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NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL.

The Annual Report on the Work of the League will, as in previous years, be issued in two parts.

Part I gives an account of the work of the League from the ordinary session of the Assembly held in September 1937 up to the end of June 1938.

Part II, to be issued in September 1938, will contain an account of the work of the League from the end of June 1938 up to the nineteenth session of the Assembly.
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1. POLITICAL QUESTIONS.

I. APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF THE COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Third Session of the Special Committee set up to study the Application of the Principles of the Covenant.

The Committee set up by the Assembly resolution of October 10th, 1936, to study the application of the principles of the Covenant held its third session from January 31st to February 2nd, 1938. It was devoted to a preliminary examination of the report of Lord Cranborne, delegate of the United Kingdom, on the question of the participation of all States in the League of Nations.

In this informative report, Lord Cranborne described the various aspects of the problem of the "universality" of the League. He studied, amongst others, the following questions: To what extent is the absence of universal membership due to the nature of the present provisions of the Covenant? Could universal membership be achieved, or at least materially facilitated, by an alteration of those provisions? Is the importance of achieving universal membership such as to warrant the steps, and it may be the sacrifices, which might be found the indispensable conditions of securing it?

At the outset of his report, Lord Cranborne remarked that there were three principal ways of conceiving of a League of Nations.

---

1 Reproduced as an annex to the Committee's report (document A.7.1938.VII, pages 41 et seq.).
In the first place, there was the League which was organised, not only for the promotion of peace, but also for its actual enforcement, owing to the existence of provisions whereby, in certain events, its Members would be obliged to impose so-called sanctions — economic, military or both. This type of League might be called a "coercive" League.

At the other end of the scale was a League which would involve no obligation to impose sanctions of any kind or in any circumstances, and in which the only duty resting on its Members, in the event of a crisis, would be to consult with one another. This type of League would, of course, provide machinery for the pacific settlement of international disputes, but in the event of such procedures being exhausted without result, or of an act of aggression being committed by a Member without recourse to them, there would be no actual obligation upon other Members to do more than enter into consultation in regard to the situation.

A third type of League might be envisaged, having an "intermediate" character. The Members of the League, while not actually obliged to do more than consult, might have the faculty of using coercion in certain circumstances. Machinery might be provided for regulating the use of coercion on the part of those of its Members who, in a given case, decided to employ it. No Member which had violated the Covenant could, as a matter of juridical right, complain of the use of force against it by other Members, or require of these the observance of the rules of neutrality.

The preliminary discussion on Lord Cranborne’s report, which bore more particularly upon this conception of three possible types of League of Nations, and, in consequence, upon Article 16 of the Covenant, gave the members of the Committee an opportunity of making declarations on the future orientation of the League and on the interpretation and present operation of the Covenant.

As a result of this discussion,¹ which occupied the meetings of January 31st and February 1st, 1938, the Committee

---

¹ This important discussion does not lend itself to a summary within the framework of this annual report. The text of the debate will be found in document A.7.1938.VII, pages 7-40. An account of it is given in the Monthly Summary of the work of the League of Nations for February 1938, pages 35-41.
decided to submit to the Assembly a report on the progress of its work. It attached to that report the Minutes of the third session and the informative reports which it had asked certain of its members to prepare. It drew the most serious attention of the Members of the League to these various documents.

**Question of the Consultation of Non-member States.**

In its resolution of October 4th, 1937, the Assembly had requested the Council to examine the conditions in which the observations and suggestions which the non-member States and the States that had announced their withdrawal from the League might think fit to make in order to assist the Special Committee in its study should be obtained as and when opportunity offered.

The Council began the examination of this question at its meeting of January 29th, 1938.¹ The Chilean delegation, which had put forward the proposal to consult the non-member States, had asked to be invited to the Council meeting. It was represented by M. Valdés-Mendeville. The third session of the Special Committee set up to study the application of the principles of the Covenant being about to begin, the question, on the proposal of the Peruvian representative, was postponed to the Council's ordinary session in May.

At that session, Chile was represented by M. Edwards, who, on May 11th,² stated his Government's views. He intimated that, as a result of the decision taken by the Special Committee on February 2nd to adjourn *sine die* the study of the reform of the Covenant, a decision which would no doubt be ratified by the Assembly, Chile would now hold aloof from the question of the consultation of the non-member States. He outlined his Government's reasons for considering that the Covenant should be divested of all elements of coercion, and expressed the opinion that the Council ought to decide whether or not to take the drastic steps which in present circumstances appeared to be necessary.

At the meeting of May 14th,³ the President spoke on behalf of the Council. The latter felt bound to point out

¹ See *Official Journal*, February 1938, pages 112, 113 and 114.
that, the Assembly being seized of the question raised by
the Chilian representative, it was not possible to discuss its
substance. The question of the application of the principles
of the Covenant was on the agenda of the Assembly, which
would have before it the report of the Special Committee it
had set up. It appeared to be of the utmost importance that
the delegations to the Assembly should be furnished with the
requisite instructions in this connection, and steps would be
taken to communicate to the Members of the League the decla-
rations made to the Council by the representative of Chile.

The representative of Chile, after thanking the Council for
the efforts that had been made to meet the views he had put
forward, regretted that the Council, on the ground that the
Assembly was seized of the problem, refused to study or to
arrange for the study of the reforms which, in Chile's opinion,
were necessary.

M. Edwards regretted to have to announce, on behalf of
his Government, that Chile had decided to withdraw from the
League of Nations, and that notice in the regular form would
be given in due course.\(^1\) This withdrawal would in no way
change the guiding rules of Chile's international policy. Chile
was further prepared to continue her active co-operation with
the Permanent Court of International Justice, with the Inter-
national Labour Office and with the technical organisations
of the League. She hoped that the Covenant would be reformed
and adapted to the realities of international life before the
expiry of the two-year period required for her effective with-
drawal. Nothing would give her greater satisfaction than to
be able to remain a Member of the League of Nations.

M. Comnène, representative of Roumania, said that, in the
legitimate desire to make the League universal, the Covenant
should not be emptied of its substance; for law which was not
backed by force was a metaphysical conception, worthy of
respect indeed, but vain, and even liable to give rise to dangerous
illusions.

\(^1\) See page 174.
After stating that Roumania could not agree to any reform which would in any way affect the principle of the equality of States, he expressed the hope that circumstances would yet enable Chile to continue to co-operate with the League of Nations.

The same hope was expressed by the representatives of Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia.

