THE PRESIDENT: The President has no objection to the convenience of the various delegations being considered; he is in fact here to see that this is done. My proposal was a mere suggestion; I have just heard another,—that the time of the meeting of the Commission on Procedure be fixed.

I suggest that it meet to-morrow at 10 a.m. and that, in accordance with the desire expressed by Mr. Byrnes on behalf of the United States Delegation, it decide itself the order and time-table of its proceedings.

Are there any remarks? If I have rightly understood the requests submitted, these imply that, to-morrow at any rate, the Plenary Conference will not meet at the same time as the Commission on Procedure. If there are no objections, all that remains to be done is to fix the agenda for the plenary meetings of the next few days.

AGENDA

THE PRESIDENT: Delegations will, I think, agree that the next plenary meetings should be devoted to the general discussion. I suggest that the various delegations send in the names of their speakers to the General Secretariat, speeches to be delivered in the order in which the names of speakers are registered.

No objection being raised, I take it that the Conference has decided that the Commission on Procedure will meet at 10 a.m. on the following day and the Commission on Credentials one hour before the next plenary meeting.

We have now to fix the time for the next plenary meeting. I propose that the Conference meet at 4 p.m. and the Commission on Credentials at 3 p.m.

Agreed.

I would remind delegates that credentials should be communicated to the General Secretariat.

I thank the Conference for its promptness in dealing with the agenda of this first meeting.

(The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.)
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M. Fouques Duparc served as temporary Chairman of the Committee, M. Spaak (Belgium) and M. Kardelj (Yugoslavia) were nomi-
nated for the position of permanent Chairman. The Delegations supporting M. Spaak (Australia, Greece, Netherlands, and the United Kingdom) stressed his experience and ability. The Delegations supporting M. Kardelj (U.S.S.R., Ukraine and Poland) held the view that political considerations should be taken into account and that Yugoslavia’s great contribution to the war made M. Kardelj a logical choice. A secret ballot was taken and M. Spaak was elected by 13 votes to 7 with 1 abstention. M. Kardelj was unanimously elected Vice Chairman.

Mr. Byrnes proposed that meetings of the Committee on Procedure be open to the press and that the Committee recommend to the Plenary Conference that its meetings and those of the commissions likewise be open to the press. The Soviet Delegation supported the proposal and it was unanimously accepted.5

SECOND PLENARY MEETING, JULY 30, 1946, 4 P. M.
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Chairman: M. Bidault (France)

The Chairman: The list of speakers is as follows: the first Delegate of the United States of America, the first Delegate of the United Kingdom, and the first Delegate of the Republic of China. After that we shall hear the report of the Credentials Commission, drawn up by its Chairman, the representative of Ethiopia.

Mr. Byrnes (United States of America): At long last we are assembled here to consider the first treaties of peace to be made since the military defeat of the Axis conspiracy to dominate the world by force.

It took six long years of war for free men to match and finally to master the forces [arrayed] to degrade and enslave them.

The Axis conspiracy started in the effort of a few men first to gain by force ascendancy over their own people, and then to extend by force their tyranny, step by step, over other peoples. Their goal, and they nearly achieved it, was to bring the whole [world] under their evil power and influence.

Let not us who fought on freedom’s side forget how near the shadows we came. Let not us forget that however great the losses and the sacrifices of our respective countries may have been, there is not a na-

5 The Commission also agreed to avoid holding plenary sessions of the Conference simultaneously with meetings of the Commission.

Procedural difficulties were encountered in electing a Chairman. Several delegates spoke at length repeatedly; the meeting lasted for nearly three and a half hours.
tion represented here that could alone have indefinitely held out against the Axis tyranny.

We live today as free men because we had friends and helpers in every country in the world, including brave souls in countries under Axis domination who in freedom's cause were willing to risk the tortures of the concentration camp.

We live today as free men because the freedom we fought for was freedom not for ourselves alone but for all mankind.

After six long years of war there is nothing that the people of the world now long for so much as a return to peace.

We want our soldiers to return to their homes and their families. We want even those whose misfortune it was to be conscripted on the side of the Axis to know what peace and freedom mean.

