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FIRST MEETING.
Held on Wednesday, September 9th, 1931, at 5 p.m.

Chairman: M. Motta (Switzerland).

1. Election of the Vice-Chairman.
   On the proposal of Lord Lytton, M. Costa du Rels (Bolivia) was elected Vice-Chairman.

2. Publicity of the Meetings.
   On the proposal of the Chairman, the Committee decided that its meetings should be held in
   public.

SECOND MEETING.
Held on Tuesday, September 15th, 1931, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: M. Motta (Switzerland).

3. Adoption of the Agenda.
The Commission adopted its agenda as follows:
   2. Protection of Minorities (referred by the Assembly to the Sixth Committee on
      the motion of the German delegation).
   3. Slavery (referred by the Assembly to the Sixth Committee on the motion of the
      British delegation).
   4. Mandates (referred by the Assembly to the Sixth Committee on the motion of
      the Norwegian delegation).
   5. Refugees.

The Chairman read the following resolution, adopted by the Assembly on September 12th, on the proposal of M. Politis, Chairman of the Fourth Committee:

"The Assembly,
"Being convinced that it is imperative not further to increase the budget of the League for 1932, which will have to provide for the expense of the International Disarmament Conference, and hoping that it will even be possible to reduce the draft budget:
"Makes a strong appeal to its Committees to follow the principles of economy dictated by present circumstances;
"Requests these Committees to limit and, if possible, to reduce to the indispensable minimum the programme of work to be undertaken in 1932, and especially to abstain, as far as practicable, from making recommendations which might involve avoidable expenditure."


The Chairman said that, although the members were of course entitled to discuss the principle of continuing the work of the Commission of Enquiry (documents A.36.I93I.VII, and A.38.I93I.VII), he trusted that the need for continuing it would not be disputed, and that there would not be much difference of opinion on that point.

The Committee would have to decide at the present meeting to refer to the Second Committee the economic and financial questions examined by the Commission of Enquiry, and then to consider the constitution and methods of work of the Commission, which had submitted a report on this matter, on which the Sixth Committee would have to take a decision.

He drew attention to the draft Pact of Economic Non-Aggression submitted by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the Commission of Enquiry for European Union, which had decided, subject to the approval of the Assembly, to set up a Sub-Committee for the study of this question instead of referring it to the Economic Committee of the League.

The Chairman read the following draft resolution submitted by the Estonian delegation:

"The Commission of Enquiry for European Union is instructed to include forthwith and permanently in the programme of its work the question of the various possible methods for the constitution and organisation of European Union.

"The Secretariat of the League is instructed to facilitate the task of the Commission of Enquiry by bringing together and collating all existing scientific information on the subject."

M. Sato (Japan) paid a tribute to the considerable results already achieved by the Commission of Enquiry, and observed that it must be remembered that non-European countries might be deeply concerned in the solution of certain problems which, although of particular interest to Europe, were, in fact, of worldwide scope. For this reason, the Japanese delegation, at the time of the creation of the Commission of Enquiry, had insisted that the resolution of the Assembly which set up the new body should take account of the interest which non-European countries might have in certain of these universal questions. He referred to the fact that the report presented by M. Motta in March 1931 on the organisation and procedure of the Commission of Enquiry was based upon the Assembly resolution, and that the Commission had decided that its meetings should be open to States Members of the League which were not represented on the Commission, and that they should be entitled to submit their views should they think fit. There was no need for him to emphasise the importance of that very desirable decision.

While Japan was glad to see European countries attacking the serious problems of the present day, and while he did not doubt that the Commission would be able to find useful solutions for them, he was of opinion that such solutions could only be fully effective with the co-operation of non-European countries. The Japanese market alone, for example, absorbed European products to the value of more than a thousand million Swiss francs, and was thus able to some extent to relieve the economic depression in Europe. It was therefore important that the non-European countries should, either directly or indirectly, be able to share in the work of the Commission of Enquiry so far as concerned matters of universal interest.

The Japanese delegation was of the opinion that a final solution of these questions must always be sought within the Economic and Financial Organisation of the League; such a procedure would undoubtedly remove certain apprehensions which were felt by non-European countries in this respect.

With regard to the proposal of the Soviet Government concerning a Pact of Economic Non-Aggression, the Japanese delegation was unable to consider such a pact as not being of universal importance. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had economic relations with all parts of the world, and an enquiry into this problem by a sub-committee under the aegis of the Commission of Enquiry would give a European character to a question which concerned the interests of numerous non-European countries. For this reason, the Japanese delegation considered that the Soviet proposal should be referred to the Economic Organisation of the League. If, nevertheless, the Commission of Enquiry felt it necessary to maintain its resolution by which a sub-committee would be set up for the examination of this question, the Japanese delegation would insist that all
non-European States Members of the League should be admitted, if they so desired, to take a part in the work of the sub-committee on a footing of equality with the European non-member States who might be present at the discussion of this question. One of those States had even put forward a proposal in this sense.

The Japanese delegate drew the attention of the Committee to the overlapping which was involved by the creation by the Commission of Enquiry of sub-committees for the examination of certain economic problems which were already within the competence of the Economic and Financial Organisation of the League. He considered that it would undoubtedly be of advantage to send direct to this organisation general matters of interest to the entire world. It was necessary to avoid the partial study of questions by *ad hoc* bodies when there were already in existence other bodies which could examine them in a wider and more universal manner.

Mirza Hussein Khan AlA (Persia) supported the remarks of M. Sato, and reminded the Committee that he had already drawn the attention of the Assembly to the interdependence of all the countries in the world, and had stated that it would be desirable to extend the beneficial influence of the League to all Asiatic countries.

M. Lange had two observations to make on the work undertaken by the Commission of Enquiry and on the report submitted to the Sixth Committee. In the first place, he had been struck with the overlapping which was revealed in the documents which had been submitted to the Sixth Committee. Many questions which were already being studied by other League organs were on the programme of the Commission of Enquiry; as an example, he might quote the enquiry concerning concerted economic action, questions of communications and transit, and questions of unemployment.

Moreover, as had been pointed out by the Japanese delegate, the problems which were of particular interest to Europe, far from being exclusively European, were questions of universal interest. There was, however, a residue of questions of exclusively European interest, among which might be mentioned the Belgian suggestion regarding the distribution of electrical energy. M. Lange agreed with the criticisms made by M. Sato and expressed disapproval of the excessive number of bodies, documents and meetings which had resulted from the activity of the Commission of Enquiry and involved considerable expense to the League in addition to a great deal of work.

Without depreciating in any way the importance of the activity of the Commission of Enquiry, and while desiring that this activity should continue, the Norwegian delegation was of opinion that certain definite limits should be set.

Carrying the matter a little further, the Norwegian delegate felt that the idea at the basis of European union belonged to the past. At the present time, life was no longer lived in continents, but in a world that economically formed a single unit. In these circumstances, it appeared to him to be a mistake to work for a more or less permanent organisation of European States. In his opinion, more useful work might be done by following the German method of "Zweckverband"—that was to say, an association with very definite and practical ends.

In conclusion, therefore, the Norwegian delegate felt bound definitely to oppose the Estonian delegate's suggestion.

M. Curtius (Germany) said that, if present events proved that, from the economic point of view, Europe could not be isolated from the rest of the world, that was not a reason for asking the Assembly at the present stage to put an end to the mandate of the Commission of Enquiry. The latter had been in existence for only one year, and its mandate should be renewed.

In reply to the criticisms of the Commission's methods of work, and particularly, of the number of committees and sub-committees it had set up, M. Curtius pointed out that this was the procedure adopted by all international organisations and that, moreover, every one of the committees and sub-committees had done very valuable work, some of them in a very short period of time and even, perhaps, at less cost than would have been incurred by the League Economic Committee. The Commission, therefore, could not be forbidden to set up such committees and sub-committees as were indispensable, it being understood, of course, that there must not be too many of them.

As regards the participation of non-European States in the Commission's work, M. Curtius appreciated their anxiety in the matter. It must, however, be remembered that the Commission's regulations authorised the non-European countries to send representatives to its meetings as observers and even to submit suggestions and memoranda. Though they had not so far exercised that right, it was none the less true that the Commission would be glad of the assistance of non-European States along the lines just indicated.

Again, the Commission of Enquiry had been set up by the League, and all its decisions must be submitted to the Assembly, where all countries, including the non-European countries, were
entitled to submit their observations. Further, the Governments were not committed by any decision of the Commission. These two facts should allay any legitimate misgivings felt by the non-European countries.

As regards the Pact of Economic Non-Aggression, submitted by the Soviet Government, M. Curtius intended to ask the Assembly to authorise the Commission to set up a sub-committee to study it.

Dealing next with the Estonian delegation's draft resolution, M. Curtius thought it would be premature at the present stage to attempt to determine the constitution and political organisation of the United States of Europe. The question should, he thought, be held over, and the Commission should concentrate its attention on economic questions, which, in view of the existing difficulties, constituted the essential part of its task for the time being.

M. BRIAND (France) recalled that he had been the prime mover in the setting up of the Commission of Enquiry, and had urged the peoples of Europe carefully to examine the question of uniting within the framework of the League of Nations for the purpose of attempting to solve the problems besetting them. After an important discussion, the question of principle had been answered in the affirmative. That question could not now be reopened. The Commission had been set up within the League. It had worked in accordance with the League's views and with the help of its organs. Complaints had been made in the Assembly of the League's lack of activity. It would hardly be a proof of activity to undo this year what had been done last year—that was to say, to abolish the Commission which had been set up.

M. Briand then reviewed the criticism advanced against the Commission's methods. He agreed that, under the impulse of events, the Commission had somewhat exceeded the functions laid down for it. But it must be remembered that, faced with the awful sufferings of Europe, it had been unable to do otherwise than respond to the cry of those in distress. It had believed that, in so doing, it was acting in accordance with the wishes of the entire League. M. Briand considered that the Commission had done useful work. If it had not succeeded in relieving the countries where the economic depression was particularly severe, it had nevertheless done something to reconcile divergent interests. It had helped to create markets and had thus restored confidence in the countries affected. In the sphere of agricultural credit—mortgage loans—it had secured quite appreciable results. It could not, therefore, be charged with inactivity. The only reproach that could be made against it was that it had been over-zealous and had taken up problems that exceeded the European horizon. It would be well to call the Commission's attention to that point.