II. THE NEUTRALITY OF SWITZERLAND AND THE SANCTIONS PROVIDED FOR IN THE COVENANT.

By communications dated April 20th and 29th, 1938, the Swiss Federal Council referred to the Council of the League of Nations the question of Switzerland's neutrality within the framework of the League of Nations. In a memorandum attached to the second of these communications, the Federal Council expressed the view that the distinction between military and economic sanctions drawn in the Declaration of London of February 13th, 1920, no longer corresponded to the present situation as far as Switzerland was concerned.

By a resolution dated May 14th, 1938, the Council of the League of Nations acceded to the request of the Swiss Federal Council. In this resolution, after considering the special position of Switzerland resulting from her perpetual neutrality, which is based on age-long tradition and recognised by international law, the Council recalls that, by its Declaration made in London on February 13th, 1920, it considered that the perpetual neutrality of Switzerland is justified by the interests of general peace, and as such is compatible with the Covenant.

It then notes that Switzerland, invoking her perpetual neutrality, has expressed the intention not to participate any longer in any manner in the putting into operation of the provisions of the Covenant relating to sanctions, and it declares that she will not be invited to do so.

It next places on record that the Swiss Government declares its determination to maintain unaltered in all other respects

---

Switzerland's position as a Member of the League, and to continue to give the facilities which have been accorded to the League for the free exercise by its institutions of their activities in Swiss territory.

The report of the Swedish representative, who submitted the resolution, was approved by the Council. This report recalls the legal foundations of Swiss neutrality. It states that Switzerland will not participate in any measures of the kind contemplated in Article 16, whether such measures are adopted in application of Article 16 or in application of some other article of the Covenant. It adds that the Council notes the assurances given that Switzerland is prepared to defend her territory under all circumstances, and that Switzerland's position as a Member of the League will remain unaltered except as regards sanctions. Lastly, the report states that the action taken on the Swiss Government's request in no way affects the position assumed by the other Members of the League of Nations towards Article 16 of the Covenant.

As regards the question of the Council's competence to deal with Switzerland's request, which had been raised by a Member of the Council, the report states that this is not a question which falls within the exclusive competence of the Council or the Assembly, and that both organs of the League are accordingly competent in the matter.

M. Motta (Switzerland) said that he unreservedly accepted the resolution submitted by the Rapporteur, and expressed his gratitude to the Council. Switzerland would regard this resolution as a further element binding her to the League of Nations. She would always be ready to defend her soil and the air above it by every means in her power in the general interests of all States, and more particularly in those of her neighbours.

M. Bonnet (France) said that it was in consideration of the special nature of Switzerland's position that the report concluded that the Federal Council's request should be met. A State could not of its own initiative withdraw from obligations imposed on it by membership of the League. In bringing such a matter before the Council, the country recognised that body's authority. He added that the Council's decision could not in
any way affect the attitude adopted by other Members of the League with regard to the application of Article 16.

Lord Halifax (United Kingdom) referred to the unique situation of Switzerland, and to the value of Swiss neutrality to Europe. He noted with satisfaction the assurance that Switzerland would continue to accord to the organs of the League all the freedom required for the exercise of their activities.

M. Comnène (Roumania) referred to the passage of the Swiss memorandum concerning the non-realisation of the collective guarantee of security which formed the counterpart of the international obligations entered into when the League was founded. He did not, however, press this point, because the Council had to consider the exceptional character of Swiss neutrality. This neutrality had been recognised by Article 435 of the Treaty of Versailles — i.e., by the very instrument by which the League was called into being. There could therefore be no objection to the resumption by Switzerland of complete neutrality.

He remarked that M. Sandler’s report ruled out any possibility of the unique case of Switzerland being taken as a precedent by other States, and that recognition of complete neutrality was inconceivable in the case of any other Member, and would indeed be outside the competence of both the Council and the Assembly.

M. Litvinoff (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the doubts he had expressed regarding the Council’s competence, said that he had had in mind not so much its legal as its political competence.

Between the resolution of 1920 and that which the Council was now going to adopt, there was in his opinion a difference not of quantity but of quality, since, unlike economic sanctions, military sanctions were not obligatory. In view of the gravity of the question, which affected the rights and duties of all League Members, it ought to have been referred to the Assembly.

As regards the substance of the question, it seemed to him that participation in economic and financial sanctions could not be considered as a violation of neutrality. Such, at any rate, had been the view taken in 1920. Since then, nothing
had occurred to justify a change. The League of Nations was
not more universal in 1920 than at present.

Switzerland's release from her obligations in regard to
sanctions should, in M. Litvinoff's opinion, be counterbalanced
by the release of the other Members of the League from their
obligations in respect of Switzerland. The reciprocity of obli-
gations was a consequence of the equality of the Members of
the League of Nations.

Nevertheless, the representative of the Union of Soviet
Socialist Republics would have been prepared to make an excep-
tion in favour of Switzerland if he had not feared that this
exception would open a breach through which similar demands
on the part of other States might pass. The latter, in virtue
of the precedent established to-day, might make a unilateral
declaration, and merely ask the Council to take note of it.

M. Litvinoff added that, recognising the necessity of the
League as an instrument for the preservation of peace, he refused
to share responsibility for decisions dangerous to the League.
For this reason, neither his conscience nor his Governemnt's
instructions permitted him to accept the report, and he would
refrain from voting thereon.

M. Komarnicki (Poland) paid a tribute to Switzerland, and
observed that the report safeguarded the attitude adopted by
the different States with regard to Article 16.

Mr. Jordan (New Zealand) took the opportunity of asking
the Swiss representative for an assurance that there would be
absolute freedom for representatives of the foreign Press to
transmit all accounts of proceedings and comments they might
think fit.

M. Costa du Rels (Bolivia) said that Switzerland's case could
not constitute a precedent, and that the Members of the League
of Nations were not entitled to divest themselves of their obli-
gations by a unilateral statement.

M. Wellington Koo (China) said that the Swiss request
could not constitute a precedent, that sanctions other than
military sanctions had a compulsory character, and that only
a collective act could release the Members of the League from the obligation to apply such sanctions.

So as not to encourage the tendency of certain States to abandon their obligations by a declaration of their intention, he would refrain from voting, although he approved Switzerland's request.

M. van Langenhove (Belgium) observed that the resolution expressed no view as to the scope of Article 16, and did not in any way affect the position taken up by Governments in relation thereto.