While we must be alert to see that Nazism and Fascism do not again raise their ugly heads, we must give democracy a chance to grow where tyranny stamped it out. Democracy cannot be imposed or taught at the point of a bayonet. As terror inspires terror, so goodwill can inspire goodwill.

Because of our suffering during the war we want an effective peace which will stand guard against the recurrence of aggression, but we do not want a peace of vengeance.

We want to plant the seeds of future peace and not the seeds of future wars.

And above all we must get back to conditions of peace without undue delay. Prolonged mass occupation of other countries after they have been effectively disarmed is not the way to get peace or the way to guard peace.

That is why it has been the policy of the government which I represent to work unremittingly for the restoration of conditions of peace throughout the world as rapidly as possible.

Of course, after six long years of exhaustive war it is difficult for each nation not to think that its own ideas of peace ought to prevail. When the enemy is vanquished, differences over the making of peace are bound to be differences among allies.

After World War I differences among the Allies were allowed to weaken and destroy their will to cooperate in the maintenance of peace. The United States unwisely decided to return to a policy of isolation rather than to cooperate and to improve a peace which fell short of its expectation. Other governments also drifted into a policy of isolation or appeasement. That must not happen again.

However difficult may be the paths of international cooperation the United States is determined not to return to a policy of isolation.

We must try to understand one another even when we cannot agree with one another. We must never accept any disagreement as final.
We must work together until we can find solutions which, while not perfect, are solutions which can be defended.

I am not unaware that there has been criticism of the meetings of representatives of the larger States to prepare draft treaties in advance of this conference. At times I myself have been critical of some of our meetings and our decisions, and I have always insisted that before the final peace terms are drawn up, the views of all the States which took an active part in the fighting must be heard and taken into account.

But peace treaties which determine boundaries and the disposition of colonies and territories cannot be made practically effective if they are not accepted by the principal Allied States.

If the principal Allied States had not attempted to harmonize their views before this conference I hesitate to say how many months this conference would have to go on while efforts were being made to reconcile their positions. We must remember that in this world where national States jealously retain their sovereignty there is as yet no way of forcing States to accept and ratify peace treaties.

It is not easy for any sizeable deliberative body, be it a peace conference, a parliament or a congress, to function effectively without having the measures which it is to consider drafted in advance and drafted with a view to meeting the views of those whose support is deemed essential.

This conference will be free not only to consider the drafts laid before them but to make such recommendations concerning the final treaties as the conference may determine. While the Council of Foreign Ministers has suggested certain rules of procedure, the conference is free to adopt its own rules of procedure. Because I believe governments must respect world opinion I hope the conference will accept the recommendation of its commission that all meetings of the conference and its committees will be public.

The very fact that the drafts which go before this conference have been prepared in advance ensures that all those present here will have an opportunity to express themselves on concrete peace proposals which are likely in some form or other to find their way into the final peace treaties.

After the last war the smaller States were free to express their views before the concrete peace proposals were formulated. But it took the Council of Four so long to come to an agreement on the important issues that the smaller States had little opportunity to review the actual decisions once they were made by the Big Four.

The drafts submitted to this conference are not the proposals which the United States would make if the United States were the sole arbiter of the peace. But neither are they the proposals which any
other State which has collaborated in their drafting would make if it were the sole arbiter of the peace. The proposals, however, represent a very real effort on the part of the States which cooperated in their preparation to reach a common understanding which in this imperfect world is an indispensable condition to the establishment of Peace.

I hope that the delegates will feel free to express the views of their respective States on the proposed treaties. No nation, large or small, can be insensitive to world opinion.

A world longing for peace will not forgive us if in striving for perfection we fail to obtain peace.

History will judge our efforts not by what we say here but what we accomplish here.

Since last September I have fought to bring about this Peace Conference of all the States which actually waged War with substantial military force against the European Axis.

The Council of Foreign Ministers in the drafting of the final treaties is pledged not only to take into account the recommendations here made, but not to reject any of them arbitrarily.

The United States will stand by its agreements in the Council. But if the conference should, by a two-thirds vote of the governments here represented, make a contrary recommendation, the United States will use its influence to secure the adoption of that recommendation by the Council. The United States believes that those who fought the war should make the peace.