M. Briand thought that, in order to render the League the important services, which the latter had the right to expect of it, the Commission of Enquiry must, as the previous speakers had suggested, be prepared to examine all problems on a broad basis and confer with non-European countries as well as with States non-members of the League, as was laid down in the Assembly resolution of September 17th, 1930.

Consequently, M. Briand thought it would be desirable to confirm the last Assembly's resolution and to ask the present Assembly to extend the Commission's mandate.

M. PUSTA (Estonia) explained his delegation's draft resolution. The Commission of Enquiry had by no means finished its work. It still had before it the question of the final form to be assumed by the co-operation of the European countries within the framework of the League. That question had been dealt with in the eleventh Assembly's resolution of September 17th, 1930, which contained the phrase, "sharing their unanimous opinion that such co-operation, whatever form it may assume, should be within the framework of the League..." He emphasised the words "whatever form it may assume", which were very significant.

The Commission had so far concerned itself mainly with economic problems, but it still had before it the second part of the task assigned to it—namely, the organisation of co-operation among the States. The Estonian proposal did not ask the Commission to bring about European union in one of the known forms of associations of States. Its only object was to confirm the terms of the Commission's mandate.

There was no need to comment on the second paragraph of the draft resolution. The League Secretariat was at the same time the Secretariat of the Commission of Enquiry, and should therefore be responsible for collecting all the necessary documentation. In conclusion, M. Pusta stated that, if his proposal could be given a more general and wider form, he would be the first to welcome it.

M. BENEŠ (Czechoslovakia) concurred in the ideas expressed by M. Curtius and M. Briand on the question as a whole. The plethora of committees and documents to which the Norwegian delegate had taken exception was explained by the desire to perform as much work as possible in the shortest possible time. Moreover, in an undertaking of such wide range, it was not always easy at the outset to discriminate between vital questions and less urgent matters. A judicious compromise could be reached on that point.

M. Beneš considered that, in raising the question of principle, M. Lange had gone somewhat too far. The idea of a Commission of Enquiry for European Union was a sufficiently practical one. The proposal had already been obtained owing to its work showed that the Commission was not only justified, but that it met a genuine need. M. Beneš had been able to appreciate that, in Czechoslovakia and the neighbouring countries, great hopes were placed in the Commission's work. The community of international interests was already being appreciated more keenly, and the Commission's work had strengthened in Czechoslovakia, as in many other countries, the feeling that close and intimate co-operation was essential. That was an appreciable moral result.
As M. Briand had observed, the interests of the non-European States must be borne in mind. That, however, did not rule out the possibility of a reasonable compromise.

With regard to the Estonian proposal, a solution might be sought on the lines suggested by M. Curtins. M. Beneš therefore supported the proposal to continue the Commission's work, and he urged that the Assembly should take a decision in that sense.

Sir Jehangir Cojaee (India) said that, if there was the least suspicion of criticism in the way in which the non-European countries regarded the work of the Commission of Enquiry, it was not because they felt anxious that they were being left out of a great movement, but because they appreciated the importance of the task undertaken.

He recognised that the Commission implied a certain amount of duplication of effort and a divergence of effort which were inevitable owing to the fact that certain world problems were sometimes considered from the Continental point of view as well.

However, the work of the Commission's work would be justified if Europe achieved union, and thus set an example of rapid and decisive action in the economic sphere. If the original idea of European union and the actual results were considered, it was plain that there was a certain weakening in action and a watering down of ideals. If the Commission contributed by its activities to the political and economic stability of Europe and thus created a confidence of which the whole world had such great need to-day, it would amply justify its existence. He hoped that that would be the case, but emphasised that it must act promptly.

In conclusion, he would enquire whether the policy of Europe in the economic depression of the 'seventies and 'eighties had not been to develop trade with the non-European and overseas countries and whether the depression had not been cured in that way. This might perhaps afford a useful suggestion for overcoming the present depression.

M. Michalakopoulos (Greece), in reply to the criticisms advanced against the creation of committees and sub-committees by the Commission of Enquiry, pointed out that this was the procedure adopted by Parliaments when they wished to do careful work. He believed, therefore, that the efficacy of the Commission's work would be lessened if its powers were restricted. It should also be remarked that each country's share in the expenses resulting from the Commission was trifling.

The view that the idea of European union belonged to past ages was, he thought, unduly pessimistic. Even if it was a very old one, was that a reason for dropping it?

M. Michalakopoulos considered that, although he was justified in hoping that the union of European States would be achieved as promptly as possible, undue haste must be avoided in order to prevent failure. The best method was the empirical method. There was no question of isolating European policy from world policy. The object was to organise the life of Europe within the general structure of the whole globe. There was no reason for apprehension regarding the Commission, since its decisions must always be submitted to the League Assembly.

In conclusion, he supported M. Beneš' proposal that the Assembly should be requested to authorise the Commission to continue its work.

M. Dekien Tung (China) appreciated the great utility of European co-operation, and stated that M. Briand's proposal had met with a sympathetic reception in China. While there were certain purely European interests, it was none the less true that the interests of all countries throughout the world were so closely related at the present moment that they could not be circumscribed by geographical frontiers.

The Chinese delegation shared the view that it was necessary for the non-European countries to take part in the work of the Commission of Enquiry.

M. Choumenkovitch (Yugoslavia) entirely agreed with earlier speakers as to the need for continuing the Commission's work. While it was true that the subject of its studies went far beyond the bounds of Europe, it was, however, impossible to set geographical limits to an enquiry of such wide scope.

The Commission had decided to investigate the world depression with regard to its effects on the European countries in particular. The depression subsisted and the European countries were more especially affected. As the causes which had brought it into being still existed, the Commission must continue its work. True, it had done much, but it had not concluded its task, and it should be a point of honour for the Commission to finish what it had begun. As representative of an agricultural country which was particularly severely affected, M. Choumenkovitch was anxious that the Commission should finish its work in that sphere. The actual text of the Sub-Committee's recommendations led to the inference that they should be carried out first and foremost within the framework of Europe. The Commission of Enquiry was the most competent body for that work.

There were certain other moral reasons in favour of continuing the Commission's work. The eyes of the world, and particularly those of Europe, were fixed on Geneva, and more especially on the European Commission. The work must continue until the depression had been overcome.

For these reasons, M. Choumenkovitch agreed with earlier speakers and urged that the Commission's mandate should be renewed.

The Chairman summed up the discussion. He noted, first, that no speaker had questioned the principle that the Commission's work should be continued; that, therefore, could be regarded as accepted unanimously.
Next, the delegates of the non-European countries had urged that most of the problems taken up by the Commission were not exclusively European problems, but, in part at least, extra-European as well. The delegates of the non-European countries who had spoken had, however, assented to the Commission’s continuing its enquiry.

Nevertheless, the Commission would not be adhering to the general spirit underlying the discussion unless it continued its work under the conditions in which it had been begun. It must preserve its character as a Commission of Enquiry for European Union.

Another point that seemed to emerge from the discussion was that the financial and economic questions considered by the Commission should be referred to the Second Committee.

Many speakers had expressed a desire that the Commission should employ the technical organs of the League to the fullest possible extent. It had, however, been generally admitted that, in certain cases, the Commission could set up special committees.

With regard to the Pact of Economic Non-Aggression proposed by the Soviet Government, M. Sato had said that he would prefer the question to be referred to the Economic Committee; but that, if the Commission adhered to its proposal to appoint a special committee, it must be understood that representatives of non-European countries would be invited to sit on the special committee. If, however, non-European countries were to be allowed to sit on a committee of that kind, it must necessarily be recognised that they must act on the same lines as those on which they acted in the plenary Commission.

The Chairman would suggest that a formula, which would be drafted later, should be adopted, to the effect that the Committee agreed in principle that the Commission of Enquiry for European Union should make use of the League’s technical organisations in all cases where there was no warrant for exceptions to this procedure, but that special committees could be set up in exceptional circumstances. It might, however, be asked whether the League organisations would be always able to do such work as the Commission might place upon them. The Chairman would be glad to have the views of the Second Committee on this point. He asked for authorisation to send a letter on this subject to the Chairman of the Second Committee, and suggested that a small drafting committee be set up to consider the texts of the letter and of a draft resolution which would be submitted to the Committee for approval.

The Committee decided to appoint a Drafting Committee consisting of M. Briand, M. Curtius, M. Sato, M. Lange, M. Beneš, M. Grandi, Lord Lytton, M. Pusta and Sir Jehangir Coyajee.

THIRD MEETING.

Held on Wednesday, September 16th, 1931, at 10 a.m.

Chairman : M. Motta (Switzerland).


The CHAIRMAN read a draft letter from the Chairman of the Sixth Committee to the Chairman of the Second Committee prepared by the Drafting Committee appointed at the last meeting (Annex I).

The draft letter was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN, referring to the Pact of Economic Non-Aggression, expressed the view that the substance of this question could not be discussed in the Sixth Committee, and that it was preferable to refer it to the Second Committee. In the course of the previous day’s meeting of the Sixth Committee and of the Drafting Committee, it had been considered advisable that extra-European States should share in the discussion on this question. It therefore appeared necessary that the Assembly should decide that, when the Commission of Enquiry for European Union and the special committee entrusted with this particular question came to deal with the Pact of Economic Non-Aggression, the non-European States should co-operate in this work on equal terms with the European States. Before taking a definite decision on this matter, he thought it would be advisable to await any communications concerning it which might be received from the Second Committee.

The Chairman read the following draft resolution prepared and adopted unanimously by the Drafting Committee:

"The Assembly notes with satisfaction the results of the work done by the Commission of Enquiry for European Union ;
"It approves the report of the Commission of Enquiry regarding its constitution, organisation and methods of work ;
"It requests the Commission to pursue the work undertaken in conformity with the principles laid down in the resolution of September 17th, 1930 ;
"It recommends it to have recourse whenever possible to the technical organs of the League of Nations and to refer to the League the settlement of any problems which it thinks capable of solution on a universal plane ;
"It requests the Commission to submit a report on its further work to the next session of the Assembly."