M. Bahramy (Iran) accepted the resolution in its entirety.

M. Motta (Switzerland) gave the New Zealand representative the desired assurance.

M. Sandler (Sweden) said that, as Rapporteur, he had endeavoured to take into account the diversity of the opinions expressed. The question of the reciprocity of the obligations of the Covenant went to the very roots of the League, and he had given very careful consideration to the question.

On the resolution being put to the vote, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and China abstained.

III. APPEAL BY THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT.

The appeal addressed to the League of Nations by the Chinese Government under Articles 10, 11 and 17 of the Covenant continued, at that Government's request, to appear on the Council's agenda.


During the Council's hundredth session (January 26th to February 2nd, 1938), the Chinese representative had conversations with the representatives of other Members of the Council specially interested in the situation in the Far East.

---

1 This appeal was the subject of two Assembly resolutions dated September 28th and October 6th, 1937, respectively. See resolutions adopted by the Assembly, Official Journal, Special Supplement No. 168, page 34.
As a result of these exchanges of views, the following draft resolution was examined by the Council on February 1st and 2nd, 1938:

"The Council,

"Having taken into consideration the situation in the Far East:

"Notes with regret that hostilities in China continue and have been intensified since the last meeting of the Council;

"Deplores this deterioration in the situation the more in view of the efforts and achievements of the National Government of China in her political and economic reconstruction;

"Recalls that the Assembly, by its resolution of October 6th, 1937, has expressed its moral support for China and has recommended that Members of the League should refrain from taking any action which might have the effect of weakening China's powers of resistance and thus of increasing her difficulties in the present conflict, and should also consider how far they can individually extend aid to China;

"Calls the most serious attention of the Members of the League to the terms of the above-mentioned resolution;

"Is confident that those States represented on the Council for whom the situation is of special interest will lose no opportunity of examining, in consultation with other similarly interested Powers, the feasibility of any further steps which may contribute to a just settlement of the conflict in the Far East."

Before a vote was taken on this draft resolution, the Chinese representative gave the Council an account of the principal events which had occurred since the Assembly's adjournment at the beginning of October 1937: continuation by Japan of her invasion of Chinese territory; bombardment by Japanese aircraft of open towns in seventeen Chinese provinces; efforts by the Japanese authorities to establish local regimes of their own choice in the territory occupied by them; declaration (January 16th, 1938) by the Tokio Government that it would henceforth cease relations with the National Government of China; continuation by the Chinese Government of its policy of legitimate defence. In conclusion, the Chinese representative

1 The full text will be found in the Minutes of the hundredth session of the Council, Official Journal, February 1938, pages 120 to 123.
emphasised that the Far-Eastern conflict was of world-wide importance. In his opinion, as long as the Japanese aggression in China was permitted to rage unrestrained, so long would the peace of Europe remain precarious and a general European settlement difficult of realisation.

After the representatives of Ecuador, Poland, Peru, the United Kingdom, France and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had stated their views on the draft resolution, the Chinese representative, while regarding the text submitted as inadequate, stated that he accepted it. He nevertheless reserved his Government's right to ask the League to adopt positive measures under the Covenant, and recalled the fact that the Council remained seized of the Chinese Government's appeal invoking Articles 10, 11 and 17 of the Covenant.

On being put to the vote, the draft resolution was approved by the Council with two abstentions — those of the delegates of Peru and Poland.

Council Resolution of May 14th, 1938.

On May 5th, in a communication to the Secretary-General, the Chinese Government enumerated a series of facts relating in particular to the "indiscriminate bombing and killing of Chinese non-combatants" committed by the Japanese forces from October 28th, 1937, to April 29th, 1938. On May 9th, in a second communication, it stated that on the Shantung front the Japanese forces had recently employed poison gases on a number of occasions and that, according to reports received by it, those forces were intensifying their preparations for the use of such gases on a large scale.

At the Council meeting on May 10th, the Chinese representative, M. Wellington Koo, after recalling the resolutions adopted by the Assembly on October 6th, 1937, and by the Council on February 2nd, 1938, stated that these texts had practically
remained unexecuted because the League Members, with one exception, had done little or nothing to aid China. The latter had had to cope with unexpected difficulties in obtaining supplies of arms and war material as well as facilities for transit.

After recalling that the Japanese army had just suffered at Taierchwang the first major defeat in its history, he said that the military commanders were on the point of using poison gas on a large scale on the Shantung front. He accordingly asked that steps be taken immediately with a view to forestalling the perpetration of a heinous crime.

The Sino-Japanese conflict constituted a simple case of pure aggression by Japan against China. That Japan was not a member of the League of Nations was no reason for refraining from making a serious effort to deal with her aggression. The Covenant expressly provided in Article 17 the procedure to be followed in such cases. China expected to receive material aid and effective co-operation from the other Members of the League. The defeat of the Japanese forces was in the general interest of humanity. China was fighting for others as well as for herself, and the task of European appeasement would be greatly facilitated by her victory. In conclusion, he asked the Council to apply the provisions of the Covenant and to implement the resolutions of the Assembly and the Council by concrete measures.

After this speech the Members of the Council proceeded to an exchange of views on the situation in the Far East. Under the chairmanship of the President of the Council, a Committee consisting of the representatives of the United Kingdom, China, France, Roumania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics drew up the following draft resolution, which was submitted to the Council on May 14th:

"The Council,

"Having heard the statement by the representative of China on the situation in the Far East and on the needs of the national defence of China:

"I.

"Earnestly urges Members of the League to do their utmost to give effect to the recommendations contained in previous resolutions of the Assembly and Council in this matter, and to take into serious and sympathetic consideration requests they may receive from the Chinese Government in conformity with the said resolutions;
"Expresses its sympathy with China in her heroic struggle for the maintenance of her independence and territorial integrity, threatened by the Japanese invasion, and in the suffering which is thereby inflicted on her people.

"II.

"Recalls that the use of toxic gases is a method of war condemned by international law, which cannot fail, should resort be had to it, to meet with the reprobation of the civilised world; and requests the Governments of States who may be in a position to do so to communicate to the League any information that they may obtain on the subject."

The Chinese representative, M. Wellington Koo, after defining his attitude to the draft resolution, which he was prepared to accept, added that it was understood that the Council remained seized of the Chinese Government's appeal under Articles 10, 11 and 17 of the Covenant. The representatives of France, the United Kingdom, Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics also stated their views on the draft resolution. The latter was adopted, Poland abstaining as regards the first part of the resolution.

