if they adhered to facts, what was added by the words “by peaceful means.” He therefore requested the Committee to accept the Belgian proposal with the necessary alterations suggested by Lord Robert Cecil.

M. Branting (Sweden) entirely agreed with the remarks of M. Motta. It did not seem to him to be going too far if they made use of words which only expressed a truth recognised by all. If the League did not dare to proclaim that the Georgian people should, one day or other, have their independence like other peoples—who themselves might also one day be subjected to the yoke of the invader—it would be far from fulfilling its purpose, and he was astonished that on this occasion Lord Robert Cecil showed so little of that courage which he had displayed on so many occasions when it had been a pleasure to follow him if it was at all possible to do so. There was no question here of converting this resolution into a simple expression of pity for unhappy Georgia, but of proclaiming to the world that the Georgian nation had a right to liberty, and that this was how the League regarded the situation in that part of the world. They should state clearly that no challenge was intended to any Power; to say to the Georgian people “invaded and occupied against its will”, that it ought to be helped by peaceful means and that the conscience of mankind was on its side was by no means an insignificant declaration. An opinion supported by the conscience of mankind would have greater weight at no very distant date. They should have the courage to pronounce these words, which would give the Georgian people faith in its independence and would show it that it aroused sincere sympathies throughout the whole civilised world.

Lord Robert Cecil (South Africa) regretted that he had not been convinced by the Swedish delegate. They must be very careful not to pass resolutions for which they might have to pay dearly. He liked boldness, provided that it involved no risks except to him who showed it. If this resolution were addressed to any Great Powers and they took no notice of it, the only result would be nothing worse than a wound to the League’s amour propre. But were they not, under the pretext of expressing some fine feelings, about to expose Georgia to further sufferings? Were they quite sure, moreover, that the resolution really represented the wishes of the Georgians? The appeal to the League came from the Minister in Paris, not from Georgia itself. To adopt the resolution, even in the form proposed by M. Motta, might amount to saying to the Georgian people: “You have right on your side: what are you waiting for to recover your liberty?” Would not that be inciting them to revolt, and a revolt would be followed by an attack of the Russian troops, with all imaginable consequences? Nobody shared noble ideas more that the South African Delegate, but he preferred to renounce them if they led to carnage. Two years before, the Assembly had adopted a resolution in favour of Armenia—a much more moderate resolution than this one, and one for which he was partly responsible. After the vote, several members asked him if he had really the right to risk increasing the sufferings of the Armenian people in this way. That risk would be greater for the Georgian people, in view of the strong wording of the proposal, and he could not be a party to it. He concluded by saying that he had no intention of restricting the action of the League in any way; still less was he deaf to the sufferings of the Georgian people.

Mr. Fisher (British Empire) regretted that M. de Brouckère was unable to accept the amendment of Lord Robert Cecil, whose apprehensions he shared. Moreover, as a member of the British Cabinet, it would be difficult for him to bind his colleagues to give effect to the resolution. The addition proposed by M. Motta explained the peaceful intention of the proposal, but it did not exclude the possibility of a rising in Georgia. Further, was it not one of the reproaches levelled against the Soviet Government that they fomented sedition in other countries? Again, the words, “invaded and occupied contrary to the wishes of its inhabitants” might be justified, but the contrary might also be the case. There was undoubtedly a strong Georgian Communist party. In any case the League could not accept responsibility for these words, which might be regarded as provocative to the Soviet Government; all the diplomats present would agree that this was so. Would the Belgian Delegate agree to add to the words “by peaceful means” the words “and in conformity with the provisions of international law”? The British Delegate suggested this solution while personally preferring Lord Robert Cecil’s amendment.

M. de Brouckère (Belgium) thought that, in spite of differences of opinion, the Committee was unanimous in wishing to come to the help of the Georgian people, not only in order to alleviate its sufferings but also to see that it had justice. The Delegate accepted Mr. Fisher’s proposal as regards the second part of the resolution. As regards the first part, he knew the Georgian people sufficiently well to be sure that an assurance of the watchful solicitude of the League would undoubtedly dissuade this people from a desperate act and enable it to be patient. Never-theless he would agree to the omission of the words in question on condition that the words “moved by the present unhappy situation, etc.” were not insisted upon.

After a further textual amendment proposed by M. Motta (Switzerland), the proposal was unanimously adopted in the following form:

“The Assembly of the League of Nations, having considered the situation in Georgia, invites the Council to follow attentively the course of events in this part of the world, so that it may be able to seize any opportunity which may occur to help in the restoration of this country to normal conditions by any peaceful means in accordance with the rules of international law.”
22. EASTERN GALICIA: PROPOSAL BY MR. FIELDING
(Annex 13)

The Chairman reminded the Committee that the Assembly had sent him the Fielding proposal, which followed upon a similar resolution adopted on September 15th of last year on the proposal of Mr. Doherty, the Canadian Delegate. He read the two texts.

M. Lapointe (Canada), on behalf of his colleague, who was then sitting on another Committee, explained that the reasons which militated last year in favour of the Doherty resolution were still stronger to-day. Nevertheless, Mr. Fielding would have hesitated had he not known that the two parties concerned, though not in agreement as to the manner of settling the question, were both desirous that it should be settled. This was evident from documents emanating both from the inhabitants of Eastern Galicia and also from Poland. The speaker hoped that the resolution would not meet with whith opposition.

M. Askenazy (Poland) reminded the Committee that in the previous year he had been anxious to make clear that the question of Eastern Galicia was one between Poland and the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, but that in order not to leave any doubt as to the loyal intentions of the Polish Government, and with a view to showing his appreciation of M. Doherty's intentions, he had accepted the latter's proposal. Since then the Polish Government had prepared a statute affording Eastern Galicia the most liberal measure of autonomy, entire political equality and all linguistic and religious guarantees. This scheme, which was completed in August, was at once communicated to the Principal Powers, and exchanges of views were still taking place. There was reason to hope that a satisfactory and definite solution would be reached.

No circumstances afforded better proof that M. Doherty's recommendation had begun to be realised. Further, far from considering the analogous proposal of Mr. Fielding superfluous, he was glad to second it, both for the reasons which he had stated in connection with the Doherty proposal and also because he thought that the renewal of this recommendation might help to accelerate a satisfactory solution, which was so desirable for every reason.

M. Sidziukauskas (Lithuania) also supported the Canadian proposal. He admired the hard-working Ukrainian people inhabiting Eastern Galicia, with whom the Lithuanian people had had opportunities of close acquaintance, particularly in North America, where, by the side of a numerous Lithuanian colony comprising nearly a million persons, there was also a considerable number of Glicians. Lithuania also realised the firm intention of the Galicians to acquire a national free and independent home, and that people had their every sympathy. The settlement of the Galician question was of special interest to Lithuania because that question was bound up with the fixing of the eastern frontiers of Poland, which the Powers had reserved for themselves by treaty. He was convinced that if the Principal Powers had made earlier use of the right, neither the question of Eastern Galicia nor that of Vilna would today be vexing the peace of Europe.

After further remarks by the Polish and Lithuanian delegates, Mr. Fielding's proposal was unanimously adopted.

M. Lapointe was appointed Rapporteur for the question of Georgia and for that of Eastern Galicia.

23. ARMENIA: PROPOSAL BY LORD ROBERT CECIL
(Annex 14)

Lord Robert Cecil (South Africa) reminded the Committee that the Armenian question was by no means new to the Assembly. It had already come before them on two occasions and the Council had repeatedly considered it. The resolution adopted by the First Assembly called for intervention in the hostilities against the Kemalists. Circumstances did not allow practical effect to be given to this resolution. The resolution passed last year was somewhat different; it was connected with the establishment of a national home when a treaty of peace should be signed. But peace had not yet been made with Turkey.

There was some prospect that peace would soon be restored in the Near East, and the Assembly should therefore make it clear that it had not forgotten the Armenians and that it confirmed its desire that they should be assigned a national home.