The draft resolution was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the Drafting Committee was of the opinion that the draft resolution proposed by the Estonian delegation at the previous meeting, together with the observations made upon it in the Sixth Committee, should be regarded as a matter for the Commission of Enquiry. The Commission might, if it thought advisable, deal with it later, and it was in this sense that the Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee might refer to the proposal in his report to the Assembly.

The Chairman's proposals were adopted.


On the proposal of M. BRIAND (France), M. Motta was appointed Rapporteur.

The CHAIRMAN agreed to carry out the duties of Rapporteur, and expressed the belief that there would be no necessity for him to submit a written report to the Assembly, but that a verbal comment on the resolution would suffice. He pointed out that a rapporteur would also be required on the subject of the Pact of Economic Non-Aggression and that, should the Committee so desire, he would be prepared to agree to act as Rapporteur for this question also.

The Chairman's proposal was adopted.

8. Protection of Minorities.

M. CURTIUS (Germany), taking as the starting-point of his observations the report presented by M. Motta to the Assembly in the previous year, pointed out that, at the time of the discussion of this report, it was generally agreed that the problem of minorities was of fundamental interest for the peace of the world.

In connection with a case of particular importance, the Council had once more defined its attitude regarding the obligations of the League in this matter, and he quoted certain declarations on this subject made by Mr. Henderson, at that time President of the Council.

M. Curtius noted, from the figures available, that the activities of the Minorities Committees had considerably increased. Referring to the decision of the Council at Madrid that the members of the Minorities Committees might be increased from three to five when particularly important questions were under consideration, he observed that, so far, use had only been made of these powers on one occasion. He considered that it would be advisable to take this course more frequently in future.

Referring to the position of petitioners under the existing procedure, M. Curtius pointed out that, although receipt of a petition was acknowledged, and although petitioners had the right to submit additional petitions, they played absolutely no part in the actual procedure. They were not even informed of any observations made by the Governments concerned. Serious inconvenience might arise from this procedure, as had been shown in connection with a certain case which had been brought before the Council. The Minorities Committees no doubt had the right, when they considered it advisable, to ask for further information from the petitioners; but they had up to the present scarcely made use of this right, which was an important means of increasing the confidence of minorities.

M. Curtius recalled the conclusions of the Council at Madrid regarding publicity for the decisions taken. He considered that publicity was an important guarantee for minorities and often made it possible to avoid misunderstandings. Publicity was particularly necessary in two cases—in the first place, when the procedure before the Committee terminated in an undertaking on the part of the Government concerned; and, secondly, when the Government concerned put an end to the procedure by declaring that it was negotiating direct with the minority. Of the twenty-nine cases dealt with in 1930 by the Minority Committees, in only three had the decisions taken been published. Similarly, of the sixty-one cases examined since the Madrid decisions, only eleven had been published. He considered it highly necessary to publish decisions in a larger proportion of cases. On the other hand, he pointed out that no information was available on the decisions taken in the fifty other cases. It was not even known in regard to some of them whether the Committees dealing with them had not met with opposition, as regards publication, on the part of the Governments concerned. It would be interesting to have figures on this point, as it would then be possible to ascertain to what extent the Minority Committees were acting on the Madrid decisions.

Finally, he urged that all decisions on minorities questions should be applied in as liberal a spirit as possible. The League should not avoid its obligations in the matter of the protection of minorities, which were sacred rights and must be safeguarded.

M. GHILA (Roumania) recalled that, during the discussions in the Sixth Committee in 1930, the delegates of Greece, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Roumania and Yugoslavia had expressed their views with regard to the question of minorities. They had nothing to add to these declarations, which they reaffirmed in toto, it being clearly understood that their declarations excluded any widening of the decisions taken at Madrid.
Count Apponyi (Hungary) maintained the position he had taken up in 1930. He agreed with the German delegate as to the necessity of improving the procedure for petitions and suggested (1) that observations made by the Governments on the subject of petitions should be brought to the notice of petitioners; (2) that the publicity given to the decisions taken should be much extended—in other words, that publicity should be the rule and not the exception.

M. Beaubien (Canada) pointed out that the minorities question was not an exclusively European one, and that it had effects in distant countries, among others, in Canada, where there lived considerable minority groups faithfully attached to their country of origin.

The Canadian delegation maintained the view previously taken up on this question. While expressing satisfaction with the progress accomplished in the administration of the regulations relating to minorities, he thought that there was room for considerable improvement in the procedure adopted. Justice must be blind, it was undesirable that she should be occult, still less that she should be irresolute and dilatory.

The Canadian delegation considered that a Permanent Consultative Committee might render very useful services in connection with minorities.

Such a Commission, administering justice openly, would instil in the minorities that confidence which was so essential to the maintenance of harmonious relations. By doing away with vexatious delays, which at present were perhaps inevitable, it might be able at the outset to ease irritation, which otherwise might lead to conflict.

Lord Cecil (British Empire) supported fully the declarations previously made by Mr. Henderson, to which M. Curtius had referred. They represented accurately the British Government's point of view. The moment was not suitable for a discussion of principle. Lord Cecil was convinced that the suggestions of M. Curtius would receive the attention they deserved, and noticed with satisfaction that the procedure was being improved. It would be well to maintain the procedure in its present form, as it would undoubtedly continue to improve with time.

M. Petsche (France) agreed with Count Apponyi and Lord Cecil that the time was not ripe for reopening a discussion which in many respects might be extremely difficult. M. Petsche adhered to the statement of principle made last year by M. Briand, and was glad to note from the speeches which he had just heard that the present system was not directly under discussion, but only the method of its application. The French delegation felt it should be applied in a liberal spirit and was confident that the Committees of the Council would continue to base their action both on the sacred rights of the minorities and on the rights of sovereign States, which were also sacred.

M. Hurtado (Spain) would not suggest any change in the procedure followed hitherto or in the legal situation relative to the minorities problem. The minorities would obviously feel greater confidence if the decisions of the Minorities Committees were made more widely known. All that was needed was to find a way of giving the decisions of these Committees greater publicity without wounding the susceptibilities of the States concerned or making them feel that they had in any way accepted permanent supervision. The decisions should only be published with the agreement of the countries concerned. The important point was to make them understand that it was to their advantage to assent to publicity.

Whatever the procedure adopted, the main thing to be borne in mind was the psychological aspect. M. Hurtado might cite his own country to illustrate his meaning. The new Spanish Republic was far more seriously affected by the mistrust felt abroad as to the stability of the Government than by internal difficulties. Two important Bills had been placed before the Cortés: a Bill for the Constitution of the Republic and a draft Charter of Catalonian autonomy. These two Bills embodied all the principles enunciated by the League with regard to the rights of minorities. It followed that, whereas last year the Spanish minorities had come to the League and tried to obtain protection against the sovereign State, they now formed part of the League and felt it an honour to represent the State of which they had previously had cause to complain.

In conclusion, M. Hurtado drew attention to the practical lesson which might be learnt from the example of the Spanish Republic and which might be summed up in the following rule: The surest method of overcoming the supposed or real disaffection of national minorities is to have confidence in them and to grant and respect their due rights.

The Chairman suggested that, as there was no definite proposal before the Committee, one of the members should be requested to sum up the discussion in a report which would be submitted to the Assembly. The Council might deduce from the report such conclusions as it thought desirable when dealing with the minorities questions under its jurisdiction.


The Chairman proposed that Baron Yrjö-Koskinen, delegate of Finland, should be appointed Rapporteur.

The Chairman's proposal was adopted.
10. Slavery.

Lord Lytton (British Empire) said that the British Government's position with regard to slavery was the same as in previous years. He reminded his colleagues of the resolution submitted to the Committee last year by the British delegation for the establishment of a Permanent Bureau of Experts on Slavery. Although the draft resolution submitted this year was slightly different, the delegation's attitude had not altered with regard to the establishment of such a bureau.

The Commission set up in 1922, following the New Zealand delegation's proposal, to deal with slavery had not completed its work when it was disbanded in 1925. The Convention subsequently drawn up—and since ratified by forty countries—could not be regarded as the end of the League's work in the matter of slavery, but rather as the starting-point of new activities. His Government would never be satisfied until the status of slavery was finally abolished and the British delegation would continue to recommend any course which, in its opinion, would help to achieve the abolition of this evil until slavery ceased to exist, not merely in name, but in fact. That aim was still remote. The number of persons at present in a state of slavery might without exaggeration be estimated at five millions. The question now was how to assist in the liberation of these five millions.

The British Government did not desire to condemn the Government of any country in which slavery still existed. It recognised the very great difficulties with which those countries were faced in fulfilling their obligations and appreciated the efforts they were making to do this. It was their knowledge of the difficulty of the task to be achieved that had convinced the British Government of the need for establishing a Permanent Advisory Bureau, not to criticise, but to help the Governments concerned, and to save them from condemnation by insufficiently instructed public opinion.

The British delegation did not think it expedient to submit again this year the proposal for such a bureau; first, for financial reasons of which everyone was aware, and, second, because it hoped that the experience derived from the temporary committee which was being proposed would remove the objections which had hitherto been raised to the establishment of a permanent bureau. These objections, he thought, were largely due to a misunderstanding. The analogy which had been suggested between the proposed Permanent Advisory Bureau and the Permanent Mandates Commission was, perhaps, responsible for this misunderstanding. The functions of the two would really be quite different.

The British delegation's new proposal was to reconstitute the Temporary Slavery Commission which had been disbanded in 1925. It was plain from a letter dated July 25th, 1925, from the Chairman of the Commission to the President of the Council of the League (document A.19.1925.VII) that, when the Commission was disbanded, it did not regard its work as completed.

Lord Lytton would also suggest that the earlier British proposal for the establishment of a Permanent Advisory Bureau should be referred to the reconstituted temporary commission. If a sub-committee were appointed to consider the matter, he would submit to it a proposal that the Assembly should request the Council to reconstitute the Temporary Slavery Commission for one year, on the understanding that the expenses involved should be reduced to the lowest possible point. In making that proposal, the British delegation reserved its right to revert next year to its original proposal for the establishment of a Permanent Advisory Bureau.

