

[Communicated to the Council,  
the Members of the League and  
the delegates at the Assembly].

Geneva, August 15th, 1923.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

REPORT  
OF THE  
TEMPORARY MIXED COMMISSION  
FOR THE  
REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS.

---

PART II.

---

SUMMARY.

- I. Limitation of national expenditure on armaments.
- II. Statistical enquiry.
- III. Private manufacture of arms and control of the traffic in arms.
- IV. Chemical warfare.
- V. Exchange of information.
- VI. Extension of the principles of the Washington Naval Treaty to non-signatory States.
- VII. Santiago and Moscow Conferences and Convention on the Reduction of Armaments between five Central American Republics.

---

ANNEXES. — I. Resolutions adopted by the fifth Pan-American Conference at Santiago.  
II. Convention on the Limitation of Armaments between the five Republics of Central America :—Guatemala, Honduras, Salvador, Nicaragua and Costa Rica.

---

I. — LIMITATION OF NATIONAL EXPENDITURE ON ARMAMENTS.

The limitation of national expenditure on armaments has been the subject of resolutions and recommendations from the first session of the Assembly. Recommendations were passed by the First and Second Assemblies with regard to the question of obtaining from the Members of the League an undertaking not to exceed during the two following years the sum total of their expenditure on military, naval and air forces provided for in their budgets for the current year.

The Third Assembly thought it possible to take a further step in the same direction, and, without in any way restricting the scope of previous recommendations on the subject, adopted the following resolution :

“The Assembly recommends that, as a preliminary step, the European States existing before the war of 1914, under their present description, whose juridical status has not been altered by the war, and which are not, at the moment, engaged in military operations which justify their armaments, be invited to reduce the total of their military, naval and air expenditure to the figures for 1913, calculated on the basis of pre-war prices according to the method employed by the Temporary Mixed Commission.”

This resolution was the object of careful study by the Temporary Mixed Commission, to which it was submitted by the Council, as a result of which it adopted the following resolution :

“The Commission considers that :

“(1) The Assembly’s resolution does not appear to cover all possible exceptions.

“Thus, there are States whose military position has changed, although they are not excepted by the resolution ; for instance, those States which have been entrusted with Mandates by the Peace Treaties.

“The Commission therefore thinks that, to carry out the Mandate entrusted to it by the Council, it must express its opinion that the recommendation of the Assembly, if sent to any State, should be sent to all without exception which existed prior to 1914.

“(2) The choice of 1913 as the standard year for military expenditure is open to several objections :

“In the first place, the positions of the various States in 1913, and even in the preceding years, are far from being comparable, expenditure in some cases answering far more closely to the requirements of national security than in others.

“Secondly, the European situation has undergone so profound a change between 1914 and 1918 that it does not seem possible to take pre-war figures as a basis for future expenditure.

“Lastly, it must be observed that the aim in view is the progressive reduction of armaments. If, therefore, the figure chosen as a basis is found to correspond to a time of uneasiness, foreshadowing war, it is clear that this aim will not be achieved, since the standard adopted for armaments will not correspond to the actual situation to-day.

“The Commission, moreover, emphasises the principles adopted by the Assembly, according to which the basis for the military expenditure for each country can be no other than the sum total of the requirements of its national security, its internal order and its international obligations.

“For these reasons the Commission is doubtful whether it would not be better to postpone sending a recommendation until the matter has been reconsidered by the Council and the Assembly.”

As a result of these objections raised by the Temporary Mixed Commission, the Council decided to adjourn all decision on the matter until the Assembly had had another opportunity of considering it in the light of the observations put forward by the Commission.

---

## II. – STATISTICAL ENQUIRY.

The Third Assembly, after examining the results of the statistical enquiry carried out by the Temporary Mixed Commission in conformity with the decision arrived at by previous Assemblies, approved the suggestion of the third Committee “that the statistical investigation should be continued on the bases of original figures relating to actual conditions as they exist, and leaving for the future the question of the method for their elaboration.”

As regards the scope of the statistical enquiry, the Assembly recognised that it is the “full military strength of the States which should form the object of the enquiry”, and that this “full military strength” consists of two factors :

1. The actual military strength, which is expressed in peace-time armaments and the expenditure on national defence ;
2. The potential military strength in which the important element is the industrial and economic power of each State, the military importance of which was proved by the last war.

Nevertheless, the Assembly considered it necessary to restrict the scope of the statistical enquiry for the present to the two principal factors which express military strength in peace-time, namely, armaments and expenditure on armaments, and adopted the following resolution :

“The Assembly expresses its satisfaction at the remarkable work accomplished in collecting and drawing up statistical data in an entirely new and particularly difficult field.

“Taking into account the work accomplished, and reserving the question of the scope which it might be necessary to give to a statistical enquiry at a later date, the Assembly desires to determine for the coming year the programme, which appears to it both immediately useful and practicable. It therefore proposes that this programme should be limited to the two following points :

- “ 1. Peace-time armaments ;
- “ 2. Expenditure on armaments.

“The Assembly considers it desirable that the Council should request the Permanent Advisory Commission to collaborate with the Temporary Mixed Commission in that part of the work which deals with technical military, naval and air questions.”