The present proposal consisted of three parts:

(1) An expression of thanks to the Council with reference to pages 33 and 34 of the report to the Assembly;
(2) A simple repetition of the hope that any treaty of peace which might be concluded with Turkey should provide for the granting of a national home for the Armenians;
(3) A request to the Council to take all desirable measures for this purpose.

It could not be said that this resolution involved risks for the Armenians on a par with those against which he had warned the Committee in connection with the resolution regarding Georgia.
For the number of Armenians which might be affected was small; it is the majority of Armenians living outside the region affected by the dispute who wish for a settlement. There was no need to plead the cause of the Armenians once again. He hoped that the Assembly would help, if not to repair the evil which had been done to them, at least to put an end to their present misfortunes.

M. Motta (Switzerland) thought that a unanimous agreement had been reached as to the principle of the resolution. Never had the word “tragedy” been more aptly applied than to the affairs of Armenia. He proposed, however, a slight textual amendment. The League of Nations was not a belligerent, and Turkey was not its enemy. By stating that “one of the essential conditions of any peace with Turkey should be the provision of a national home for the Armenians”, the League would appear to be assuming the part of a belligerent, and this must be avoided in the interest of the Armenians themselves. On the contrary, all the Powers concerned in the peace should be approached, including Turkey, who, moreover, had an interest in knowing the League’s view on the matter.

After a further definition of the issue by Lord Robert Cecil (South Africa) the proposal, supported by Mr. Fisher (British Empire) was adopted in the following form:

“The Assembly notes with gratitude the action taken by the Council with respect to Armenia and recommends that in the negotiations for a peace with Turkey, the necessity for providing the national home for the Armenians should not be overlooked, and requests the Council to take all steps which it may think useful to secure this result.”

On the motion of M. de Brouckère, M. Motta was appointed Rapporteur for this question.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.
NINTH MEETING
Held on September 22nd, 1922, at 4 p.m.

Jonkheer Loudon in the Chair.

24. WITHDRAWAL OF THE PERSIAN DELEGATION'S PROPOSAL REGARDING THE NEAR EAST

The Chairman informed his colleagues that the President of the Assembly had forwarded to him a letter from Prince Arfa-ed-Dowleh, the Persian Delegate, informing him of the withdrawal of the Persian Delegation's proposal regarding the establishment of a neutral commission for the protection of the civil population in the Near East (Annex 15).

The Committee noted this withdrawal.

M. Streit (Greece) wished to make clear that it was at the request of Greece that the International Red Cross had kindly accepted this charitable mission. He wished to take this opportunity of once more expressing his deep gratitude to the Red Cross.

25. DR. NANSEN'S PROPOSAL REGARDING HOSTILITIES IN THE NEAR EAST

The Chairman read the report of the Committee on Agenda (Annex 16), regarding Dr. Nansen's proposal to request the Council to consider without delay what steps it could take on behalf of the League, whether, by offering its good offices to the belligerent parties or otherwise, to secure the immediate cessation of hostilities in the Near East. He asked Dr. Nansen to speak on his proposal.

Dr. Nansen (Norway) read the draft resolution which he intended to propose; he attached little importance to its wording so long as the Committee approved of its substance:

"The Assembly resolves to request the Council to consider what steps it could take on behalf of the League, whether by offering its good offices to the belligerent parties or otherwise, to secure the immediate cessation of hostilities in the Near East".

He recalled the terms of Article 3 and of the first paragraph of Article 11 of the Covenant, and concluded that there could be no doubt that the war in the Near East was a question which concerned all the Members of the League. Peace had to be restored as soon as possible, and the Assembly must not disperse without having settled the question. He did not propose that the Assembly itself should act; it was evidently the affair of the Council, which represented the Assembly and could act in the name of the whole League. This was why he had brought forward his proposal.

He was well aware that, up to the present time, affairs in the Near East had been in the hands of a certain group of Powers which had already arranged one peace settlement, which had fallen to the ground. It was possible that the negotiations in progress would be successful. In any case, it was indispensable for the Council to get into touch with the Powers concerned and to see what action was being taken. There could be no doubt that in doing this the Council would be supported by the immense moral authority of all the nations in whose name it spoke. The Council would have many opportunities of taking a direct share in the actual settlement.

The Near East had, by reason of its mixed populations, been for the past six centuries a centre of discord and disorder. Throughout the Near East there could never be real peace until a satisfactory and impartial settlement of international relations was arrived at. In drawing up such an agreement the machinery of the League might be of very great value.

For this purpose, the two parties should be invited to a conference held under the auspices of the League at which the Council, either as a whole or by means of a Sub-Committee, would take a direct and active part. It would be essential that the League should treat both parties on a footing of absolute equality, and that the Angora Government should be invited to accept the rights and duties of membership of the League while the negotiations were in progress.
would be, by analogy, an application of Article 17 of the Covenant. One of the essential provisions of the treaty should be that Turkey entered the League.

The participation of the League in the settlement of the Eastern question was sooner or later inevitable. It was certain that all the parties involved would hand over to the League the control or administration of many of the decisions of the peace settlement; and it was better that the League should undertake this duty before the problem became too acute.

Sir Joseph Cook (Australia) congratulated Dr. Nansen on his proposal and on the frank speech he had just made. During the two years of its existence, the League had been engaged in liquidating the remnants of the Peace Conference. Like Dr. Nansen, he thought that, even when peace negotiations were at an end, many questions would remain which would require to be dealt with by the League of Nations. The people of Australia had received the news of this fresh crisis in Europe as if a bolt had fallen from the blue. Was it for this that a League of Nations had been at work for two years with its Council, its Assembly, its Secretariat, its Permanent Armaments Commission and its Permanent Court of International Justice, which had been equipped with such infinite labour and at such great expense?

The countries which were negotiating this settlement were already represented on the Council, but, for some reason, they were acting through other representatives. No doubt there were difficulties. Turkey was still at war with the Allies, as no treaty had been ratified with her, but that was not the question; that was a question which affected the peace of the world, and, as such, the delay in settling it constituted a challenge to the League.

There was another difficulty in the fact that if they appointed an independent body to settle the question they would find negotiators already engaged on the settlement. This would lead to inextricable confusion unless there was collaboration, earnest and cordial.

He was of the opinion that the League might do useful work in ascertaining the facts, making an authoritative presentation of these so that the negotiations could be carried out on firm and incontrovertible ground. The League was the organisation best fitted for this purpose and the negotiators would lose no prestige thereby. It was time. The League had no material force behind it with which to apply its sanctions but it was supported by the most powerful force in existence: the moral force of public opinion throughout the world. He saw no difficulty, either, in the League undertaking the task of defining the boundaries of a neutral zone, policing the Straits and other similar tasks such as it had already accomplished elsewhere for the general good.

As Dr. Nansen had said, the matter would be referred to the League sooner or later. Why should it not be referred at the beginning, rather than at the end, as had been the case after the Paris and Genoa Conferences?

In conclusion he said that, personally, he found Dr. Nansen's proposal rather weak, and thought they could pass a more energetic resolution without hurting anyone and without compromising the prospects of peace.

M. Zoka-ed-Dowlleh (Persia) wished, as representative of a peaceful nation, to say a few words on the conflict in the Near East. First and foremost, he wished to congratulate Dr. Nansen and Sir Joseph Cook on their intervention. An early termination of the war would be greatly in Persia's interests. When, last year, Persia was one of the first to request the friendly intervention of the League, her Greek friends had suspected her of taking Turkey's part. Although a Moslem country, Persia was neutral, and aimed only at the good of humanity; she did not wish to take sides in the matter.

The difficulties in solving the question had increased, and the Turkish question had become vital; the responsibility of the League was greater than last year. Many thousands of innocent persons had been sacrificed in vain, for all wars were vain. Turkey was no longer alone; Russia was implicated in the question, and there were other Moslem countries. Afghanistan, Turkestan, and the Moslems of India, China, Russia and Egypt were looking towards Turkey. They must act with such infinite labour and at such great expense?