The Chairman drew attention to a letter he had received from the first delegate of New Zealand forwarding correspondence between the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society and the Emperor of Abyssinia (Annex 2).

Count de Penha Garcia (Portugal) was obliged to make the same objections of principle as those he had made two years previously, when the British proposal had first been brought forward. There were two additional reasons for voting against the proposal this year: (1) the need for economy, and (2) the fact that the Sixth Committee had adopted the principle that, whenever the existing League organisations were sufficient for the performance of any work, it was useless to set up others. Very strong legal arguments could be opposed to the British proposal. He would develop them during the discussion in the sub-committee of which Lord Lytton had just spoken. Another reason why Count de Penha Garcia objected to the proposal was that the methods adopted by the Assembly on two occasions to accelerate the effects of the Convention on Slavery had been found excellent in practice, and consequently no new method should be adopted unless there were very serious reasons for doing so. The procedure adopted by the Assembly in its resolutions of 1929 and 1930 had given admirable results, as was proved by the number of new ratifications to the Convention received by the Secretariat since the procedure in question had been applied and, as well, by the information supplied by the States under the terms of the Convention.

Further, the documents received by the Secretariat, as a result of the methods established by the Assembly, gave every reason to be satisfied with what had been done in recent years to abolish slavery in the countries in which this deplorable condition still existed. Among the documents supplied by the British Government was a report by the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society. That report provided information in somewhat measured terms with regard to slavery in certain countries. After showing the extent of the evil, it indicated the means of fighting it and eradicating it completely.
According to the above report, three factors were required to achieve the latter result. The first was time. It was difficult to make a rapid change in usages founded on old traditions, and a commission of experts would be unable to take effective action to change this situation which the report of the Anti-Slavery Society rightly placed in the forefront.

The second factor was money for compensation to dispossessed slave-owners, expenses for the upkeep of schools, organisations of all kinds for freed slaves, etc. While the Commission could draw attention to the importance of this factor, it would be unable to obtain the money.

The third factor was the pressure of public opinion. Public opinion, however, was kept on the alert in a matter of this kind, not only by anti-slavery societies, but by the discussions at the League.

To sum up, there was nothing to show that the Commission proposed by the British delegation would be useful. Count de Penha Garcia thought that, not only was it doubtful whether it would be of value, but it was not covered by the Covenant, and, above all, it was incompatible with the legal situation created by the Slavery Convention. A new Convention would be required before the principle of a temporary or permanent commission on slavery could be accepted. The Portuguese Government was not prepared to agree to the creation of any Commission the duties of which were not in accordance with those legal principles which the Assembly was bound to respect. Count de Penha Garcia proposed to develop these arguments later.

(The continuation of the discussion was adjourned to the next meeting.)

FOURTH MEETING.

Held on Thursday, September 17th, 1931, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: M. MOTTA (Switzerland).

11. Slavery (continuation).

Count APPONYI (Hungary) supported, as he had done in the previous year, the British proposal, in spite of the altered form in which it was submitted. He thought it desirable that there should be a permanent body to supervise the progress of the campaign against slavery, an institution which was universally condemned. He did not wish to blame any countries in which slavery still existed, recalling the fact that the Civil War in America had been partly due to the support of slavery by States which, from the standpoint of culture, were highly developed.

He did not agree with the Portuguese delegation that the present position was satisfactory. The information received so far was incomplete, and the permanent committee now proposed would be able to collect information systematically and procure it from quarters which, up to the present, had not supplied any. Its existence would also be evidence of the keen desire of the League of Nations that this evil should be abolished.

With regard to the important action taken by the Emperor of Abyssinia, in spite of considerable difficulties, he pointed out that, according to the latest decree, slaves were to be liberated immediately on the death of their master and not after an interval of seven years, as had previously been the case. The loan of slaves was also prohibited, and a tribunal had been set up to enforce the decrees. Slave-trading was also being satisfactorily dealt with. He handed to the Chairman an English translation of these decrees (Annex 3) and suggested that the League of Nations should congratulate the Emperor of Abyssinia on his action.

M. SOTTILE (Liberia) supported the British proposal for the restoration of the old Committee on the understanding that it did not concern itself with the internal policy of the States. His views on this matter had undergone a change, as he had previously opposed the British proposal. Last year his Government, giving an unprecedented example of courage and loyalty which everyone must appreciate, decided to ask an international Committee to conduct an enquiry into slavery, forced labour and the pawn system in his country. That committee, after five months of work, completed its investigations in September 1930. Unfortunately, at the time of this investigation, there was a Presidential election in Liberia, and the situation had been exploited for electoral ends by means of wrong moves and forged documents, etc. The result of this unfortunate atmosphere had been to prevent the Committee from obtaining a fair view of the facts, and it had, as a consequence, exceeded its terms of reference.

There were undoubtedly exaggerations and inaccuracies in the report of the Committee, and they were no doubt due to the above causes. The publication of the report last December had been followed by a newspaper campaign against Liberia which had not confined itself to the statements, already inaccurate and exaggerated, made in the report, but had added many other unfounded assertions. The result was that Liberia had had a very bad advertisement, which, although it drew the attention of the world to the existence of Liberia, was in other respects regrettable.

The Liberian Government had taken energetic action with a view to carrying out the recommendations made in the report, within the limits of its constitutional and financial powers.
It would go still further in this direction and would willingly examine any offers of assistance it might receive and which were within the limits of the Covenant of the League.

The Council of the League had appointed a special Committee to examine in what practical way assistance might be given to his country. This Committee had sent three experts to Liberia, one in administrative matters, one in finance and one in hygiene. The experts had returned to Geneva on August 17th, and he hoped that their report would soon be in the possession of the Committee.

His reason for supporting the British proposal was that the result of the Press campaign against Liberia had been a general conviction that Liberia was a hotbed of slavery. This he strongly denied. He could produce evidence to show that forms of slavery and forced labour were in existence in other parts of the world which would not be tolerated in his own country. He desired to contribute to the eradication of slavery and to prove to public opinion that Liberia had not, as had been stated, a monopoly in slavery and the various forms of the slave trade, and, further, that in many other parts of the world these evils existed in far greater proportions.

M. LOUDON (Netherlands) proposed a via media between the British suggestion that the old Slavery Committee should be revived and the views of the Portuguese delegate, who considered that the existing system should continue. A small committee of, say, three people—colonial experts—might be set up to make suggestions as to the best means effectively to combat slavery. It would be difficult to reconstitute the old Committee, and there would be the further disadvantage of the expenditure involved. He hoped that this proposal would meet with the support of those who were in favour of the British proposal, and suggested that it should be discussed by a sub-committee.

Diwan Abdul Hamid (India) supported the British proposal, particularly as the cost involved was to be as low as possible. He saw no fundamental difference between Lord Lytton's proposal and that of M. Loudon, apart from the small matter of the number of members.

There was no slavery in India. It had formerly existed in the so-called non-administered areas of Burma; but, in the last five years, the Government of India had sent expeditions to those areas, and slavery and human sacrifice no longer existed there. He suggested that one of the members of the committee proposed by Lord Lytton should be a representative of Oriental countries. He supported Count Apponyi's suggestion that the Emperor of Abyssinia should be congratulated on his action against slavery. As a Moslem, and particularly as it had been stated that slavery existed in Arabia, he wished to say that his religion afforded no protection to this practice, and the liberation of slaves was stated in their Holy Books to be a meritorious action.

M. LOUDON (Netherlands) emphasised that the chief object of his proposal was to save expense.

M. DEKIEN TUNG (China) wished to correct a statement made by the British delegation that slavery still existed in China. The rights of man had been recognised in his country long before the French Revolution, and the principles of Confucianism and of family morality in China made it impossible for the institution of slavery to exist.

With regard to the traffic in women and children referred to in a letter from the Anti-Slavery Society of June 11th, 1931, that practice was a breach of the law and a crime which, unfortunately, went on in all parts of the world, including Europe. There were numerous laws in the Chinese Criminal Code against this practice, and a law was in preparation to abolish prostitution altogether. Traffic in children did not exist in China—in fact, could not co-exist with the Chinese traditions of filial piety and the well-known readiness of Chinese mothers to adopt other children in cases of disaster.

As regards the reference in the Secretary-General's report to police-court cases, it was recognised that Hong-Kong was a centre of crime, and this, he considered, was largely due to the existence of treaties under which an unequal regime had been established. Although not directly concerned in this matter, his Government was considering ratifying the Convention for the abolition of slavery.

Mr. PiENAAR (Union of South Africa) stated that his delegation had voted against the British proposal last year on the ground that several delegations had asked for a further year's experience of the present system. The year had passed, and he did not consider that the position had sufficiently improved to warrant further delay. As the British delegation's proposal this year was in a milder form, he hoped that the delegations with whom he had voted last year would be prepared to agree to it. It was desirable that the League should stand forward as definitely opposed to slavery and as being anxious to do all that could be done to bring it to an end. Slavery was, in fact, a deeper form of degradation than war, which had been declared a crime by the League.

M. AUBERT (France) said that France had had no difficulty in ratifying the Slavery Convention, which was in entire harmony with her national legislation and colonial policy. This ratification had not involved any legislation.
He would be glad to support the proposed temporary committee if the Sixth Committee considered it desirable, provided that its temporary character was emphasised and that it contained members with colonial experience and confined itself to the examination of information voluntarily supplied by the countries concerned and by associations acting with the approval of those countries. The committee might well consider other matters, such as serfdom; but it should be clearly understood that there were constitutional questions which were beyond its scope and which involved the relation of the League of Nations to colonial Powers, a matter with which the Committee would clearly not be competent to deal.

M. GORGE (Switzerland) was of the opinion that the existing measures were not adequate, and warmly supported the British proposal. He would, indeed, have supported the fuller proposal for the establishment of a Permanent Bureau if that had been put forward again by the British delegation. As regards the economic objections put forward by the Portuguese delegate, he pointed out that, if the Committee turned out to be superfluous, the expenditure involved would be small; whereas, if it produced valuable results, no one would regret having voted the credits. He did not consider the fact that the ratifications of the Slavery Convention had been considerably increased in number during the past year was evidence of the success of the existing system. Many of the acceding countries had no slavery problems in their territories, and their accession was rather the expression of the desire that something more should be done than evidence that the existing state of affairs was satisfactory.