As a result of this Assembly resolution, which the Council forwarded to the two Commissions for their opinion, the Temporary Mixed Commission organised the statistical enquiry on this fresh basis, at the same time looking to the Permanent Advisory Commission for co-operation in regard to the military side of the enquiry. This co-operation took the form of statistical tables

which, the Permanent Commission suggested, should be forwarded to Governments with a view to their furnishing such details as would enable the Temporary Commission to lay before the Fourth Assembly a summary showing the peace-time armaments to a date as close as possible to that on which the actual statement was drawn up.

The tables drawn up by the Permanent Advisory Commission and approved by the Temporary Mixed Commission were, with the Council's approval, forwarded to the Governments of all States Members of the League on March 1st. Replies were received during the spring and summer<sup>1</sup>, and the Secretariat was authorised by the Temporary Commission to condense these replies into a single report which would be presented to the Fourth Assembly. This Report comprises, in addition to the replies from Governments, a short *exposé* of the systems of recruitment existing in each country. This latter has been drawn up by the Secretariat from official and public documents according to the Commission's instructions.

The statistical study into expenditure on armaments was regarded by the last Assembly as a continuation of the work commenced by the Temporary Commission for presentation to the Second Assembly. In 1922, a collection of tables drawn up by the Secretariat and adopted by the T. M. C. (Document A. 31a) constituted a first effort in this direction. The explanatory note accompanying these tables points out that, owing to the difference in the systems of public book-keeping adopted by various States, it is advisable to be cautious in drawing comparisons between the figures corresponding to the various countries. The Temporary Commission studied this question, and arrived at an opinion that it would be necessary to analyse carefully the methods employed by the various Governments in drawing up their military, naval and air budgets, in other words, it appeared necessary to the Commission to investigate the means of comparing these budgets.

The difficulty of comparing armaments budgets arises from various causes, the most important of which have been outlined in the introduction to the above-mentioned report, *i.e.* :

- (a) Difference between gross and net appropriations ;
- (b) Difference in the methods of accounting for military and naval establishments ;
- (c) Difference in the scope of the functions devolving upon the army and navy departments ;
- (d) Difference in the method of accounting for non-effective services (pensions, etc.) ;
- (e) Difference in the method of accounting for charges remaining from the war (demobilisation expenses, etc.).

Only after very careful analysis of these differences might it be possible to compare the armaments budgets of different countries.

The Commission further considers that special attention should be directed to the connection between home budgets and colonial budgets. Great divergences of practice exist in the distribution of charges as between these budgets according to the country concerned.

The Third Committee considered that the main task would appear to be to make an analytical study of armament budgets comprising detailed notes on the accounting systems, the relation between imperial and colonial budgets, etc. It was in this sense that instructions were issued to the Secretariat with a view to the preparation of a more complete volume than that which had been submitted to the Third Assembly, and which would allow of a general but precise survey being given of expenditure on armaments in the greatest number of countries compatible with the means at their disposal.

An important limitation which must be borne in mind is that due to the short time intervening between the date on which the official data are published and the date by which the work has to be completed. The closed accounts and budget estimates for each financial year only become available in the case of most countries between April 1st and July 1st and, consequently, the preliminary work in connection with this study cannot usefully be carried out before the spring and summer of the year. The Secretariat has been authorised to submit this study to the Assembly direct.

---

### III. - PRIVATE MANUFACTURE OF ARMS AND CONTROL OF THE TRAFFIC IN ARMS.

The Third Assembly recognised the close connection existing between the two questions of the private manufacture of arms and the control of the traffic in arms. After examining the situation arising from the inability of the United States to ratify the Convention of St. Germain, the Third Assembly adopted the following resolution :

---

<sup>1</sup> Up to August 10th, the following Governments have replied to this circular :

Albania	Great Britain	Norway
Austria	Greece	Poland (excepting military forces)
Belgium	Hungary	Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and
Bulgaria	Italy (excluding aviation)	Slovenes
Canada	Japan	South Africa
China	Latvia	Sweden
Czechoslovakia	Luxemburg	Switzerland
Denmark	Netherlands	
France	New-Zealand	

“The Assembly, having noted the proposal of the Temporary Mixed Commission for an international agreement for the control of the manufacture of arms by private companies, urges the Council to consider the advisability of summoning, at an appropriate moment, a conference of the Members of the League to embody this agreement in the form of a convention. The Assembly is further of the opinion that States not Members of the League should be invited to participate in this conference, and to co-operate in the policy on which it may agree.

“(a) The Assembly considers it highly desirable that the Government of the United States should express the objections which it has to formulate to the provisions of the Convention of St. Germain, as well as any proposals which it may care to make as to the way in which these objections can be overcome.

“(b) The Assembly is of the opinion that the Temporary Mixed Commission should be instructed to prepare a scheme for the control of the international traffic in arms to be considered by the conference which is to deal with the private manufacture of arms.

“(c) The Assembly requests the Council to take such steps as it thinks advisable to carry out the purpose above indicated.”