IV. APPEAL BY THE SPANISH GOVERNMENT.

It will be remembered that, at the close of its examination of the situation in Spain and connected questions, the eighteenth Assembly had to take a decision on a draft resolution which had been submitted to it by the Sixth Committee. On being

2 This draft resolution was as follows:

"The Assembly:

"(1) Associates itself with the Council in recalling that it is the duty of every State to respect the territorial integrity and political independence of other States — a duty which, for Members of the League of Nations, has been recognised by the Covenant;

"(2) Affirms that every State is under an obligation to refrain from intervening in the internal affairs of another State;

"(3) Recalls the special undertakings entered into by the European Governments, and the London Non-intervention Committee which, in the intention of the countries to whose initiative it owes its origin, was set up for the purpose of restricting the Spanish conflict and thereby safeguarding peace in the rest of the world;

"(4) Regrets that not merely has the London Non-intervention Committee failed, despite the efforts of the majority of its Members, of which the Assembly
put to the vote, the draft resolution was not adopted unanimously, so that it did not become a valid resolution of the Assembly.

In a communication from Barcelona, dated April 19th, 1938, the Spanish Government asked the Council to examine afresh the situation created by foreign intervention in Spain.

At the Council meeting on May 11th (one-hundred-and-first session), the Spanish representative, M. Alvarez del Vayo, explained the Spanish Government's new appeal by the intensification of foreign intervention on behalf of the rebels, and the representatives of the United Kingdom, France, New Zealand, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Poland and Roumania defined their attitude to non-intervention in Spain. On May 13th, after a further speech by M. del Vayo, the following draft resolution was submitted by him to the Council:

"The Council,

"After having heard the statements submitted to it:

"(a) Recalling its resolution of May 29th, 1937; 5

expresses its appreciation, to secure the withdrawal of non-Spanish combatants taking part in the struggle in Spain, but that it must to-day be recognised that there are veritable foreign army corps on Spanish soil, which represents foreign intervention in Spanish affairs;

"(b) Observes that the Council in its resolution of May 29th last justly described this withdrawal as ' the most effective remedy for a situation, the great gravity of which, from the standpoint of the general peace, it feels bound to emphasise, and the most certain means of ensuring the full application of the policy of non-intervention ';

"(c) Sincerely trusts that the diplomatic action recently initiated by certain Powers will be successful in securing the immediate and complete withdrawal of the non-Spanish combatants taking part in the struggle in Spain;

"(d) Appeals to the Governments, which must all be animated by the desire to see peace maintained in Europe, to undertake a new and earnest effort in this direction;

"(e) And notes that, if such a result cannot be obtained in the near future, the Members of the League which are parties to the non-intervention agreement will consider ending the policy of non-intervention;

"(f) Requests the Council, in view of the provisions of Article 11 of the Covenant of the League, to follow attentively the development of the situation in Spain and to seize any opportunity that may arise for seeking a basis for a pacific solution of the conflict."

---

1 Number of voters: 48
Abstentions: 14
For the resolution: 32
Against: 2


3 A full record of this meeting will be found in the Official Journal, May-June 1938, pages 325 to 332.

4 Ibid., page 356.

"(b) Recalling that the Sixth Committee of the eighteenth session of the Assembly submitted to the Assembly a draft resolution containing, notably, the following provisions :

"‘The Assembly . . . "

"‘(6) Sincerely trusts that the diplomatic action recently initiated by certain Powers will be successful in securing the immediate and complete withdrawal of the non-Spanish combatants taking part in the struggle in Spain;

"‘(7) Appeals to the Governments, which must all be animated by the desire to see peace maintained in Europe, to undertake a new and earnest effort in this direction;

"‘And notes that, if such a result cannot be obtained in the near future, the Members of the League which are parties to the Non-intervention Agreement will consider ending the policy of non-intervention’;

"(c) Recalling that this draft resolution, although it did not succeed in receiving the unanimous vote of the Assembly, was voted by thirty-two States, including all the Members of the Council with the exception of Bolivia and Peru, which were among the countries that abstained from voting;

"(d) Observing that the hypothesis envisaged in this draft resolution has been wholly realised, since neither the diplomatic initiative announced in September 1937, nor any other subsequent initiative, has led to the departure from Spanish territory of a single non-Spanish combatant;

"(e) Observing that the favourable vote of the Governments which voted this draft resolution can only be interpreted as the expression of an opinion in favour of envisaging the end of non-intervention if the non-Spanish combatants have not left Spanish territory ‘in the near future’;

"(f) Trusting that these Governments did not consider that the expression ‘in the near future’ could be applied to the period of seven months which has elapsed since the draft resolution was submitted to the Assembly;

"(g) Observing that it is a measure which can be adopted individually by each country without necessity for concerted action;

"(h) Observing that, in a similar situation, the strict application of rights under international law has not resulted in a general conflagration;

"Invites the Member States of the League who voted in favour of the draft resolution on the Spanish situation, presented to the Assembly by the Sixth Committee on October 2nd, 1937, to envisage, as from the present moment, the end of the policy of non-intervention."

The United Kingdom representative, Lord Halifax, thought that the draft resolution was in direct contradiction to the United Kingdom Government's policy, which had been inspired only by the desire to serve the best interests of the Spanish people and to secure the maintenance of European peace.

The French representative, M. Georges Bonnet, expressed once again the French Government's sympathy with Spanish democracy. That Government had applied the policy of non-intervention for nearly two years in the desire that the Spanish people should settle its destiny for itself. The Spanish representative knew in what spirit France had applied this policy, which the French Government would continue to follow.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, M. Litvinoff, said that it was not his Government which would be an obstacle to giving justice now to the Spanish Government's demand.

A vote on the draft resolution was then taken by roll-call.

The representatives of Spain and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics voted for the draft resolution.

The representatives of the United Kingdom, France, Poland and Roumania voted against.

The representatives of Belgium, Bolivia, China, Ecuador, Iran, Latvia, New Zealand, Peru and Sweden abstained from voting.

The required unanimity not having been obtained, the draft resolution was not adopted.¹

¹ After the vote, the representative of Ecuador, M. Quevedo, recalled that his Government had always supported in America the policy of non-intervention in the internal conflicts of other States. But his country was not a member of the European Non-intervention Committee and it was not bound by any of that body's decisions. He had had to abstain from voting as his Government did not feel justified in asking a body of European States to modify their policy.