Lord LYTTON (British Empire) pointed out that no serious opposition had been made to the British proposal, which contained nothing inconsistent with any speeches subsequently made. As regards finance, he was anxious that the setting up of the committee should not involve any increase in the League's budget. The views expressed by the French and Liberian delegates were satisfactorily met by the proposal he had put forward. He therefore suggested that it might be possible to settle the question without reference to a sub-committee.

With regard to the remarks of the Chinese delegate, Lord Lytton pointed out that his statement was based upon a paragraph contained in document A.29 to the effect that, according to Reuter's agency, "about 400,000 persons have been sold into slavery during the last few years in the province of Shensi, according to the Government Special Commissioner who was sent to the province recently to investigate famine conditions". It was far from his desire to be unfair to any country, and he only quoted the statement as it was apparently authorised by the Chinese Government.

M. DEKIEN TUNG (China) stated that news agency reports were not necessarily reliable, and he wished emphatically to deny the statement in question.

Sir Thomas WILFORD (New Zealand) said he could not add anything to Lord Lytton's remarks, which had perfectly expressed his views.

The CHAIRMAN regretted that he could not see his way to doing without a sub-committee, as various differences of opinion had come to light, which would require to be reconciled.

After discussion, it was agreed that a sub-committee should be formed, including representatives of the following countries: Abyssinia, Belgium, Denmark, France, Great Britain, India, Italy, Liberia, The Netherlands, Portugal, Spain.

12. Mandates.

M. LANGE (Norway) said that, although at the beginning there had been some imperfections in the working of the mandates system, which had been an innovation, these mistakes had been rectified largely owing to the valuable work of the Permanent Mandates Commission. Various important questions were under consideration. In the first place, there was the question of the conditions under which a mandate could be brought to an end. This had arisen in the case of Iraq, Great Britain having stated that she would support a request from that country for admission to the League. A State seeking independence should be able to point to certain de facto conditions—for example, that it was able to maintain order in the country and to assure an effective administrative system. The interests of foreigners in such countries had also to be borne in mind, and he was glad to see that, in the case of Iraq, it was proposed to deal with this problem, not by the revival of capitulations, but by a special judicial agreement subject to the approval of the League.

As regards the guaranteeing of minority rights, about which some apprehension was already being felt in Iraq, there were in that country half a million Kurds, and also two religious minority groups (40,000 devil-worshippers, and an equal number of Assyrian Christians) whose rights must be protected. The present form of protection would end with the mandate, and guarantees must be required from any country anxious to obtain its independence. This matter was one which might be arranged between the Council and the mandatory Power concerned.

Amongst other questions of interest was that of public health, concerning which recommendations had been put forward by the Permanent Mandates Commission. It was important that the Government of a country under mandate should be provided with the necessary resources and should have a medical corps capable of performing the work required of it. Doubtless
it could obtain some help from experts sent, for example, by the Health Organisation of the League. If necessary, it should also call upon States Members of the League to send it young doctors. This procedure would perhaps go some little way to relieve the present difficulties felt in professional and industrial circles. He suggested that the principle of the open door should be observed in the matter, and that it might be possible for foreigners to be admitted to work in these countries.

Referring to Palestine, he expressed the opinion that, although affairs were now considerably improved, there was some doubt whether the present state of tranquillity was permanent. He quite realised the difficulties arising as between the Arabs, who regarded Palestine as their country, and the Jews, who had taken up residence there as a result of the Balfour Declaration. The existence of the Jewish National Home in Palestine had aroused amongst Israelites throughout the world a great national sentiment of personal dignity, and, in view of the fact that a large number of Jews belonged to the proletariat and lower middle classes, he considered it inadvisable, from the point of view of the present social crisis, to lessen in any way that feeling of dignity, which no doubt exercised a restraining influence on Jews throughout the world. He therefore suggested that, in its resolution, the Assembly might emphasise the fact that the present policy of the League of Nations towards the Jews should be continued in future.

(The continuation of the discussion was adjourned to the next meeting.)


On the proposal of the Chairman, M. Lange was elected Rapporteur for mandates questions, and M. Sato for intellectual co-operation.

FIFTH MEETING.

Held on Friday, September 18th, 1931, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: M. Motta (Switzerland).


M. Bodrero (Italy), referring to the statements made by the Italian representative to the Council on September 4th on this subject, observed that the object of the mandates system was to provide for the eventual independence of certain peoples. The League should therefore satisfy itself, before agreeing to the termination of a mandate, that the country concerned was in a position to maintain its independence, and should examine any guarantees to be given by the country under mandate to the States Members of the League. This principle implied the maintenance of economic equality and the application of the most-favoured-nation clause, limited to a reasonable time. Reciprocity and the open door were the two fundamental bases on which the new States should establish their economic independence.

M. Muhlstein (Poland) said that Poland was particularly interested in the question of Palestine, both as a Member of the League, and because of the large Jewish population of Poland. He noted with pleasure the endeavour made to develop the constitutional system in Palestine, a step which was necessary for the protection of the Jewish population. He wished to draw a distinction between the Jews in Palestine and “minorities” as the term was understood in the League. He felt that it was not a question of securing to this people the rights inherent in minorities, as the circumstances arising out of the Balfour Declaration placed the Jewish population of Palestine in a special category.

M. Petsche (France) observed that, at the meeting on September 4th, the French representative on the Council gave further indications of the French Government’s views as to the conditions on which the termination of a mandatory system should depend. In particular, he pointed out that, both as regards the position of foreigners and the protection of minorities, the change must be accompanied by guarantees sufficient to reassure all the interests at stake. He also stated, in agreement with the Italian representative, that he regarded the maintenance, subject to reciprocity, of the most-favoured-nation clause for the benefit of Members of the League as compatible with the sovereign rights and interests of the new State and with the interests of the community of nations.

M. Petsche wished merely to mention these statements and to define the special points which had been touched upon in the discussions either in the Council or in the Sixth Committee.

In the matter of Iraq, which had, and rightly so, attracted the particular attention of the Committee—since Iraq was, so to speak, opening out the path which the other territories under A mandate might follow subsequently—he did not wish, in asserting here and now the friendly interest which France took in Iraq’s development, to trespass on the sovereign right of the next Assembly to take a decision. There was, however, one condition for the admission of new States into the League which the Sixth Committee of the next Assembly would, in the ordinary course of events, have to examine in connection with Iraq, and which France, as a mandatory Power,
could, as Iraq's neighbour, assist Iraq to fulfil—he referred to the existence of a "defined territory". Since the occasion now arose, he desired to state that the French Government was, as it had already informed the British Government, prepared to settle without delay all outstanding frontier questions between Iraq and Syria.

One question concerning Syria and the Lebanon had been raised before the Council by the representative of Persia. His Excellency Mirza Hussein Khan Alá complained that France had not yet accorded to Persian nationals the judicial regime which other foreign nationals enjoyed in these territories. In order to dispel all doubts, M. Petsche desired to state first, most categorically, that there was no discrimination in respect of Persians. Under the mandatory regime, whereby capitulations had only been suspended, the system of mixed tribunals could only apply to nationals of the capitulatory Powers. The question would naturally arise in another form under the treaty regime. The precedent of Iraq was calculated to allay the Persian delegate's anxiety on this subject.

Colonel Ali Khan Riazi (Persia) stated that, before the institution of the mandates system, Persian nationals were in the same position as nationals belonging to other capitulatory Powers, and they asked that they should remain so, pending the introduction into the territory under mandate of a judicial system such as that in Iraq.

Mr. Collins (Australia), as the accredited representative of the Commonwealth of Australia, and as the representative of His Majesty's Government in connection with the administration of Nauru, wished to express his appreciation of the work done by the Permanent Mandates Commission. The difficulties involved in the administration of the archipelago of New Guinea were very great, owing to the widely scattered nature of the territory. Progress was necessarily slow, and the work was by no means easy. His Government welcomed the scrutiny of the Permanent Mandates Commission and realised that the aim of the mandatory system was to place the responsibility for the control of a backward race upon an efficient and civilised nation. Australia regarded itself as responsible for the intellectual and cultural development of the peoples entrusted to her; the Permanent Mandates Commission's criticism had always been constructive in spirit, and was warmly welcomed.

M. Curtius (Germany) thanked the Norwegian delegate for enabling the question of mandates to be dealt with by the Sixth Committee. He considered that the tradition in this matter was a sound one. He noticed that a recommendation had been made that foreign doctors should be granted admission into mandated territories; this principle had already been adopted in respect of one large mandated area, and he hoped that the practice would extend.

With regard to the problems raised by the termination of mandates, he did not think it was possible to lay down clear and precise conditions applicable to every case. He considered that the policy taken by the Mandates Commission in this matter was satisfactory. The principles established by the Commission applied to Iraq. He welcomed the approaching end of the mandate in that country, and had no doubt that the change would be carried out in a manner satisfactory to all concerned. He looked forward also to Iraq's entry into the League.

M. Sato (Japan) summarised the work of the Japanese Government in the territories under C mandate in the Pacific. He pointed out the great material difficulties involved and mentioned that the Marianne Archipelago, the Caroline and the Marshall Islands contained about 1,400 islands scattered over an area of 800,000 square kilometres. The total area of the islands was less than 2,150 kilometres. The Japanese Government's task included education, communications, public health, the development of economic activities and the setting up of a judicial system; it was also endeavouring to improve the conditions of a native population which was naturally inclined to indolence.

Owing to the rudimentary development of these islands, the cost of this work fell on the Japanese Treasury, which granted subsidies to natives and settlers for the development of the resources of the territories, and for public health. From 1922 to 1930, the Japanese Treasury had provided subsidies amounting to more than 50,000,000 Swiss francs. In 1925, it had established five primary schools; in 1926, an occupational school had been organised. To-day, the primary schools numbered thirty-one, nine of which were for Japanese children, while twenty-two were for the natives. Education was free; the children in some cases were maintained and fed by the Government. Attendance on the whole was good, varying from 95 to 22.5 per cent, according to localities. In April 1930, the number of native school-children was 3,729, of whom 2,467 received free board and lodging. The subjects taught in the occupational school were carpentry, agriculture, hat-making, ironwork, knitting, etc. The religious life of the natives was not neglected; Catholic, Protestant and Buddhist missions being granted Government subsidies.