It was at once apparent to the Temporary Commission that neither the preparation of a new scheme for the control of the international traffic in arms laid down in paragraph (b) of this resolution, nor the execution of a scheme for the control of private manufacture could be successfully undertaken until the co-operation of the United States Government, as indicated in paragraph (a) of the above resolution had been obtained. It was in this sense that the Commission reported to the Council in accordance with paragraph (c) of the Assembly resolution. The Council considered the arguments put forward to be well founded, and requested its President to address a letter to the Secretary of State of the United States on the lines indicated by the Assembly Resolution. Accordingly, on May 3rd, 1923, the acting President of the Council despatched the following letter to the Government of the United States :

“I have the honour to inform you that the Council of the League of Nations, at its meeting of April 21st, adopted the following resolution :

“‘The Council, on the proposal of the Temporary Mixed Commission for the Reduction of Armaments, requests its President to ascertain whether the Government of the United States would be disposed to state its views as to the manner in which it would be willing to co-operate with other Governments in the control both of the traffic in arms and the private manufacture of arms.’

“You are perhaps aware that both the question of the private manufacture of arms and that of the international control of the arms traffic have engaged the continuous attention of the Assembly and the Council of the League.

“The Convention of Saint-Germain was framed, as you will recall from the records of the American Peace Commission which co-operated in its drafting, with a view to an adequate solution of the arms traffic question on a world-wide basis. As it is obvious that this Convention could not fulfil its aim unless ratified by all the manufacturing Powers, the Assembly and the Council, when they first took up the question in 1920, directed their efforts towards this end, and an enquiry was accordingly conducted by the Secretary-General.

“The Temporary Mixed Commission, in the report which it submitted to the Assembly on September 7th, 1922, summed up the results of this enquiry in the following terms :

“The following States have ratified or adhered to the Convention : Brazil, Chile, China, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Peru, Siam, Venezuela.

“Great Britain, as well as Spain, Canada, New Zealand and South Africa, is prepared to ratify the Convention as soon as all the other principal Powers are willing to do so.

“France has announced that the President of the Republic has been authorised by the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate to ratify the Convention and that ratification will be carried out as soon as the principal Signatory Powers shall themselves have taken steps to ratify the Convention.

“Italy has expressed her readiness to ratify the Convention as soon as it has been approved by Parliament, and Japan has promised to ratify it with as little delay as possible after its ratification by the other Powers.

“A certain number of States, such as Denmark, India, Sweden and Norway, make their ratification conditional on that of all the signatory Powers, whereas Roumania, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Colombia, Uruguay and Persia declare their willingness to adhere to the Convention.

“It will be seen from this statement that the principal Powers which have replied to the enquiry make their ratification depend on that of the other principal signatory Powers. This reservation would seem to refer especially to the United States of America, which are signatory to the Convention, and which had not, up to the present, replied to the invitation addressed to them.

“In reply to the note addressed to the United States on November 21st, 1921, you were good enough to inform the Secretary-General, on July 28th, 1922, that ‘while the Government of the United States was in cordial sympathy with efforts to restrict traffic in arms and munitions of war, it found itself unable to approve the provisions of the Convention and to give any assurance of its ratification.’

“The Third Assembly, which met shortly afterwards, in September, had therefore to consider the situation thus created.

“The Third Committee of the Assembly, referring to this reply, expressed the following opinion :

“ ‘This reply puts an end to the hopes that the Convention of Saint-Germain in its present form would receive general acceptance.

“ ‘As has already been said, it is most desirable that some treaty should be universally accepted for the control of the international trade in arms, and that all civilised countries should co-operate in a common policy of regulation.

“ ‘Whether that can be done, however, depends on the attitude of the United States of America. It is important, therefore, that the Members of the League should endeavour in every way to meet the views of the United States Government, and to secure their co-operation in a common policy.’

“In the meantime the work carried out by the Permanent Advisory Commission on Military, Naval and Air Questions and by the Temporary Mixed Commission for the Reduction of Armaments, had led these bodies to the conclusion that the two problems of the private manufacture of arms and the international control of the arms traffic were too closely connected to be dealt with separately, and that the solution of both had to be sought at the same time and by the same methods. The Third Assembly therefore adopted the following resolutions :

“ ‘The Assembly, having noted the proposal of the Temporary Mixed Commission for an international agreement for the control of the manufacture of arms by private companies, urges the Council to consider the advisability of summoning at an appropriate moment a conference of the Members of the League to embody this agreement in the form of a convention. The Assembly is further of the opinion that States not Members of the League should be invited to participate in this conference and to co-operate in the policy on which it may agree.

‘The Assembly considers it highly desirable that the Government of the United States should express the objections which it has to formulate to the provisions of the Convention of Saint-Germain, as well as any proposals which it may care to make as to the way in which these objections can be overcome.’

“ ‘Since these resolutions were taken, the Council and the Temporary Mixed Commission have given their attention to this matter, with the result that the Council passed at its last session the resolution quoted at the beginning of this letter. In virtue of this resolution, I have the honour to ask you whether the United States Government would be ready to inform the Members of the League of Nations as to the general lines on which it would be willing to co-operate in an attempt to solve on a universal and permanent basis the two problems of the private manufacture of arms and the international control of the arms traffic.