M. Wellington Koo, representative of China, said he had had to abstain because he had not had time to consult his Government. He had acceded to the desire expressed by a number of Members of the Council to proceed to the vote immediately and had refrained from asking for an extension of time in view of the difficulty of knowing his Government's views.

M. Jordan, representative of New Zealand, said that, to a great extent, non-intervention was disregarded, but that it was rather a dangerous thing to pass a resolution that non-intervention should be ended. His Government, which he had of course not had time to consult, would probably have preferred a resolution to the effect that the League would enforce non-intervention.
V. Consequences Arising out of the Present Situation in Ethiopia.

Following upon the letter of April 9th, 1938,\(^1\) in which the United Kingdom Government asked that the question of the "consequences arising out of the existing situation in Ethiopia" should be placed on the Council's agenda, the Emperor Haile Selassie I, in a communication to the Secretary-General dated May 6th, announced that he was appointing Ato L. Taezaz, assisted by various technical advisers, to represent Ethiopia at the Council table.

On May 10th, M. Taezaz forwarded to the Secretary-General a documentary statement on the existing situation in Ethiopia.\(^2\) According to this statement, in three-quarters of Ethiopia the Italian authorities had no military control beyond an area varying from ten to thirty miles radius around the larger towns, while the Ethiopian civil and military administration was maintained in a large part of the territory.

On May 12th, at the opening of the Council meeting (one-hundred-and-first session), the President, M. Munters, representative of Latvia, stated that it was the desire of the Council to admit the representatives of the Emperor Haile Selassie I to participate in its discussions on this question without prejudice to questions of principle and irrespective of the precise character of their full powers. Having been informed that the Emperor had expressed the wish to participate in the discussions himself, the President invited him, in accordance with the Council's wishes, to come to the Council table.

The United Kingdom representative, Lord Halifax, recalled that, in its communication of April 9th, His Majesty's Government had drawn attention to the anomalous situation arising from the fact that certain Members of the League recognised that the Italian Government exercised sovereignty over Ethiopia, or had taken action that might be held to imply such recognition, while other States Members of the League had not done

---

\(^1\) See *Official Journal*, May-June 1938, page 535.

so. His Majesty's Government had desired to take an opportunity for consultation between Members of the League before it took a decision on the question as an individual Member.

While no express obligation had been assumed by Members of the League with regard to such a consultation, yet in view of the "common action" of the Members of the League in the dispute between Italy and Ethiopia, the recognition of Italy's position in the latter country was a matter of concern to all the Members. His Majesty's Government did not wish to make any criticism of those Members of the League which had already recognised Italy's sovereignty over Ethiopia. It was open to those States to regard the Assembly resolution of July 4th, 1936, as closing the question in so far as they were concerned, and His Majesty's Government did not think that the various steps which the League had taken in the course of the Italo-Ethiopian dispute could be held to constitute any binding obligation upon Member States to withhold recognition until a unanimous decision had been taken. His Majesty's Government held the view that Members of the League might without disloyalty take such action at such time as might seem to them appropriate.

Moreover, His Majesty's Government did not wish to suggest that the Council or any Member of the League should condone the action by which the Italian Government had acquired its present position in Ethiopia. Nor did it propose that any organ of the League should modify the resolutions and decisions which it had taken during the dispute. On this issue, it had declared its judgment in plain terms and could not go back upon it. It considered, however, that the question of the recognition of Italy's position in Ethiopia was one which every Member of the League must be held entitled to decide for itself in the light of its own situation and obligations. This would not impose any obligation upon Member States to take steps in the direction of recognition. The action of His Majesty's Government itself would be dependent upon the progress made in the solution of another difficult question, and the acceptance of the opinion held by His Majesty's Government would in fact merely confirm the correctness of the attitude taken by a number of States that, with the adoption of the Assembly's resolution of July 4th, 1936, their collective obligations were discharged.
His Majesty’s Government had no desire to embark on a discussion of legal points, but attached predominant importance to the political aspect of the problem. Since July 4th, 1936, the de facto situation with which Members of the League were confronted had become more definitive and more stable. According to his Government’s information, the Italian Government had obtained control of virtually all the former territory of Ethiopia. While resistance was still continuing in certain parts of the country, there was no organised native authority and no central native administration with the slightest prospect of reconquering the country. The only means by which the situation could be modified would be by going to war, which had already been excluded by implication by the resolution of July 4th, 1936.

The United Kingdom representative respected, but could not share, the view of those who felt that any action designed to facilitate recognition impinged on principle. Those who sought to establish a better world upon the basis of universal acknowledgment of League principles were clearly right to feel reluctance to countenance action by which these might appear to be infringed. But, whereas here two ideals were in conflict — on the one hand, the ideal of devotion, unflinching but unpractical, to some high purpose; on the other, the ideal of a practical victory for peace — the stronger claim was that of peace.

In an imperfect world, the indefinite maintenance of an international principle evolved without regard to the circumstances in which it had to be applied might have the effect merely of increasing international discord. For practical purposes, Italy controlled virtually the whole of Ethiopia, and sooner or later, unless they were prepared by force to alter it, or unless for ever they were to live in an unreal world, that fact would have to be accepted. If this was so, the question to be settled, and particularly that of the time of recognition, was one of political judgment.

His Majesty’s Government did not abandon in any respect the principles of the Covenant or its determination to do its utmost to secure that disputes arising between nations should be resolved by peaceful methods and not by force. But no cause was served by vain lamentations over the past. Great as was the League of Nations, the ends that it existed to serve were
greater than itself, and the greatest of those ends was peace. The world to-day was troubled and disturbed, and it was vital to bend all the energy they possessed to protect the world from a return of the dread scourge of war. His Majesty’s Government believed that these great issues might be affected by the treatment of the subject which was at present before the Council. It therefore hoped that the Members of the League would share its opinion that the question of the recognition of Italy’s position in Ethiopia was one for each Member of the League to decide for itself in the light of its own situation and its own obligations.

The Emperor Haile Selassie said that, in spite of the state of his health, he had decided to come himself to the Council to defend the cause of his people. At his request, the Council authorised the Emperor to ask M. Taezaz to read a statement. This statement pointed out that, since 1935, Ethiopia had observed how various signatures affixed to the Covenant had been successively disclaimed. A number of Powers, themselves threatened by aggression and realising their own weakness, had abandoned Ethiopia; they had thus surrendered the very principles on which their existence and independence were based — treaties of non-aggression, the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Pact of Paris. But, as a consequence, aggressions had multiplied and fear dominated the world.