The difficulties in solving the question had increased, and the Turkish question had become vital; the responsibility of the League was greater than last year. Many thousands of innocent persons had been sacrificed in vain, for all wars were vain. Turkey was no longer alone; Russia was implicated in the question, and there were other Moslem countries. Afghanistan, Turkestan, and the Moslems of India, China, Russia and Egypt were looking towards Turkey. They must act

M. Tcheou Wei (China) reminded the meeting that the League of Nations had been founded to put an end to bloodshed. It was in this spirit that China had joined the League, and that in all humility it had brought to the League the co-operation of 400 million pacifists and of a
Mr. Fisher (British Empire) thought that the Committee owed a debt of gratitude to Dr. Nansen for bringing this question to its notice. It would have been paradoxical and even scandalous if the Assembly had dispersed without having given consideration to the dangerous situation in the Near East. He agreed with Dr. Nansen in thinking that it was the principle and not the precise form of the resolution that mattered. What was it they wanted to say? They wanted first of all to express the grave anxiety with which they viewed the present state of affairs in the Near East and their earnest desire to see a prompt cessation of hostilities and the establishment of a satisfactory and lasting peace. They must also take note of the fact that negotiations had been opened by certain Powers, Members of the League, which were apparently being carried on in an excellent spirit of concord. The League must avoid complicating these negotiations, yet at the same time it must indicate its willingness to render any assistance for which it might be asked, either in the course of the negotiations or in the event of their failing; for, as Dr. Nansen had said, the League certainly possessed great advantages as the medium through which peace negotiations could take place. The atmosphere of Geneva was favourable to this object. For the moment, the essential point was to exhibit a united front and not to quarrel about resolutions. He hoped that the Committee would adopt a draft resolution which he would submit, and which gave full weight to all these various considerations.

He did not agree with his colleague and friend, Sir Joseph Cook, that the problem of the Near East was insufficiently understood, and that the League alone was in a position to clear up the facts of the situation. No problem of longer standing existed and none which was better known to the Foreign Offices of Europe. He read the following draft resolution:

"The Assembly, viewing with dismay the possibility of the prolongation of the war in the Near East, notes with satisfaction the announcement of a conference at which the interested Powers will be represented, and trusts that the Council will be prepared as the occasion demands to render any assistance which may be invited by the negotiating Powers towards the attainment of a prompt and durable peace."

He wished to add, on behalf of his Government, that the latter was very anxious to obtain the co-operation of the League, which was capable of assisting in several ways in the attainment of a lasting settlement in the Near East. He knew that there was a widespread feeling in the Dominions of the British Empire that the League should take a leading part in the settlement of this difficult matter. He could assure his colleagues of the Dominions that the British Government fully respected that sentiment, and that, if the occasion should arise, it would be prepared, in conjunction with the Allied Powers, which were participating in the negotiations, to afford such facilities and such openings as might be desirable.

Lord Robert Cecil (South Africa) thought that the expression "delicate situation" had been used rather too often in the discussions. In every important affair there were delicate situations, but if there was danger in action, there was equal danger in not acting. The facts were that a war was raging, and it was the express duty of the League, in conformity with Article 11 of the Covenant, to take all necessary measures to safeguard effectively the peace of the nations. The measures taken must be wise and effective. The Persian Delegate had shown very clearly how much more difficult the situation was this year than was the case last year. It was also interesting to note that the Persian and Chinese Delegates had supported Dr. Nansen's motion. He agreed with his British colleague that the form of the resolution mattered little if they were in agreement as to the substance. But they must not be content with merely expressing their horror of war; they must go further and say that the Council must be prepared to take any measures which might be necessary. They must not dictate to the Council what it should do, nor was there any question of the Council hindering the peace negotiations. If these negotiations were to succeed without the co-operation of the League, all its Members would rejoice. Unhappily, in too many previous cases such negotiations had failed, and, if this were to happen again, the only body qualified to offer mediation was the League.

In Mr. Fisher's text there was a dangerous phrase, which might be misconstrued by the Turks. If the phrase "negotiating Powers" was intended in its usual sense, he regarded it with great apprehension.

Furthermore, it must not be said that the League only took action in important affairs when it was invited to do so by the Great Powers. He did not like the idea that a group of Members negotiating outside the League should issue instructions to the League or invite it to take or to refuse any particular action. Such a course would be an affront to the prestige of the League. That body ought to show that it was an independent international organisation, able to act on its own initiative, from no other motive than the desire to see the world at peace. He therefore urgently requested his colleague, Mr. Fisher, to find a formula which would enable them to adopt a unanimous resolution.

Personally, he saw no objection to accepting the wording proposed by Dr. Nansen. The essential point was for them to say clearly what they wanted to do and not to wait to act until pressure was applied from outside the League.
tiators who were then at work. It would be a very great handicap to assume beforehand that the negotiations would not succeed in view of the efforts which were being made to obtain the part of one authority when the matter was under consideration by another, they would have to be satisfied with the precedents established by the Assembly and the Council, according to which the negotiations would not be left without interference until it became clear that agreement could not be reached by way of negotiation. This depended upon satisfactory methods of procedure. The negotiators must be left to make every possible effort which they were entitled and authorised to make, while the Council, as Dr. Nansen had said, would keep a vigilant watch and remain ready to intervene for the realisation of an immediate and permanent peace if the Powers had recourse to it for this purpose.

Lord Robert Cecil (South Africa) wished it to be clearly understood that there was no question of interference in the negotiations then proceeding. He therefore asked Dr. Nansen if he would agree to this addition to his resolution of 15th March: "without interfering with any negotiations now pending". The meaning of the resolution would then be quite clear, and they would avoid any appearance of having acted upon the request of a group of Powers, certain of which, speaking candidly, were not then regarded with great sympathy or affection by the Turks.

The Marquis Imperiali (Italy) said that he thought the Committee was in agreement as regards the principle, and he wished to point out that he gave his full and complete adherence to the formula proposed by Mr. Fisher, with which M. Hanotaux had associated himself. This formula appeared well calculated to reconcile the duties of the League with the requirements of the situation, and to facilitate the attainment of the goal which all had in view, namely, a just and permanent peace.

M. Radeff (Bulgaria) pointed out that Bulgaria was particularly interested in the solution on the question of the Near East. Though hoping that peace was near and that fair account would be taken of all the legitimate interests at stake, she feared that the conflict might extend to the countries bordering on her own frontiers; she had, however, been disarmed by the treaties, and was not even allowed the minimum forces regarded as indispensable for all neutral States for the protection of their neutrality. Whatever might be the course of events, whether peace were concluded on the morrow or at a later date, he wished to declare on behalf of his Government that his country would maintain an attitude of perfect loyalty and that she had neither the intention nor the desire to involve herself in a war. But however strong might be the desire for neutrality, it was not always possible to remain unaffected by the encroachments of war. For this reason, Bulgaria anxiously followed the development of the position and ardently desired the success of the negotiations then proceeding.

It the Powers negotiating were so unfortunate as to fail, he hoped that the Council would assume the responsibility of assisting the negotiations in accordance with the spirit of the League. The Council occupied a high place in the estimation of all the countries concerned in the dispute. These countries saw their safety in a steady increase of the activities and the power of the League of Nations.

M. Streit (Greece) said that the position of the Greek Delegation in this dispute was particularly delicate, as the question formed the subject of preliminary negotiations which were pending between the three great Powers directly interested. He wished to speak on the subject, since he did not wish his silence to be interpreted as a sign of ingratitude for the generous initiative of Dr. Nansen, or as implying that Greece felt in any way unwilling that the League of Nations should, if necessary, undertake a complete or partial settlement of the question of the Near East. Though hoping that peace was near and that fair account would be taken of all the legitimate interests at stake, she feared that the conflict might extend to the countries bordering on her own frontiers; she had, however, been disarmed by the treaties, and was not even allowed the minimum forces regarded as indispensable for all neutral States for the protection of their neutrality. Whatever might be the course of events, whether peace were concluded on the morrow or at a later date, he wished to declare on behalf of his Government that his country would hold her position in Asia Minor, this was because she felt it necessary to fulfil her duty towards the unfortunate Greek, Armenian, and even the non-Turkish Mussulman populations in Asia Minor, who would have been exposed to the greatest danger if the Greek Army had retired. Greece had accepted a sacred obligation when she received the mandate to disembark at Smyrna for a war undertaken by the side of the Allied Powers for the liberation of her oppressed compatriots.