“ ‘In order to enable you to form an accurate opinion of the scope and nature of the work carried out on this subject by the organs of the League, I beg to enclose the report of the Temporary Mixed Commission to the Council and that of the Third Committee to the last Assembly, in each of which two chapters are devoted to these questions.’”

The Temporary Commission felt they were interpreting the spirit of the Assembly resolution quoted in this letter and particularly that portion of the resolution which states : “ ‘The Assembly is further of the opinion that States not Members of the League should be invited to participate in this conference and to co-operate in the policy on which it may agree ’”, when they submitted the following resolution to the Council :

“ ‘The Commission resolves to recommend the Council to invite the Governments of all States not Members of the League of Nations to express an opinion as to how they would be prepared to co-operate in the solution of the problems of the traffic in arms and ammunition and the private manufacture of arms.’”

From the point of view of these two problems, the non-Member States may be divided into two categories :

1. Those which are not bound by any obligation in the Treaties of Peace ;
2. Those which have obligations laid down in the Treaties of Peace in respect of the traffic and the private manufacture of arms.

Apart from the United States, which do not come into the question, Russia, Mexico, Ecuador, etc., belong to the first category; Germany belongs to the second category. (The position of Turkey in this matter may be regarded as a special one.)

In respect of the international traffic in arms, Germany is bound by Article 126 of the Treaty of Versailles, which says :

“ ‘Germany undertakes to accept and observe the agreements made or to be made by the Allied and Associated Powers or some of them with any other Power with regard to the trade in arms and spirits, and to the matters dealt with in the General Act of Berlin of February 26th, 1885, the General Act of Brussels of July 2nd, 1890, and the conventions completing or modifying the same.’”

In respect of private manufacture, she is bound by Article 168 of the Treaty of Versailles :

“The manufacture of arms, munitions, or any war material, shall only be carried out in factories or works the location of which shall be communicated to and approved by the Governments of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, and the number of which they retain the right to restrict.

“Within three months from the coming into force of the present Treaty, all other establishments for the manufacture, preparation, storage or design of arms, munitions, or any war material whatever shall be closed down. The same applies to all arsenals except those used as depots for the authorised stocks of munitions. Within the same period the personnel of these arsenals will be dismissed.”

Article 170 of the Treaty may be regarded as dealing with both the traffic and with private manufacture :

“Importation into Germany of arms, munitions and war material of every kind shall be strictly prohibited.

“The same applies to the manufacture for, and export to, foreign countries of arms, munitions and war material of every kind.”

During its July session, the Council examined this question, and, while recognising the advisability of postponing its decision on the matter in order to give time to the United States Government to reply to the letter of May 23rd, took note (as the Minutes show) that such a course would not prejudice its action at the next session.

The following resolution was adopted :

“The Council, having examined the resolution adopted by the Temporary Mixed Commission recommending that the Governments of all States not Members of the League of Nations should be invited to state their views as to the manner in which they would be willing to co-operate in the solution of the problems of the traffic in arms and munitions and of the private manufacture of arms, approving the principle of this resolution without, at the same time, prejudging the obligation which certain of these Governments have undertaken in the Treaties of Peace, considers it advisable to postpone its decision on the matter until such time as the reply from the United States Government to the letter addressed to it by the President of the Council on May 1st, 1923, is received.”

On July 26th, 1923, the United States Legation at Berne wrote on behalf of its Government to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations stating that it was instructed to inform him that the matter was receiving the consideration of the United States Government, and that a reply would be sent in due course.

---

#### IV. - CHEMICAL WARFARE.

The Third Assembly, having considered the report of the Temporary Mixed Commission on the subject of the employment of asphyxiating gases in time of war, adopted the following resolution :

“(a) The Assembly, having considered the report of the Temporary Mixed Commission on the subject of the development of chemical warfare, approves its action in establishing a special Sub-Committee to report on the probable effects of chemical discoveries in future wars, and requests the Council and the Temporary Mixed Commission to take every measure to secure the fullest publicity for the report of this Sub-Committee.

“(b) The Assembly requests the Council to recommend the Members of the League and other nations to adhere to the Treaty of Washington (February 6th, 1922) concerning the use of asphyxiating gas and submarines in war, and other similar matters.”

1. As regards paragraph (a) of the above resolution, the special Sub-Committee referred to was set up by the Temporary Mixed Commission during its first session:

The composition of the Committee was as follows: Lord Robert Cecil, Admiral Segrave, Lt.-Colonel Requin, and later, on his appointment as Member of the two Commissions (P. A. C. and T. M. C.), Brigadier-General A. de Marinis.

The Committee has met on several occasions during the year. It adopted as its programme of work a scheme drawn up by Lt.-Colonel Requin, which defines the task entrusted to the Committee by the Commission in the following terms :

The *aim* is to show to the public opinion of the world the *effects* which would be produced by the most powerful means of destruction placed at the service of modern warfare by modern science.

It will be borne in mind that henceforward an *armed nation*, utilising the whole of its human and material resources, will attempt to strike, not only at the combatants on the enemy's front, but at the whole enemy nation in arms—its population, its riches and its resources of every kind.