The attitude of the powerful States which had unceasingly proclaimed their fidelity to the Covenant had been disappointing. The real purpose of the United Kingdom Government in raising before the Council the vague question of the “consequences arising out of the existing situation in Ethiopia” had been to ensure the execution of an annex to the Anglo-Italian Agreement of April 16th, in which the British Ambassador at Rome informed the Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs that his Government intended to take steps at the forthcoming meeting of the Council for the purpose of clarifying the situation of Member States as regards recognition of Italian sovereignty.

By that agreement the United Kingdom Government had given Italy, subject to certain conditions, an undertaking to recognise the Italian Government as de jure sovereign of Ethiopia. The United Kingdom Government asked the Council to set
aside the rule laid down by the Assembly on March 11th, 1932, and confirmed on July 4th, 1936, declaring that it was incumbent upon the Members of the League not to recognise any situation which might be brought about by means contrary to the Covenant of the League of Nations or to the Pact of Paris. Yet non-recognition of a conquest by aggression was the least onerous way of observing Article 10 of the Covenant. The Emperor was not unmindful of the gratitude which he owed to the Governments of the United Kingdom and France, but he was bound to protest against a request under which the Members of the League were recommended to associate themselves with a measure calculated to weaken the Ethiopian people’s power of resistance.

Even were it true, which it was not, that the invader had broken the Ethiopian people’s resistance, the proposal before the Council should be rejected in order that Ethiopia should remain in the midst of the League as the living symbol of violated right. But, actually, the Italian Government exercised no control over the greater part of Ethiopian territory, or even in Tigre, which was the province nearest to Eritrea. In several provinces there was not, or there was no longer, the slightest Italian control. The Italian Government itself had had to admit that the annual cost of occupation amounted to thousands of millions of lire, despite which it had proved impossible to develop Ethiopian territory. To overcome the Ethiopian people’s resistance, the Italian Government was endeavouring to obtain recognition of its conquest, which it would represent to the Ethiopian peoples as a condemnation of Ethiopia by the League of Nations. Meanwhile the war continued in Ethiopia. International law absolutely prohibited a belligerent from making any annexation, and forbade any Power not party to the conflict to recognise the occupying Power as the de jure sovereign.

To justify its action, the United Kingdom Government claimed that the promotion of general appeasement was at stake. But was it compatible with the spirit of the Covenant to sacrifice a State Member of the League for the tranquillity of other Powers?

---

1 On May 12th, the Emperor Haile Selassie communicated to the Council a number of declarations made by Ethiopian chiefs asking for the assistance of the League of Nations and of the United Kingdom Government. See Official Journal, May-June 1938, page 543.
Furthermore, the question raised by the United Kingdom Government could not be settled by the Council, and only the Assembly was competent. The Emperor therefore asked that the question be referred to the Assembly. It was true that the essential object of the League of Nations, as Lord Halifax had proclaimed, was to maintain peace, but there were two ways of achieving this purpose: through right, or through the principle of peace at any price. The League of Nations had no freedom of choice. Created to maintain peace through right, it could not desert that principle. The Italian aggression had ruined all the efforts made to lead the Ethiopian people along the path of progress and Western civilisation. The Emperor was prepared, now as before, to discuss any proposal for a solution which, even at the cost of sacrifices, would guarantee his people the free development of their civilisation and independence. But he asked the League of Nations to refuse to encourage the Italian aggressor by the sacrifice of his victim.

After the Members of the Council had each stated his Government's attitude to the United Kingdom's proposal, the President, M. Munters, said that without attempting to sum up the entire discussion, he would try to bring out the essential points.

The Council had not been asked to pronounce on questions of principle, nor to retract its past judgments or those of the Assembly in regard to the Italo-Ethiopian conflict. Nor had it been asked to lay down any line of conduct with a suggestion that that line should be followed by its Members or by other Members of the League. The Members of the Council had been asked whether they shared the opinion that the question of the recognition of Italy's position in Ethiopia was one for each Member of the League to decide for itself in the light of its own situation and its own obligations. The Council had not been invited to take any formal decision in this respect; it followed that no formal question of competence arose. Reference had been made to the possibility that the Assembly might be called upon to consider the question, and the Council's discussions did not prejudge the Assembly's freedom of action.

---

1 The full text of these statements will be found in the Official Journal, May-June 1938, pages 333 to 346.
Contradictory accounts had been laid before them concerning the actual situation in Ethiopia at the present time. They were, unfortunately, not in a position to ascertain the facts by the normal League methods of enquiry. Members of the League must draw their own conclusions from the statements available and from such other information as they might possess.

Among the points which had been raised before the Council was that of the principle that League Members were obliged to refuse to recognise a situation brought about by armed force, whether such obligation was based on contractual undertakings or on the past resolutions of the Assembly and the Council, which were not called in question. The question of the application of this principle had been discussed with great thoroughness and clearness, and he would not attempt to summarise these arguments or to draw conclusions as to their application in this particular case.

It was, however, clear that, in spite of the regrets which had been expressed, the great majority of the Members of the Council felt that, so far as the question they were now discussing was concerned, it was for the individual Members of the League to determine their attitude in the light of their own situation and their own obligations.

The discussion was then declared closed.

VI. STATEMENT BY THE UNITED KINGDOM REPRESENTATIVE WITH REGARD TO THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED KINGDOM AND ITALY OF APRIL 16TH, 1938.

At the Council meeting on May 10th, the United Kingdom representative, Lord Halifax, recalled ¹ that his Government had always intended that if and when it was able to reach an agreement with Italy it would find a means of bringing that agreement to the notice of the League of Nations. Although the entry into force of the Agreement which had been reached must await the fulfilment of certain conditions, the United Kingdom Government wished to explain to the Council the significance of its conclusion.

Since the Italian action in Ethiopia, there had been a state of tension between Italy and the United Kingdom which reflected itself particularly in the Mediterranean area, thus impairing the sense of security of many nations. It was, therefore, not only to the advantage of their own specific interests which ran parallel through the Mediterranean and down the Red Sea to the Indian Ocean, but also to the advantage of many other countries that the two Governments should settle their outstanding differences and lay down the basis of a good understanding between them. The mere fact that the mutual interests of two great countries should be thus capable of reconciliation was significant and must encourage all who believed that international differences could be resolved on a basis of reason and goodwill; it must also of necessity react favourably upon the general sense of security, not only in Europe, but throughout the world. The United Kingdom Government therefore regarded the Anglo-Italian Agreement as a contribution to general peace.