Since undertaking the mandate, Japan had investigated the very serious death rate in these islands and had built eight hospitals, provided with a large staff. In remote areas, tours by doctors had been organised and depots set up for drugs and bandages. Enquiry into the question of the reduction in the population of Yap, which had been referred to by the Mandates Commission, showed that 50 per cent of the deaths in that island were due to tuberculosis. A strenuous campaign had been undertaken against leprosy, three establishments having been set up to deal with this scourge. The expense was covered by a special fund given by the Emperor of Japan.
Medical work in the Islands was much hindered by the unwillingness of the natives to have recourse to foreign medical science rather than to their own traditional remedies.

Subsidies had also been provided for the construction of drinking-water reservoirs, public baths, physical culture, etc. Agriculture was still in a very primitive stage, apart from the cultivation of the coconut; but encouragement was being given to the cultivation of sugar-cane, coffee and vegetables. Steps were also being taken to further the stock-breeding and fishing industries.

A spirit of thrift had been developed in the natives, and in 1929 more than 60,000 yen had been deposited in the savings banks. Exports for 1929 reached 7,038,000 yen; imports amounted to 7,122,000 yen.

It was the Japanese Government's firm intention to carry on this work, and he hoped that its efforts would be duly appreciated by the League.

Mr. Cadogan (British Empire) was glad to take note of the declaration of the French delegate as to the readiness of his Government to settle frontier questions still outstanding between Syria and Iraq. The British Government would do all in its power to bring about a satisfactory solution.

Sir Thomas Wilford (New Zealand) congratulated the Japanese delegate upon the report which he had just made; the difficulties inherent in a task of this nature were perhaps not fully understood by all the delegates present. The Japanese Government had clearly dealt satisfactorily with the suspicion and distrust of modern methods which were, quite naturally, entertained by these people. New Zealand had a large Maori population, and, after the signature of the Treaty of 1840, there had been some difficulty and misunderstanding between the two races; but understanding and forbearance had resulted in the fact that the Maori people and the Europeans to-day were living in perfect harmony and accord. The people in Samoa were related to the Maoris and had much in common with them.

Sir Thomas Wilford had been much struck with the statement of the Japanese delegate regarding the sums deposited in the savings banks. The teaching of thrift was one of the most difficult problems in dealing with these people. He also appreciated its success in dealing with the prejudice that obtained against modern medical methods.

In New Zealand, the mandate for Samoa was regarded as a sacred trust, and it was hoped that, under wise and considerate administration, the wish of the Permanent Mandates Commission—that those for whom the mandatory Power acted as guardian and trustees might in the near future be able to stand alone—might be accomplished. The New Zealand Government desired to congratulate the members of the Permanent Mandates Commission for their untiring vigilance in the interests of mandated territories, and the ability with which they had handled the multifarious duties imposed upon them.

M. Sato (Japan) thanked Sir Thomas Wilford for his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN pronounced the discussion closed.


M. Loudon (Netherlands) read the report of the Sub-Committee (Annex 4). It would be noticed that Count Apponyi's draft resolution congratulating the Emperor of Abyssinia had not been included in the report. The Sub-Committee had considered that, in view of the tributes which had been paid to the Emperor of Abyssinia, both in the Committee and in the documents, a special resolution was not necessary. The Liberian delegate had agreed to this procedure so far as the tribute to his own Government was concerned.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that, provided the Sub-Committee's report were approved by the Fourth Committee, any remarks of a congratulatory nature should be included by the Rapporteur in his report to the Assembly.

Count de Penha Garcia (Portugal) said that it gave him great satisfaction to be able to approve, to a certain extent, the proposal made by the British delegation, to which he had at first objected. During the discussion in the Sub-Committee, the British delegation had accepted the amendments he had suggested. The Portuguese delegation could not agree to the revival of the former Slavery Commission which had concluded its mission; nor could it countenance any Commission that was not in conformity with the Covenant or with the legal situation created by the Slavery Convention. The legal reasons which had prevented the Portuguese delegation from assenting to the British proposal for three years still obtained, and it would adhere to them. Subject, however, to these reservations, it was glad to support the resolution adopted by the British delegation.

Financial considerations came within the jurisdiction of the Fourth Committee, and the Portuguese delegation reserved its right to examine them in connection with the question of the urgency of taking action on the Sub-Committee's resolution.

M. Louwers (Belgium) said that the Sub-Committee had taken care to give the resolution a legal basis. It must be borne in mind that the States represented at the Assembly could take no resolution that would be binding on them except to the extent to which such resolutions were in accordance with the Covenant or the Conventions in force.

For instance, the Assembly could not pass a simple resolution and so create, in the matter of slavery, institutions implying supervision, of whatever kind, over the action of the countries...
concerned, since neither the Covenant nor the 1926 Convention made provision for supervision. The votes and the discussions that had taken place during the framing of the Convention even ruled out supervision categorically.

The same remark might be made of any institution implying, in this subject, any kind of intervention by the League in the life of the States concerned. If such supervision or intervention were necessary or expedient—and he would pass no judgment on that point at the moment—they must be set up in due and regular form. The Sub-Committee had considered, and M. Louwers still held this view, that no objection could be taken to the resolution from this point of view. Nevertheless, certain highly qualified persons had expressed to him certain apprehension regarding it.

As time was short, M. Louwers would not ask that the text should be examined by a qualified Committee of jurists—the First Committee, for example—but he thought it useful for the Sixth Committee to take note of the reservation he had made, so that the resolution might not constitute a precedent.

M. Gorée (Switzerland) asked that his country might be included amongst those which had unreservedly supported the British proposal.

On the motion of the Chairman, New Zealand was also added to this list.

It was further decided that the Rapporteur, when mentioning the countries supporting the motion, should make it clear that, in doing so, they were merely voicing the general attitude of the whole Committee.

Mlle. Vacaresco (Roumania) wished to thank the Chairman for remembering that silent States were also consenting States.

Mr. Cadogan (British Empire) said he was sure Lord Lytton would wish him to express his satisfaction at the agreement which had been reached.

The Committee adopted the report and draft resolution submitted by the Sub-Committee.

16. Russian, Armenian, Assyrian, Assyro-Chaldean and Turkish Refugees.

M. Max Huber (President of the Nansen International Office for Refugees), reminded the Committee that the Assembly last year had set up a Nansen International Office for Refugees, which was to submit an annual report, and a plan for winding up its activities (document A.27).

The Office had endeavoured to follow the principle laid down by the League that its budget should be decreased by 10 per cent annually. It had not been possible to keep to this rate of reduction as regards the budget for 1932, but the plan prepared would reduce the life of the Office from ten to nine years, and thus wind it up definitely in 1938. The absence of any considerable reference in its report to actual work done would be understood when it was remembered that the report had had to be prepared only two months after the Office had started operations. The resources of the Office, and in consequence its work, had been considerably hampered by the economic depression, which had much reduced subscriptions. The widespread unemployment, moreover, made it more difficult to provide for the settlement of refugees.

M. Huber was glad to say that there was a prospect of reviving the Erivan scheme, which Dr. Nansen had, to his great regret, felt bound to abandon. Though he had no official information from the Erivan Government, M. Huber had been informed by the various Armenian Refugee Associations that the Erivan Republic was prepared to take 6,000 refugees at once, and hoped to take 4,000 more towards the end of the present year. The only condition was that the cost of the transport of the refugees to Batum should not be a charge on the State of Erivan. M. Huber had hoped to follow the principle laid down by the League that its budget should be decreased by 10 per cent annually. It had not been possible to keep to this rate of reduction as regards the budget for 1932, but the plan prepared would reduce the life of the Office from ten to nine years, and thus wind it up definitely in 1938. The absence of any considerable reference in its report to actual work done would be understood when it was remembered that the report had had to be prepared only two months after the Office had started operations. The resources of the Office, and in consequence its work, had been considerably hampered by the economic depression, which had much reduced subscriptions. The widespread unemployment, moreover, made it more difficult to provide for the settlement of refugees.

M. Huber was glad to say that there was a prospect of reviving the Erivan scheme, which Dr. Nansen had, to his great regret, felt bound to abandon. Though he had no official information from the Erivan Government, M. Huber had been informed by the various Armenian Refugee Associations that the Erivan Republic was prepared to take 6,000 refugees at once, and hoped to take 4,000 more towards the end of the present year. The only condition was that the cost of the transport of the refugees to Batum should not be a charge on the State of Erivan. M. Huber had applied to the Greek Government in this matter, and M. Venizelos had very generously agreed on behalf of the Greek Government, to be responsible for the cost of transport of 10,000 Armenians, from Greece to Batum. He was sure the Committee would agree with him in thanking Greece for the assistance, which would involve an expenditure on her part greater than the annual budget of the Office. It was expected that 1,000 Armenians would be sent from Bulgaria, and the Bulgarian Government had also undertaken to consider favourably the payment for the transport of these refugees. He hoped that the Council and the Assembly would support this scheme, and that some assistance might be given to the Erivan Government in this matter, either in monetary payments or in kind.

The French Government had requested the continuance of the work of the Office in Syria, and a plan was being prepared for dealing with the refugees still there. Financial difficulties were considerable, but he was hoping much from the generosity of the Armenians themselves, with whose help it might be possible to complete the settlement within two years.

A further matter to be dealt with by the Office was that of Russians in Manchuria and China. The difficulties in this case arose largely from the vast distances concerned, and it was only owing to lack of funds that it was impossible to contemplate the transfer of some of the refugees to South America. There was, further, the cost of the maintenance of the refugees themselves. He referred particularly to the difficulties of the Russian refugees of German origin, whose lot was a very hard one. The work of the Office could be extended greatly if the Nansen stamp system were widely applied. In the case of the 70 per cent of the refugees it was not applied at all or only on a voluntary basis. In this connection, he referred to the appeal which had been made by a number of statesmen on the anniversary of Dr. Nansen’s death, and wished to thank them for what they had done. Some result had already been obtained from this appeal: £4,000 had been subscribed by Denmark, and a similar amount by the Armenian (Lord Mayor’s) Fund and the “Save the Children” Fund in England. While M. Huber was very grateful for these contributions, he pointed out the vast
extent of the work to be done. He appealed to the Assembly to give the Office all the assistance in its power to enable the work to be continued.