The Greek Delegation hoped that these explanations would suffice to show that Greece was not responsible for the bloodshed which had lasted for so long in the Near East, as the delegate for Persia seemed to believe. He thanked the delegate for Persia for the sympathetic way in which he had alluded to the relations which had existed for centuries between their countries, and he also thanked the distinguished speakers who had shown so great an interest in this question, which had a decisive importance for his own country. He thanked Lord Robert Cecil in particular, who, again on this occasion had upheld the great traditions of his family. He felt convinced that the three great Powers two of whom had presided over the re-birth of Greece, and had so often, lent her their assistance in her legitimate aims and the other of whom had always been the champion of the principle of nationality, the great allies of Greece during the world-war, signatories of the Treaty of Sevres, would continue to assist in the honourable task of concluding a permanent and just peace in the Near East in conformity with the principles which had triumphed in the Great War. If, however, the Powers considered it expedient to ask the League of Nations to intervene in the negotiations, Greece would certainly not refuse to accept this suggestion, feeling sure that these great principles, considered in the light of the great lessons of
history, would find in the League and its valuable organisation the best guarantee and the most effective means for securing a genuine peace in the East and effective protection of the non-Turkish population.

He was certain that this discussion and the generous initiative taken by so great a personality as Dr. Nansen, and the support accorded to this proposal by the representatives of so many nations, would expedite and further the negotiations conducted by the Allied Governments in co-operation with the interested States. The declarations made by the representatives of the three great interested Powers were such as fully to ensure the establishment in the near future of an honourable and lasting peace, with the assistance, if necessary, of the Council of the League of Nations.

Viscount ISHII (Japan) intimated his satisfaction at the unanimous desire evinced by the Committee for the re-establishment of peace in the Near East. The difference between the proposals made respectively by Mr. Fisher and Lord Robert Cecil was a matter of procedure and not of principle. Lord Robert Cecil agreed that there ought to be no interference in the negotiations then pending. Everyone might be satisfied if the first part of Mr. Fisher’s resolution were retained and the second part were amended as follows:

"The Assembly . . . . . . . . . and trusts that the Council of the League of Nations will take all proper measures justified by the circumstances with a view to giving effect to the unanimous desire of the Assembly for the prompt establishment of peace in the Near East."

Mr. FISHER (British Empire), like the Delegate of Japan, pointed out that the Committee agreed, first, in noting that a conference had been convened, secondly, in recognising that there was no need for intervention in the negotiations, and, thirdly, in stating that the League might intervene if the conference were to fail. The only difference of opinion between Lord Robert Cecil and his French and Italian colleagues and himself lay in the question whether a suggestion ought to be made to the Council that it should offer its good offices at once, or whether it should await an invitation from the Powers. His own proposal had been dictated by the desire to recognise the negotiations then pending. If he had thought that peace might be delayed by his proposal he would not have made it. He feared, however, that Lord Robert Cecil’s amendment might compromise the negotiations. However, it appeared to him that the difference was largely a matter of drafting, and he suggested the appointment of a Drafting Committee to consider the proposals put forward by Dr. Nansen, Lord Robert Cecil and himself, and to submit to the next meeting a text upon which they had all agreed.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway) supported Mr. Fisher’s proposal, which had anticipated his own intention. He noted with pleasure that unanimity had been obtained upon three important points:

1. The entire Committee desired the cessation of hostilities;
2. The question was one for the whole League of Nations;
3. The Committee wished to draw the Council’s attention to the question and to request it to take action if called upon to do so.

The Norwegian Delegation accepted Lord Robert Cecil’s amendment if the object were to avoid any misunderstanding. He wished, however, to point out that he had no official information as to the conference of which they were speaking, which, in any case, had not been suggested when he had made his proposal. It would be unfortunate if so valuable an organisation as the League of Nations should not be used in these negotiations. The Great Powers, which were then negotiating, had representatives on the Council; that body could do nothing without their consent if the resolution were adopted. He concluded by seconding the suggestion for the appointment of a Drafting Committee.

M. HANOTAUX (France) stated his satisfaction at the progress they had made towards agreement. He thought that the principal point was the statement by Lord Robert Cecil that no intervention should be made in the negotiations pending. In order to make his point of view clear, he wished to state that his suggestion to await a request from the Great Powers was, for his part, based not upon a question of principle but of precedent. In previous cases, as, for example, Upper Silesia and Austria, the League had not intervened except at the request of the Powers and for the general good. They were at the cross-roads. The respective competence of the Powers and of the League of Nations would have to be decided. It would be advisable to recall the example of a still recent past, and to consider whether any improvements could be made. He hoped that a satisfactory formula could be found by the appointment of a Drafting Committee and approved as a basis the suggestion made by the Japanese Delegate.

The Marquis IMPERIALI (Italy) and Lord Robert Cecil (South Africa) also agreed that the text should be referred to a Drafting Committee.

The Committee decided to appoint a Drafting Committee composed as follows:

Lord Robert Cecil (South Africa).
Mr. Fisher (British Empire).
M. Hanotaux (France).
Marquis Imperiali (Italy).

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.
TENTH MEETING

Held on September 25th, 1922, at 4 p.m.

26. DRAFT RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE NEAR EAST

The Chairman recalled the fact that the Committee had appointed a Drafting Committee, composed of Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Fisher, M. Hanotaux, the Marquis Imperiali, Viscount Ishii, Dr. Nansen and himself, to study the three proposals of Dr. Nansen, Lord Robert Cecil and Viscount Ishii for the purpose of drawing up a single formula.

After long deliberation, during which each word was fully weighed, the Committee agreed upon the text, taking that proposed by Viscount Ishii as a basis. The text was as follows:

"The Assembly, earnestly desirous of securing the restoration of peace in the Near East and of supporting all efforts which are made for that purpose, notes with satisfaction the proposals for the summoning of a special conference to deal with the situation, and trusts that the Council, without interfering with any negotiations now pending, will take such steps as it may deem desirable and justifiable by the state of the negotiations with a view to giving effect to the unanimous desire of the Assembly for the prompt re-establishment of peace."

The Committee had considered that, in order to take the proper steps without interfering in the negotiations, it was necessary to record the proposed convening of the conference and the full confidence of the Assembly in the Council.

The Committee had agreed upon the proposed text in its French version. It would perhaps be necessary to revise the English version.

Lord Robert Cecil (South Africa) explained that the discussions of the Committee had turned chiefly upon the words "at the invitation of the Powers". In the end these words were omitted, and any misunderstanding was thereby avoided. The text of the resolution refrained from expressing any approbation or disapprobation of the terms on which the conference was convened. It was not within the province of the League to do so, even, and indeed above all, if it had to act as mediator. Moreover, they had had no particulars of this suggested conference when the proposal was drawn up on the previous Saturday.

He left it to those who had drawn up the French text to see that that text was perfectly clear and could not give rise to erroneous interpretations. The English text would have to be amended.

Sir Francis Bell (New Zealand) suggested that they should say: "notes with satisfaction that it is proposed to summon a special conference to deal, etc."

Lord Robert Cecil (South Africa) concluded by saying that, although the text did not display any particular vigour, it was the result of a compromise, and, as such, should be preserved as not tending towards any misunderstanding.

M. Hanotaux (France) stated that the French text was, in fact, quite clear. No idea had ever been entertained by those who had drawn it up of expressing an opinion on the basis of the negotiations then pending, which, moreover, were not known on the previous Saturday. The accuracy of the translation of this text into English would have to be assured.