Mr. Attlee (United Kingdom): Mr. President and fellow delegates: I would like at the outset to thank the French Government and the French people, our kind hosts, for the excellent arrangements they have made for our personal comfort and for doing our business here. When I was last here the enemy was still fighting. Paris was then just beginning to recover. I rejoice to see the progress made since then. It is a good omen. We are met together to take the first step in making peace. We are seeking to make a beginning in re-establishing the normal relationships between nations by bringing back into the European family circle five erring members.

They were not mainly responsible for the calamity which fell upon the world, but they have been accessories. With their support or acquiescence the Governments of these peoples joined in the attack on civilisation. To a greater or lesser degree in the later stages of the struggle these peoples have sought to make atonement.

By the treaties now submitted to you, we are endeavouring to open a new chapter in the history of Europe. I believe that we must approach the problems looking forward not backward, not dwelling so much on past failures as considering how best we can make a success of the future. We should not be devoting ourselves to examining
historical claims or the supposed interests of particular States. We should keep before our minds the simple objective of removing from the hearts of the common people in all lands the brooding fear of another war and of enabling them to live together as good citizens not only of their own States but of Europe and the world.

In my country, as in most of yours, the Government is dealing with the very difficult task of reconstruction. Homes have been destroyed, people have had to move from their accustomed dwelling places and have had to change their occupations while industry has been directed to war purposes. Now we are engaged in re-knitting the fabric of our national life.

But we are not trying to make our life exactly on the old pattern. Retaining the best of the past, we are weaving a new pattern.

In my view we are engaged in a comparable task in these peace treaties. We must seek to make a Europe in which the peoples will live more secure and happier lives in which the relationships of the members of the European families will be more neighbourly and friendly than ever before. This new Europe will have, I hope, the best of the old, but will discard much that was evil.

Our task is limited. The major task of dealing with Germany and the German people remains, but much will depend on how and in what spirit we manage the immediate business before us.

These treaties in themselves are only contributions to the ground plan of the city of European peace which we want to build. The life of the city will depend on the conduct of the inhabitants. But agreement on the plan is an essential first step.

Twice in my lifetime the world has experienced the horrors of a world war. The peoples of America, Asia, Africa and Australasia have been involved. The primary cause on each occasion has arisen from the failure of the people of Europe to dwell together in amity.

It is, therefore, right that those who live in other continents should join with the representatives of the European nations to seek to make an enduring settlement.

That after all is our primary task, the minor gains and losses, the short term advantages of particular provisions in these treaties are as nothing compared to the overriding interest of us all to make a peace that shall endure.

The greater part of the drafts before you have been agreed by the Four Powers. They are put forward as embodying the greatest measure of agreement. Having agreed to them ourselves we shall naturally support them at this Conference, but we are anxious to hear the opinion of the seventeen other States to whose judgment they are now submitted. Criticism, suggestions and recommendations made here must be given full consideration when the final drafts are framed.
The remaining articles which have not been agreed will come before you and I have no doubt that the discussions here will be powerful factors in resolving difficulties and promoting agreement.

The Four Powers should not and indeed cannot be irresponsible to the desires of the wider community of nations and equally of those nations who have made such significant contribution to victory.

Peacemakers may be blessed, but their way is hard. I think that whatever method had been adopted would have been open to criticism. The present procedure has certainly not passed unscathed, but whatever its defects it has in fact brought before the Conference definitive drafts which will serve to focus discussions and provide a basis for our work.

I have no doubt many will feel that the differences between the Four Powers have taken too long to resolve. But the main fact is that we have now found agreement on many important matters. This in itself is a matter for rejoicing and not an occasion for criticism. For, quite frankly, without such agreement, the chances of producing acceptable Peace Treaties would have been remote.

I think we sometimes tend to forget that, after such an unparalleled convulsion and a catastrophe as the last war, the nations who did the fighting (and that includes all those in this hall), are very tired indeed. They are greatly exercised by the domestic difficulties attending the aftermath of war; and for that reason we should all make quite exceptional efforts to see each other’s point of view. As the war recedes there also recedes the stimulus of the common danger which brought us together. The enemy is broken and humble. As States, Germany and Japan can hardly be said to count at present; but let us never forget that they are still there and that their capacity for making trouble, if there is any disunion in the Allied ranks is still very real. Let us not forget either that what brought us together was not so much the aggressor himself as the spirit behind the aggression. This spirit of militant totalitarian nationalism, the spirit that animated Hitler, Mussolini and the Japanese warlords, has not yet been altogether killed. It is a virus which still remains and the culture in which it will breed is famine, disease and social disruption. Only by a great co-operative effort can we destroy this virus; and the putting of our hands to just Peace Treaties, jointly agreed by the community of nations, is only a first step on a long road.

