches.

We are met to discharge an urgent duty which requires no explanation. Indeed the whole world will understand that the reason and the justification for our meeting here are not far to seek. The maintenance of peace is of vital interest to every country. War is a contagion that may spread, but, even if its direct effects are confined to the peoples actually at war, the profound distress and loss of national prosperity, which must inevitably ensue, adversely affects all countries. We in this Conference have come together by virtue of the fact that we represent those powers which are more directly interested in the Far East. It is natural that we should wish to consult together, even if there were no treaty basis for consultation, to see whether there be any way in which we can assist towards an early cessation of hostilities and the restoration of stable conditions. Actually, however, not only the moral, but also the treaty obligation is there. We are met under the provisions of the Nine-power Treaty to which at Washington, fifteen years ago, our nations have all set their names. It is well that we should recall that fact. We are none of us disinterested spectators; we are bound signatories of an instrument which we signed together.

We much regret the absence of one of the parties to the dispute; we feel that this absence must hamper our efforts for peace, but we cannot on that account lessen our endeavors. We are confident that we shall demonstrate by our attitude the sincerity of our intention to promote peace in the Far East. In this attempt we feel justified in asking for the collaboration of all, whether present or absent.

If our right to meet or the wisdom of our meeting is questioned in any quarter, we need have no hesitation about our reply. If we are told that our prospects of achieving our object are slender, that is no reason why we should shirk our duty, both to ourselves and to the

world. If we were afraid to face possible failure, we should certainly not be deserving of success.

This assurance at least I can give the Conference at its first session. His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom are prepared to offer their fullest collaboration to promote the success of the work of the Conference. For our part, we believe that the very difficulty of our enterprise should stimulate our energies. We hope that, with the least possible delay, the Conference will resolve itself into a working committee and so get to grips with its task.

#### ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY YVON DELBOS, OF FRANCE

(Translation)

I desire whole-heartedly to associate myself with the expression of thanks offered to Belgium, to her Sovereign and her Government. I warmly appreciate everything which was said in the speech of her distinguished Foreign Minister, Mr. Spaak. After him, the delegates of the United States of America and of the United Kingdom have so well defined the object of this Conference, and the spirit and methods which should ensure its success, that I should be taking up your attention unnecessarily were I to re-echo their words. I am the less inclined to do so since, as Mr. Eden has observed, our aim is not to indulge in rhetoric but to make a positive and rapid effort to achieve the result we all desire.

We are concerned with the possibilities of putting an end to a conflict which imposes upon us imperative duties—in the first place, a duty to humanity, because we cannot remain impassive before the atrocities now accumulating in the Far East. We should become accomplices if we did not, by every means, seek to put an end to merciless massacres which revolt both heart and mind. Ours is a duty, also, of conservation, because we have to defend not merely legitimate interests but, above all, peace in general, which is threatened by any war wherever it may break out. No one is secure from the possible extensions of a conflict and, if, in a spirit of inexcusable selfishness, we were to turn our eyes away from the fields of carnage we should increase the risk of becoming involved in those very complications we desire to avoid. Ours is also a duty of justice, because we are all interested in the protection of the rules on which the existence of civilization depends.

Undoubtedly, the most essential of those rules is that obligations which have been assumed and contracts which have been signed must be honored. That is the reason for our meeting, based as it is upon the Nine-power Treaty. I firmly hope that, taking our stand on that treaty, we may find the peaceful issue we are seeking. That treaty was devised by its signatories at a time when no menace threatened



the Far East, when nothing stood in the way of an impartial consideration of the problems with which it dealt. The parties, therefore, were free from any spirit of prejudice when, in Washington, they applied themselves to defining the fundamental principles of their common policy in China. That policy had no other object, and could have had no other object, than respect for the integrity and independence of that nation, towards which all the participants professed a legitimate friendship and which they were all glad to see progressing towards unity, order and prosperity. The principles then laid down were intended to be permanent. Any settlement, if it is to be a lasting one, must be such as does not derogate from those principles. No new situation should prevail over them. It is certainly not the desire of any of us here not to regard the undertakings subscribed to in 1922 as still valid.

France, for her part, is anxious to remain faithful to those principles. She feels that we should strain every effort, in the present circumstances, to discover the basis of a settlement, inspired by those principles, which will enable China and Japan to lay down their arms and by friendly negotiation, resume their partnership in the common effort to maintain peace.

The treaty of February 6, 1922, by its wisdom, clearness, and comprehensiveness, and by the simplicity of its machinery, makes it possible to direct the interests involved toward equitable adjustments. We are all making our appeal to that reason to which Mr. Davis referred just now, speaking for his great country and for the great American democracy. Similar reference was made by Mr. Eden, who is, with his country, one of the most stalwart champions of peace.

This appeal should be heard by both the nations to whom it is addressed—nations which in all the domains of speculative and creative activities have contributed so largely to human civilization.

There is no dispute which cannot be settled by good-will. In providing the two parties with an opportunity to reach an understanding under honorable and just conditions, we shall be fulfilling the hope reposed in us by world opinion—our most solid support. We shall fulfil it all the more satisfactorily if we can achieve unanimity in our methods as well as in our aim. This aim is so lofty and essential that we must move heaven and earth to achieve it, putting aside all mental reservations and prejudices, bearing in mind both the ideal and the means by which it may be realized. Therefore I firmly hope that our joint effort will develop and will be strengthened through the cooperation of all peaceful peoples, whilst at the same time it will be facilitated by the comprehension of those to whom we address ourselves with the determination to service their interests as well as the interests of all mankind.

If, as I hope, we succeed in putting an end to the war in the Far East, we shall have saved countless human lives, and have prevented the heaping up of ruin and disaster here and now; but beyond this we shall have set an example that will bear fruit elsewhere. In the series of trials through which the world is passing, this may be the signal for the much-needed effort to effect a recovery. Though war may be contagious, the victories of peace may also have incalculable repercussions. May we therefore, through the success of our work, give to the suffering peoples of the world an opportunity, which they have so often awaited in vain, for regaining confidence and hope.

ADDRESS BY COUNT LUIGI ALDROVANDI-MARESCOTTI,  
OF ITALY

(Translation)

Italy, as a signatory to the Washington treaty of February 6, 1922, accepted the Belgian Government's invitation to this Conference.

I desire to express to His Majesty's Government our most lively gratitude for its kind hospitality. I entirely associate myself with Mr. Norman Davis' observation concerning the happy coincidence of our meeting today, and, like the representatives of Great Britain and France who have preceded me, I present, on behalf of the Italian Government and people, my respectful congratulations and homage to His Majesty King Leopold.

Article 7 of the Washington treaty provides that, in certain circumstances, the contracting parties "shall, with regards to the provisions of the treaty, exchange full and frank communication".

Moreover, the Belgian Government's invitation states that the meeting will be held "to examine the situation in the Far East and to consider friendly methods for expediting the end of the present regrettable conflict in that part of the world".

The invitation of Italy to this Conference is therefore occasioned by, and limited by, these two texts.

Thus it is clear that there can be no question of any direct or indirect coercive measures such as have been called for in certain irresponsible quarters nor even of a more or less moral "quarantining" of one or other of the parties in conflict.

No country can deplore the present state of affairs in the Far East more than Italy. She deeply regrets this bitter struggle between two peoples, both of whom she regards as her friends and both of whom have deserved well of the civilization of the world.

The Fascist Government would be glad to see this cruel struggle come to an end as soon as possible, but in circumstances such as will preclude its recrudescence.



In this particular case, we are not called upon to ascertain when and how these happenings began. Experience proves that it would be impossible to do so with any certainty or finality.

The occurrences in Manchuria provide an example. After months of study a Commission expressly sent to the spot, notwithstanding the good-will, good faith and erudition of its members, was only able to reach a compromise verdict that lent itself to divergent interpretation and had only one definite result—the withdrawal of one of the parties from the League!

The Chaco case is another example. Another Commission sent to the spot by the League of Nations not only failed to stop the conflict but did not even begin to inquire where the responsibility lay for fear that yet another withdrawal might still further reduce the membership of the League.

Absolute proof of where the first shot came from, is almost impossible to obtain. Even were it obtainable, we could not base on any such trivial incident an equitable judgment as to the deeper causes of terrible conflicts.

Only the parties directly concerned are in a position to eliminate the real and underlying causes.

Therefore what should be the practical role of our Conference, if, as in the present case, one of the parties is not represented?

Our "full and frank communication" can have no meaning except for ourselves and between ourselves, and it will not stop the conflict unless we succeed in our main object, namely, to lead the two parties towards a peace—and a lasting peace—by bringing them together and by persuading them to look straight ahead and eliminate the hidden and deep-rooted causes of their dissensions.

These deep and hidden causes may be both internal and external. The internal causes include some that are not indigenous and have nothing to do with the ancient traditions of a country like China, which has always taken as the solid basis of its life two institutions—"family and property"—certain forces which are seeking, for hidden purposes, to disturb the international relations of peoples who ought, on the contrary, to understand one another and agree.

Having said this with the greatest frankness, the Fascist Government must reserve its opinion as to the results of a Conference which, however amicable the means employed, can lead to little more than "platonic resolutions", and a further revelation of impotence unless it takes into account the realities I have mentioned.

Now that we have met, the only useful thing we can do is to invite the two parties to establish direct contact and leave the matter there.

I do not expect to hear the outward signs of approval which greeted the speeches of previous speakers, but I think I am not far wrong in believing that many of you know that my remarks do represent the naked truth.

#### ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY MR. LITVINOV, OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

The Soviet Delegation being present at this Conference on the invitation of the signatories to the Washington treaty, in virtue of a decision of the League of Nations, I wish to express my agreement with the appreciation of events in the Far East which has been given this morning by the inviting powers, and in particular by the honorable representative of the United States. I need make no special declaration here, the more because the problem before the Conference has already been the subject of discussion in Geneva, where the calling of this Conference was suggested, and where everything which the situation requires was said.

The Soviet Government has more than once had to make its position clear, both on the general question of combating aggression as an international phenomenon and on the subject of particular cases when that aggression became active. All these statements were invariably inspired by the Soviet Government's devotion to the cause of peace. With very few exceptions, the governments of all other states are undoubtedly inspired by the same idea, which creates a platform and a point of departure common to them all. Divergences among them begin only when the question arises of going on from the general idea to the most effective methods of maintaining peace, or restoring it where it has been broken.

At all events, the first and inevitable step toward the adoption of any methods whatsoever is the discussion of the problem at international conferences and in international organizations. In some cases, the very fact of the summoning of a conference for joint discussion represents a definite action with a certain moral value. That is why I welcome this Conference on behalf of the Soviet Government, and express its gratitude to the Belgian Government and to Mr. Spaak, the Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs, for their efforts in organizing this Conference, as well as for the cordiality with which they have received the delegations.

Recent years have added extremely valuable experience to international life, and that experience obliges me to draw attention to those dangerous ruts and pitfalls which lie in the path of international conferences. The experience I have in mind teaches us that international conferences, committees and other organizations, which are called upon to serve a particular end, sometimes are inclined, particularly in the event of a protracted existence, to forget their direct purpose and the technical part they have to play, and begin to live their own life, with their own peculiar interests. They begin to concern themselves principally with the maintenance of their own existence, with the procuring of moral satisfaction for those who have initiated such

conferences, and with their own superficial successes, which do not always coincide with successes for the cause on account of which the conferences were brought into existence. Moreover, there sometimes even arises a divergence between those various interests; there even comes a moment when a conference or committee which should be striving to eliminate and overcome the phenomena of aggression, itself becomes imperceptibly a tool of the aggressor, who utilizes it as a screen and an auxiliary for his aggressive activities.

This happens when international organizations come into contact with the aggressors themselves in an attempt to persuade them to alter their attitude. In the course of negotiations, leading to systematic concessions to the aggressor, it is possible to cross the boundary beyond which people who are undoubtedly inspired with the best intentions slip, without noticing it, over to the point of view of the aggressor and begin to talk his language, substantially justifying and encouraging his activities.

When it is a question of an aggressive attack by one state against another, and if that attack has been in some measure successful, there is nothing easier than for an international organization, in order to gain a momentary success, to say to the aggressor: "Take your plunder, take what you have seized by force, and peace be with you", and to say to the victim of aggression: "Love your aggressor; resist not evil." But while that may constitute a superficial success for the Conference, it does not represent the victory of peace or the victory of the peace-loving countries. That kind of success can only provoke new cases of aggression, giving rise to new conferences and so on without end. The encouragement and multiplication of acts of aggression is moreover facilitated by the circumstance that when international organizations leave their direct path in the manner I have indicated, there quite inevitably arises friction between the peace-loving countries, leading to divisions among them which are skilfully utilized in their turn by the aggressors. Yet the unity of all peace-loving countries is particularly necessary at the moment when aggressive countries are more and more uniting and consolidating their forces, thereby creating a menace to an ever-increasing number of states.

Having uttered this warning, which seems to me essential, against the perils which may confront any international conference in present conditions, I desire to express my sincerest good wishes for the success of the Brussels Conference and of those proposals which we shall probably hear from the inviting powers. I am certain that the new Conference will manage to avoid the perils I have mentioned, and that the proposals we all anticipate will pursue the aim not only of restoring peace in the Far East, but of establishing a just peace, a peace which will not untie but, on the contrary, will bind the hands of aggressors, also for the future and in other parts of the world.

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY DR. V. K. WELLINGTON KOO,  
OF CHINA

I wish first of all to express the appreciation and gratitude of the Chinese Government to the Belgian Government for its consent to the use of Brussels as the seat of the Conference. I wish also to thank our distinguished President, M. Spaak, who, as the Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs, has rendered a valuable service to us all in connection with the arrangements for the convocation of our Conference.

The Chinese Delegation deems it a privilege to be able to associate itself with the words of felicitation which were so eloquently expressed by the speakers this morning to the illustrious sovereign of Belgium on the occasion of the anniversary of his birthday. China, proud of an unbroken record of friendship and confidence in her relations with Belgium, is glad to join in this testimony of good wishes for the happiness and prosperity of His Majesty King Leopold III.

