

with the Treaty of Rappallo) reviewed the history of the Julian March. He mentioned the danger of taking from Italy territories inhabited by Italians which had been gained through the sacrifices of the 1914-18 war and of creating a free territory which would be coveted by both sides. He pointed out that the Upper Isonzo Valley was economically and geographically linked to the Venetian Plain ; that it was necessary that Trieste should have communications with its hinter-land through both Italy and Yugoslavia ; that the French line separated Gorizia from its suburbs and water-supply. He asked for a new commission to revise this part of the frontier.

On the subject of the Free Territory of Trieste, he said that the French line had been based on the principle of "ethnic equilibrium"—*i.e.*, that equal numbers of each people should be under alien rule. It did not take into account the fact that the Free Territory would include 226,000 Italians as against 50,000 Slavs ; these figures should be added to the number of those under foreign rule. In order to restore the equilibrium it was essential to enlarge the Free Territory to include those parts of Istria lying to the west of the British line. He finished by protesting against the solution at present envisaged for the Italo-Yugoslav frontier, and appealed for justice as being the only basis for a durable peace.

The Yugoslav delegation were equally emphatic in their condemnation of the Italian case and of the proposals of the Council of Foreign Ministers, as embodied in Articles, 3, 4, and 16 of the treaty, attacking the French line on the grounds that it abandoned the principle of the ethnic line, that it prevented the national liberation and union of a considerable part of the Slovene people, that it deprived the Slovene people of the whole of their coast-line, and barred them from their outlet to the sea, and that it deprived the Slovene littoral of all urban centres. They rejected the theory of "ethnic equilibrium," which, in effect, meant placing equal numbers of Italians and Yugoslavs on each side of the frontier, and they stressed that this conception, the principle of "equality of injustice" rather than "minimum of injustice," was contrary to the decision of the Council of Foreign Ministers, because the adoption of the French line deprived Yugoslavia of important parts of her ethnical territory in order to compensate Italian settlements in the towns on the Yugoslav Adriatic coast and favoured the Italian urban population at the expense of the Slovene rural population.

The Yugoslavs claimed that their great sacrifices in the war merited the most favourable consideration of their claims.

In September, 1945, the Council of Foreign Ministers had appointed a body of experts to investigate the boundaries and to make recommendations covering both the frontiers and the settlement of Trieste. After months of study and discussion the experts had made the considerable advance of agreeing upon the facts, but found themselves unable to agree upon any recommendations, and each of the four put