M. Teixeira Gomes (Portugal) asked whether, in case of doubt, the French text should not be valid.

Lord Robert Cecil (South Africa) and the Chairman replied that, according to the rules of the League, the English and French texts were both equally valid.

M. Motta (Switzerland) stated on behalf of his Government that he supported the text submitted, which could not otherwise express certain ideas. He agreed with Lord Robert Cecil in thinking that the League, even if it were called upon to intervene, should not express any opinion on the basis of the discussion then in progress. At the same time, he had seen with the greatest satisfaction that, in their communication to Turkey, the Powers had recommended the admission of that country into the League of Nations. The speaker considered this step admirable, just and wise, and he saw in it a firm guarantee for future peace.
After further observations by Sir Francis Bell (New Zealand), M. Lapointe (Canada) and Lord Robert Cecil on the English text of the proposal, the President put it to the vote.

Lord Robert Cecil (South Africa) informed the Committee that Dr. Nansen, who was detained at another Committee, had informed him that he agreed with the explanation given by M. Hanotaux regarding the French text.

Mr. Fisher (British Empire) thought that the English text must have been drawn up rather hastily; he suggested that it should be left to the experts of the Secretariat to rectify it.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

On the proposal of the Chairman, Viscount Ishii (Japan) was appointed Rapporteur.

27. CLOSURE OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

The Chairman stated that the Committee had reached the end of its work, which had produced clear and tangible results.

In the first place it had discussed the admission of Hungary and had been able to add to the Assembly a new Member. That was another step towards the universality of the League.

Next, the Committee had discussed the question of minorities. Thanks to the wise and conciliatory collaboration of those whom the question more closely concerned, and especially to the generous and practical spirit in which Professor Murray had been able to secure unanimity on his proposals, the Committee had been able to submit a formula to the Assembly which would ensure the minorities question being kept under the auspices of the League, and which reminded the minorities and their Governments of their mutual obligations.

The discussion on mandates had enabled them to realise the degree to which the mandatory Powers and the Permanent Commission were conscious of their task and the great progress that had been made, especially regarding petitions.

The Committee had also discussed the questions of Eastern Galicia, Armenia, Georgia, and, finally, the Near East; the unanimous resolution which it was submitting to the Assembly on this question would doubtless also meet with unanimous acceptance by that body.

In the Assembly, as in the Committees, and especially in the latter, they could not but remark the atmosphere which prevailed. Problems were regarded there from a loftier point of view than could be done by the Governments and peoples themselves. Hence, it would be possible in the future to submit, to the Political Committee especially, still more arduous problems than those which had been submitted hitherto. The spirit which prevailed there, the spirit of Geneva, would help the peoples to understand one another, and would bring closer the hour of the ideal of peace.

The Chairman thanked his colleagues for having made his task so easy. He thanked the Secretariat, the Press and the public, which had closely followed the debates. He concluded by saying that the Committee had added another stone to the great edifice which all hoped to see erected in the more or less distant future.

M. Hanotaux (France) thanked the Chairman on behalf of the Committee. That which was done from the heart was well done. The Chairman had directed the labours of the Committee with a noble mind and a warm heart.

M. Teixeira Gomes (Portugal) agreed with M. Hanotaux. He wished to emphasise the fact that, if the atmosphere of the Committee and of the Assembly was so favourable to the solution of questions submitted to them, it was thanks to the new science called sociology. It was the most complicated of all, but it was beginning to be put into application.

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.
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ANNEX 1

PROTECTION OF MINORITIES

Motion proposed by Professor Gilbert Murray, Delegate for South Africa, on September 6th, 1922.

That the questions dealt with in Chapter 9, Sections A, B, C, and D, of the General Report to the Assembly on the Work of the Council be referred to a Committee of the Assembly, with the request to report thereon to the Assembly in order that the latter may have an opportunity of expressing its considered view on these questions.

ANNEX 2

PROTECTION OF MINORITIES

Motion proposed by Dr. Walters, Delegate for Latvia, on September 7th, 1922.

(Amendment to the motion proposed by Professor Gilbert Murray on September 6th, 1922.)

That the questions dealt with in Chapter 9, Sections A, B, C, and D, of the General Report to the Assembly on the Work of the Council, as well as the general questions arising out of the protection of minorities for all the Members of the League of Nations, be referred to a Committee of the Assembly, with the request to report thereon to the Assembly in order that the latter may have an opportunity of expressing its considered view on these questions, and of laying down the main lines for the general protection of minorities in the States Members of the League of Nations.
Proposals of Professor Gilbert Murray, Delegate for South Africa on September 11th, 1922.

1. While in cases of grave infraction of the Minorities Treaties it is necessary that the Council retain its full power of direct action, the Committee recognises that in ordinary circumstances the League can best promote good relations between the various signatory Governments and the minorities under their sovereignty by benevolent and informal communications with the said Governments. For this purpose the Committee suggests that the Council might reasonably require to have a larger staff at its disposal.

2. In case of disputes as to the interpretation of the Treaties or of their application in particular cases or as to any matter of fact on which such application depends, the Committee recommends that recourse should be had without delay to the decision of the Permanent Court.

3. In some localities of mixed population, the Committee believes that the protection of minorities cannot be securely attained except by the appointment of resident agents of the League to report impartially on the behaviour of both, or all, sections of the population.

4. While the Committee recognises the primary right of the minorities to be protected by the League from oppression, it also emphasises the duty incumbent on the minorities to cooperate as loyal fellow-citizens with the nation to which they now belong.

5. The Committee expresses the hope that those States which are not bound by any legal obligation to the League with respect to minorities will nevertheless observe in the treatment of their own minorities at least as high a standard of justice and toleration as is required by any of the treaties.
The Sub-Committee appointed on September 7th, 1922, by the Sixth Committee of the Assembly of the League of Nations to examine Hungary's application for admission to the League, held two meetings. It consisted of the following members:

M. Loudon, Chairman.
M. Benes (Czechoslovakia); M. Osusky, substitute.
Mr. H. A. L. Fisher (British Empire).
M. Fortoul (Venezuela).
M. Hanotaux (France).
Marquis Imperiali (Italy).
M. Motta (Switzerland).

The Sub-Committee entrusted the Chairman with the preparation of the present report on the result of its work.

In accordance with precedent, the Sub-Committee based its investigation on the questionnaire employed on the occasion of the admission of new Members by the first two Assemblies.

The questionnaire runs as follows:

1. Is the application of the Hungarian Government for admission to the League of Nations in order?
2. Is the Hungarian Government recognised de jure or de facto and by what States?
3. Does the country possess a stable Government and well-defined frontiers?
4. Is it fully self-governing?
5. What have been the acts and declarations of the Hungarian Government regarding:
   (a) its international engagements; and
   (b) the stipulations of the League with reference to armaments?

The members of the Sub-Committee were able to reply without hesitation to the first two questions in the affirmative, and they concurred in the opinion expressed by one member that the Hungarian State had for a long time been a member of the “International Family”.

They were also of opinion that the conditions laid down in the third and fourth questions ought to be regarded as duly satisfied. They pointed out, however, that the frontiers established between Hungary and Austria on one side and Jugo-Slavia on the other might be subject to modifications in detail as the result of proceedings which are at present before the Council of the League of Nations.

Before considering the fifth question, and in order to be able to examine it with full knowledge of the facts, the Sub-Committee thought it desirable, in accordance with a precedent of the session of the Assembly of 1920, to obtain from the Allied Military Committee at Versailles particulars regarding the execution by the Hungarian Government of the provisions of the Treaty of Trianon relating to effectives, armaments and war material.

The information received by the Sub-Committee through the intermediary of the Conference of Ambassadors may be summarised as follows: Although the military clauses of the Treaty of Trianon have been partially carried out in the sense that steps to enforce their application have been taken by the Hungarian Government and that Hungarian legislation has been brought into harmony with the provisions of the Treaty, a certain number of operations have still to be carried out in order to ensure Hungary's effective disarmament.