Mr. President, we are assembled here in conference for the purpose of a full and frank communication between us as provided under article VII of the treaty of Washington of February 6th, 1922, relating to principles and policies to be followed in matters concerning China, because a situation has arisen which involves the application of the stipulations of the said treaty and renders desirable the discussion of such application.

What is the situation? It is that which has been created by the armed aggression of Japan, a signatory power of the same instrument, against my country in violation of article I of the said treaty which provides that the contracting powers, other than China, agree:

- (1) To respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China;
- (2) To provide the fullest and most unembarrassed opportunity to China to develop and maintain for herself an effective and stable government;
- (3) To use their influence for the purpose of effectually establishing and maintaining the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations throughout the territory of China; and
- (4) To refrain from taking advantage of conditions in China in order to seek special rights or privileges which would abridge the rights of subjects or citizens of friendly States, and from countenancing action inimical to the security of such States.

The facts relating to this Japanese armed aggression have been examined by the representatives of twenty-three nations and their unanimous report has been approved by fifty-one nations of the world. Since these facts are now public knowledge, it is, therefore, not necessary for me to dwell upon them here.

Suffice it to recall to you the findings in the report that it cannot be challenged that powerful Japanese armies have invaded Chinese territory and are in military control of large areas including Peiping itself;



that the Japanese Government has taken naval measures to close the coast of China to Chinese shipping; and that Japanese aircraft are carrying out bombardments over widely separated regions of the country.

For nearly four months the weight of Japan's mighty war-machine has been brought to bear upon innocent, peace-loving China by land, sea and air. During the past four weeks this ruthless aggression has further accentuated its intensity for the domination and conquest of my country. Japanese military occupation of North China covers practically three whole provinces, Hopeh, Chahar, and Suiyuan, with a population of 30 million, a railway mileage of 3,163 kilometers, and a total area of over 700,000 square kilometers, which is about the combined size of Great Britain and Germany. They have also occupied parts of the two provinces of Shantung and Shansi, with a total population of 45 million, a railway mileage of 1,728 kilometers, and a combined area of 314,000 square kilometers—the size of Italy. They have entered Chapei and Kiangwan in Shanghai, which the Chinese forces evacuated after gallantly holding out for 77 days against the most formidable attacks of Japan's modern mechanized forces. Five formidable Japanese armies totaling more than half a million men continue to attack the Chinese defense lines on five fronts with a view to forcing a rapid victory in order to impress and perhaps to overawe this very Conference.

For the same purpose the Japanese Navy, besides tightening its strangle-hold on the main channels of access to the Chinese coast, of several thousand kilometers in length, has been attacking the principal ports in Central and South China and attempted the landing of Japanese marines.

The Japanese Air Force has redoubled its death-dealing power. Not only did it concentrate over 100 planes to attack the Chinese forces at Shanghai in a single battle, but turning a deaf ear to the chorus of universal condemnation it has increased its ruthlessness in slaughtering unarmed civilians in disregard of the rules of international law and the time-honored principles of humanity. According to the Japanese Admiralty's own announcement of October 14th last, 62 cities and towns in eight provinces were bombed by Japanese naval aircraft alone. Widely scattered cities like Nanking, Canton, Swatow and Taiyuan have been subjected to almost daily attacks ranging sometimes from 3 to 15 raids a day. In a single raid on an open, defenseless city of Sungkiang in Kiangsu Province a week ago, Japanese bombs from the air massacred nearly 1,000 civilians, of whom a great part were helpless women and children. The civilized world has never seen such utterly ruthless methods of warfare and such stark indifference to considerations of decency.

In the light of the history of the past few years in the Far East, it is evident that the present outbreak of Japanese armed aggression is merely a continuation of Japan's policy of territorial expansion on the Asiatic mainland, already betrayed in all its flagrancy at the time of her attack on Mukden in 1931 with her subsequent military occupation of Manchuria and Jehol.

The setting up of a puppet regime in Manchuria propped up by the Kwantung army and packed with Japanese advisers in all key posts, has been only a camouflage for territorial conquest. The invasion of Chinese provinces inside the Great Wall; the occupation of eastern Chahar in 1933; Japan's peremptory demand in 1935 for the removal of the governor and other high provincial officials of Hopeh, for the evacuation of the Central Government troops therefrom, and for the expulsion of the Kuomintang Party workers from the same area; her creation in December of the same year of the so-called East Hopeh autonomous and anti-communist regime with the aid and protection of the Japanese military guards; her military occupation of north Chahar, and the open attempts of the Japanese military agents in the past two years to establish an autonomous government for the five provinces of North China—all these acts and activities in contravention of the rules of international law and Japan's own treaty obligations show only too clearly her sinister design on China, with whom she claims to have been at peace.

The gigantic campaign of smuggling, fostered and promoted by the Japanese military authorities in North China with the double purpose of raising funds to carry on their political intrigues in North China and dealing a financial blow to the Chinese Government at Nanking, was another method of disrupting the Chinese administrative integrity in North China and strengthening their hold on that region. The Japanese military authorities seized every occasion on which the Chinese customs authorities attempted to enforce the Chinese customs regulations upon the smugglers as a pretext for forcing them first to disarm and then to cease patrolling to prevent violation of the Chinese fiscal laws.

The encouragement by the Japanese military authorities in China of the illicit traffic in drugs and narcotics conducted by Japanese *ronins* and Koreans in Chinese territory is yet another proof of Japan's real intentions towards China. In North China, Manchuria and Jehol this is an open secret and well known to the Advisory Committee of the League of Nations on opium and drugs. It is a deliberate policy to deprave the Chinese people in the hopes of bringing about their moral degradation to a point where they would be powerless to resist the invaders.

The instigation of a Mongolian rebellion and attack on Suiyuan Province in the winter of 1936 under Japanese officers was frankly



admitted by General Kita, the Japanese military attaché in Shanghai, in an interview published in the *New York Times* of November 23d, 1936. The setting up by the Japanese Army a week ago of the so-called Mongol State, its new puppet, at Kweihua in Suiyuan Province puts a finishing touch to their intrigues in Inner Mongolia.

In the last two years the Kwantung army has against the protests of Chinese authorities stationed the so-called special service agents at ten strategical points of North China. The Japanese garrison has since adopted the same practice and maintains agents in eight important centers in the five northern provinces of China. During the past four years Japanese military planes have been flying over the Chinese territory in spite of the repeated protests of the Chinese Government.

Japan has been carrying on these unlawful activities in disregard of international morals and in violation of her treaty obligations. Every one of these activities constitutes an attack upon the sovereignty, the independence and the territorial and administrative integrity of China, which she has solemnly undertaken to respect in the Nine-power Treaty of Washington. Instead of providing the fullest and most unembarrassed opportunity for China to develop and maintain for herself an effective and stable government, Japan has sought by the activities I have just enumerated either to frustrate such opportunity or to deprive China of it. Wherever her invading armies have remained they have sought to disestablish and undermine the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations, as has been clearly demonstrated in Manchuria and Jehol. Time and again she has sought to create embarrassing conditions in China in order to seek special rights and privileges for her nationals to the detriment of the rights of the subjects or citizens of other friendly states.

That Japan by her acts and activities in China during the past few years has contravened her obligations under the Nine-power Treaty of February 6th, 1922, has been established by an impartial tribunal of fifty-one nations. I do not, therefore, propose to ask you to confirm it here. It is unnecessary to do so.

The Chinese Delegation regrets that Japan has refused to join this Conference. If she had a case and a clear conscience, she need have no apprehension that she might not obtain a just hearing. Her refusal, in our view, is only another proof of her disregard of her treaty obligations, for under article VII of the Nine-power Treaty participation in the consultation is as much a duty as a right.

I am aware, however, that Japan, though not present here, has made known her views in an attempt to justify her policy of aggression in China both in her reply to the invitation to participate in the Conference and in her recent official statement to the world press on the

same occasion. She has advanced certain reasons and explanations which are intended to influence the uninformed opinion of the world.

One of the reasons most frequently advanced in her attempt to justify her policy of force and aggression in China is that there has been anti-Japanese feeling in my country. I admit there has existed in the past six years, and exists today, a sentiment of opposition in China, not to Japan as a nation but only to her overt acts of aggression against China or to her open preparation for such aggression. As the Chinese Government has emphasized on more than one occasion, the so-called anti-Japanese feeling is a natural consequence of the Japanese policy towards China. The Chinese people harbor no ill-will against the Japanese people as such but strongly object to the Japanese policy of force of the mailed fist in contravention also of the Kellogg-Briand Pact of Paris. The Chinese feeling of resentment is a fact the cause of which lies in Japan's own hands and springs from her own doing. For what self-respecting people in the world, if placed in the position of the Chinese, would not feel in the same way as the Chinese do towards Japan? Can Japan expect to win China's good-will and confidence by deliberately and repeatedly seeking by intrigue or by force to infringe her sovereignty, to disrupt her political unity, to dismember her territory, to deprave her people and to destroy her independence? The real wonder in the relations between the two countries is not the fact that there has been anti-Japanese feeling in China but the great moderation, restraint and conciliation on the part of the Chinese Government and people towards Japan.

Official protestations of good intentions from Tokyo are powerless to convince the people of the world if they are not based upon the truth. For in international relations just as in individual relations action speaks louder than words.

Japan has again insinuated and alleged that the Chinese Government has been under the influence of the Chinese Communist elements. No one familiar with the recent developments in China can take this accusation seriously. For nearly ten years the Chinese Government has combated with determination and with all the resources at its disposal the unlawful activities of the Chinese Communist Party. The objection has been not so much to the philosophy of Communism itself since the attachment of the average Chinese citizen to the family and to landed property, as has also been attested by the honorable Delegate of Italy, is traditional and profound, but rather to the setting up of a rival government with an independent army, thereby constituting an obstacle to the work of political unification under the National Government.

But the Chinese Communists, like the great bulk of their fellow citizens, are after all patriotic and love their country. Their recent acceptance of the principles upon which the Chinese National Gov-

ernment is founded, their pledge of allegiance to Nanking, the voluntary dissolution of their so-called Soviet organization, and the disbandment of their small army to be completely reorganized by the Central Government in order to enable China more effectively to resist the Japanese aggression prove beyond doubt that the so-called menace of Chinese Communist elements is only a pretext on the part of the Japanese war party to hoodwink the world as to the real aggressive character of its own policy. Its true intention has been betrayed recently when it proclaimed its desire to bring about the fall of the present National Government which has effectively done away with the erstwhile menace of Communism in China and successfully achieved political unification of the whole nation.

In this connection it may well be recalled that at the time of the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931-32 the Japanese Government, in an attempt to justify its policy of aggression, argued that there was no stable and effective government in China, thereby making it necessary for Japan to undertake the task of maintaining order and tranquillity in East Asia. Today when China has established a most stable government whose authority is accepted throughout the nation, responsible Japanese leaders have openly declared their insistence upon its fall and disappearance, again on the professed ground of assuring tranquillity and order in East Asia. In the face of such obvious contradictions, what confidence could the Chinese Government place in Japan's protestations of innocent intentions towards China?

I wish to say here also that China does not look upon the world as a divided camp of rival political ideologies. She believes in the liberty and right of each nation to choose and adopt for itself any political system which it believes to be best suited to the genius of its people. Each country has a right, in our view, to work out its own destiny. The question of political ideology is primarily a right for self-determination of each people. Just as China recognizes this right of other countries, so she claims the same right for herself. It is an inherent right of every independent state and gives no privilege to Japan to interfere in the domestic affairs of China.

It has also been claimed by Japan that the Chinese Government has been conducting for some years a militaristic propaganda aimed at Japan, and that at the same time, by importing vast quantities of munitions, constructing fortifications, and giving intensive training to the troops, it has succeeded in building large, strong armaments. She claims that her aggression in China is "a measure of self-defense in face of China's challenge".

Mr. President, in view of her possession of one of the most powerful war machines in the world equipped with an up-to-date and mighty army, navy and air force, and ranking as one of the strongest mili-

tary powers in the whole world, Japan's complaint against China's armaments, which are far inferior to her own and which are unjustifiably small in the presence of constant Japanese aggression, might be considered as comical if it were not for the tragic consequences which she has already inflicted, and is still inflicting, with her tremendous fighting-machine, upon scores of open, peaceful cities in China and upon thousands of innocent Chinese people.

China's regret today is that her rearmament in recent years has not been more rapid and more extensive so that she might be able to offer a yet more effective resistance to Japanese aggression, and thereby lessen the toll of suffering ruthlessly imposed upon the Chinese people by Japanese arms.

China had never given any challenge to Japan before the deliberate opening of hostilities on China by Japan. The Chinese armed forces had never invaded a single foot of Japanese territory, nor had the Chinese air force bombed a single Japanese town. China had not wished to make war on Japan and is fighting today determinedly and bravely only to resist the unceasing onslaught of the invading Japanese forces. Those Japanese who claim that Japan has been acting in self-defense either betray, to use their own pet expression, regrettable lack of sincerity or take all other people for fools. No man of common sense would consider a burglar who had forcibly broken into a house to be acting in self-defense when he is trying to murder the landlord desperately engaged in resisting the criminal intruder.

The Japanese Government claims that the situation in the Far East is difficult for the occident to understand, and complains that there is a lack of comprehension on the part of the powers of her intentions. Let me point out, Mr. President, that the only difficult point to understand in the Far East is the persistent, incessant aggression of Japan against China, not only in violation of her pledged word but also in opposition to her real self-interest.

I know there are in Japan far-sighted statesmen who condemn this policy of force against a peaceful neighbor from whom she has borrowed so much in civilization and in culture. But these enlightened elements are helpless against the grip of the military hierarchy on the government of the country.

It does no credit to Japan, who used to complain of the alleged lack of stable and effective Government in China, to have the civil branch of her own Government give an assurance of her peaceful intentions one day, to be belied the next day, if not at once, by the action of its military authorities. China has had bitter experience of this perpetual "dual diplomacy" which the Japanese statesmen themselves have openly denounced but which the Japanese Government as such has been powerless to overcome.



In the light of the extraordinary acts and activities of the Kwantung army and the Japanese garrison in North China, to which I made reference a little while ago, is there any wonder that the powers of the occident cannot fully understand the intentions of Japan? Indeed, no people who love law and order and who respect the peace and security of other nations could understand this organized lawlessness and aggression on the part of Japan against China.