War of this sort, which carries destruction beyond the fighting lines and which renders opposing nations vulnerable to the extreme limits of their territories, has been made possible by the increasing range of modern guns, by the far-reaching activity of air forces and by conveying and disseminating in other ways the means of destruction.

Without discussing the legitimacy of such practices, the Commission will merely seek to discover what is *possible* in warfare, whether permitted or not by the laws of war, in order that the public may have an accurate conception of the dangers which it has to fear.

In these circumstances, it is desirable to obtain from the most-qualified experts as detailed and complete a statement as possible of the effect which would be produced on human life, animal life, vegetable life, and on the wealth and resources of all kinds of a country, which is attacked at any point within its territory by :

- i. Chemical warfare by means of the most powerful explosives, chemical products and gases, as already practised and as further developed since the last war ;
- ii. Bacteriological warfare by means of microbes or any other agents, if, in defiance of all human laws, its effectiveness should induce nations to adopt it.

This programme of work was submitted to a certain number of experts<sup>1</sup>, chosen after consultation with the Health Committee of the League.

At its eighth session, the Temporary Mixed Commission was of opinion that it was not possible for it to publish before the Assembly any report on the subject of chemical warfare, since the report would have to co-ordinate the views of the various experts. A summary will be published after reception of the various data for the report.

2. With regard to paragraph (b) of the resolution, which proposes to extend to non-signatory States the principles of the Washington Treaty on the asphyxiating gases and submarines in time of war, the Temporary Mixed Commission (which had already referred to this question in its previous report) always recognised that this Treaty was subject to the general conditions governing the Washington Treaties as a whole. The Commission had also considered the question of extending to non-signatory States the principles of the Washington Convention relating to the Limitation of Naval Armaments, and, consequently, the Council, thinking that it would be well for these two questions to be considered together, decided that the former, *i. e.* adherence to the Washington Convention concerning the use of asphyxiating gases in time of war, should be placed on the agenda of the International Conference on the Limitation of Naval Armaments which the Assembly had recommended should be summoned.

---

## V. - EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION.

I. At the suggestion of the Temporary Mixed Commission, the Third Assembly requested the Council to consider whether the time had not come to discuss the application of the last paragraph of Article 8 of the Covenant relating to the exchange of military information between States Members of the League. The Council referred this question for examination to the two Commissions on the Reduction of Armaments, at the same time emphasising, in a report which it had adopted, the close connection which existed between this question and the statistical enquiry which, at the Assembly's request, had occupied the attention of the Temporary Mixed Commission.

The Temporary Mixed Commission has undertaken the work on these lines. The Commission considered first of all what practical results might be expected from an exchange of information such as is contemplated in Article 8 of the Covenant.

The data which would supply the material for such an exchange concern facts which may be grouped under three headings :

1. Facts which are public property ;
2. Facts which are known to foreign general staffs concerned, but which are not public property ; and are obtained :
  - (a) by the systematic sifting of public documents :
  - (b) by other means ;
3. Facts which are kept secret.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Bacteriologists :*

Sir Almoth WRIGHT, London.  
Professor Jules BORDET, Institut Pasteur de Brabant, Brussels.  
M. Richard PFEIFFER, Professor at Breslau University.  
Professor Th. MADSEN, State Serum Institute, Copenhagen.  
Professor W. H. WELCH, Baltimore.  
M. MAYER, Professor at the Collège de France, Paris.

*Chemists :*

M. G. BERTRAND, Professor at the Pasteur Institute, Paris.  
M. NERNST, Professor at the Berlin University.  
M. Angeli Cav. ANGELO, Professor of Chemistry at the "Institut des Etudes supérieures de Florence".  
M. W. B. CANNON, Professor at Cambridge (United States).  
Professor J. E. ZANETTI, Columbia University, New York.  
Professor J. BARCROFT, Cambridge (United States).  
Sir William J. POPE, University College, Cambridge (United States).

Opinions may differ as to what military facts should come under the respective categories. It appears from the military point of view that the exchange of information may be carried out, *without causing the least change* in the present situation with regard to facts falling under the first two categories referred to above 1 and 2 (a), *i. e.*, with regard to facts which are public property and facts which are known to foreign general staffs concerned as a result of the systematic analysis of public documents. The question arises, however, what would be the use of an exchange of this nature.

From the technical military point of view, such an innovation would not perceptibly modify the present conditions as regards general staff information. It would, nevertheless, tend to reduce the number of facts falling under category 2 (b) referred to above.

From a moral point of view, however, the effect of such exchanges would be considerable. Article 8 of the Covenant was not drawn up with a view to facilitating the work of general staffs. Its object was to improve the political atmosphere by creating confidence. It seems clear, therefore, that the system laid down in Article 8 of the Covenant would, on these grounds, be of considerable advantage, from two points of view :

1. It would create among the general staffs concerned that feeling of confidence which is a result of open dealings, instead of the mutual distrust engendered by indirect and surreptitious methods of obtaining information.
2. It would create an organisation for mutual information concerning military situations which would render it possible to nip in the bud any campaign started by an alarmist Press and based upon the armaments of countries considered as potential enemies.