The reception given to this Agreement had been favourable, particularly in Europe, where the French Government and the members of the Balkan Entente had welcomed it as a contribution to European appeasement. The President of the United States of America had made a statement on the subject to the Press which had been particularly gratifying to His Majesty's Government.

His Majesty's Government had close relations with many other Governments (especially with the French Government) in Europe and elsewhere, but it did not regard these relationships as by any means exclusive and, while strengthening its existing friendships, it was always seeking to increase their number and extend their scope. The Agreement with Italy marked a further step in this direction, as well as towards the aim of the Covenant — namely, the maintenance of peace. For the same reason, His Majesty's Government was following with interest and goodwill the progress made by the French Government in its efforts to reach a similar agreement with Italy. The greatest purpose of the League of Nations was to promote true peace in the world, and to promote it by agreement, in order that there should be no risk of a solution for differences being sought by war. The fact that His Majesty's Government and the Italian Government had been able to compose their differences by agreement entitled
those Governments to claim that they had contributed to the cause of peace and thereby strengthened the purpose which the League of Nations existed to serve.¹

VII. SETTLEMENT OF THE ASSYRIANS OF IRAQ.²

On September 29th, 1937,³ the Council took cognisance of the report of the Committee for the Settlement of the Assyrians of Iraq. It expressed its deep regret that, despite the efforts made for four years, it had not proved possible to carry through a comprehensive scheme for the resettlement outside Iraq of all such Assyrians as had expressed their desire to leave that country.

The Council also approved the proposals made by the Committee for the reorganisation of the settlement in the upper valley of the Khabur on a fully self-supporting basis. It authorised the Committee to proceed with the execution of this plan, which involves the purchase of a large area of land, the acquisition of title to the lands at present occupied by the settlement, the building of new villages, the improvement of the existing system of irrigation, and the supply of essential agricultural equipment and live-stock to the Assyrians.

Moreover, the Council noted with satisfaction the readiness of the Governments of the United Kingdom and Iraq to contribute their proportionate share of the cost of the scheme of reorganisation.⁴

In view of the changed circumstances, the Council terminated the functions vested in the Committee in respect of the Assyrians remaining in Iraq.

It then noted a declaration by the Iraqi Minister for Foreign

¹ This statement by the United Kingdom representative was followed by short speeches in which the representatives of France, Roumania, Belgium, Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics expressed their Governments’ views on the Agreement between the United Kingdom and Italy of April 16th, 1938. The text of these speeches will be found in the Official Journal, May-June, 1938, pages 305 and 306.


⁴ As regards the League subsidy to the cost of the plan, the Council referred the Committee’s report to the Supervisory Commission, in order to obtain its consent to taking the required sum from the contribution granted by the Assembly in 1935.
Affairs that the Assyrian community in Iraq would now resume its position as an ordinary national minority which, while enjoying the benefits of the declaration on the protection of minorities signed by the Iraqi Government at the time of its admission to the League of Nations, would itself continue to be bound by obligations of loyalty to the Iraqi State.

Lastly, the Council invited the Iraqi Government to take all necessary steps to ensure that the Assyrians remaining in Iraq were given every assistance to settle down within that country as a prosperous and contented section of the Iraqi people.

The representative of Iraq on the Council stated that the Government of Iraq had had no difficulty in accepting the report’s conclusion that the only step to be taken in existing circumstances was to reorganise the settlement of the Assyrians on the Khabur in such a way as to enable the inhabitants to become self-supporting.

After a few remarks designed to dispel certain misapprehensions regarding the Assyrians remaining in Iraq, the representative of Iraq informed the Council that his Government intended, as soon as possible, to send an expert to the northern part of Iraq to enquire into the economic condition of the Assyrians and their neighbours, and that he would communicate to the Council in due course particulars of the nature of the expert’s report and the steps which the Iraqi Government had been able to take as a result of his recommendations.

The United Kingdom representative also expressed his regret at the failure to find a comprehensive solution of the Assyrian problem, and observed that the Assyrian question had now come to have two distinct aspects — that of the settlement on the Khabur River and that of the future of the Assyrians in Iraq. The Khabur settlement was at present the direct responsibility of the League, and the only course was to give it the further equipment and necessary measure of reorganisation which it required to make it fully self-supporting. His Majesty’s Government, like the Iraqi Government, was prepared to pay its proportionate share of the cost of the reorganisation.

He noted with satisfaction the Iraqi Government’s intention to help the Assyrian community which remained under its administration.
The French representative emphasised that it was owing to an urgent request by the Council that France, the mandatory Power, had agreed to withdraw, at any rate partially, the objections to which the proposal for the settlement of the Assyrians in Syria had at first seemed to it to give rise. In that same spirit, the mandatory Power, taking into consideration all the circumstances of the problem, both general and local, had declared its readiness to co-operate fully in reorganising the present settlement on the Khabur.

The Latvian representative — Chairman of the Council Committee — thanked the representative of Iraq for his communication, and expressed his conviction that the Khabur settlement would constitute a satisfactory solution on the part of the League.¹

* * *

The Committee's attention has since been concentrated on the execution of the plan approved by the Council. At its sessions held in December 1937 and January 1938, it examined the estimates submitted by the Trustee Board for the current expenditure of the Assyrian settlement in 1938 and the estimates for its reorganisation. In approving the two budgets, the Committee was guided by the principle of the strictest economy. It noted with satisfaction the assurance of the Chairman of the Trustee Board that that body would always endeavour to apply this principle in the administration of the budgets entrusted to it.

Being anxious to ensure order and tranquillity in the settlement, the Committee addressed a message to the inhabitants of the Khabur colony, confirming the permanent character of the settlement, and exhorting them to observe the laws and regulations in force in Syria.

The reports of the Trustee Board ² indicate that the Assyrians,

¹ The Supervisory Commission, on being acquainted with the recommendations contained in the Committee's report, agreed to sums being withdrawn from the contribution voted by the Assembly within the limits of the new plan described in the report.
² Recent reports received from the Trustee Board are published in the Official Journal (see Official Journal, March-April 1938, pages 251 to 265; July 1938, page 643).
once assured of their future, set to work in the realisation that they would soon have to rely on their own labour for their livelihood and that of their families. Remaining entirely outside local politics, they are living on friendly terms with their neighbours.