It is also claimed that Japan's intention is to seek cooperation with China. If that be her object, she has certainly adopted a most extraordinary method to attain it. A reasonable man does not begin to try to make a friend of his neighbor by smacking his face, by "beating him to his knees", and by trying to murder him.

China realizes that Japan is a highly industrialized nation. She has different problems to face and her economic well-being depends upon a reasonable assurance of markets and raw materials from abroad. But economic cooperation, to be successful, must be sought by peaceful means and friendly negotiation. It must be, as has been justly said by the honorable Delegate of the United States of America, a cooperation between free and equal partners on the basis of reciprocity. There have been occasions in the past when China, in the midst of her devotion to the task of economic reconstruction and development, sought such cooperation from Japan as from other countries but the Japanese policy of domination and force always prevented its realization. Is it not natural that China, with her own experience of the unceasing bullying and aggression of the Japanese military warlords in North China and in the light of Korea's fate in accepting the so-called cooperation of Japan, should be wary of her professed intentions?

As Prince Konoe said prior to assuming his present post of Premier, "Japan's proposal must be of obvious benefit to China in order to be acceptable. There must be a unity of public opinion in Japan on China policy and effective aid be given to the Chinese nation in its struggle for rejuvenation." So long as Japan hopes by the magic word "cooperation" to enslave China and so long as she continues, through the medium of her armed forces, to attack, kill and destroy China, there can be no real prospect of achieving cooperation between the two countries. Cooperation in the Japanese vocabulary evidently means only conformation to Japan's will by means of coercion.

In our view, the example of the other powers in China might well be followed by Japan. China's relations with them in the past had not always been smooth. Their former method of economic cooperation smacked in our view of the character of exploitation and was therefore not always welcome. But since their adoption of the new policy of free, frank and friendly collaboration for reciprocal benefit, all difficulties have disappeared. Good-will and confidence now prevail in their relations with China and the continued development in the scope and

extent of their economic cooperation with ever-increasing advantage to both sides has fully justified their new policy. It is only Japan who still clings to the archaic idea of making economic exploitation a mask for political domination. Unless and until she abandons this ruthless outworn policy, and substitutes for it one based upon equality and reciprocity, there can be no real economic cooperation between the two countries. And to be fully acceptable to China such cooperation, in conformity with the spirit of the open-door policy, must be inclusive of other powers and not exclusive for Japan.

The interpretation which the Japanese Government has put forward in regard to certain local agreements which were previously made to liquidate incidents provoked by the Japanese troops themselves is obviously designed to distort the true facts and confuse public opinion.

It is also claimed by Japan that the present dispute between her and China can only be settled by direct negotiation between the two countries. Such a claim, in our view, ignores the important fact that the lives of the nationals of many powers, as well as their material interests, are already affected. Besides, there is a general interest which all states have in the upholding of law and order in international relations and in the maintenance of peace and security between nations. I need not try to develop this point here, because the conclusion that the present situation is a matter of concern not only to the two states in conflict but, to a lesser or greater degree, to all states has been solemnly acknowledged by fifty-one nations. The fact that this Conference has been convoked and is sitting testifies to the concensus of opinion of the other signatory powers of the treaty.

China, indeed, fully shares this view and, therefore, welcomes the presence at this Conference not only of the powers which have important interests in the Far East but also of all those which may be only indirectly interested in that region.

The principal fact of the present situation in the Far East is that Japan has flagrantly violated the terms of the Nine-power Treaty of February 6th, 1922, to which she has solemnly attached her signature and thereby pledged her respect for it. It is not only a violation against China, whose sovereignty, independence and territorial and administrative integrity have been and are being threatened by Japan's repeated aggression against her, and whose fullest and most unembarrassed opportunity to develop and maintain for herself a stable and effective government has been denied her by the Japanese policy of interference and invasion; it also constitutes a violation against all the other signatory powers that she will discharge her obligations in accordance with the stipulations of the treaty.

China, faithful to her signature, has been doing her best to make the treaty respected by Japan. In the last four months she has been defending, at tremendous sacrifice of the life and blood of her people,



her sovereignty, independence, and territorial and administrative integrity against the overwhelming superiority of the Japanese forces of aggression. In doing this she, in fact, defends not only the material interests of the powers in China but also the general cause of the sanctity of treaties.

China's resistance has been and remains under severe handicaps of all kinds. It is, however, animated by an undaunted spirit and a determined will. The bravery of the Chinese soldier in the face of the most formidable onslaught of Japanese aggression has given, I hope, no cause for criticism even when judged by the most exacting standard of military gallantry in the world. I cannot believe that the mighty powers which are represented here at the Conference and which are also parties to the treaty which China has been trying to defend with her limited resources of power and strength, will refuse to do their part in upholding the principle of the sanctity of treaty obligations, a principle which forms an essential basis of peace in the world. On the contrary, let me say that China has the utmost confidence in your loyalty and devotion to the stipulations of the treaty which gives the mandate for our Conference and in your willingness also to do your utmost in order to make the principle of faith in the pledged word prevail in international relations. Such an effort will as much serve the general interest of civilization itself as render full justice to China.

The delegates of several powers represented at this Conference have expressed a sincere desire to bring about a cessation of the hostilities now raging between my country and Japan and to work for the restoration of peace by agreement. China, whose love of peace is traditional, appreciates this gesture of good-will. The Chinese Government which steadily pursued a policy of peace in the past years in the face of the most flagrant armed aggression from Japan, and which clung to that policy even in the trying days just preceding the opening of hostilities by Japan on her, has been fighting only to resist the Japanese invasion. We desire peace but we know that we cannot obtain it in the presence of Japanese aggression. So long as that aggression persists, so long we are determined to continue our resistance. It is not a peace at any price that will either render justice to China or do credit to civilization. It is only by accepting a peace based upon the principles of article I of the Nine-power Treaty of Washington, under which we are sitting, that China, by her tremendous sacrifices during the past few months, will be contributing to the cause of law and order in the relations between nations.

Gentlemen, knowing your devotion to the principle of the sanctity of treaties, which has been so ably affirmed by the honorable Delegates of France, Great Britain and the United States this morning, I wish to assure you of the whole-hearted collaboration of our Government.

We give you this assurance the more willingly because we believe that if the rampant forces of Japanese aggression in the Far East are not effectively checked and faith in the pledged word is not restored, there is every danger that these forces will overrun the boundaries of China and throw the world into a general war from which no important power will in the long run be able to keep aloof. As President Roosevelt has so truly said in a majestic speech recently, "The peace-loving nations must make a concerted effort in opposition to those violations of treaties and that ignoring of human instincts which today are creating a state of international anarchy and instability from which there is no escape through mere isolation or neutrality." Mr. President, it is in the interests of the general cause of peace and security between nations, as well as in the hope of obtaining justice for China, that we wish you success in your efforts and are ready to contribute our fullest share for its attainment.

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY MR. AUGUSTO DE CASTRO, OF  
PORTUGAL

(Translation)

I should like first of all to associate myself on behalf of my Government with the homage paid on this day of his birthday to His Majesty King Leopold, and I desire also most cordially to welcome the presence of our distinguished President, Mr. Spaak, the eminent Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs.

The Portuguese Government, as a signatory to the Washington treaty of 1922, received the Belgian Government's invitation to be represented at this Conference. Its considerable interests, not merely historical and geographical—the part played by Portugal in the civilization of Asia is so well known that there is no need to remind you of it—but also its political and territorial interests at the present time, and its position in the Far East, made its presence at this assembly essential. I think it is quite unnecessary to assure you that, in this spirit, and with a view to collaborating in any moral effort in the world for securing real peace, the Portuguese Government, which, from the beginning of the Sino-Japanese conflict has declared its neutrality, will give most friendly consideration, and, within the limits and spirit of its neutrality, will lend its support to all useful work for conciliation to which this Conference may lead in connection with the aims defined in the invitation that has brought us together here.

COMMENTS OF THE CHINESE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS, NOVEMBER 4, 1937, ON THE JAPANESE REPLY TO THE INVITATION TO THE CONFERENCE AND THE STATEMENT OF THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT OF OCTOBER 28, 1937

The note sent by the Japanese Government to the Belgian Embassy at Tokio on October 27th and the lengthy statement issued on the following day, purporting to clarify Japan's stand in respect to her refusal to participate in the forthcoming Nine-power Conference at Brussels not only contain many unwarranted statements concerning China but also show a definite antipathy towards the efforts of the League of Nations and the United States for the reestablishment of peace.

The Japanese statement contended:

1° That the fundamental cause of the Sino-Japanese conflict was the anti-foreign policy of the Chinese Government since the revolution of 1911, especially the anti-Japanese aspects;

2° That, being sympathetic towards China's national aspirations, Japan had rendered assistance towards their realization;

3° That instead of showing grateful appreciation of Japan's good-will, China had amassed weapons of war against her, thereby causing the present conflict; and

4° That the key to the solution of the Sino-Japanese dispute lies in the abandonment of China's anti-Japanese policy for one of cooperation with Japan.

Anyone who is familiar with the recent events of the Far East will readily perceive the fallacy of the above contentions. China's foreign policy since the revolution has been based on the legitimate aspiration of attaining independence and equality. It has been generally understood and sympathetically supported by all friendly nations. The Chinese Government has always respected legitimate foreign interests in China and welcomes foreign capital as well as technical assistance. The ever-increasing volume of Sino-foreign trade and the very friendly relations existing between the Chinese people and the peoples of other countries today are concrete proofs of China's good-neighbor policy, which defy distortion by the Japanese.

China and Japan are close neighbors who are, moreover, tied by racial kinship and linguistic affinity. It cannot but be the fervent desire of the Chinese Government and people to befriend their neighboring country. Unfortunately, ever since the days of the revolution in 1911, Japan has been pursuing her continental ambitions

at the expense of China. The episode of the Twenty-one Demands is still fresh in our memory. During the nationalist revolution, Japan deliberately obstructed the northward advance of the nationalist army and prevented the unification of China under the new regime by precipitating the Tsinan incident in 1928. One can hardly imagine any nation which professes to welcome the awakening of China's national spirit would behave in such a manner.

As regards the claim that Japan took the lead in restoring to China her customs autonomy and proclaimed her sympathy towards China's aspirations for the abolition of extraterritoriality, all recorded facts prove that the contrary was the case. In 1928, China had concluded with other powers treaties providing unconditional restoration of her customs autonomy, but it was not until 1930 when Japan consented to conclude a similar tariff agreement, subject to certain conditions favorable to herself. In the last two years, Japan has inspired and given protection to large-scale smuggling in China and actively interfered with her customs' preventive service, causing enormous losses to China's revenues and dislocation of her customs administration.

Regarding extraterritoriality, Japan has lately taken every advantage of this special privilege to carry on numerous illegal activities in China such as unauthorized airplane flights over Chinese territory, the establishment of espionage organizations, supplying ammunition to bandits and the protection of drug traffic. Such being the case, it is inconceivable how these facts could be reconciled with the claim that Japan pursued a policy designed to satisfy legitimate wishes of the Chinese people. Since September 18th, 1931, Japan's acts of aggression in China have taken on an ever-increasing degree of audacity, and vast tracts of territory have been seized from China. Following the organization of the puppet "Manchukuo" and the so-called "East Hopeh Autonomous Council", she is now busily engaged in the creation of the so-called "Manchukuo" or "Mongol State" in the provinces of Chahar and Siuyuan. No nation can be expected to endure so much humiliation, yet China, hoping Japan would finally awaken to her mistakes, time and again admonished the Chinese people to exercise forbearance. In every unfortunate incident between Chinese and Japanese nationals, the Chinese Government, in keeping with her good-neighbor policy, has always patiently sought an amicable settlement, even though the fault usually did not lie with the Chinese involved. During the past three years, Japan's trade with China increased annually while the customs statistics of the past six months of the current year show that she has almost attained the first place in Sino-foreign trade. That such steady development of Japanese trade with China should be possible should itself be ample proof that there has been no anti-Japanese policy on the part of the Chinese Government.



The evacuation of Japanese nationals from various parts of China after the Lukouchiao incident was in fact intended to spare them from such mass slaughters as were later perpetrated by Japanese airmen at Canton, Hankow and elsewhere. The Chinese Government provided the Japanese with every facility in their evacuation and undertook to protect Japanese property left in its custody, although Chinese evacuation from Japan was impeded in all manners by the Japanese authorities. Telling contrast in this case is sufficient indication of the underlying sentiment entertained by each of the parties concerned.

There is, however, a definite limit in human endurance. Relentless pressure of Japan's aggressive activities in China has at last compelled the Chinese people to rise in self-defense. But even in this armed resistance, the Chinese people clearly perceived that China's enemy is not the Japanese people but the Japanese militarists who are bent on aggression. What the Chinese people want to do is not to eliminate legitimate Japanese interests in China, but to halt the acts of aggression on the part of the Japanese militarists. In short, there is no such thing as anti-foreignism in China, nor in reality anything which may be regarded as anti-Japanese. The present unfortunate situation has arisen entirely from the intolerable and ceaseless pressure of Japanese aggression in China. The Japanese statement further alleged that the immediate cause of the Sino-Japanese conflict in North China was China's violation of the so-called Ho-Umetzu agreement by sending troops northward and that hostilities at Shanghai were caused by China's disregard of the 1932 agreement. Therefore, it contended that Japan's action in Hopeh and Shanghai has been taken purely in self-defense and does not violate the Nine-power Treaty; such specious argument totally ignores the facts. The outbreak of the Lukouchiao and Hungjao aerodrome incidents as a result of provocative actions of the Japanese Army; earnest and repeated endeavors made by the Chinese Government to seek a peaceful solution for these incidents; the lack of sincerity on the part of the Japanese to keep peace, as manifested by their concentration of huge military and naval air forces for offensive purposes; consequent attacks on the Chinese troops who were forced to resist in self-defense; the indiscriminate killing of Chinese non-combatants by Japanese forces and the destruction of Chinese cultural and educational establishments—all these are facts which the Chinese Government has repeatedly made public and which have been attested by impartial reports.

These same facts have been dealt with justly and thoroughly in the reports and the resolutions of the League Assembly adopted on October 6th, leaving little doubt who is the aggressor and who the victim.