My friends: I would like to end on this note. One of the chief characteristics of the Hitler regime was that it rejected all standards of conduct other than that dictated by its rulers. The Nuremberg trials have shown to what depth a supposedly civilised people could sink when there was no objective standard of conduct.
We are discussing these treaties freely and openly in public with the world as our audience. We can feel here the force of world public opinion. Let us keep our ears open to it, for no nation, no ruler can afford to disregard it. It is, indeed, the essence of the democratic principles for which we stand, that Governments should be responsible to the will of the people.

We are delegates from our particular countries, but collectively we are responsible to all the peoples of the world who long for peace and security. We are trustees for the unborn children of the future in all countries.

I can never forget a cartoon depicting a statement of the Versailles Treaty saying at the conclusion “I seem to hear a child cry”. A baby labelled 1939 was in the background. The foreboding was justified. The child cried in the Second World War. Let it not cry again.

**Dr. Wang Shih-Chien:**

Mr. President and Gentlemen: The calling of this Peace Conference represents the first concrete step towards the liquidation of the war and the restoration of peace for which all mankind has been longing since the collapse of Germany and Japan. In the past few months, men everywhere have been looking for some sign that will give them relief from their anxiety about the future. Hopes have been alternating with doubts as to whether a peace conference would ever be held. The fact that the representatives of twenty-one nations are now sitting in this hall to discuss peace settlements is by itself affording some relief to the world. The choice of the Capital of France as the seat of this Conference is a happy one. Her traditional love of justice and liberty should not fail to be a source of inspiration to all the Delegations in the performance of their task. I wish to express the appreciation of the Chinese Delegation for the courtesies and facilities extended to us by the French Government.

The Chinese Delegation come to this conference with the earnest hope that it will succeed. China, as you all know, was the longest in the war; she was the first to take up arms to resist Axis aggression and among the very last to lay them down. Although she did not take a direct part in the military operations of the European theatre, she has had her full share in the global war. Her resistance for over eight long years, with loss of millions in lives, is no small sacrifice. Being convinced that peace, like war, is indivisible, she cannot but be concerned with the peace which the United Nations are making in any part of the world.

No doubt, the winning of the peace is no easier than the winning of the war. We all know that to impose terms on the vanquished is one thing, and to embody such terms in a treaty that will prove workable in the long run and make peace durable is entirely another. The
Chinese Delegation firmly believe that it will be most helpful if all suggestions and proposals, no matter by which Delegation they are presented should be heard and treated with such consideration as they merit. Moreover, we believe that complete frankness in our discussions and the consequent publicity given to them, will be most effective in promoting true understanding among nations.

As to the terms of peace, I have no intention at present to go into details. But I would like to lay stress on two points, because, in our view, they deserve particular attention if this and subsequent peace conferences are to succeed. The first one is that the victors must strictly abide by the pledges they have given and the principles they have proclaimed during the war. In dealing with conflicting territorial claims, for instance, we must not forget the words of the Atlantic Charter, or try to restrict their application. The other point is that the victors should not impose such terms as will only give a chance for the reactionary elements in the defeated countries to rise again, but deprive the democratic forces of any opportunity to survive or consolidate.

On the basis of the foregoing observations, I should like to make clear, briefly, the position of my Delegation on the draft treaties submitted for the consideration of this Conference:

1. Regarding the Military Clauses, I believe the drafts provide adequate safeguards for the United Nations and, at the same time, should not be considered as too severe by the defeated nations. Besides, in the case of Italy, the part she played in the final phase of the war has been given due recognition.

2. As to the Territorial, Political and Economic Clauses, I believe that the drafts deserve fuller discussion by this Conference, for the subject-matters dealt with therein will vitally affect the future stability of Europe. Reading the text of these draft treaties, one cannot deny that many of the agreements reached have been based on compromises. If we can find ways to improve upon some of these compromises—not in the narrow interest of any of the parties concerned but in the general interest of a just and lasting peace—much will be gained.