When in possession of this information, the Sub-Committee requested Count Banffy, Hungarian Minister for Foreign Affairs, to make a statement to it. In the course of the subsequent discussion, the Chairman of the Sub-Committee reminded Count Banffy of the conditions governing the admission of a State to the League of Nations which arise out of the provisions of Article 1 of the Covenant. He further reminded him of the terms of the questionnaire setting out these conditions.

His Excellency Count Banffy replied in the following statement:

"In the autumn of 1921, Hungary had already requested admission into the League of Nations.
"Following certain events in Western Hungary, controversies arose as to the interpretation..."
and the mode of execution of Article 71 of the Treaty of Trianon. As these controversies did not come to an end in time, our delegate was requested to beg the League of Nations to adjourn the debate concerning our admission for the next session of the Assembly.

"Since the last autumn, circumstances have cleared up. Thanks to the initiative of Italy and the consent of the Great Powers, the incident of Western Hungary has ended by the agreement of Venice in a manner acceptable to both parties concerned.

"Henceforth I think no scruple can arise against the legitimacy of our request for admission.

"I am empowered by my Government to negotiate this admission.

"It is in calm and confidence that I appear before this honourable Committee, firmly confident that my request will be favourable considered.

"Hungary, in effect, satisfies all the conditions required by the Covenant.

"1. She is independent.

"2. She has a stable Government.

"3. Her area, determined by the boundaries of the Peace, and the number of her population, enable her to fulfil the obligations of the Covenant.

"It is also my duty to declare in the name of my Government, which, in requesting the admission of Hungary, is backed by the overwhelming majority of the nation, that Hungary sincerely means to fulfil the regulations of the League of Nations, the treaties concluded and all international obligations.

"I here solemnly invoke Article I of the Covenant.

"If my application should render further explanation necessary during your discussions I am entirely at your disposal."

The members of the Sub-Committee took note of the assurances contained in Count Banffy's statement and drew his attention to certain points regarding the execution of the clauses of the Treaty of Trianon relating to the reduction of armaments and also to the international engagements of Hungary with regard to the protection of minorities, defined in Articles 54 to 60 of that Treaty.

The members of the Sub-Committee then decided unanimously to recommend the Sixth Committee to propose to the Assembly that Hungary should be admitted to the League of Nations, as they were of opinion that the requirements of the Covenant were fulfilled by the solemn engagement taken by Count Banffy on behalf of his Government that Hungary would observe all her international obligations in accordance with treaties or acts subsequent to their signature.
Letter from Count Banffy to the Chairman of the Sixth Committee.

[Translation]

Geneva, September 15th, 1922.

YOUR EXCELLENCY,

With reference to the declaration I made to the Sub-Committee on September 14th, in which I emphasised the fact that, in its request for admission, the Hungarian Government is backed by the overwhelming majority of the nation, I have the honour to assure your Excellency, on behalf of my Government, that the Hungarian National Assembly will not fail to ratify with the least possible delay the obligations assumed by Hungary towards the League of Nations.

I have the honour to be, etc.,

(Signed) C. N. BANFFY,

Hungarian Minister for Foreign Affairs.
ANNEX 6

MINORITIES

Report of the Third Sub-Committee to the Sixth Committee.

At its meeting on September 13th, the Sixth Committee appointed a Sub-Committee composed of: M. Askenazy (Poland), Mr. Fisher (British Empire), M. Motta (Switzerland), M. Nintchitch (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes), M. Radeff (Bulgaria), and M. Scialoja (Italy), to consider Proposals 2 and 3 submitted by Professor Murray, in order to draw up a definite text for these proposals, taking into consideration the observations on this subject made at the plenary meetings of the Committee.

The Sub-Committee met on September 14th, at 10 a.m. Professor Murray also took part in the discussions.

The Sub-Committee, after consideration of the proposals, decided to propose to the Committee the following text:

Proposal 2.

"In case of any difference of opinion on questions of law or fact arising out of the provisions of the Minorities Treaties between the Government concerned and one of the States Members of the Council of the League of Nations, the Committee recommends that, should the circumstances require it, an appeal for a decision should be made without hesitation to the Permanent Court of International Justice, in accordance with the Minorities Treaties."

Proposal 3.

"In certain localities with a mixed population which are in an exceptional situation and where conflicts are more frequent and more serious, the Committee considers that sometimes the protection of minorities would be assured in the most effective manner by the establishment, with the consent of the Government concerned, of representatives of the League, who would be able to give an impartial account of these conflicts."

The Sub-Committee was further requested to consider the draft of a proposal made by M. Benès at the meeting of the Committee on September 13th. It has the honour to submit the following text to the Committee:

"The Secretariat of the League, which has the duty to collect information concerning the manner in which the Minorities Treaties are carried out, should not only assist the Council in the study of complaints concerning infractions of these treaties, but should also assist the Council in ascertaining in what manner the persons belonging to racial, linguistic or religious minorities, fulfil their duties towards their States. The information thus collected might be placed at the disposal of the States Members of the League of Nations if they so desire."

(Signed) V. Scialoja,

President of the Third Sub-Committee
of the Sixth Committee.
The Sub-Committee directed by the Sixth Committee to consider the Report of the Permanent Mandates Commission on Mandates proposes the following report for presentation by the Sixth Committee to the Assembly.

The Committee has noted with great satisfaction the intention of the Permanent Mandates Commission to investigate further the questions of indentured labour in the Pacific Islands, of the laws of land tenure in mandated territories, of the liquor legislation and the importation of alcoholic liquors in Africa, and to draw the attention of the mandatory Powers to the social, economic and political effects of the Ruanda frontier. The Committee is confident that the Council and the mandatory Powers will do everything they can to facilitate the task of the Commission in its further labours.

The Committee has also noted with pleasure that the mandatory Powers have evidenced their desire to enable due performance of the important duties which the Covenant of the League imposes upon the Council and the Permanent Mandates Commission by adding to the official report required by the Covenant full replies to questionnaires framed by the Permanent Mandates Commission.

With regard to the Nauru mandate dealt with in Part II of the Report of the Permanent Mandates Commission, the Sixth Committee deems it advisable to prevent possible misinterpretation by taking note: First, that the British Empire (the unit responsible for the Nauru mandate) consists of Great Britain together with a number of territories all owing a common allegiance but distinct in their respective powers of government, and the mandatory authority of the British Empire can therefore only be exercised by some one or more of the several Governments of the territories composing the Empire. If, for the statement in the report that the British Empire "had transferred the responsibility for the administration of the Island of Nauru to Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand", there were substituted a statement that "the British Empire had provided for the administration of the Island of Nauru by Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand", the position would be defined with greater precision and exactitude; secondly, the statement in the report that the Governments of Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand had reserved to themselves the exclusive rights of the administration of the rich deposits of phosphates which constitute the wealth of the Island is capable of misinterpretation without the explanation that the three Governments acquired, by direct purchase, through voluntary sale on the part of the owners and not through the mandate, exclusive rights granted before the war by the German Government to a private company.

The Committee has had the advantage of reading the explanatory document presented by the representatives of the Commonwealth of Australia and Japan in the document printed as A. 37. 1922. VI, as well as the statement handed in by the Australian delegate which is appended to this report, and recommends that these documents be read together with the Report of the Permanent Mandates Commission.

With regard to the Report on the Bondelzwart Rebellion, the Committee has considered and decided to recommend the adoption of the motion proposed by M. Dantes Bellegarde, delegate for Haiti, which reads as follows:

"The Assembly, highly appreciating the action taken by the Government of South Africa in communicating, in its capacity of mandatory Power for South-West Africa, the Report on the Bondelzwart Rebellion, 1922;

"Moved by feelings of great anxiety for the welfare and the relief of the survivors:

"Resolves to express:

"1. Its profound satisfaction with the official statement made by Sir Edgar Walton that a full and impartial enquiry will be made into all the facts of the Bondelzwart Rebellion and its repression;

"2. The confident hope that the Permanent Mandates Commission at its next session will consider this question and be able to report that satisfactory conditions have been established, and that, in the meanwhile, the mandatory Power will make every effort to relieve the suffering of the victims, particularly the women and children, and that it will ensure protection and restitution of the remaining livestock, and, in general, the restoration of the economic life in the Bondelzwart district."
The Committee, having considered the matter of the right of petition alluded to in the Report of the Permanent Mandates Commission, expresses the hope that this right may be defined in such a manner as to ensure that:

1. All petitions emanating from inhabitants of mandated areas will be sent to the Permanent Mandates Commission through the intermediary of the local administration and of the mandatory Power;
2. No petition concerning the welfare of the inhabitants of mandated areas emanating from other sources will be considered by the Permanent Mandates Commission before the mandatory Power has had full opportunity of expressing its views.