Moreover in moving its armed forces within its own territory, whether Shanghai or North China, the Chinese Government exercised but sovereign rights which cannot be subjected to any restriction. It is preposterous to assume that Japan is entitled to despatch an enormous army to China, while China is denied the right to move troops for self-defense. The Shanghai agreement of 1932 has been repeatedly violated by free and unlawful movements of Japanese armed forces around Shanghai. Upon the outbreak of the present hostilities, the Japanese openly made use of the International Settlement as bases of operations. It is, therefore, incomprehensible that Japan should have accused any party but herself of tearing up the Shanghai agreement.

As signatory to the Nine-power Treaty, Japan is bound to respect China's sovereignty, territorial and administrative integrity. But instead of living up to her pledged word, Japan, without the least ground, embarked upon large-scale military operations against China, occupying Chinese cities, massacring the Chinese people, destroying Chinese property. It is inconceivable that such aggressive actions could have been taken in the name of self-defense and reconciled with the terms of the Nine-power Treaty.

Many references were made by the Japanese to the Chinese Communist Party and the question of Communism. It was contended that Communism and anti-Japanese policy of the Chinese Government were the two main obstacles to peaceful relations between China and Japan. Such groundless propaganda however can hardly deceive the world.

China's policy rests firmly on the foundation of the Three People's Principles enunciated by the late Dr. Sun Yat-sen. During the last decade, supreme efforts have been made by the Kuomintang and the National Government to prevent the spread of Communist doctrines and to suppress violence of the Chinese Communists. The long-drawn-out campaign against the Communists and the great cost it involved are facts too well known to require lengthy narration. More recently, the Communist Party, awakening to the acute danger of foreign aggression, realized that national salvation could be achieved only through whole-hearted enforcement of the Three People's Principles. Consequently on September 22, the Communist Party formally declared: 1° the renunciation of the theory and practice of violence; 2° the cessation of all activities aimed at Bolshevizing China; 3° the abolition of the Chinese soviets; 4° the disbandment of the Chinese Red army. In view of these developments, it may be said that the whole Chinese nation is devoted to the Three People's Principles today, striving, under the guidance of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, to resist foreign aggression and to realize Dr. Sun Yat-sen's lofty ideals.



The facts recapitulated above cannot be obscured by propaganda, however cleverly contrived. In conclusion, it cannot be overemphasized that the present unhappy state of relations between the Chinese and the Japanese is entirely due to Japan's ceaseless aggressions against China. Peace and normality will be restored to East Asia the instant Japan abandons her traditional policy of force, ceases her acts of aggression and recalls her invading forces from Chinese soil.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CONFERENCE TO THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT, NOVEMBER 7, 1937

1° The representatives of the states met in Brussels on November 3d last have taken cognizance of the reply which the Japanese Government sent in on October 27th to the invitation of the Belgian Government, and the statement which accompanied this reply.

2° In these documents the Imperial Government states that it cherishes no territorial ambitions in respect of China and that on the contrary it sincerely desires "to assist in the material and moral development of the Chinese nation", that it also desires "to promote cultural and economic cooperation" with the foreign powers in China and that it intends furthermore scrupulously "to respect foreign rights and interests in that country".

3° The points referred to in this declaration are among the fundamental principles of the treaty of Washington of February 6th, 1922 (the Nine-power Treaty). The representatives of the states parties to this treaty have taken note of the declarations of the Imperial Government in this respect.

4° The Imperial Government moreover denies that there can be any question of a violation of the Nine-power Treaty by Japan and it formulates a number of complaints against the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government for its part contends that there has been violation, denies the charges of the Japanese Government and, in turn, makes complaint against Japan.

5° The treaty has made provision for just such a situation. It should be borne in mind that the exchange of views taking place in Brussels is based essentially on these provisions and constitutes "full and frank communication" as envisaged in article VII. This Conference is being held with a view to assisting in the resolving by peaceful means of a conflict between parties to the treaty.

One of the parties to the present conflict, China, is represented at the Conference and has affirmed its willingness fully to cooperate in its work.

The Conference regrets the absence of the other party, Japan, whose cooperation is most desirable.

6° The Imperial Government states that it is "firmly convinced that an attempt to seek a solution at a gathering of so many powers whose interests in East Asia are of varying degree, or who have practically no interests there at all, will only serve to complicate the

situation still further and to put serious obstacles in the path of a just and proper solution".

It should be pointed out that all of these powers which are parties to the treaty are, under the terms of this instrument, entitled to exercise the rights which the treaty confers upon them; that all powers which have interests in the Far East are concerned regarding the present hostilities; and that the whole world is solicitous with regard to the effect of the hostilities on the peace and security of the members of the family of nations.

However, the representatives of the states met at Brussels believe that it may be possible to allay Japan's misgivings referred to above; they would be glad to know whether the Imperial Government would be disposed to depute a representative or representatives to exchange views with representatives of a small number of powers to be chosen for that purpose. Such an exchange of views would take place within the framework of the Nine-power Treaty and in conformity with the provisions of that treaty. Its aims would be to throw further light on the various points referred to above and to facilitate a settlement of the conflict. Regretting the continuation of hostilities, being firmly convinced that a peaceful settlement is alone capable of ensuring a lasting and constructive solution of the present conflict, and having confidence in the efficacy of methods of conciliation, the representatives of the states met at Brussels earnestly desire that such a settlement may be achieved.

7° The states represented at the Conference would be very glad to know as soon as possible the attitude of the Imperial Government towards this proposal.

#### REPLY OF THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT, NOVEMBER 12, 1937, TO THE COMMUNICATION OF NOVEMBER 7 FROM THE CONFERENCE

The Imperial Government has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the *note verbale* of November 7th concerning the Brussels Conference.

The Imperial Government is glad to observe that the opinion expressed in this document by the powers participating in the Conference is the result of careful consideration. It regrets, however, that this opinion is not such as would enable it to modify the views which it set out clearly in its reply and statement of October 27th. The participating powers have been good enough to state that they are prepared to designate representatives of a small number of powers for the purpose of exchanging views with one or more representatives of Japan within the framework of the Nine-power Treaty and in conformity with the terms of that treaty. The Imperial Government, however, cannot do otherwise than maintain its points of view, that since it has been obliged to resort to its present action as a measure of defense against Chinese acts of provocation, this action does not come within the scope of the Nine-power Treaty and that there is no justification for discussing the applicability of the latter; moreover, it could not agree to take part in a meeting based on the provisions of the treaty while it is accused of having violated the terms of that treaty.

As the present occurrences have their origin in conditions peculiar to the Far East, an endeavor to reach a solution by the only two parties having direct and immediate interests constitutes the means of securing the most just and the most equitable settlement. The Imperial Government is firmly convinced that the intervention of a collective organ such as the present Conference would merely excite national feeling in the two countries and would make it more difficult to reach a solution satisfactory to all. Nevertheless, the Imperial Government would be very glad if the powers, after taking full cognizance of the views expressed above, could make a contribution in conformity with the real situation to the stabilization of East Asia.

The participating powers have pointed out that all powers which have interests in the Far East are affected by the present hostilities and that the whole world is anxious regarding the effects of these hostilities on the peace and security of the members of the family of

nations. In this connection the Imperial Government wishes to emphasize, as it has clearly repeated in its former declarations, that it is endeavoring by every means to ensure respect for the rights and interests of foreign powers in China and that it attaches the highest importance to the establishment of a lasting peace in the Far East following on a satisfactory settlement of the present affair.

DECLARATION AND ADDRESSES MADE AT THE  
SEVENTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE, NO-  
VEMBER 13, 1937, IN CONSIDERING THE REPLY  
OF THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT

DECLARATION BY HIS EXCELLENCY DR. V. K. WELLINGTON  
KOO, OF CHINA

After ten days of effort the Conference finds itself back in the position where it started. The latest reply of the Japanese Government to the appeal of the Conference sent a week ago is another flat refusal to collaborate in the interest of peace. It throws, in our opinion, no new light on any of the points brought to its attention, but simply gives a more determined "No" than ever.

It will be recalled that the last communication of the Conference, like the original invitation of the Belgian Government addressed to Japan, was couched in most conciliatory terms. All reference to the League of Nations, which first suggested the idea of holding a conference, was carefully omitted. The unanimous opinion of 51 nations of the world on her invasion of China and the nature of her military operations in Chinese territory was not even alluded to. The studied reticence in regard to her flagrant violation of the Nine-power Treaty, under which the Conference has been sitting, was a clear assurance that she was not summoned to appear before a tribunal to defend her unlawful actions in China. She was invited to participate in the Conference as an equal partner and implored to extend her cooperation. Particular attention was paid to the language of the communication, and every care was taken to avoid any expression that might ruffle the tender susceptibilities of the Japanese Government. The Conference went so far as to take note of her objection to dealing with a large body of powers represented at the Conference, and offered to choose a small number of powers in order to induce her to consent to an exchange of views with them.

We, of the Chinese Delegation, assured the Conference from the outset of the determination of the Chinese Government to contribute its full cooperation for the restoration of peace consonant with justice, and for a settlement of the conflict on the basis of the principles of the treaty. In our desire to contribute to the success of your effort, we offered even to retire temporarily from the meetings of the Conference in private if our absence would facilitate progress in its discussions.



nations. In this connection the Imperial Government wishes to emphasize, as it has clearly repeated in its former declarations, that it is endeavoring by every means to ensure respect for the rights and interests of foreign powers in China and that it attaches the highest importance to the establishment of a lasting peace in the Far East following on a satisfactory settlement of the present affair.

#### DECLARATION AND ADDRESSES MADE AT THE SEVENTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE, NOVEMBER 13, 1937, IN CONSIDERING THE REPLY OF THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT

DECLARATION BY HIS EXCELLENCY DR. V. K. WELLINGTON KOO, OF CHINA

After ten days of effort the Conference finds itself back in the position where it started. The latest reply of the Japanese Government to the appeal of the Conference sent a week ago is another flat refusal to collaborate in the interest of peace. It throws, in our opinion, no new light on any of the points brought to its attention, but simply gives a more determined "No" than ever.

It will be recalled that the last communication of the Conference, like the original invitation of the Belgian Government addressed to Japan, was couched in most conciliatory terms. All reference to the League of Nations, which first suggested the idea of holding a conference, was carefully omitted. The unanimous opinion of 51 nations of the world on her invasion of China and the nature of her military operations in Chinese territory was not even alluded to. The studied reticence in regard to her flagrant violation of the Nine-power Treaty, under which the Conference has been sitting, was a clear assurance that she was not summoned to appear before a tribunal to defend her unlawful actions in China. She was invited to participate in the Conference as an equal partner and implored to extend her cooperation. Particular attention was paid to the language of the communication, and every care was taken to avoid any expression that might ruffle the tender susceptibilities of the Japanese Government. The Conference went so far as to take note of her objection to dealing with a large body of powers represented at the Conference, and offered to choose a small number of powers in order to induce her to consent to an exchange of views with them.

We, of the Chinese Delegation, assured the Conference from the outset of the determination of the Chinese Government to contribute its full cooperation for the restoration of peace consonant with justice, and for a settlement of the conflict on the basis of the principles of the treaty. In our desire to contribute to the success of your effort, we offered even to retire temporarily from the meetings of the Conference in private if our absence would facilitate progress in its discussions.

But neither the spirit of conciliation nor the soft words were of any avail. The refusal of the Japanese Government is more resolute and absolute than ever, and both the language and the tone of its reply seem to indicate clearly that all the painstaking efforts of the Conference to secure her collaboration for the cause of peace and the respect of treaties have been taken as a sign of weakness and served apparently only to inspire her insolence.

The latest reply of the Japanese Government, as I have said, adds nothing new to its previous communications. It repeats the flimsy pretexts and excuses with which I dealt at length in my statement before the Conference on the opening day. The reiterated claim that Japan's present action in China is resorted to as a measure of defense is not only a deliberate distortion of the meaning of the time-honored term, but makes a mockery of the universal sentiment of justice and truth. Even if the Japanese Government really believed—which the Chinese Delegation seriously doubts—that Japan's aggression in China was dictated by considerations of self-defense, it could in no way justify her claim that the matter lay outside the scope of the Nine-power Treaty. The "full and frank communication" envisaged in article VII of the treaty is intended, in our view, for just such a situation.

The reply again insists upon a direct settlement of the present conflict by China and Japan. Let me inform you here that for four years the Chinese Government patiently tried to reach a peaceful settlement with Japan of the questions outstanding between them, and the present conflict is the result. For every act of concession, every gesture of conciliation on the part of China was taken by Japan as a sign of fear and led to more bullying and brow-beating. The acceptance of one demand by China was always followed by the presentation of other demands. Failing compliance by China, the Japanese Army resorted to intimidation and coercion in the form of nefarious activities of smuggling, night maneuvers, war exercises, and heavy reinforcements to the Japanese garrison in North China in violation of the protocol of 1901 and out of all proportion either to the purpose of keeping open communication from Peiping to the sea or in comparison with those of the other powers. The perpetual "dual diplomacy" practiced by Japan through the Japanese Foreign Office and the Japanese Army in her dealings with China has convinced China of the danger and futility of direct negotiation.

It is said that "the present occurrences have their origin in conditions peculiar to the Far East". For our part we do not see that there is anything peculiar in the Far Eastern situation, unless it be the Japanese method of preserving peace in Eastern Asia by armed invasion of peaceful China. Moreover, conditions in the Far East are no more peculiar today than they were in the time the Nine-power Treaty was signed freely by Japan and the other signatory powers.

Whatever the conditions are—and they are of her own creation or encouragement—they are not beyond the purview of the treaty, but are proper subject-matter for discussion by the interested powers.

The Chinese Government is convinced that the cooperation of the Conference, far from exciting national feeling in the two countries and making it more difficult to reach a solution, will facilitate a settlement and inspire confidence in its justice and conformity with the principles of the treaty. It will allay mutual suspicion and distrust, and will also serve the cause of peace.

As Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek has declared in a statement of last week: "Direct negotiation between China and Japan will merely be another opportunity for Japan to press such demands as are not only unacceptable to China but also unacceptable to the other signatories of the Nine-power Treaty." For, besides our recent experience, the story of the notorious Twenty-one Demands pressed on China by Japan is still fresh in the memory of those who are familiar with the history of the Far East in recent times.