The Syrian Government has signified its intention of granting the Assyrians Syrian nationality at the end of five years’ stay in Syria.

As is shown by the periodical reports of the medical officer of the settlement, who carefully records all cases of disease and medical intervention, the state of health of the Assyrians may be regarded as very satisfactory. The monthly average of cases of malaria fell from 510 in 1936 to 289 in 1937.

This improvement in health conditions and in the material situation of the settlers has been reflected in a decline in the death rate and an increase in the birth rate. The natural increase which resulted in 1937 was 103, or 1.17%. This brought the number of Assyrians settled on the Khabur to 8,922 at the end of 1937, as compared with 8,819 at the end of the previous year.

The agricultural situation shows considerable progress. After suffering seriously from the drought of 1937, the Assyrians enjoyed a rainy period at the beginning of 1938, so that a very fine harvest is expected. Simultaneously with the extension of the surface sown, the Assyrians have extended their vegetable gardens and planted a variety of trees.

The existing irrigation system and mills are working normally. The state of the live-stock is very satisfactory.\(^1\)

From the point of view of security, the position in the settlement has been growing steadily more stable during the last few months.

---

\(^{1}\) During the first quarter of 1938, it totalled 11,937 head, showing an increase of 857 head compared with the previous year. Eighty-seven pairs of ploughing oxen and the same number of ploughs and yokes were distributed on April 1st, 1938, to the different Assyrian villages. To these should be added 400 draught oxen which the Trustee Board bought in Iraq in May 1938 in execution of the reorganisation plan.
VIII. Request of the Iraqi Government under Article 11, Paragraph 2, of the Covenant of the League of Nations.¹

At the request of the parties, the Council decided, on September 10th, 1937, to withdraw from its agenda the Iraqi Government's request regarding the frontier between Iraq and Iran.

The two Governments had informed the Council that their frontier dispute had recently been settled by an agreement which would shortly be ratified by their Parliaments.

IX. Convention relating to the Regime of the Straits. (Signed at Montreux on July 20th, 1936.)

Under Article 24 of the Convention relating to the Regime of the Straits, the Turkish Government is required to address to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations and to the contracting parties an annual report giving details regarding the movements of foreign vessels of war through the Straits and furnishing all information which may be of service to commerce and navigation both by sea and by air, for which provision is made in that Convention.

At the beginning of 1938, the Turkish Government forwarded to the Secretary-General its first annual report regarding the movements of vessels through the Straits and of civil aircraft between the Mediterranean and the Black Sea. The Secretary-General communicated this report to the Council and Members of the League of Nations and to the technical organs of the League interested in this information.

The Turkish Government regularly forwarded to the Secretary-General the information provided for in Article 18, paragraph 1 (b) of the Montreux Convention on the total tonnage of the respective fleets of the Black Sea littoral Powers in the Black Sea. The Secretary-General acquainted the Members of the League of Nations with these communications through the Official Journal.²

X. FREE CITY OF DANZIG.

The Council Committee appointed on July 4th, 1936, to follow the situation at Danzig, and consisting of the representatives on the Council of the United Kingdom (Rapporteur), France and Sweden,¹ held several meetings during the Council's sessions last year.

The Committee examined, on the basis of the information given by M. C. J. Burckhardt, High Commissioner at Danzig, the circumstances in which his duties had to be performed and the situation in the Free City. It also had occasion to confer with the Polish representative.

The Committee expressed its satisfaction at the manner in which the High Commissioner had performed his task. It did not think it necessary to propose that the Council should place any questions regarding Danzig on its agenda.

2.

QUESTION OF ALEXANDRETTA.¹

The Fundamental Law of the Sanjak of Alexandretta, which was adopted by the Council together with the Statute of the Sanjak on May 29th, 1937,² lays down in Article 15 that the first elections in the Sanjak are to be organised and supervised by a Commission appointed by the Council of the League of Nations.

In accordance with paragraph 8 of the report adopted by the Council on the same date, this Commission was set up on October 4th, 1937.

After a first visit to the Sanjak for purposes of study, the Commission drew up a plan for the organisation and supervision of the electoral proceedings and prepared the text of regulations for the first elections in the Sanjak.

The Commission at the same time proposed that March 28th, 1938, should be fixed as the date for the first stage of the elections, and April 12th as the date for the second stage. In accordance with paragraphs 8 and 9 of the report adopted by the Council on May 29th, 1937, these proposals were approved by the President of the Council, who authorised the Commission to engage the staff required to enable it to discharge its duty of supervising the elections. The electoral regulations were transmitted to the mandatory Power for promulgation.

Nevertheless, in two telegrams dated December 15th and 24th, 1937, respectively, the Turkish Government made a number of observations and reservations regarding the preparation and application of the electoral regulations.

The Turkish Government's reservations and observations were submitted to the Council at its session in January 1938, and the Electoral Commission meanwhile postponed the execution of the programme of work it had adopted.

After hearing the statements of the Turkish and French representatives and a declaration by the President of the Electoral Commission, the Council decided, on January 31st, 1938, to set up a Council Committee consisting of representatives of Belgium, the United Kingdom, France, Sweden and Turkey. Within the limits of the provisions and texts adopted by the Council on May 29th, 1937, and accepted by France and Turkey, this Committee was to endeavour to make such modifications as might prove necessary in the electoral regulations. The President of the Electoral Commission was to afford the Committee his assistance, and the latter's decisions were to be unanimous. In the probable event of this work being completed before the Council's next session, the Committee would submit to the President of the Council the regulations finally adopted by it. The President of the Council would then immediately communicate those regulations to the mandatory Power, on behalf of the Council, for promulgation in the Sanjak. Furthermore, the Committee would take the decisions mentioned in paragraphs 8 and 9 of the report adopted by the Council on May 29th, 1937, concerning, on the one hand, the appointment of officials and staff, and, on the other, the date of the first elections. It was understood that the latest date mentioned for these elections (April 15th, 1938) would be postponed as far as might be necessary.

The Council Committee met at Geneva from March 7th to 19th, 1938. After examining the text of the electoral regulations drawn up by the Commission, and a counter-proposal submitted by the Turkish representative, the Council Committee unanimously adopted the regulations for the first elections in the Sanjak.¹ In the report which accompanies the final text of the regulations, the Council Committee fixed July 15th, 1938, as the date by which the elections were in any case to be completed, on the understanding that the Electoral Commission would do its utmost to complete the proceedings by June 30th, 1938.