\* \* \*

II. The statistical enquiry which has been entrusted to the Temporary Mixed Commission and to the Secretariat, in conformity with resolutions adopted by the Second and Third Assemblies may, to a certain extent, be regarded as an exchange of information. It is true that the information concerning military, naval, and air questions, which is collected in the course of this enquiry, does not cover the whole programme outlined in Article 8 of the Covenant. The information does not all come direct from the Governments, although it is, in every case, obtained by comparing and studying official and public data. The Temporary Mixed Commission has decided to submit to the Assembly a collection of all the replies received from the Governments to the statistical tables, which were drawn up by the Permanent Advisory Commission and sent to all States, together with the results of the enquiry into the National Defence budgets which the Secretariat was instructed to carry out. The Commission is of opinion that the annual publication of such data on a scale which may be extended or reduced in accordance with the wishes of the Assembly and of the Council might prove to be one solution of the problem of exchanging information as defined in Article 8 of the Covenant, and such a solution would possess the advantage that it would be applied immediately.

Having this end in view, the Commission decided to suggest to the Council "to collate the results of the statistical enquiry, to keep it up to date, and to publish a year-book which would be the most complete of all documents of this kind. The Secretariat should accordingly be invited to bring out a year-book based on information drawn from official documents and keeping within the limits of the last paragraph of Article 8 of the Covenant".

When this point was raised in the Council, the Rapporteur made the following remarks, which the Council adopted :

"The engagements undertaken by the signatories of the Covenant in the last paragraph of Article 8 might now be begun by giving instructions to the Secretariat periodically to publish a year-book containing a certain number of data regarding the matters referred to in the last paragraph of Article 8."

The programme for the statistical enquiry which was laid down by the First Assembly and amended by the Second, could now be permanently established on the basis of the last paragraph of Article 8 of the Covenant. Two questions at once arise ; the first is connected with collaboration by the Governments in this publication. There is no doubt that any direct official collaboration should be regarded as being a most valuable assistance to the publication which the Temporary Mixed Commission has in mind. It is nevertheless a fact that, if we judge by the experience acquired, there can be no question of making the publication of the proposed year-book dependent upon the receipt of the necessary information from all the Governments of States Members of the League. Such a method could have no result but the indefinite postponement of the publication. On the other hand, it may be said that there are hardly any States which do not periodically publish, if only for internal political reasons, the greater part of the information necessary for the proposed publication. From this point of view, the definition of the work which the Commission has undertaken and which is to be entrusted to the Secretariat, is satisfactory from every point of view.

The second question which arises is that of the extent of ground which this publication is to cover. The League of Nations already publishes, for instance, in its Economic and Financial and in its Epidemiological Sections, a certain amount of general information. There can be no doubt that the League of Nations should give at least as much attention to the publication of the

information which directly affects disarmament and the maintenance of peace as to that of the technical information in respect of which its work has so successfully developed.

On the other hand, such publication should be carefully organised. It would seem that the best method to carry it out successfully would be to proceed gradually. The collection to be published in the first year should be considered as only a first attempt which should be completed according as the experience acquired might allow. It would therefore be desirable to accept the suggestion of the Temporary Mixed Commission, it being, of course, understood that the programme of periodical publication would be gradually developed and proportionate to the experience in this matter obtained by the Secretariat.

The Council, on the proposal of its Rapporteur, adopted the following resolution :

“The Council, in view of the decision of the Temporary Mixed Commission with regard to the publication of a year-book which would allow the carrying out as from the present time of the intentions of the last paragraph of Article 8 of the Covenant, decides to authorise the Secretariat to publish this year-book, beginning with an experimental volume dealing with the figures for 1923 and developing this publication by degrees according to the experience acquired, it being clearly understood that the information would be drawn solely from official and public documents, and that the programme of the year-book would exactly correspond to the terms of the last paragraph 8 of Article of the Covenant.”

---

## VI. - EXTENSION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF THE WASHINGTON NAVAL TREATY TO NON-SIGNATORY STATES.

The Third Assembly adopted the following recommendations :

“(a) That an International Conference should be summoned by the Council as soon as possible to which all States, whether Members of the League or not, should be invited, with a view to considering the extension to all non-signatory States of the principles of the Washington Treaty for the limitation of naval armaments, it being understood that any special cases, including those of the new States, shall be given due consideration at the conference ;

“(b) That the Report of the Temporary Mixed Commission, together with the report and the draft Convention prepared by the Permanent Advisory Commission, as well as the text of the Washington Treaty, should be forwarded immediately to the various Governments for consideration.”

The Council, during its session held at Paris January to February, 1923, accepted the Assembly's recommendation to summon an International Conference, but decided to reserve the question of inviting to the conference non-Members of the League. Having in view the fact that the Washington Naval Treaty had not been ratified by all the signatory Powers and also the meeting to be held at Santiago in March, 1923, of a Pan-American Conference, which would deal with the limitation of armaments, it decided that the Conference should be held at Geneva after the close of the Santiago Conference.