The powers at the Conference are asked by the Japanese Government to "make a contribution in conformity with the real situation to the stabilization of East Asia". Does this mean, Mr. President, that the Conference should accept the temporary changes brought about by the force of arms, and condone Japan's open violation of her treaty obligations as embodied not only in the Nine-power Treaty of Washington but also in the Kellogg-Briand Pact of Paris? This is the language of the treaty-breaker who wishes to impose upon the Conference a *fait accompli*. China is confident that the participating powers who are all faithful to their signatures to the treaty and respect the principles of law and justice will choose to make their contribution to stability in the Far East by upholding treaty obligations and thereby serving the real interests of peace.

The issues of the present conflict between China and Japan are not confined to the territorial and political integrity of China. In fact important rights and interests of the foreign powers in China and their obligations under the Nine-power Treaty are involved; and, more than that, the principle of respect for treaty obligations and the cause of peace, in which all nations rightly feel a deep concern and interest, are at stake.

China asks only to be left in peace and free from external aggression in order to pursue her stupendous task of political and economic reconstruction. The Nine-power Treaty has assured her of this opportunity and the Japanese aggression has deprived her of it. We ask that the Japanese aggression be stopped and the Nine-power Treaty be respected. It is a treaty which all powers parties to it have a common obligation to uphold.

China, on her part, has been fighting with life and blood of her people to stop Japanese invasion and uphold the treaty. She has



But neither the spirit of conciliation nor the soft words were of any avail. The refusal of the Japanese Government is more resolute and absolute than ever, and both the language and the tone of its reply seem to indicate clearly that all the painstaking efforts of the Conference to secure her collaboration for the cause of peace and the respect of treaties have been taken as a sign of weakness and served apparently only to inspire her insolence.

The latest reply of the Japanese Government, as I have said, adds nothing new to its previous communications. It repeats the flimsy pretexts and excuses with which I dealt at length in my statement before the Conference on the opening day. The reiterated claim that Japan's present action in China is resorted to as a measure of defense is not only a deliberate distortion of the meaning of the time-honored term, but makes a mockery of the universal sentiment of justice and truth. Even if the Japanese Government really believed—which the Chinese Delegation seriously doubts—that Japan's aggression in China was dictated by considerations of self-defense, it could in no way justify her claim that the matter lay outside the scope of the Nine-power Treaty. The "full and frank communication" envisaged in article VII of the treaty is intended, in our view, for just such a situation.

The reply again insists upon a direct settlement of the present conflict by China and Japan. Let me inform you here that for four years the Chinese Government patiently tried to reach a peaceful settlement with Japan of the questions outstanding between them, and the present conflict is the result. For every act of concession, every gesture of conciliation on the part of China was taken by Japan as a sign of fear and led to more bullying and brow-beating. The acceptance of one demand by China was always followed by the presentation of other demands. Failing compliance by China, the Japanese Army resorted to intimidation and coercion in the form of nefarious activities of smuggling, night maneuvers, war exercises, and heavy reinforcements to the Japanese garrison in North China in violation of the protocol of 1901 and out of all proportion either to the purpose of keeping open communication from Peiping to the sea or in comparison with those of the other powers. The perpetual "dual diplomacy" practiced by Japan through the Japanese Foreign Office and the Japanese Army in her dealings with China has convinced China of the danger and futility of direct negotiation.

It is said that "the present occurrences have their origin in conditions peculiar to the Far East". For our part we do not see that there is anything peculiar in the Far Eastern situation, unless it be the Japanese method of preserving peace in Eastern Asia by armed invasion of peaceful China. Moreover, conditions in the Far East are no more peculiar today than they were in the time the Nine-power Treaty was signed freely by Japan and the other signatory powers.

Whatever the conditions are—and they are of her own creation or encouragement—they are not beyond the purview of the treaty, but are proper subject-matter for discussion by the interested powers.

The Chinese Government is convinced that the cooperation of the Conference, far from exciting national feeling in the two countries and making it more difficult to reach a solution, will facilitate a settlement and inspire confidence in its justice and conformity with the principles of the treaty. It will allay mutual suspicion and distrust, and will also serve the cause of peace.

As Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek has declared in a statement of last week: "Direct negotiation between China and Japan will merely be another opportunity for Japan to press such demands as are not only unacceptable to China but also unacceptable to the other signatories of the Nine-power Treaty." For, besides our recent experience, the story of the notorious Twenty-one Demands pressed on China by Japan is still fresh in the memory of those who are familiar with the history of the Far East in recent times.

The powers at the Conference are asked by the Japanese Government to "make a contribution in conformity with the real situation to the stabilization of East Asia". Does this mean, Mr. President, that the Conference should accept the temporary changes brought about by the force of arms, and condone Japan's open violation of her treaty obligations as embodied not only in the Nine-power Treaty of Washington but also in the Kellogg-Briand Pact of Paris? This is the language of the treaty-breaker who wishes to impose upon the Conference a *fait accompli*. China is confident that the participating powers who are all faithful to their signatures to the treaty and respect the principles of law and justice will choose to make their contribution to stability in the Far East by upholding treaty obligations and thereby serving the real interests of peace.

The issues of the present conflict between China and Japan are not confined to the territorial and political integrity of China. In fact important rights and interests of the foreign powers in China and their obligations under the Nine-power Treaty are involved; and, more than that, the principle of respect for treaty obligations and the cause of peace, in which all nations rightly feel a deep concern and interest, are at stake.

China asks only to be left in peace and free from external aggression in order to pursue her stupendous task of political and economic reconstruction. The Nine-power Treaty has assured her of this opportunity and the Japanese aggression has deprived her of it. We ask that the Japanese aggression be stopped and the Nine-power Treaty be respected. It is a treaty which all powers parties to it have a common obligation to uphold.

China, on her part, has been fighting with life and blood of her people to stop Japanese invasion and uphold the treaty. She has



been, and still is, exerting her utmost to defend her political and territorial integrity and to maintain the principle of the sanctity of treaties. She has been fighting against the violation of the treaty, a violation which is against all other signatory powers as well as against China. So long as Japanese aggression persists, so long will China continue to resist. The Government and the people of China are determined to fight the aggressor to the end.

Now that the door to conciliation and mediation has been slammed in your face by the latest reply of the Japanese Government, will you not decide to withhold supplies of war materials and credit to Japan and extend aid to China? It would be, in our opinion, a most modest way in which you can fulfil your obligation of helping to check Japanese aggression and uphold the treaty in question.

In our struggle against the forces of Japanese aggression with a whole nation behind us, resolute in purpose and undaunted in spirit, we do not ask the other signatory powers to fight for us, but we need material help to enable us to continue our effective resistance. In order to shorten the duration of hostilities and hasten the restoration of peace, it is also necessary to refrain from contributing to the financial and economic resources of the aggressor and feeding him with an uninterrupted flow of arms and raw materials for his war industries.

International peace, Mr. President, like national peace, if it is to be made durable, must be defended. The restoration and defense of peace in the Far East at present calls for concerted action of a moral, material, financial and economic character on the part of the other participating powers in the Conference. Such action must also be timely. For if it is delayed too long because of hesitation and doubt, then the violence and disorder now raging in the Far East will soon reach such proportions as will be impossible to restrain and control without undergoing the trials and tribulations of another world war.

#### ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY YVON DELBOS, OF FRANCE

(Translation)

Before we resume our work, I should like to make a few observations of a general character.

In addition to the interests which we have to defend in the Far East, and to our rights and the duties incumbent upon us under the treaty of Washington, there are other considerations that are even more important.

We are ardently devoted to peace, there as everywhere, because we cannot remain indifferent to so much accumulated devastation and so many ruined human lives, and because we realize that no one can be sure to escape the possible consequences and extension of a conflict. We are, moreover, mindful of the fact that the first condi-

tion of peace is the observance of the principles on which civilization itself is founded; respect for treaties signed and fidelity to the pledged word. It is not merely an obligation binding on persons; it is a duty common to all states and all individuals—a permanent universal law, every infraction of which is prejudicial to general confidence and security.

Doubtless, no undertaking can be regarded as eternal; and the immutability of texts is no effective argument against altered circumstances; but any work of readjustment must be the result of free and peaceful collaboration between the nations concerned, and not of violence based on the concept that certain needs—of which the interested party is the sole judge—are a justification for resort thereto.

A further condition of peace is respect for the independence of each state. France is a democratic nation, passionately devoted to the maintenance, within her own borders and within the framework of parliamentary institutions, of a just balance between order and liberty, between the rights of the individual conscience and the duties of each citizen towards his country; but she is herself so firmly resolved to resist all foreign interference that she could never dream of forcing her own principles on other states.

Each nation is entitled to choose its own institutions freely. No ideological groupings—or any coalitions of interests for which these may serve as a pretext—can protect the legitimate rights of nations nor provide a stable foundation for their welfare and security. Any attempt either to impose or prohibit any particular political theory outside one's own frontiers is bound to embitter disputes, introduce a new element of distrust and increase discord and confusion throughout the world. It is the duty of all peace-loving nations to unite to prevent the ardor of passions resulting in outbreaks of violence.

Respect for international obligations, respect for the right of peoples to govern themselves freely—these are the necessary rules of life between nations, the rules by which the policy of France is inspired. The sincere and active collaboration of France will always be available to those who are endeavoring, in this spirit, to establish confidence and consolidate peace.

It is in the hope of assisting in the restoration of these bases of normal and pacific relations between China and Japan that we have come to the Brussels Conference and that we have associated ourselves with the invitation extended to Japan to exchange with the powers parties to the treaty of Washington the "full and frank communication" for which the treaty makes provision.

In addressing this appeal to Japan—an appeal to which China has already replied favorably—we had no other desire than to assist the two powers to settle, by amicable and effective arrangement, the conflict which now divides them. The Japanese reply raises a prob-

been, and still is, exerting her utmost to defend her political and territorial integrity and to maintain the principle of the sanctity of treaties. She has been fighting against the violation of the treaty, a violation which is against all other signatory powers as well as against China. So long as Japanese aggression persists, so long will China continue to resist. The Government and the people of China are determined to fight the aggressor to the end.

Now that the door to conciliation and mediation has been slammed in your face by the latest reply of the Japanese Government, will you not decide to withhold supplies of war materials and credit to Japan and extend aid to China? It would be, in our opinion, a most modest way in which you can fulfil your obligation of helping to check Japanese aggression and uphold the treaty in question.

In our struggle against the forces of Japanese aggression with a whole nation behind us, resolute in purpose and undaunted in spirit, we do not ask the other signatory powers to fight for us, but we need material help to enable us to continue our effective resistance. In order to shorten the duration of hostilities and hasten the restoration of peace, it is also necessary to refrain from contributing to the financial and economic resources of the aggressor and feeding him with an uninterrupted flow of arms and raw materials for his war industries.

International peace, Mr. President, like national peace, if it is to be made durable, must be defended. The restoration and defense of peace in the Far East at present calls for concerted action of a moral, material, financial and economic character on the part of the other participating powers in the Conference. Such action must also be timely. For if it is delayed too long because of hesitation and doubt, then the violence and disorder now raging in the Far East will soon reach such proportions as will be impossible to restrain and control without undergoing the trials and tribulations of another world war.

#### ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY YVON DELBOS, OF FRANCE

(Translation)

Before we resume our work, I should like to make a few observations of a general character.

In addition to the interests which we have to defend in the Far East, and to our rights and the duties incumbent upon us under the treaty of Washington, there are other considerations that are even more important.

We are ardently devoted to peace, there as everywhere, because we cannot remain indifferent to so much accumulated devastation and so many ruined human lives, and because we realize that no one can be sure to escape the possible consequences and extension of a conflict. We are, moreover, mindful of the fact that the first condi-

tion of peace is the observance of the principles on which civilization itself is founded; respect for treaties signed and fidelity to the pledged word. It is not merely an obligation binding on persons; it is a duty common to all states and all individuals—a permanent universal law, every infraction of which is prejudicial to general confidence and security.

Doubtless, no undertaking can be regarded as eternal; and the immutability of texts is no effective argument against altered circumstances; but any work of readjustment must be the result of free and peaceful collaboration between the nations concerned, and not of violence based on the concept that certain needs—of which the interested party is the sole judge—are a justification for resort thereto.

A further condition of peace is respect for the independence of each state. France is a democratic nation, passionately devoted to the maintenance, within her own borders and within the framework of parliamentary institutions, of a just balance between order and liberty, between the rights of the individual conscience and the duties of each citizen towards his country; but she is herself so firmly resolved to resist all foreign interference that she could never dream of forcing her own principles on other states.

Each nation is entitled to choose its own institutions freely. No ideological groupings—or any coalitions of interests for which these may serve as a pretext—can protect the legitimate rights of nations nor provide a stable foundation for their welfare and security. Any attempt either to impose or prohibit any particular political theory outside one's own frontiers is bound to embitter disputes, introduce a new element of distrust and increase discord and confusion throughout the world. It is the duty of all peace-loving nations to unite to prevent the ardor of passions resulting in outbreaks of violence.

Respect for international obligations, respect for the right of peoples to govern themselves freely—these are the necessary rules of life between nations, the rules by which the policy of France is inspired. The sincere and active collaboration of France will always be available to those who are endeavoring, in this spirit, to establish confidence and consolidate peace.

It is in the hope of assisting in the restoration of these bases of normal and pacific relations between China and Japan that we have come to the Brussels Conference and that we have associated ourselves with the invitation extended to Japan to exchange with the powers parties to the treaty of Washington the "full and frank communication" for which the treaty makes provision.

In addressing this appeal to Japan—an appeal to which China has already replied favorably—we had no other desire than to assist the two powers to settle, by amicable and effective arrangement, the conflict which now divides them. The Japanese reply raises a prob-



lem that the Conference must consider. In any case, no solution by force could, either in law or in fact, provide a lasting adjustment of the relations between the two countries. Peace in the Far East, as elsewhere, is inseparable from respect for international law.