3. With regards to the question of the Italian Colonies, it must be admitted that the issue has been left unsolved. In the view of my Delegation, certain fundamental principles should be accepted by this Conference to guide us in finding an ultimate solution. One of those guiding principles, I submit, should be this:—Some of those Colonies should be either given immediate independence or, if that should not be feasible, be placed under the Trusteeship of the United Nations for a fixed period of time, during which preparations for self-government and independence should be completed. The effect of such a policy, Gentlemen, will not be confined to the peoples of the territories directly concerned, but will inspire hope and confidence in the hearts of millions of people elsewhere awaiting early and full realisation of their legitimate aspirations.
Gentlemen, differences of opinion there may be among us under this roof, but with the common people in all the countries we represent, there is certainly a unanimous desire that this conference should give them a real and durable peace. With them, there still seems to be a general apprehension that the Governments represented here may not co-operate as fully as they should in this historic task. In closing my remarks, may I express the hope that the Conference will, by its work, ultimately satisfy the general desire of the common people and remove their apprehension, so that the peace we are making will be a peace of the common people, and not merely a peace of government delegates as was the case with many of the peace settlements in the past.

Report of the Credentials Commission

The Chairman: I call upon Mr. Lorenzo Taezaz, a delegate of Ethiopia, to read the Report of the Credentials Commission.

Mr. Lorenzo Taezaz (Ethiopia): The Credentials Commission met on Tuesday, 30th July, at 3 p.m. The meeting was attended by:

Messrs. Lorenzo Taezaz (Ethiopia) Chairman, W. R. Hodgson (Australia), Kozma Kisselev (Byelorussia), H. Accioly (Brazil), Lone Liang (China), Star Busmann (Netherlands), and Karel Lisicky (Czechoslovakia).

The Commission found that all the credentials had been drawn up in good and due form and that only one country had been unable to communicate full powers, due to material difficulties which will be overcome by to-morrow.

The Commission decided that those credentials should be regarded as valid for all discussions of the Conference. Nevertheless, they will be more closely scrutinised later, before signing the final acts of the Conference and any recommendations which may be made by the various Commissions.

The Chairman: I should like to thank the Rapporteur for his report.

(The Report of the Credentials Commission was adopted).

Procedure

The Chairman: I would remind you that there will be a meeting of the Commission on Procedure at 10 o'clock to-morrow morning, to be followed by a plenary meeting of the Conference at 4 p.m. to continue the general discussion.

The following delegates will speak:

M. Molotov, on behalf of the U.S.S.R.;
Dr. Evatt, on behalf of Australia;
M. de Fontura, on behalf of Brazil;
M. Kisselev, on behalf of Byelorussia.

(The meeting rose at 6:05 p.m.)

257-451-70—6
Mr. Zilber is the second-ranking official of the Rumanian economic staff. He is a Communist. He called to discuss in general terms the economic provisions of the Rumanian Treaty.

Mr. Zilber asked for information on American claims against Rumania, with particular reference to provisions of Article 26 regarding Rumanian property in Allied countries. He was informed that the United States has until recently not solicited the filing of claims by American citizens and that we are not in a position to state at the present time how extensive these claims are. He was informed that they probably relate principally to American property in Rumania, although there might be some claims for personal injury suffered by American citizens.

Mr. Zilber thought that any claims of this character would not be likely to amount to more than $5,000,000, as compared to the total of Rumanian assets in the United States of about $20,000,000. He asked what would happen to Rumanian assets and was informed that any assets of Rumania after the satisfaction of American claims would be returned to Rumania. Mr. Zilber asked whether the assets taken for satisfaction of claims would be those of the Rumanian Government or Rumanian private individuals. He was informed that the United States Government would undoubtedly wish to obtain the views of the Rumanian Government regarding this subject and, in general, to work out the arrangements for the satisfaction of claims on some mutually agreeable basis within the framework of the Treaty to the greatest extent possible. It was explained to him that our principal interest is in obtaining satisfaction for the claims of private individuals, for settling the claims promptly and for obtaining some method of arbitration which would permit a fair and prompt resolution of the disputes.