The Council decided that the agenda for the Geneva Conference should include the question of extending to non-signatory States Members of the principles of the Washington Naval Treaty and also that of the adhesion of those States to the Treaty of Washington (February 6th, 1922) concerning the use of asphyxiating gases and submarines in time of war.

It further decided to give effect to paragraph (b) of the Assembly recommendation. Action was taken on this resolution of the Council on February 17th, 1923.

The Temporary Mixed Commission, during its February session, took note of the Council's decision to reserve the question of inviting to the Conference States not Members of the League, but at the same time requested the Council to consider the advisability of issuing to the Permanent Advisory Commission the necessary instructions for examining the extension of its technical scheme to States not Members of the League. The Council, during its April and July sessions, decided to postpone consideration of this question.

---

## VII - SANTIAGO AND MOSCOW CONFERENCES AND CONVENTION ON THE REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS BETWEEN FIVE CENTRAL AMERICAN REPUBLICS.

The present report includes a short note relative to three international events concerning the reduction of armaments: (1) the Moscow Conference, (2) the Pan-American Conference of Santiago and (3) the Convention on the Reduction of Armaments concluded between five Central American Republics.

### 1. MOSCOW CONFERENCE.

The Moscow Conference lasted from December 2nd to 12th, 1922, and was attended by the Republics of Esthonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Russia.

During its February session 1923, a statement on the subject was made to the Temporary Commission by Prince Radziwill, Polish Delegate to the Moscow Conference. From this it appears that, after discussing a draft scheme of non-aggression presented by Poland in the name of Esthonia, Finland and Latvia and a draft of a scheme on limitation of armaments put forward by M. Litvinoff, the Russian Delegate and President of the Conference, the Conference closed on December 12th, without arriving at any definite decisions.

### 2. PAN-AMERICAN CONFERENCE AT SANTIAGO.

The Pan-American Conference at Santiago had formed the object of several official communications made at meetings of the Temporary Mixed Commission during 1922. M. Rivas-Vicuña, the Chilian Member of the Commission, returned to his country and took up the post of Secretary-General to the Conference. His successor on the Commission, M. Villegas, Chilian Minister at Rome, following the example of his predecessor, kept the Commission informed of the progress of events. During its June session, M. Villegas was good enough to give the Commission a statement of the results of the Pan-American Conference. The text of the resolutions adopted by this conference is annexed to the present report. Speaking of these decisions, M. Villegas said:

“I venture to point out to the Commission that all the resolutions passed by the Pan-American Conference are in agreement with the work of your Commission and with the spirit of the Covenant. Allow me to cite more particularly: Resolution 2, the principle underlying which is in reality also one of the foundations of the League of Nations; Resolution 3, which is only a general statement of the endeavours of your Commission to incorporate all treaties of guarantee in a general text; Resolution 4, the guiding idea of which is included in your programme, and has several times been discussed at your meetings; paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) of Resolution 5, the subjects of which have also engaged your Commission's attention, and have been embodied in resolutions which are now being carried out. This hasty survey of the decisions taken by the fifth Pan-American Conference enables us to arrive at the conclusion that the work of our Conference and of the League of Nations are guided by the same spirit and are directed towards the same result, and that we both have to overcome the same obstacles, and are both inspired by the same hopes.”

The resolutions adopted by the Santiago Conference regarding the reduction of armaments are annexed. (Annex I.)

### 3. CONVENTION ON THE LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS BETWEEN FIVE CENTRAL AMERICAN REPUBLICS.

During its June session, M. Urrutia, the Colombian member, drew the attention of the Commission to a Convention on the Limitation of Armaments, which had been signed at Washington on February 7th, 1923, by five Central American Republics: Guatemala, Honduras, Salvador, Nicaragua and Costa Rica, and which he pointed out was the first convention of its kind.

The text of the convention is annexed to the present report. (Annexe II.)

---

## ANNEXES.

---

### Annex I.

#### RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE FIFTH PAN-AMERICAN CONFERENCE AT SANTIAGO.

1. The fifth Pan-American Conference decides :
  - (a) To confirm its sincere desire to maintain unalterable and permanent peace between all the nations of America and of the world.
  - (b) To declare that it condemns the system of armed peace, which leads to exaggeration of military and naval strength in excess of the requirements of internal security and of the sovereignty and independence of the States concerned.
2. The fifth Conference decides :
  - (a) To recommend that the Governments should adhere to the principle of conciliation adopted by the second Hague Conference of 1907 with a view to reaching a peaceful solution of international disputes.
  - (b) To recommend that the Governments should adhere to methods calculated to prevent war and, in particular, to methods which consist in the investigation and discussion of international disputes before the outbreak of hostilities.
3. The fifth Conference decides :
  - (a) To recommend that the Governments should undertake, within the limits of their free and absolute sovereignty and in agreement with any State which, in the exercise of their sovereignty, they may see fit to consult, and under such conditions as they may consider appropriate, the preparation of treaties providing for the judicious regulation of their respective armaments.
4. The fifth Conference decides :

To recommend that the Governments should adhere to the provisions of Treaty No. 1 concluded at Washington on February 6th, 1922, in so far as this Treaty lays down that :