ADDRESS BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE ANTHONY EDEN, OF THE  
UNITED KINGDOM

We are meeting here in conference because the nations we represent are signatories of the Nine-power Treaty or because we have special interests in the Far East. We are all of us directly concerned with the preservation of peace in that quarter of the world, peace which is at present being violated. It would, therefore, be quite impossible for us to assent to the doctrine that the conflict which is at present raging in the Far East is a matter for China and Japan alone. A mere recollection of recent events will show how unacceptable such an attitude must be to us. Losses in lives and property have not been confined to two nations only.

Nor is this all. There is another reason for which the Government I represent were willing and indeed anxious to cooperate in this Conference at Brussels. We are signatories of the Nine-power Treaty. We believe that there is only one enduring foundation for the preservation of world peace, and that is not national ambitions with alliances or ideologies, but a respect for international law and the observance of treaties. By this means, and by this means alone, can the world escape from a further ordeal such as it passed through twenty years ago. This does not imply that we will consider no change at any time in any sphere; such an attitude would be impossible to uphold, for the world is not static. But it does imply that we must be opposed to changes brought about by force and that, if such changes continue to be attempted on whatever pretext, then civilization will proceed by stages of ever-increasing suffering to destruction.

Many of us have been conscious in recent times of the risks inherent in any attempt to base international relationships on anything else than respect for international law and for each other's institutions. I, therefore, take this occasion, when we are met together to discuss the observance of a treaty which we have signed, to repeat that it is on the basis of a respect for international law that His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom will conduct their international policy. No other basis is acceptable to us, and no other, we are convinced, will in the end achieve the purpose we must all have at heart, preservation of world peace. We cannot accept that dislike however deep-seated, abhorrence however sincerely felt, for the form of government or the political institutions of one nation, justifies another nation in interfering by force in its internal affairs. To admit such

a principle would be to deny the right of each nation to live its own life in peace and freedom which is the prerogative of all peoples.

And now let me make some preliminary observations on the problem which confronts us in the light of the Japanese Government's reply to the communication addressed to them by this Conference. I would state emphatically that His Majesty's Government would sincerely have welcomed Japanese cooperation at this Conference. We would have been glad to hear from that country a statement of her view of the present conflict. We would readily have entered into an unprejudiced examination of the problem with Japan and with China. Japan, however, was unable to accept either the original invitation to attend the Conference or the later invitation which we addressed to her last week to appoint a representative to exchange views with a small number of powers whom the Conference would have been willing to choose for that purpose. Such an exchange of views would have been both proper, because the Nine-power Treaty provides for it, and helpful, as a means of reaching an agreed settlement in the Far East.

It remains the view of His Majesty's Government that it is in the interest of both of the powers at present waging an undeclared war that such a settlement should be found. His Majesty's Government are profoundly convinced that fruitful international relations will only result from a general acceptance of international law. A system of law has been slowly built up as a result of the efforts of almost every nation in the world. Of recent years, however, there has been a growing tendency to override that system and to attempt to achieve settlements by force. Yet it is a matter of the greatest importance to the nations who believe it to be the duty of all peoples to seek to settle disputes by peaceful means, that such a system should be upheld. Indeed this is the fundamental issue which the world has to consider today. While, therefore, the Conference will no doubt wish to state with the least possible delay its views on certain points of the Japanese Government's reply, careful consideration of the international situation created by that reply will be necessary for us all.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE NORMAN H. DAVIS, OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Like M. Delbos and Mr. Eden, I also feel that this occasion calls for some general observations. If we do not from time to time pause in our consideration of the particular, and reiterate the principles that guide us in their relation to the general, then the impression may gain ground that our policies have less depth or purpose than is in fact the case. We are in this Conference very much concerned with



peace in one important area of the world, the Far East. It is of vital importance that peace be restored there, not merely for the two participants in the present conflict, but for the world at large. The cost in human misery is vast, and the material losses are heavy. But even greater is the loss to world confidence and the undermining of stability and security if the integrity of certain principles which we hold sacred is not preserved. Through a period of centuries, the world has developed a system of international law, which is the basis of international morality and conduct and which provides for fair dealing among nations, just as private relationships are based on codes of fair dealing among individuals. When observed, this gives a sense of security to nations, enables them to develop their own civilization in their own way, to choose the form of government they desire, and to know that they are free to solve their internal problems without the interference of outside powers. This is essential for orderly progress in the world.

International law has been written into, and is based upon, a series of international agreements and the cornerstone of progress is the observance of undertakings solemnly given and solemnly received between nations. Change is possible—more than that, it is often desirable—but is legitimate only if carried out by peaceful methods and by mutual agreement. The question we are considering, in its final analysis, is whether international relations shall be determined by arbitrary force or by law and respect for international treaties. In fact, that seems to be the greatest issue that faces the world today, and is one of the most momentous problems that mankind has been called upon to solve. As President Roosevelt expressed it the other day, "Those who cherish their freedom and recognize and respect the equal rights of their neighbors to be free and live in peace must work together for the triumph of law and moral principles in order that peace, justice, and confidence may prevail in the world." If the conception of change by violence should prevail, we would be faced by international anarchy; only the concept of respect for law and treaty will give us a world that is secure and wherein good-will and confidence can exist and in which peace can be successfully preserved. Respect for treaties, and observance of the pledged word, is the immutable foundation on which the structure of world peace can be built. If, today, I have reiterated this in simple language, it is to emphasize the conviction which is ours, that on no other basis can an equitable and lasting solution of the Sino-Japanese conflict be found and in no other way can a just peace be reestablished and be maintained in the Far East.

To come to the specific problem with which we are here immediately concerned: Japan was invited to attend the Conference, where we would have welcomed from her a full explanation of her side of the

case as to the incidents which led to the outbreak of hostilities, as well as the underlying causes of the conflict. She declined. Going one stage further, and in a desire to be considerate of every possible susceptibility, we asked Japan whether she would be disposed to depute a representative to exchange views with the representatives of a small number of powers to be chosen for that purpose by the Conference. Such an exchange of views would have taken place within the framework of the Nine-power Treaty and in conformity with its provisions; its aims would have been to throw further light on the various points under discussion and to facilitate a settlement of the conflict. Again Japan's reply is negative. Had Japan accepted, I am confident that we could have been most helpful to her as well as to China, which it was and is our most sincere desire to be.

I am convinced that the only just and durable solution would be a settlement by voluntary, peaceful agreement, which would result in good-will and confidence and in mutually beneficial commercial relations. It would, of course, have been desirable had China and Japan been able to compose their difficulties by peaceful negotiation without resort to armed conflict. Unfortunately, however, they did not do so, and their failure created a situation in which the rights and interests of other powers became involved and which has made still more difficult a peaceful and mutually acceptable settlement by direct negotiation.

From the standpoint of observance of the letter and spirit of treaties to which she voluntarily put her name, from the standpoint of her material self-interest, from the standpoint of world peace and progress and international good-will, it would seem that there are compelling reasons why Japan should cooperate in our work. We hope that Japan may still see her way clear to doing so.

#### ADDRESS BY MR. POTEMKINE, OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

(Translation)

Faithful to her policy of peace, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is always ready to give her support to any initiative inspired by a desire to maintain peace and to prevent resort to war becoming a method for the settlement of international disputes. That is why the Soviet Government, which is particularly concerned in the maintenance of peace in the Far East, has taken part in the Brussels Conference. We are compelled to note with regret that all the efforts made by the Conference to terminate hostilities in the Far East by methods of mediation and conciliation have failed.

There is, however, no reason for abandoning the hope that peace may be restored. The Soviet Delegation is firmly convinced of the

possibility of settling the conflict on the basis of equity, respect for treaties signed and the principle of national sovereignty.

This object, however, cannot be achieved unless the joint and effective efforts of the powers concerned in the maintenance of peace in the Pacific are directed to that end. Any agreed initiative taken on this basis will have the support of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

ADDRESS BY COUNT LUIGI ALDROVANDI-MARESCOTTI, OF ITALY

(Translation)

I have listened closely and with great interest to all the speeches that have been made at this meeting. I think I could agree with much that has been said concerning sincerity in the respect of treaties. It must, however, be remembered that, in connection with these treaties, there are conditions which change.

I think also that certain remarks have been made which, to me at least, seem to fall entirely outside the scope of our Conference: mention has been made of measures that might be adopted in regard to one or other of the parties to the conflict. I do not think that we are called upon to take such action. We have a very limited aim regarding which I expressed my views at the first meeting.

Adhering to the few observations I offered on that occasion I think that the question which arises is: What is there now that remains for this Conference to do?

DECLARATION OF THE CONFERENCE  
NOVEMBER 15, 1937

The representatives of the Union of South Africa, the United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, China, France, the United Kingdom, India, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics have drawn up the following declaration:

1° The representatives of the above-mentioned states met at Brussels, having taken cognizance of the Japanese Government's reply of November 12, 1937, to the communication addressed to the latter on November 7, 1937, observe with regret that the Japanese Government still contends that the conflict between Japan and China lies outside the scope of the Nine-power Treaty and again declines to enter into an exchange of views for the purpose of endeavoring to achieve a peaceful settlement of that conflict;

2° It is clear that the Japanese concept of the issues and interests involved in the conflict under reference is utterly different from the concept of most of the other nations and governments of the world. The Japanese Government insist that, as the conflict is between Japan and China, it concerns those two countries only. Against this, the representatives of the above-mentioned states now met at Brussels consider this conflict of concern in law to all countries party to the Nine-power Treaty of Washington of 1922 and to all countries party to the Pact of Paris of 1928, and of concern in fact to all countries members of the family of nations;

3° It cannot be denied that in the Nine-power Treaty the parties thereto affirmed it to be their desire to adopt a specified policy designed to stabilize conditions in the Far East and agreed to apply certain specified principles in their relations with China and, in China, with one another; and that in the Pact of Paris the parties agreed "that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means";

4° It cannot be denied that the present hostilities between Japan and China adversely affect not only the rights of all nations but also the material interests of nearly all nations. These hostilities have brought to some nationals of third countries death, to many nationals of third countries great peril, to property of nationals of third coun-



tries wide-spread destruction, to international communications disruption, to international trade disturbance and loss, to the peoples of all nations a sense of horror and indignation, to all the world feelings of uncertainty and apprehension;

5° The representatives of the above-mentioned states met at Brussels therefore regard these hostilities and the situation which they have brought about as matters inevitably of concern to the countries which they represent and—more—to the whole world. To them the problem appears not in terms simply of relations between two countries in the Far East but in terms of law, orderly processes, world security and world peace;

6° The Japanese Government has affirmed in its note of October 27th, to which it refers in its note of November 12th, that in employing armed force against China it was anxious to make "China renounce her present policy". The representatives of the above-mentioned states met at Brussels are moved to point out that there exists no warrant in law for the use of armed force by any country for the purpose of intervening in the internal regime of another country and that general recognition of such a right would be a permanent cause of conflict;

7° The Japanese Government contends that it should be left to Japan and China to proceed to a settlement by and between themselves alone. But, that a just and lasting settlement could be achieved by such a method cannot be believed. Japanese armed forces are present in enormous numbers on Chinese soil and have occupied large and important areas thereof. Japanese authorities have declared in substance that it is Japan's objective to destroy the will and the ability of China to resist the will and the demands of Japan. The Japanese Government affirms that it is China whose actions and attitude are in contravention of the Nine-power Treaty; yet, whereas China is engaged in full and frank discussion of the matter with the other parties to that treaty, Japan refuses to discuss it with any of them. Chinese authorities have repeatedly declared that they will not, in fact that they cannot, negotiate with Japan alone for a settlement by agreement. In these circumstances, there is no ground for any belief that, if left to themselves, Japan and China would arrive in the appreciably near future at any solution which would give promise of peace between those two countries, security for the rights and interests of other countries, and political and economic stability in the Far East. On the contrary, there is every reason to believe that if this matter were left entirely to Japan and China the armed conflict—with attendant destruction of life and property, disorder, uncertainty, instability, suffering, enmity, hatreds and disturbance, to the whole world—would continue indefinitely;

8° The Japanese Government, in their latest communication, invite the powers represented at Brussels to make a contribution to the stability of Eastern Asia in accordance with the realities of the situation;

9° In the view of the representatives of the above-mentioned states met at Brussels, the essential realities of the situation are those to which they draw attention above;

10° The representatives of the above-mentioned states met at Brussels are firmly of the belief that, for the reasons given above, a just and durable settlement is not to be expected of direct negotiations between the parties. That is why, in the communications addressed to the Japanese Government, they invited that Government to confer with them or with representatives of a small number of powers to be chosen for that purpose, in the hope that such exchange of views might lead to acceptance of their good offices and thus help towards the negotiation of a satisfactory settlement;

11° They still believe that if the parties to the conflict would agree to a cessation of hostilities in order to give an opportunity for such a procedure to be tried, success might be achieved. The Chinese Delegation has intimated its readiness to fall in with this procedure. The representatives of the states met at Brussels find it difficult to understand Japan's persistent refusal to discuss such a method;

12° Though hoping that Japan will not adhere to her refusal the above-mentioned states represented at Brussels must consider what is to be their common attitude in a situation where one party to an international treaty maintains against the views of all the other parties that the action which it has taken does not come within the scope of that treaty and sets aside provisions of the treaty which the other parties hold to be operative in the circumstances.

The representative of Sweden made the following statement:

No one can regret more deeply than does the Swedish Government the fact that the Conference's efforts at mediation have so far remained without result. Having to take note of this fact, my Government, which adheres to the principles of the declaration but which does not possess the same political interests in the Far East as certain other powers, feels that it is its duty to abstain from voting for this text.

The representative of Norway made the following statement:

The Norwegian Government accepted the invitation to this Conference in the desire thereby to contribute if possible to a settlement of the conflict in the Far East by peaceful mediation.

Nobody deploras more than my Government that the efforts of the Conference towards such mediation have hitherto been fruitless.

I am quite in accord with the principles underlying the declaration before us and venture to express the hope that it may still prove possible to obtain through mediation a settlement on the basis of those principles.