Statement by Mr. Justice Rich, Australian Delegate.

The statement in the report (and the context) that it is not clear what powers and means of control the Australian Administration possesses with regard to this organisation, seems to be capable of misinterpretation without the explanation that the political and economic powers are distinct. The Administrator is paramount. He is invested with the power (Article I of the Act) to make laws for the peace, order and good government of the Island. The Commissioners, powers are confined to the control over the business connected with the phosphates free from Government interference in such business (Article 13). They, in common with other citizens, are subject to the laws made by the Administrator under Article 1. They hold office during the pleasure of their respective Governments (Article 4).

ANNEX 8
MANDATES

Draft Resolution.

The Committee has noted, in the reports of the Council and of the Permanent Mandates Commission, the events which have taken place with regard to the application of Article 22 of the Covenant since the last Assembly. It wishes to express its keen satisfaction that the terms of the mandates, which had not yet been promulgated in 1921, have now been defined; that reports on the administration of mandated territories have been presented to the Permanent Mandates Commission and examined in the presence of duly accredited representatives of the Mandatory Powers; and that the mandates system has thereby been brought fully into force.

The Committee wishes, in particular, to express its deep gratitude to the Permanent Mandates Commission for the great care and impartiality which it has devoted to the accomplishment of its important and delicate task.
ANNEX 9
PROTECTION OF MINORITIES

Report to be presented to the Assembly by the Sixth Committee.

The Assembly, in a decision dated September 9th, 1922, referred to the Sixth Committee the proposals expressed in the general discussion on the work of the Council concerning the question of the Protection of Minorities:

1. The proposal submitted by the delegate for South Africa, Professor Gilbert Murray, which runs as follows:

"That the questions dealt with in Chapter 9, Sections A, B, C and D, of the General Report to the Assembly on the Work of the Council be referred to a Committee of the Assembly with the request to report thereon to the Assembly in order that the latter may have an opportunity of expressing its considered view on these questions."

2. The proposal submitted by the Delegate for Latvia, Dr. Walters. This proposal, which enlarges the scope of the preceding one, is as follows:

"That the questions dealt with in Chapter 9, Sections A, B, C and D of the General Report to the Assembly on the Work of the Council, as well as the general questions arising out of the protection of minorities for all the Members of the League of Nations, be referred to a Committee of the Assembly with the request to report thereon to the Assembly in order that the latter may have an opportunity of expressing its considered view on these questions and of laying down the main lines for the general protection of minorities in the States Members of the League of Nations."

The Sixth Committee discussed the important question of the protection of minorities at five meetings. At the first meeting, Professor Gilbert Murray, the South African delegate, submitted draft resolutions drawn up after protracted research and many conversations with important persons from various countries and milieux.

These draft resolutions run as follows:

1. "While in cases of grave infraction of the Treaties it is necessary that the Council retain its full power of direct action, the Committee recognises that in ordinary circumstances the League can best promote good relations between the various signatory Governments and the minorities under their sovereignty by benevolent and informal communications with the said Government. For this purpose the Committee suggests that the Council might reasonably require to have a larger staff at its disposal."

2. "In case of disputes as to the interpretation of the Treaties or of their application in particular cases or as to any matter of fact on which such application depends, the Committee recommends that recourse should be had without delay to the decision of the International Court."

3. "In some localities of mixed population, the Committee believes that the protection of minorities cannot be securely attained except by the appointment of resident agents of the League to report impartially on the behaviour of both, or all, sections of the population."

4. "While the Committee recognises the primary right of the minorities to be protected by the League from oppression, it also emphasises the duty incumbent in the persons belonging to minorities to co-operate as loyal fellow-citizens with the nation to which they now belong."

5. "The Committee express the hope that those States which are not bound by any legal obligation to the League with respect to minorities will nevertheless observe in the treatment of their own minorities at least as high a standard of justice and toleration as is required by any of the Treaties."

Although the Committee did not give its unanimous approval to all the points in the proposals submitted by the South African representative, they provided an extremely useful basis for the whole discussion. Many delegates then took part in an exhaustive discussion on the subject, during which the Estonian, Finnish, Latvian, and Czechoslovakian Delegates submitted special proposals. The Committee unanimously agreed to adopt the following declarations:

1. "While in cases of grave infraction of the Minorities Treaties it is necessary that the Council should retain its full power of direct action, the Committee recognises that
in ordinary circumstances the League can best promote good relations between the various signatory Governments of Minorities Treaties and persons belonging to racial, religious or linguistic minorities placed under their sovereignty by benevolent and informal communications with those Governments. For this purpose, the Committee suggests that the Council might require to have a larger secretarial staff at its disposal.

2. "In case of difference of opinion as to questions of law or fact arising out of the provisions of the Minorities Treaties between the Government concerned and one of the States Members of the Council of the League of Nations, the Committee recommends that the Members of the Council appeal without unnecessary delay to the Permanent Court of International Justice for a decision in accordance with the Minorities Treaties, it being understood that the other methods of conciliation provided for by the Covenant may always be employed."

3. "While the Committee recognises the primary right of the minorities to be protected by the League from oppression, it also emphasises the duty incumbent upon persons belonging to racial, religious or linguistic minorities to co-operate as loyal fellow-citizens with the nations to which they now belong."

4. "The Committee expresses the hope that the States which are not bound by any legal obligations to the League with respect to minorities will nevertheless observe in the treatment of their own racial, religious or linguistic minorities at least as high a standard of justice and toleration as is required by any of the Treaties and by the regular action of the Council."

5. "The Secretariat-General, which has the duty to collect information concerning the manner in which the Minorities Treaties are carried out, should not only assist the Council in the study of complaints concerning infractions of these Treaties but should also assist the Council in ascertaining in what manner the persons belonging to racial, linguistic or religious minorities fulfil their duties towards their States. The information thus collected might be placed at the disposal of the States Members of the League of Nations if they so desire."

Professor Murray, representative of South Africa, further pointed out that in certain localities of mixed population, where conflicts were frequent and serious, order had frequently been disturbed, and the need for a system of legislation for minorities founded on the same basis in all countries.

Dr. Walters, Latvian representative, told the Committee that the Latvian Delegation had hoped, by means of its draft resolution mentioned above, to give rise to a thorough investigation, by the Sixth Committee, of the minorities question, both as regards its general aspects and as regards its details. He hoped that the Committee's discussions might lead to the creation of a system of legislation for minorities founded on the same basis in all countries.

The Finnish Delegate then proposed that the Assembly should request the Council to appoint a committee to investigate the question of the protection of minorities in general and to submit a report to the next Assembly. This proposal was supported by the Estonian Delegate, but was withdrawn owing to the consideration that the resolutions already adopted by the Committee mentioned above provide for a searching enquiry by the Council and the Secretariat into minorities questions, and also that the establishment of a special committee would involve considerable expense.

The Committee has the honour to submit the following draft resolutions to the Assembly:

The Assembly approves the report of the Sixth Committee with regard to the protection of minorities and accordingly takes the following resolutions:

1. "While in cases of grave infraction of the Minorities Treaties it is necessary that the Council should retain its full power of direct action, the Assembly recognises that in ordinary circumstances the League can best promote good relations between the various signatory Governments and persons belonging to racial, religious or linguistic minorities placed under their sovereignty by benevolent and informal communications with those Governments. For this purpose, the Assembly suggests that the Council might require to have a larger secretarial staff at its disposal."