M. VAN MUTIUS (Germany) wished to associate himself with M. Huber's remarks regarding the hard lot of the Russian refugees of German origin.

The Chairman expressed the thanks of the Committee for the work done by M. Huber, to whom he wished to pay a personal tribute. He did not think that the Fourth Committee would raise difficulties about contributions, as this was a question of life and death for the Office.

Mlle. FORCHHAMMER (Denmark) was very glad to hear that the Erivan scheme was being revived. She was sure that this would have given great pleasure to Dr. Nansen.

With regard to the contributions of Denmark to the funds of the Office, she paid a tribute to the Chairman of the Committee—Count Moltke. It was largely due to his personal efforts that Denmark had been able to make what was a not unimportant contribution for so small a country. She wished to support M. Huber's appeal to the various nations for constructive assistance in this great work.

M. FIERLINGER (Czechoslovakia), agreeing with the remarks of previous speakers, hoped that private charity would respond to the appeal made on behalf of the Nansen Fund.

As regards the question of juridical protection for refugees, he stated that the Czechoslovak Government would treat all passport questions with the greatest possible liberality, and, as regards entry and transit, would put the refugees on an equality with other nationals. He hoped that other countries would follow the same policy.

M. LANGE (Norway) was glad to see that his great compatriot, Dr. Nansen, had found so worthy a successor in M. Huber. He felt that the humanitarian work for refugees which the League performed through the Office did great credit. The position of the refugees would be serious when the Office was wound up. In this connection, M. Lange referred to the statement of the Inter-Governmental Commission found on page 38 of the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League (document A.6 (I)). He realised that, at the conclusion of their activities, the refugees were not in a worse position. M. Lange had read with interest the report of the Office on its work during the past year, and he fully approved its Statute and Regulations. He felt, however, that it would be wise to insert in future reports information with regard, not only to the administrative work of the Office, but also to its actual efforts on behalf of the refugees. That was essential if a favourable response were to be obtained to the appeal issued by certain statesmen on behalf of the creation of a fund for refugees.

M. VACAESCO (Roumania) felt that Dr. Nansen was present in spirit with the Committee. She herself had constantly been concerned with refugees in her own country, and the various Governments in Roumania had, without exception, given close attention to this question. They were faced by the spectre of lack of funds and the spectre of economy, but these spectres were now so familiar that she suggested that an endeavour might perhaps be made to hustle them somewhat. In conclusion, she advocated more strenuous propaganda in support of this work.

M. RAPHAEL (Greece) said that his Government entirely approved of the report, and had followed the work of the Office with great interest. He hoped that the Assembly would not refuse the contribution requested, which represented but a small expenditure from each of the Member States.

M. DEKIJEN TUNG (China) thanked the President of the Office for his report, and paid a tribute to the work of the late Dr. Nansen. He called the attention of the Office to the situation of more than 100,000 Russian refugees in China, and particularly to that of more than 1,500 of German origin in Harbin.

M. HUBER (President of the Nansen International Office for Refugees), in thanking the Committee for their remarks, wished to add that he had been greatly assisted by members of the Secretariat and by the various refugee organisations. He was also greatly indebted to Major Johnson, who was familiar with the details of the work carried out by Dr. Nansen, and had been of inestimable assistance to him in the work which he had so recently undertaken.

The Chairman, on behalf of the Committee, endorsed M. Huber's remarks.

17. Russian, Armenian, Assyrian, Assyro-Chaldean and Turkish Refugees (continuation) : Appointment of a Rapporteur.

On the proposal of the Chairman, M. FOTITCH was appointed Rapporteur.
SIXTH MEETING.

Held on Saturday, September 19th, 1931, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: M. Motta (Switzerland).

18. Russian, Armenian, Assyrian, Assyro-Chaldean and Turkish Refugees (continuation: Examination of the Draft Report to the Assembly.

M. Fotitch (Yugoslavia), Rapporteur, read his report (Annex 5).

He stated that he had reason to believe that the Supervisory Commission would propose a reduction of 10 per cent in the budget of the Office. He considered that it would be for the President of the Office to consider to what extent this step might affect the liquidation proposals and the working of the Office in 1932, and to discuss the matter with the Governing Body of the Office.

The Chairman pointed out that it would be premature to discuss the question until the report of the Fourth Committee on this matter had been received, in order to see whether a reduction in the budget of the Office was, in fact, proposed.

M. Lange (Norway) regretted that no mention had been made in the report of a matter on which he had laid emphasis on the previous day, and which he considered of great importance—namely, the necessity that the reports should contain, in future, information regarding the work carried out by the Office. It was not possible to appeal for funds on the basis of a purely administrative and legal report, and it was important that the public should be informed of the work done. He asked that this point should be mentioned, if not in the resolution, at least in the body of the report.

M. Fotitch (Yugoslavia), Rapporteur, was ready to accede to the request of M. Lange. He explained that the Nansen Office had only been in existence three months, and its President had expressed the opinion that a fair idea of the practical work of the Office could not be obtained in so short a time. It was, moreover, understood that future reports would certainly contain this information.

M. Fierlinger (Czechoslovakia) was of the opinion that a resolution of the Assembly could not fail to be of assistance to the Nansen Office.

Mlle. Forchhammer (Denmark) wondered whether, without waiting for the next session of the Assembly or the Council, it would be possible, when launching an appeal for funds, to publish some sort of interim report, giving details of the work done by the organisations dealing with refugees. She noted that reference was made in the report to the Armenian refugees of the “Armenian Republic”, whereas, previously, the term “Republic of Erivan” had been employed. She thought some confusion might arise in the minds of the public which did not know of the change that had been made.

Major Johnson (Secretary-General of the Office) stated that the Governing Body intended to give full information in its reports on the work done by the Office, and was about to publish a very complete handbook to accompany the appeal for funds. This handbook would give a clear idea of the work done by the High Commission and the Office up to the present time, and information regarding its future programme. The Governing Body, during the first three months of its existence dealt with in the report, had been compelled to follow the very clear instructions of the last Assembly, and to concentrate its attention on drawing up a liquidation scheme; that was the main reason why only brief mention was made in the report of refugee work undertaken by the Office. This information would certainly be given in future reports.

The Chairman thought that this explanation would satisfy Mlle. Forchhammer and M. Lange. The second remark of Mlle. Forchhammer might be met by inserting the word “Erivan” in parentheses after the word “Armenia”.

M. Fotitch (Yugoslavia), Rapporteur, stated that the Inter-Governmental Advisory Commission for Refugees had expressed the wish that its members should include a representative of the Belgian Government; he had only that morning received information that the Belgian Government agreed to be represented on the Commission, and he asked permission to mention this fact in his report and in the resolution.

This proposal was adopted.
The draft report and resolution were adopted.
M. Fotitch was appointed Rapporteur to the Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN welcomed the attendance of M. de Reynold, Member of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation; M. Dufour-Feronce, Under-Secretary-General; M. de Montenach, Secretary of the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation at the Secretariat; and M. Bonnet, Director of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation.

The report of M. Sato (Japan), Rapporteur (document A.VI/7/1931), was read.

M. DE REYNOLD (International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation) made the following statement:

(i) The machinery of the Organisation was in working order and was giving results, largely owing to the reforms of the previous years. The Assembly might therefore now be asked to complete this reform by taking up again, in the sense indicated in the report of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, its resolution of September 24th, 1926, in which the Organisation of Intellectual Co-operation was approved.

(ii) The work of international co-operation in intellectual life was being rapidly developed. It already existed as between national institutions concerned with intellectual rights, international associations of students, directors of national university offices, institutes for the scientific study of international relations and in relation to museums and popular art. It was in course of completion as regards libraries and archives, and, in the field of primary education, for educational museums and exchanges of material; preparations were being made for co-operation between institutes for the history of art; attention was also being paid to co-operation in the matter of translations and that of the natural and exact sciences. It was gratifying to note that the Committee was now being approached for assistance in such matters and in the establishment of international co-operation in general.

(iii) The development of science, art and letters was gaining much from the Organisation of Intellectual Co-operation, and that in two ways—in the first place, thanks to its organisation and procedure, and, above all, the system of expert committees, which was much more flexible and less clumsy than the previous method of congresses. The conclusions of these committees were rapidly brought before the Council or the Assembly through the Committee, and were finally transmitted to the bodies concerned, in the first place to the Governments. Secondly, this development was fostered by the work of the Organisation of Intellectual Co-operation itself; evidence of this could be seen in the field of museums and of popular art.

(iv) By means of intellectual co-operation, the work of the scientist, the writer and the artist was receiving material assistance in the more rapid supply of information, in meetings between workers in different countries, and in defending intellectual rights.

(v) The tendency of the work was to become still more universal, and, in particular, as was mentioned by M. Sato, contact was being established between European and Asiatic civilisations. This was shown by the recent proposals of the Chinese Government and by the despatch of two missions to China. A further proof was to be seen in the interest taken in the subject in Latin America where the Ibero-American collection had been published.

(vi) Intellectual co-operation was also of assistance in bringing the nations together.

(vii) Intellectual co-operation also assisted the cause of the League by making it more widely known, by spreading abroad its ideas and principles and by associating with its work an ever-increasing number of intellectuals.

The development of national committees and the increasing importance of their work deserved special mention. They were becoming more and more the basis of intellectual co-operation, to which they were constantly giving most valuable assistance. The recent successful reorganisation was largely due to the efforts of these bodies. It was therefore essential that they should meet at regular intervals, in order that they might be acquainted with the results of the reforms.

Finally, he wished to draw attention to the desire expressed by the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation that the Assembly might show itself in future as generous as possible in the free distribution of documents concerning the League.

M. PETSCH (France) regarded the work of intellectual co-operation as a sign of the vitality of the League, and considered that the results of last year’s reforms promised well for the future.