Referring, however, to my previous declaration made on the 13th instant, I find it proper to abstain from voting.



tries wide-spread destruction, to international communications disruption, to international trade disturbance and loss, to the peoples of all nations a sense of horror and indignation, to all the world feelings of uncertainty and apprehension;

5° The representatives of the above-mentioned states met at Brussels therefore regard these hostilities and the situation which they have brought about as matters inevitably of concern to the countries which they represent and—more—to the whole world. To them the problem appears not in terms simply of relations between two countries in the Far East but in terms of law, orderly processes, world security and world peace;

6° The Japanese Government has affirmed in its note of October 27th, to which it refers in its note of November 12th, that in employing armed force against China it was anxious to make "China renounce her present policy". The representatives of the above-mentioned states met at Brussels are moved to point out that there exists no warrant in law for the use of armed force by any country for the purpose of intervening in the internal regime of another country and that general recognition of such a right would be a permanent cause of conflict;

7° The Japanese Government contends that it should be left to Japan and China to proceed to a settlement by and between themselves alone. But, that a just and lasting settlement could be achieved by such a method cannot be believed. Japanese armed forces are present in enormous numbers on Chinese soil and have occupied large and important areas thereof. Japanese authorities have declared in substance that it is Japan's objective to destroy the will and the ability of China to resist the will and the demands of Japan. The Japanese Government affirms that it is China whose actions and attitude are in contravention of the Nine-power Treaty; yet, whereas China is engaged in full and frank discussion of the matter with the other parties to that treaty, Japan refuses to discuss it with any of them. Chinese authorities have repeatedly declared that they will not, in fact that they cannot, negotiate with Japan alone for a settlement by agreement. In these circumstances, there is no ground for any belief that, if left to themselves, Japan and China would arrive in the appreciably near future at any solution which would give promise of peace between those two countries, security for the rights and interests of other countries, and political and economic stability in the Far East. On the contrary, there is every reason to believe that if this matter were left entirely to Japan and China the armed conflict—with attendant destruction of life and property, disorder, uncertainty, instability, suffering, enmity, hatreds and disturbance, to the whole world—would continue indefinitely;

8° The Japanese Government, in their latest communication, invite the powers represented at Brussels to make a contribution to the stability of Eastern Asia in accordance with the realities of the situation;

9° In the view of the representatives of the above-mentioned states met at Brussels, the essential realities of the situation are those to which they draw attention above;

10° The representatives of the above-mentioned states met at Brussels are firmly of the belief that, for the reasons given above, a just and durable settlement is not to be expected of direct negotiations between the parties. That is why, in the communications addressed to the Japanese Government, they invited that Government to confer with them or with representatives of a small number of powers to be chosen for that purpose, in the hope that such exchange of views might lead to acceptance of their good offices and thus help towards the negotiation of a satisfactory settlement;

11° They still believe that if the parties to the conflict would agree to a cessation of hostilities in order to give an opportunity for such a procedure to be tried, success might be achieved. The Chinese Delegation has intimated its readiness to fall in with this procedure. The representatives of the states met at Brussels find it difficult to understand Japan's persistent refusal to discuss such a method;

12° Though hoping that Japan will not adhere to her refusal the above-mentioned states represented at Brussels must consider what is to be their common attitude in a situation where one party to an international treaty maintains against the views of all the other parties that the action which it has taken does not come within the scope of that treaty and sets aside provisions of the treaty which the other parties hold to be operative in the circumstances.

The representative of Sweden made the following statement:

No one can regret more deeply than does the Swedish Government the fact that the Conference's efforts at mediation have so far remained without result. Having to take note of this fact, my Government, which adheres to the principles of the declaration but which does not possess the same political interests in the Far East as certain other powers, feels that it is its duty to abstain from voting for this text.

The representative of Norway made the following statement:

The Norwegian Government accepted the invitation to this Conference in the desire thereby to contribute if possible to a settlement of the conflict in the Far East by peaceful mediation.

Nobody deploras more than my Government that the efforts of the Conference towards such mediation have hitherto been fruitless. I am quite in accord with the principles underlying the declaration before us and venture to express the hope that it may still prove possible to obtain through mediation a settlement on the basis of those principles.

Referring, however, to my previous declaration made on the 13th instant, I find it proper to abstain from voting.

The representative of Denmark made the following statement:

I should like to associate myself with the statements just made by my colleagues from Sweden and Norway. Also my country deplores that the efforts for mediation have hitherto not met with success, and I fully share the hope that through means of mediation it may still be possible to obtain some results. For similar reasons as those given by my Scandinavian colleagues, also I think it proper to abstain from voting on the text of this declaration, while fully in accord with the principles laid down therein.

The representative of Italy made the following statement:

Italy considers the declaration before us as a door open not towards the settlement of the conflict, but rather towards the most serious complications.

Italy does not intend to assume the responsibilities that might devolve therefrom, and she therefore expresses her definitely contrary vote, whilst reserving her attitude as regards all that concerns the subsequent phases of the dispute.

## STATEMENTS MADE AT THE CLOSING MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE, NOVEMBER 24, 1937

STATEMENT BY HIS EXCELLENCY DR. V. K. WELLINGTON KOO,  
OF CHINA

The Chinese Delegation notes that the revised text of the draft declaration contains a number of modifications and clarifications of the original text. The new draft, like the old one, reaffirms certain general principles which China has always accepted. But in view of the continued raging of the hostilities in the Far East, the Chinese Delegation believes that a mere reaffirmation of these principles cannot be considered as a satisfactory result of the Conference, because it is not adequate to deal effectively with the grave situation.

The Chinese Delegation regrets that the suggestions which it made to the Conference, particularly at the meeting on November 22d, with a view to the adoption of certain positive and concrete measures, have not been considered by the Conference. For the reasons which it explained in its statements before the Conference on November 13th and 22d, the Chinese Delegation holds that such common action is indispensable in any effort to restrain the Japanese aggression and hasten the restoration of peace in the Far East.

The Chinese Delegation notes that the suspension of the sittings of the Conference is to be only temporary and deemed advisable in order to allow time for participating governments to exchange views and further explore all peaceful methods by which a just settlement of the dispute may be attained consistently with the principles of the Nine-power Treaty and in conformity with the objectives of that treaty. As regards such further exploration by participating governments, the Chinese Delegation cannot refrain from expressing its conviction that, in order to make this additional effort successful, it is not only essential that such effort should be made actively and promptly but that it is also indispensable to consider at the same time the necessity of common action in the form of positive aid to China and restrictive measures against the aggressor.

While prepared to accept the declaration in the spirit of solidarity, the Chinese Delegation requests the Conference to take note of this statement and attach it to the declaration of the Conference.



STATEMENT BY COUNT LUIGI ALDROVANDI-MARESCOTTI,  
OF ITALY

(Translation)

At the very first meeting I expressed doubts as to the utility of the present Conference. My doubts have proved to be well founded. Therefore nobody can find more natural than I do the adjournment of the Conference. I should even find its dissolution natural. I therefore declare myself favorable to the adjournment as proposed. At the same time I declare that I do not accept the arguments put forward in the document in question, and therefore I cannot give my vote in favor of its adoption.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE NORMAN H. DAVIS, OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Before recessing, Mr. President, I desire to express a word of appreciation not only for the hospitality shown by the Belgian Government during this Conference but for the many courtesies that we have all received at your hands. May I say, Sir, that I have rarely seen sessions presided over with so much clarity and tact as has been shown by yourself.

I also wish to refer to one point which appears in our declaration and which I feel should be particularly emphasized, namely, that this recess does not in any sense signify that the problem we have been considering is to be dropped, or that our interest in its solution is to be in any way lessened.

The fact that we have been unable, thus far, to bring about negotiations looking to a peaceful settlement by agreement of the Sino-Japanese conflict in no way diminishes our interest and our concern. On the contrary, it makes it all the more important to continue earnestly and actively to seek every possible peaceful means for hastening a cessation of hostilities and bringing about a constructive settlement.

For myself, I may say that with this end in view, I am returning home for consultation with my Government.

Those who may be discouraged and impatient over the delay in achieving the objectives sought, should realize that we are not now ending the Nine-power Conference. We are merely going into a recess. Nothing has been lost and much has been gained through the fact of our having assembled, of having engaged in an exchange of views and having exerted the efforts thus far made. We are dealing here not with a new problem, but with a new development in a situation which over many years has given rise to many perplexities—a situation which is of concern to many different powers, each of which has its own sum total of preoccupations—a situation in which a great variety of interests are involved. On the basis of our exchanges of

views, each of our respective Governments will have a more accurate understanding of the problem which confronts us in common and of those features of that problem which are of immediate and peculiar concern to it. Each and all of the Governments here represented will be able to proceed with the further shaping of policies in relation to the Far Eastern situation in the light of more complete knowledge of the difficulties and possibilities involved than were possessed by any of us before the Conference began. We have put on record and have made available to the world affirmations of a common view and declarations of a common attitude. We have enunciated fundamental principles which, in their relations with one another, should contribute substantially toward molding a sound and helpful world opinion and official thought.

## STATEMENT BY VISCOUNT CRANBORNE, OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

I should like to associate His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom with the thanks that have been tendered by the representative of the United States to the Belgian Government for their kind hospitality, and in particular to our President, Mr. Spaak. This is perhaps not the usual moment to do so, for the Conference is not coming to an end, but is merely temporarily suspending its sessions. At the same time, we are so deeply indebted to Mr. Spaak for his courtesy, his patience, his good judgment, and the firm yet kindly control which he has exercised over our labors, that I feel we could hardly separate without expressing our deep gratitude.

I should like to express the agreement of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom with what has been said by Mr. Norman Davis in summing up the results of our work to date. The Conference has heard today the words of the representative of China. He has explained how far the results have fallen short of his hopes. Let me assure him that we are fully conscious of this. We are not unmindful of the situation that he has so clearly and so temperately put before us. At the same time, I am sure that he too appreciates the conditions in which this Conference has met and in which its deliberations have been carried on. Given those conditions, I think that there will be few of the delegates assembled here who have taken part in deliberations of this Conference, who will not share the view expressed by Mr. Norman Davis that the conclusions incorporated in the declaration which has just been passed are those which alone could practically have been reached at this stage of our work.

The declaration itself emphasizes our necessarily continuing interest in the peace of the Far East and the governments assembled here will keep in the closest touch during our recess with a view to taking advantage of any opportunity that may occur of advancing the objects



for which we have met. So far as His Majesty's Government are concerned, this remains their constant aim and they will be glad to associate themselves with any of the other powers assembled here to bring it to fruition.

STATEMENT BY MR. FRANÇOIS DE TESSAN, OF FRANCE

(Translation)

Naturally my first words, like those of Mr. Norman Davis and Lord Cranborne, will be an expression of thanks to the Belgian Government for its most cordial hospitality, and to the President of this Conference who has given us one more proof of his distinguished statesmanship.

Every effort to secure peace, even if it does not achieve the desired results, is a highly commendable act in itself. An experiment giving apparently negative results may sometimes make it possible to gage and circumscribe inherent difficulties and so encourage us to persevere in our endeavor.

As long as the problem remains unsolved, we must exert every effort to reestablish normal conditions around the Pacific. As Mr. Norman Davis has said, although the Brussels Conference may be suspending its meetings, the nations represented here are still bound to continue their efforts, to keep in touch with one another and thus discover the most effective approach to peace.

The feeling, which has developed during our meetings, that we have a common task proves that we are agreed on the principles of conciliation, the application of treaties, and our joint duty towards humanity. The document submitted to you for your approval not only expresses but unifies our determination.

Since our discussions will now be discontinued for a time, the French Delegation, fully aware of its responsibilities and admitting its regret that the Conference's action has not led to more immediate success, earnestly hopes that a fair and lasting settlement will be reached as soon as possible. It continues to hope that all the powers interested in peace will be able eventually to fulfil the mission assigned to them under the Nine-power Treaty.

We sympathize most deeply with China in her present trials which we trust will soon cease. France, for her part, faithful to the terms of this Conference's mandate, will associate herself with all efforts that may be made to shorten and settle, in conformity with justice, the conflict which is raging in the Far East.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE RAOUL DANDURAND,  
OF CANADA

Mr. President, at the end of this first phase of our work I feel it my duty as the oldest delegate present at this Conference to express to

His Majesty, on behalf of all the delegations here assembled, our feelings of gratitude for the gracious interest he has taken in our work.

I also wish to offer our sincerest thanks to the Belgian Government for having consented to undertake the organization of this Conference, for the cordiality of its welcome and for the many attentions that it has bestowed upon us.

Finally, addressing myself to our President, I desire to assure him of our great gratitude, and our admiration of the manner in which he has directed our efforts in the difficult task we have undertaken. His authority, his art of accurate understanding, and the rapidity of his decisions have been of inestimable value. I must also mention that magnificent vitality which has enabled him, when he was so fully occupied elsewhere, to make us feel that he was, with his unflinching good humor, devoting himself exclusively to us.

I would beg him to be good enough to convey to his collaborators, the members of the General Secretariat, our congratulations on the effective aid that we have constantly received from them.

STATEMENT BY MR. W. J. JORDAN, OF NEW ZEALAND

The New Zealand Delegation endorses all that has been said regarding your chairmanship, Sir, and the hospitality of your country. Your tact, patience and outstanding statesmanship have impressed us all. We thank you, Sir. We could express at some length our disappointment at the failure of this Conference to bring about a cessation of hostilities. Notwithstanding the Nine-power Treaty Conference, China is still the victim of aggression, her people, including non-combatants, are still suffering death at the hands of invading armies. We will leave it at that. May I also express to Dr. Wellington Koo our sympathy with his bereaved people and my personal admiration for the faithful and able manner in which he has stated the case for his country?

STATEMENT BY COUNT LUIGI ALDROVANDI-MARESCOTTI, OF  
ITALY

(Translation)

I desire whole-heartedly to associate myself with the sentiments that have been expressed with regard to the Belgian Government and with regard to our President, Mr. Spaak.

STATEMENT BY HIS EXCELLENCY DR. V. K. WELLINGTON KOO,  
OF CHINA

I think the Chinese Delegation would be untrue to its sentiments if it did not take this opportunity to associate itself with the words of

appreciation and gratitude for the hospitality of the Belgian Government and also for the distinguished manner in which you, Mr. President, have presided over the proceedings of the Conference with such marked skill and eminent impartiality. I wish at the same time to take this occasion to express the thanks of our Delegation to the New Zealand Delegation, particularly, for the kind words of its distinguished representative here, and to all the other delegations for the time and labor which they have devoted to this problem in the Far East, which is of vital importance to my country, as well as to world peace.