2. "In case of difference of opinion as to questions of law or fact arising out of the provisions of the Minorities Treaties between the Government concerned and one of the States Members of the Council of the League of Nations, the Assembly recommends that the Members of the Council appeal without unnecessary delay to the Permanent Court of International Justice for a decision in accordance with the Minorities Treaties, it being understood that the other methods of conciliation provided for by the Covenant may always be employed."
3. "While the Assembly recognises the primary right of the minorities to be protected by the League from oppression, it also emphasises the duty incumbent upon persons belonging to racial, religious or linguistic minorities to co-operate as loyal fellow-citizens with the nations to which they now belong."

4. "The Assembly expresses the hope that the States which are not bound by any legal obligations to the League with respect to minorities will nevertheless observe in the treatment of their own racial, religious or linguistic minorities at least as high a standard of justice and toleration as is required by any of the Treaties and by the regular action of the Council."

5. "The Secretariat-General, which has the duty to collect information concerning the manner in which the Minorities Treaties are carried out, should not only assist the Council in the study of complaints concerning infractions of these treaties but should also assist the Council in ascertaining in what manner the persons belonging to racial, linguistic or religious minorities fulfil their duties towards their States. The information thus collected might be placed at the disposal of the States Members of the League of Nations if they so desire."
REQUEST OF THE LITHUANIAN GOVERNMENT TO INCLUDE A NEW QUESTION IN THE AGENDA OF THE ASSEMBLY

Resolution adopted by the Assembly at its meeting held on September 15th, 1922.

The Third Assembly, being requested by the Lithuanian Government to include on its agenda a new question drafted as follows:

Protest against arbitrary actions of the Polish Government in connection with the territory of Vilna subsequent to the Council's recommendation of January 13th, 1922;

In view of the letter of the Polish Government raising the previous question; In view of the reply of the Lithuanian Government dated September 6th, 1922:
Approves the report presented on behalf of the special Committee by M. Hymans, the Delegate of Belgium;
Decides, in consequence, that the previous question should be adopted as regards the Lithuanian complaint brought against the statute of Vilna and the elections which the Polish Government proposed to hold in that district; Maintains in the agenda the new question so far as it concerns abusive treatment alleged to have been inflicted upon the Lithuanian population in the Vilna district; And, as it is not desirable that the discussion of the Lithuanian allegations should be raised at the Assembly before the competent Committee has had an opportunity of investigating them, refers the question, thus clearly defined, directly and without discussion, to the Sixth Committee of the Assembly, which is responsible for the investigation of political questions.
ANNEX 11

QUESTION OF SLAVERY

Draft Resolution.

The Sub-Committee directed by the Sixth Committee to consider the draft resolution on slavery in Africa proposed by Sir Arthur Steel-Maitland on September 6th, 1922, proposes the following resolution for presentation by the Sixth Committee to the Assembly:

"The Assembly decides that the question of slavery should be inserted in the agenda of the Fourth Assembly and requests the Council to lay before the Fourth Assembly a report on the information which it shall have received on the matter."

ANNEX 12

SITUATION IN GEORGIA

Motion proposed by M. de Brouckère, Delegate for Belgium, on September 15th, 1922.

The Assembly of the League of Nations, moved by the present unhappy position of Georgia as a country invaded and occupied contrary to the wishes of its inhabitants, invites the Council to follow attentively the course of events in this part of the world so that it may be able to seize any opportunity which may occur to help in the restoration of this country to normal conditions.
ANNEX 13

STATUS OF EASTERN GALICIA

Motion proposed by the Hon. William Stevens Fielding, Delegate for Canada, on September 18th, 1922.

The Assembly of the League of Nations renews its wish, expressed in the resolution adopted by the Second Assembly on September 27th, 1921, that the Council of the League draw the attention of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers to the desirability of determining at an early date the status of Eastern Galicia.

ANNEX 14

ARMENIA

Motion proposed by Lord Robert Cecil, Delegate for South Africa, on September 18th, 1922.

The Assembly notes with gratitude the action taken by the Council with respect to Armenia, and declares that it is of the opinion that in any peace with Turkey it should be an essential condition that a national home should be provided for the Armenians and requests the Council to take all steps which it may think useful to secure this result.
THE SITUATION IN THE NEAR EAST

(a) Letter from the Persian Delegation to the President of the Assembly dated September 18th, 1922.

[Translation]

SIR,

We have the honour to inform you that we have received a letter from the delegation in Rome of the Great National Assembly of Turkey requesting the intervention of Persia with the League of Nations, as the only State of the Mahomedan world represented on the Assembly, for the purpose of organising an impartial enquiry into the atrocities committed during the present war in the Near East. We beg to call attention to two essential points in this letter:

1. The Turkish National Assembly desires an impartial judgment from the League of Nations.
2. Turkey requests protection for the Mahomedan minorities in Thrace.

The League of Nations knows that Persia is maintaining a strictly neutral attitude towards the two belligerents, and she continues to enjoy the best relations with both. We have considered it right to call your attention to the request of the delegation of the Great National Assembly of Turkey, because that country is not yet a Member of the League. When the League is universal, as is the earnest desire of Persia, each State can send representatives here to submit their requests. Meanwhile, the League has a unique opportunity of proving to the Mahomedan Eastern world its utility as a high authority overriding all conflicts and working for the whole human race without distinction of race or religion.

With this great object in view, the Persian Delegation has the honour to propose to the Assembly the following resolution:

The Assembly, moved by the pitiful events in the Near East and the accusations which each belligerent has made against the other concerning the treatment of the civil population, invites the Council to send at once a neutral Commission of Enquiry to throw light on these occurrences and to avoid reprisals against the ethnical or religious minorities of Thrace and of Asia Minor.

We have the honour to be, etc.

(Signed) Prince Arfa-ed-Dowleh.

Emir Zoka-ed-Dowleh.

(b) Letter from the Persian Delegation to the President of the Assembly dated September 22nd, 1922.

[Translation]

SIR,

Since putting forward our proposal that a neutral Commission of Enquiry should be appointed for the protection of the civil populations in the Near East, we have learnt with great satisfaction that the International Red Cross Committee, of which M. Gustave Ador is the esteemed President, is taking active measures with the same object.

In order to co-ordinate all efforts and avoid useless increase of expenditure, we consider it advisable in these circumstances to withdraw our proposal, the aim of which was strictly humanitarian, and to leave this charitable work to the generous initiative of the Red Cross.

We would venture to take this opportunity of thanking the International Committee and its eminent President for the solicitude they have already shown, both to Musulman and to Christian populations.

I have the honour to be, Sir, etc.

(Signed) Prince Arfa-ed-Dowleh.
REPORT TO THE ASSEMBLY BY THE AGENDA COMMITTEE.

Geneva, September 20th, 1922.

The Committee appointed to give its opinion as to the inclusion upon the agenda of the proposals submitted to the Assembly during its present session has taken note of the proposal made by the Persian Delegation regarding an enquiry into the atrocities in the Near East.

The proposal reads as follows:

The Assembly, moved by the painful events in the Near East and the mutual accusations of the belligerents as to the treatment meted out to the civil populations, requests the Council urgently to send to the spot a neutral Commission of Enquiry instructed to throw light on these events and to see that no reprisals are taken against the racial or religious minorities in Thrace and Asia Minor.

The Assembly has just decided, in view of the exceptional nature of the circumstances, and in accordance with the Agenda Committee's report, to place on the agenda the proposal of Dr. Nansen, the Norwegian Delegate, regarding the events in Asia Minor, and to refer it to the Sixth Committee.

The Agenda Committee is of opinion that for the same reasons the Persian Delegate's proposal should be placed on the agenda and referred to the Sixth Committee.

(Signed) P. HYMANS (Chairman).
J. C. BLANCO.
Robert Cecil.
C. DISSESeco.
R. W. ERICH.