Mr. Zilber indicated that this general approach was understood and appreciated by the Rumanian Government. He went on to say that the Rumanian Government considers the provisions of the American proposal regarding compensation for damage to Allied property as fair, with two exceptions. The first is that the Rumanian Government feels that any damage sustained by Allied nationals after the Rumanian armistice should be settled on the same basis as the war damage claims of Rumanian nationals. The second point relates to paragraph 4, D, of Article 24 of the Rumanian Treaty (U.S. pro-
posal). Mr. Zilber said that this provision, which defines the damages connected with the war for which compensation is to be made, goes much too far. He thought that it should include such matters as loss of profits and similar claims, some of which are included in the British annex on petroleum.

Mr. Zilber said that the Rumanian Government had in mind proposing a compromise between the United States and Soviet proposals which would adopt the United States proposal with the exception of the two points mentioned above. He asked whether the United States would give consideration to such a proposal. He was informed that, while we would of course give consideration to any proposal submitted to us, the draft provisions to which he had referred affected the interests of countries other than the United States and had been proposed in all of the treaties. They are not specifically directed at Rumania. He was informed that, in so far as his first point was concerned, the United States would find it difficult to make any distinction based upon the date of the armistice or which omitted damages which our property suffered under the armistice regime. With regard to the second point, he was told that, while subparagraph D of the American draft of Article 26, paragraph 4, is broadly phrased, we did not consider that it would place any unreasonable obligations on Rumania; in particular, we think it is entirely reasonable that injuries suffered by our property as a result of the action of the Rumanian Government should be compensated for and that the exact definition of what constitutes injury will necessarily have to be worked out in the application and interpretation of the Treaty provisions.

In the course of the discussion, reference was frequently made to the position of the oil companies. It was made clear to Mr. Zilber that the United States Government is not satisfied with the treatment which the Rumanian Government is according to the oil companies and that this matter would undoubtedly be taken into account in working out the disposition of Rumanian property in the United States. Mr. Zilber claimed that all measures which had been taken regarding the oil companies had been taken on a non-discriminatory basis as between foreign and domestic companies. He alleged that the American companies would have no further interest in Rumania and would not take any particular pains to maintain and develop their properties. He did not blame them for this, as he considered that the production of petroleum in Rumania is on the decline and has little future in the long run as compared with other areas.

There was a brief discussion of the question of the Rumanian bonded indebtedness in connection with Article 26 of the Treaty. Mr. Zilber was asked what the intentions of the Rumanian Govern-
ment are with respect to Rumanian bonded indebtedness. He said that the Rumanian Government would pay its obligations to American bond holders, if some arrangement could be worked out under which the obligations could be refunded. However, he said that the Rumanian Government would not wish to agree to any arrangements under which bonds held in other countries could be made eligible for such treatment. He was told that in so far as dollar bonds are concerned, any refunding arrangements would necessitate the taking of certain steps with the Securities and Exchange Commission and that it would be difficult to make any distinction in these arrangements on the basis of the nationality of the bond holder.
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The meeting was taken up with general discussion of the draft rules of procedure suggested to the Conference by the Council of Foreign Ministers.4 The Yugoslav Delegation announced its support of those suggestions but wished to amend them by adding a provision that in cases where recommendations dealt with boundary questions, such recommendations would require the assent of the Allied state, ethnic or national portions of which were affected. The Yugoslav Delegation also suggested that Albania be invited to take part in the Conference.

The Delegations of the Netherlands and Australia emphasized the role of the smaller powers in making peace and indicated their view that the proposed rules of procedure did not take full account of that role. They referred particularly to the provision that a two-thirds majority vote of the Conference was required for recommendations to the Council of Foreign Ministers. The two-thirds vote was supported by the Soviet and Yugoslav Delegations.

The Greek Delegation put forward an amendment according to which the Conference would consider, together with the draft treaties, any cognate question which it may by simple majority have decided to place on its agenda at the request of one or more delegations.

4 For text of C.F.M. (46)204 (2nd Revision), July 9, 1946, the Rules of Procedure suggested by the Council of Foreign Ministers, see vol. iv, p. 852. C.P. (Plen) Doc. 1, the Draft Rules of Procedure as submitted to the Conference by the Commission on Procedure on August 7, is printed in vol. iv, p. 796.