Although the results of the Conference, from our point of view, have not been satisfactory, we know that the world has centered its interest on the proceedings of the last three weeks. Therefore I wish, in this connection, to raise a question which is really of more or less a routine character for all international conferences—I mean the question of publicity. I know that the report which has been adopted will be published in the Press, but I ask, Mr. President, whether it would not be possible, in order to increase its authoritativeness, for a copy to be sent by the Secretary General of the Conference to all the governments of the world, not as a formal report of the Conference submitted to the governments for their consideration, but for the purpose of authentic information.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE NORMAN H. DAVIS, OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

This Conference has accentuated the fact during our sessions that the specific problem with which we have been dealing is a matter which does concern the entire world, and as the issues involved are of particular interest to all the world, it seems to me that Mr. Koo's suggestion, that the result of our work here, this report, might well be communicated to all the governments of the world for their information, is a good one.

CLOSING REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE CONFERENCE, HIS  
EXCELLENCY PAUL-HENRI SPAAK, OF BELGIUM

(Translation)

Before I declare this meeting closed I wish to tell you how deeply I have been moved by the eulogies of our venerable *doyen* and the heads of other delegations—eulogies too kind as regards Belgium and her Government, and certainly too generous as regards myself.

My work has been made easy by your unfailing courtesy, for which I thank you sincerely.

I do not think that I should be departing from our self-imposed rule of impartiality were I to thank the Chinese Delegation in particular for

the spirit of moderation and conciliation which it has invariably shown throughout this session, in spite of the tragedy in which its country has been plunged. I desire to pay a very special tribute to its distinguished head, Dr. Wellington Koo.

Dr. Wellington Koo has told us that he will leave the Conference with a feeling of some disappointment. This disappointment is doubtless shared by many of us who realize that we have not accomplished the mission assigned to us of restoring peace in the Far East by friendly methods.

We are somewhat disappointed, but we are not discouraged. The words spoken here by Mr. Norman Davis, by Lord Cranborne and M. de Tesson show that nobody intends to abandon effort. It is, in fact, encouraging to think that the representatives of countries with a total population of many million inhabitants have agreed to affirm certain great principles and that they are determined to remain faithful to these principles: love of peace and respect for treaties.

Let us not be discouraged therefore; let us continue our effort. Personally I still have confidence and faith; I am sure that the principles you have asserted will triumph in the end.

DECLARATION OF THE CONFERENCE  
NOVEMBER 24, 1937

1° The Nine-power Treaty is a conspicuous example of numerous international instruments by which the nations of the world enunciate certain principles and accept certain self-denying rules in their conduct with each other, solemnly undertaking to respect the sovereignty of other nations, to refrain from seeking political or economic domination of other nations, and to abstain from interference in their internal affairs.

2° These international instruments constitute a framework within which international security and international peace are intended to be safeguarded without resort to arms and within which international relationships should subsist on the basis of mutual trust, good-will, and beneficial trade and financial relations.

3° It must be recognized that whenever armed force is employed in disregard of these principles the whole structure of international relations based upon the safeguards provided by treaties is disturbed. Nations are then compelled to seek security in ever-increasing armaments. There is created everywhere a feeling of uncertainty and insecurity. The validity of these principles cannot be destroyed by force, their universal applicability cannot be denied, and their indispensability to civilization and progress cannot be gainsaid.

4° It was in accordance with these principles that this Conference was called in Brussels for the purpose, as set forth in the terms of the invitation issued by the Belgian Government, "of examining, in accordance with article VII of the Nine-power Treaty, the situation in the Far East and to consider friendly methods for hastening the end of the regrettable conflict now taking place there".

5° Since its opening session on November 3d the Conference has continuously striven to promote conciliation and has endeavored to secure the cooperation of the Japanese Government in the hope of arresting hostilities and bringing about a settlement.

6° The Conference is convinced that force by itself can provide no just and lasting solution for disputes between nations. It continues to believe that it would be to the immediate and the ultimate interest of both parties to the present dispute to avail themselves of the assistance of others in an effort to bring hostilities to an early end as a necessary preliminary to the achievement of a general and lasting settlement.

It further believes that a satisfactory settlement cannot be achieved by direct negotiation between the parties to the conflict alone, and that only by consultation with other powers principally concerned can there be achieved an agreement the terms of which will be just, generally acceptable and likely to endure.

7° This Conference strongly reaffirms the principles of the Nine-power Treaty as being among the basic principles which are essential to world peace and orderly progressive development of national and international life.

8° The Conference believes that a prompt suspension of hostilities in the Far East would be in the best interests not only of China and Japan but of all nations. With each day's continuance of the conflict the loss in lives and property increases and the ultimate solution of the conflict becomes more difficult.

9° The Conference therefore strongly urges that hostilities be suspended and resort be had to peaceful processes.

10° The Conference believes that no possible step to bring about by peaceful processes a just settlement of the conflict should be overlooked or omitted.

11° In order to allow time for participating governments to exchange views and further explore all peaceful methods by which a just settlement of the dispute may be attained consistently with the principles of the Nine-power Treaty and in conformity with the objectives of that treaty, the Conference deems it advisable temporarily to suspend its sittings. The conflict in the Far East remains, however, a matter of concern to all of the powers assembled at Brussels—by virtue of commitments in the Nine-power Treaty or of special interest in the Far East—and especially to those most immediately and directly affected by conditions and events in the Far East. Those of them that are parties to the Nine-power Treaty have expressly adopted a policy designed to stabilize conditions in the Far East and, to that end, are bound by the provisions of that treaty, outstanding among which are those of articles I and VII.

12° The Conference will be called together again whenever its Chairman or any two of its members shall have reported that they consider that its deliberations can be advantageously resumed.



## REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE

DATED NOVEMBER 24, 1937

1. The Conference at Brussels was assembled pursuant to an invitation extended by the Belgian Government at the request of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom with the approval of the American Government. It held its opening session on November 3rd, 1937. The Conference has now reached a point at which it appears desirable to record the essential phases of its work.

2. In the winter of 1921-22 there were signed at Washington a group of interrelated treaties and agreements of which the Nine-power Treaty regarding principles and policies to be followed in matters concerning China constituted one of the most important units. These treaties and agreements were the result of careful deliberation and were entered upon freely. They were designed primarily to bring about conditions of stability and security in the Pacific area.

The Nine-power Treaty stipulates in article I that—

The Contracting Powers, other than China, agree:

- (1) To respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China;
- (2) To provide the fullest and most unembarrassed opportunity to China to develop and maintain for herself an effective and stable government;
- (3) To use their influence for the purpose of effectually establishing and maintaining the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations throughout the territory of China;
- (4) To refrain from taking advantage of conditions in China in order to seek special rights or privileges which would abridge the rights of subjects or citizens of friendly States, and from countenancing action inimical to the security of such States.

Under and in the light of these undertakings and of the provisions contained in the other treaties, the situation in the Pacific area was for a decade characterized by a substantial measure of stability, with considerable progress toward the other objectives envisaged in the treaties. In recent years there have come a series of conflicts between Japan and China, and these conflicts have culminated in the hostilities now in progress.

3. The Conference at Brussels was called for the purpose, as set forth in the terms of the invitation, "of examining in accordance with article VII of the Nine-power Treaty, the situation in the Far East and to consider friendly, peaceable methods for hastening the end of

the regrettable conflict now taking place there". With the exception of Japan, all of the signatories and adherents to the Nine-power Treaty of February 6, 1922, accepted the invitation and sent representatives to Brussels, for the purpose stated in the invitation.

4. The Chinese Government, attending the Conference and participating in its deliberations, has communicated with the other parties to the Nine-power Treaty in conformity with article VII of that treaty. It has stated here that its present military operations are purely in resistance to armed invasion of China by Japan. It has declared its willingness to accept a peace based upon the principles of the Nine-power Treaty and to collaborate whole-heartedly with the other powers in support of the principle of the sanctity of treaties.

5. The Japanese Government, in replying with regret that it was not able to accept the invitation to the Conference, affirmed that "The action of Japan in China is a measure of self-defense which she has been compelled to take in the face of China's fierce anti-Japanese policy and practice, and especially by her provocative action in resorting to force of arms; and consequently it lies, as has been declared already by the Imperial Government, outside the purview of the Nine-power Treaty"; and advanced the view that an attempt to seek a solution at a gathering of so many powers "would only serve to complicate the situation still further and to put serious obstacles in the path of a just and proper solution".

6. On November 7, 1937, the Conference sent, through the Belgian Government, to the Japanese Government, a communication in the course of which the Conference inquired whether the Japanese Government would be willing to depute a representative or representatives to exchange views with representatives of a small number of powers to be chosen for that purpose, the exchange of views to take place within the framework of the Nine-power Treaty and in conformity with the provisions of that treaty, toward throwing further light on points of difference and facilitating a settlement of the Sino-Japanese conflict. In that communication the representatives of the states met at Brussels expressed their earnest desire that peaceful settlement be achieved.

7. To that communication the Japanese Government replied in a communication of November 12, 1937, stating that it could not do otherwise than maintain its previously expressed point of view that the present action of Japan in her relations with China was a measure of self-defense and did not come within the scope of the Nine-power Treaty; that only an effort between the two parties would constitute a means of securing the most just and the most equitable settlement, and that the intervention of a collective organ such as the Conference would merely excite public opinion in the two countries and make it more difficult to reach a solution satisfactory to all.

8. On November 15 the Conference adopted a declaration in the course of which it affirmed that the representatives of the Union of South Africa, the United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, China, France, the United Kingdom, India, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics ". . . consider this conflict of concern in law to all countries party to the Nine-power Treaty of Washington of 1922 and to all countries party to the Pact of Paris of 1928, and of concern in fact to all countries members of the family of nations".

9. In the presence of this difference between the views of the Conference and of the Japanese Government there now appears to be no opportunity at this time for the Conference to carry out its terms of reference in so far as they relate to entering into discussions with Japan towards bringing about peace by agreement. The Conference therefore is concluding this phase of its work and at this moment of going into recess adopts a further declaration of its views.

10. The text of the communication sent to the Japanese Government on November 7th, 1937, reads as follows: [For text, see *ante*, p. 51.]

11. The text of the declaration adopted by the Conference on November 15, 1937, reads as follows: [For text, see *ante*, p. 65.]

12. The text of the declaration adopted by the Conference on November 24, 1937, reads as follows:

[The report ends with the declaration of the Conference of November 24, 1937; for text of the declaration, see *ante*, p. 76.]

STATEMENT TO THE PRESS, MADE BY THE HONORABLE NORMAN H. DAVIS, AMERICAN DELEGATE, UPON ARRIVAL IN NEW YORK, DECEMBER 11, 1937

The Conference which has been in session in Brussels, Belgium, under the Nine-power Treaty, is taking a recess. The American Delegation has come home to report.

The objective of this Conference has been to examine the situation in the Far East and seek a method of bringing to an end by peaceful means the Chino-Japanese conflict. The United States is participating because it is a signatory to the Nine-power Treaty and because it is deemed important that this country participate in any appropriate common effort to effect a peaceful settlement of that conflict.

Although the Conference has not thus far achieved its main objective, it has nevertheless accomplished a number of useful things. It has made clear the issues involved in the conflict which it has under consideration. In its formal declarations, sixteen nations have affirmed their views that war arising in any part of the world directly affects and is of concern to all nations and have reaffirmed their adherence to the principles of the Nine-power Treaty. It has emphatically reiterated fundamental principles which should govern international relations, which are essential for a just settlement in the Far East and which in the long run must prevail.

The fact that the Conference has not thus far found a method for bringing about peace in the Far East by no means disposes of that problem or brings to an end the effort of the Conference. On the contrary, nations whose interests, treaty rights and obligations are affected thereby will continue to concern themselves with that problem until it is solved constructively.

Accordingly, the governments participating in the Conference will, during the recess, exchange views and further explore all peaceful methods by which a just settlement of the conflict may be attained consistently with the principles of the Nine-power Treaty and in conformity with the objectives of that treaty.

## THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE CONFERENCE

STATEMENT MADE TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE BY THE  
HONORABLE NORMAN H. DAVIS, AMERICAN DELEGATE,  
DECEMBER 16, 1937

The outstanding achievements of the Conference were as follows:

1. Exchanging of views, among nineteen governments, enabling the delegates of each—and through them their governments—to obtain knowledge of the attitude and position of the others;
2. Demonstration of the unwillingness of Japan to resort to methods of conciliation;
3. Clarification of the fact that the Japanese continue to insist that the issues between Japan and China are exclusive to those two countries whereas the Conference powers, with the exception of Italy, deny this and affirm that the situation is of concern to all of them and in fact to all members of the family of nations;
4. Express reaffirmation by the Conference powers, with the exception of Italy, of the principles of the Nine-power Treaty;
5. Express serving of notice that the settlement ultimately arrived at must be consistent with the principles of the Nine-power Treaty and satisfactory to the Conference powers;
6. Express serving of notice that the Conference powers will continue to concern themselves with the situation and that the Conference is not ended but is in recess and is subject to reconconvocation.



## THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE CONFERENCE

STATEMENT MADE TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE BY THE  
HONORABLE NORMAN H. DAVIS, AMERICAN DELEGATE,  
DECEMBER 16, 1937

The outstanding achievements of the Conference were as follows:

1. Exchanging of views, among nineteen governments, enabling the delegates of each—and through them their governments—to obtain knowledge of the attitude and position of the others;
2. Demonstration of the unwillingness of Japan to resort to methods of conciliation;
3. Clarification of the fact that the Japanese continue to insist that the issues between Japan and China are exclusive to those two countries whereas the Conference powers, with the exception of Italy, deny this and affirm that the situation is of concern to all of them and in fact to all members of the family of nations;
4. Express reaffirmation by the Conference powers, with the exception of Italy, of the principles of the Nine-power Treaty;
5. Express serving of notice that the settlement ultimately arrived at must be consistent with the principles of the Nine-power Treaty and satisfactory to the Conference powers;
6. Express serving of notice that the Conference powers will continue to concern themselves with the situation and that the Conference is not ended but is in recess and is subject to reconvoation.