  - (a) no Power shall acquire capital ships of over 35,000 tons, nor aircraft carriers of over 27,000 tons.
  - (b) no war vessel shall carry guns exceeding a 16-inch calibre (406 millimetres).
5. The fifth Conference decides :
  - (a) To recommend that the Governments should adhere to the Conventions of the Hague Conference of 1907 and other later Conventions, the object of which is to discourage a resort to arms, and to establish on a definite basis the usages of war and the rights and duties of neutrals, and so to endeavour, within the limits of their sovereign jurisdiction, to render the Positive International Law of the American nations uniform as regards measures for the limitation of the horrors of war and, in general, as regards the laws of warfare.
  - (b) To declare that, among the regulations adopted by civilised nations for the protection of the lives of neutrals and non-combatants at sea, those regulations which are contained in the provisions of Articles I, II, IV and V of the Treaty of Washington, No. 2 (February 26th, 1922) concerning the capture, attacking and destruction of merchant vessels, and concerning the employment of submarines, should be regarded as forming an integral part of International Law.
  - (c) To recommend that the Governments should confirm the prohibition of poison gas and other similar substances or elements, as defined in the Treaty of Washington of 1922.
  - (d) In view of the importance which aerial warfare seems destined to assume, it is recommended that consideration should be given to the question of imposing restrictions on this form of warfare, with a view to confining action to the legitimate aims of war and to ensuring the protection of unarmed populations and unfortified towns.

---

Annex II.

CONVENTION ON THE LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS BETWEEN FIVE REPUBLICS OF CENTRAL AMERICA : GUATEMALA, HONDURAS, SALVADOR, NICARAGUA AND COSTA RICA.

ARTICLE I.—In view of the respective population, area, length of frontier and other factors of military importance of each country, the Contracting Parties undertake, for a period of five years as from the date of the coming into force of the present Convention, not to keep under arms a permanent army and national guard greater than indicated below, except in the event of civil war or threat of war from another State :

Guatemala . . . . .	5,200	men
Honduras . . . . .	2,500	»
Salvador . . . . .	4,200	»
Nicaragua . . . . .	2,500	»
Costa Rica . . . . .	2,000	»

The provisions of the present article do not apply to commanders and officers of the permanent army, who are required under the military regulations of each country, or to those of the national guard, or to the police force.

ARTICLE II.—As the primary duty of the armed forces of the Central American Governments is to maintain public order, each of the Contracting Parties undertake to establish a national guard to co-operate with the present armies in preserving order in the various districts of the respective countries and on the frontiers, and will at once consider the best means of organising this force. For this purpose, the Governments of Central America shall consider the desirability of employing suitable instructors in order to utilise the experience acquired in other countries in organising bodies of this kind.

The total forces of the army and of the national guard shall in no case exceed the maximum fixed in the previous article, except in the contingencies provided for in that article.

ARTICLE III.—The Contracting Parties undertake not to export or to allow the export of arms or munitions or other military stores of any kind from one Central American country to another.

ARTICLE IV.—None of the Contracting Parties may possess more than ten military aircraft, or acquire vessels of war. Armed coastguard vessels shall not, however, be considered as vessels of war.

The provisions of this article shall not apply in the event of civil war or threat of war on the part of another State, in which case the right of defence shall not be limited, except in so far as is laid down in existing treaties.

ARTICLE V.—The Contracting Parties recognise that the use in time of war of asphyxiating and poisonous or similar gases, liquids or substances, or substances containing these, is contrary to all humanitarian principles and to international law ; under the present Convention, therefore, they undertake not to have recourse to these methods in time of war.

ARTICLE VI.—Six months after the coming into force of the present Convention, each of the Contracting Governments shall submit to the other Central American Governments a complete report on the measures adopted in execution of the present Convention. Similar reports shall be furnished every six months during the prescribed period of five years.

The information in these reports shall refer to units of the army (if any) and of the national guard, and any other information which the Contracting Parties may consider it desirable to furnish.

ARTICLE VII.—The present Convention shall apply, in respect of those Parties which have ratified it, as from the date on which it has been ratified by at least four of the signatory States.

ARTICLE VIII.—The present Convention shall not lapse before the first day of January nineteen hundred and twenty-nine, even if previously denounced, or for any other reason. After the first day of January nineteen hundred and twenty-nine, it shall remain in force for one year after the date on which one of the Contracting Parties has notified to the others its intentions of denouncing it. If the present Convention has been denounced by any of these Parties, it shall nevertheless remain in force in respect of the others which have ratified it and which have not denounced it, provided the latter number at least four. Any Central American Republic which has not ratified this Convention may adhere to it so long as it remains in force.

ARTICLE IX.—The ratifications of the present Convention shall be exchanged by means of communications from the other Governments to the Government of Costa Rica, the latter Government then duly notifying the other Contracting States. When the Government of Costa Rica itself shall have ratified the Convention, it shall communicate the ratification to the other States.

ARTICLE X.—The original copy of the present Convention, signed by all the Plenipotentiary Delegates, shall be placed in the archives of the Pan-American Union at Washington. A certified copy shall be sent by the Secretary-General of the Conference to each of the Contracting Governments.