He reviewed the work done in France in this field and mentioned, in particular, the new school of peace set up in 1930 on the initiative of Mlle. Louise Weiss; the propaganda carried out on behalf of intellectual co-operation; M. Roger Lévy’s memorable book, Intellectuels, unissez-vous.

M. Petsche read the following extract from the Minutes of the sixth meeting of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, on July 23rd, 1931:

“M. Oprescu and M. de Reynold pointed out, in this connection, that, in accordance with a recommendation by the Committee of Enquiry, it was no longer necessary for the Committee to invite the representatives of the various associations, confederations, etc., with which it was in touch to attend its meetings.”

He thought it would be a pity to exclude the Confederation of Intellectual Workers from the meetings of the Committee, and hoped that the Confederation would be given satisfaction in this matter.

The International Institute had considered the educational value of broadcasting. It was sure that broadcasting, like cinematography, and, in the future, television, undoubtedly raised educational problems; but they also raised intellectual problems of a much wider scope than those of mere education. The results of this invention might be very good, but they might also be very
dangerous, and the League should keep a watchful eye upon the effect of these new methods for the diffusion of knowledge upon the human mind. He suggested that a resolution should be passed authorising the International Institute and the International Committee to consider the problem of broadcasting in all its aspects.

M. CASARES (Spain) referred, in the first place, to the resolution by the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation regarding the official recognition of the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation and suggested that the Sixth Committee should address a recommendation to the Assembly on this subject.

He pointed out that the new Organisation had not yet had time to make good, but that a considerable improvement in the Institute was already noticeable, and that there was every reason to hope that results would finally be achieved.

As regards the instruction of youth, a question which had always keenly interested the Spanish delegation, no one could deny that the work of moral disarmament in the elementary schools and the education of the rising generation in the spirit of international co-operation and cordiality constituted a specific part of the League’s work. For that reason, he had conducted a strong campaign in order that the question of instruction should be placed on the Committee’s programme, in spite of the opposition of all his colleagues in the Committee of Enquiry. Since that time, he had had the satisfaction of seeing his point of view adopted by other members of the Committee, including M. Painlevé. It had also been adopted by M. Briand, who had made an urgent appeal to teachers at the last Assembly.

M. Casares was very glad to see the consolidation of the educational information centre. Turning to the revision of school text-books, he noted that the resolution adopted in 1925 by the Assembly included machinery for making corrections. The system had already shown good results and could be still more useful if it were better known and more frequently utilised. This resolution was, in fact, insufficient at present, and should be supplemented by more direct and effective measures. M. Casares, in agreement with M. Munch, had therefore, in 1930, submitted to the Sub-Committee of Experts for the Instruction of Youth a resolution with a view to organising an enquiry regarding school text-books used for instruction in history and geography, civics and morals. This enquiry was summarised in a report which M. Casares thought should be given the greatest possible publicity.

In order to draw the conclusions from the enquiry, it was proposed to form a Committee of Experts composed of representatives of the Commission on History Teaching of the International Committee for Historical Sciences, pedagogical circles, institutes for the scientific study of international relations and the Sub-Committee of Experts for the Instruction of Youth in the Aims of the League of Nations. M. Casares suggested that a representative of the International Bureau of Education of Geneva should also be included among the members of this Committee of Experts.

The Spanish Government was greatly interested in the studies undertaken with a view to reaching a universal agreement on the basis of the Berne and Havana Conventions.

In conclusion M. Casares personally drew attention to a resolution adopted by the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation regarding the universal adoption of Roman characters. The support of the League of Nations would be very useful to this movement.

M. COSTA DU RELS (Bolivia) concluded from the documents placed at the Committee’s disposal that last year had been particularly fertile. He praised the systematic efforts of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation and the Institute, the management of which had given proof of intelligence and firmness. He did not overlook the International Museums Office, and he paid a tribute to the men who had devoted their learning and faith to this work.

With regard to the programme drawn up by the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, he noted with satisfaction the efforts to form a collection of Ibero-American works. Thanks to the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation and to the Institute, the countries of Latin America would henceforward have a means of direct co-operation in the sphere of thought.

In South America, national centres of intellectual co-operation had been created. He referred, in particular, to the centre at La Paz.

Intellectual co-operation helped to bring about closer relations between the nations by means of the cinematograph, broadcasting, and all methods of disseminating thought. He was, however, particularly interested in the question of instruction in the history of art. He pointed out in this connection that, thanks to the collection of engraving plates and casts, by which the American youth were enabled to study the works of European museums, this instruction would no longer be so uninteresting as it had formerly been in Latin America.

He noted the great progress made in educational matters by the exchange of pupils, professors and school material.

Lastly, M. Costa du Rels was glad that, henceforward, the treasures of European culture and the marvells of the museums and libraries could be shared by all nations.

M. LANGE (Norway) assured the Committee that Norway attached great importance to the work of intellectual co-operation and asked, in the interest of the work itself, that the greatest care should be taken to preclude any overlapping. He was not convinced that this had been completely avoided. In this connection, M. Lange referred to the creation of an educational information centre. If this institution was intended to give instruction in the works and aims of the League of Nations, its title was likely to lead the public astray, since it created the impression that it was...
an institution dealing with education in general; there was already an International Bureau of Education, with which the centre in question would overlap.

He would like to say a few words regarding private action taken last year at Geneva by a Scandinavian group. A Folk High School had been created at Geneva, by means of funds collected in the Scandinavian countries, where instruction was given in the three Scandinavian languages on the work of the League of Nations, etc. This instruction was given in two stages. First, an important place was given to the history, literature and social conditions of the Scandinavian countries themselves. The students were thus made aware, within a limited sphere with which they were familiar, of the possibilities and means of co-operation between nations. In the second place, the school dealt with political and economic problems of international importance, and the manner in which the Geneva institutions endeavoured to solve them.

This was an example which might well be followed. M. Lange thought he was not too bold in imagining that one day a sort of university city would arise at Geneva, where would be assembled students of various national groups, following the courses of a popular university at Geneva, organised in accordance with this model and giving teaching in the languages of the students, who would be able at the same time to study the working of the Geneva institutions on the spot. The Scandinavian school in question proposed to organise, on the eve of the Disarmament Conference, a special course for Scandinavian journalists, with a view to their better comprehension of the technical problems of disarmament.

M. GORGE (Switzerland) congratulated the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, its secretariat, its executive committee, the Institute, its collaborators and, in the first place, its distinguished Director, M. Bonnet, on the rapidity with which the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation had overcome the growing pains from which it had suffered in the previous year. He regretted that time did not permit of his dwelling on the various resolutions adopted by the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation at its last session. He would confine himself to calling attention to the following resolution adopted by that Committee:

"The International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation feels that it should call the particular notice of the Assembly of the League of Nations to the Exhibition of Popular Arts which it is proposed to hold at Berne in 1934, and begs it to urge the Governments of States Members of the League to undertake to associate themselves with this great international manifestation, either by appointing delegates to the Grand Committee of the Exhibition or by sending exhibits. Small credits might be provided from now onwards in the budgets for 1932, 1933 and 1934."

The French representative on the Council had strongly supported the project when it was brought before the Council. It was not surprising that the Committee and the French representative were supporting the Exhibition, seeing that the idea was French rather than Swiss. It was nevertheless a French idea which had developed and taken shape within the League of Nations itself.

M. Gorgé then reviewed the various stages in connection with this proposal—M. Henri Focillon’s initiative in favour of organising a Congress and Exhibition of Popular Art, the decision, in the first place, merely to convene a congress to express an opinion on the organisation of the Exhibition, and the step taken in 1927 by the city of Berne in soliciting the honour of being the seat of the future Exhibition.

M. Gorgé then recalled the resolutions passed by the Council and the Assembly on this subject, the meeting of the First Congress at Prague, the creation of an International Committee on Popular Arts, which had formed a bureau under the direction of M. Lehmann, the Director of the Altona Museum, and, lastly, the acceptance by the Prague Congress of the offer made by the city of Berne. M. Gorgé stated that, in 1929, the city of Berne had created the provisional organs of the Exhibition. Those organs had decided, in agreement with the Bureau of the International Committee on Popular Arts, that the Exhibition should include all aesthetic products emanating from the people and intended for popular use—that was to say, useful products to which the artisan’s traditional work had added an element of grace, art and beauty.

The International Committee, at its Rome session in 1929, entirely approved the steps taken by the city of Berne. In 1930, the city of Berne prepared a provisional plan of the Exhibition, providing for an expenditure of about 14 million Swiss francs, of which 4 millions would be supplied by the city of Berne, the canton of Berne and the Confederation. The Second Congress on Popular Arts was held at Antwerp, Liège and Brussels during the same year and unreservedly approved the measures taken by the city of Berne.

In 1931, the Swiss Federal Council issued invitations to all Members of the League of Nations and to fourteen States non-members. In the meantime, the provisional organs of the Exhibition were replaced by definitive organs and the Exhibition was given a well-defined juridical status in accordance with the Swiss Civil Code. A Committee known as the “Grand Committee” had also been formed, including not only representatives of the city of Berne and the Swiss cantons, but also of all the States which had decided to take part in the Exhibition. The Secretariat of the League of Nations was represented, as was also the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation and the Institute. In this connection, M. Gorgé referred to the very important part which M. de Reynold had played in this Committee as representative of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.

The success of the Exhibition obviously depended on the co-operation of the States. In calling the attention of the members of the Sixth Committee to the urgency of the question, M. Gorgé ventured, as representative of the Swiss delegation, to express the hope that the Governments would examine the question of their possible participation as early as possible.
Count de Penha Garcia (Portugal) said that when, two years ago, the Committee and Institute had endeavoured to solve the problem of intellectual co-operation, he had had some uneasiness as to the scope of the reform contemplated. Since the reform had been introduced, the results had convinced him that the new method was full of promise. In the first place, the principle had been laid down that, if effective work were to be done, the best elements should be chosen as collaborators from that select group which formed the intellectuals. On the other hand, a certain reorganisation had taken place with a view to making the office administration more effective. Lastly, a careful choice had been made of the questions to be studied.

Nevertheless, the human mind was so vast and its field of action so extensive that it could not be expected that organisations, however powerful they might be, would obtain very great results in the space of a few years.

The report before the Committee showed that the work of intellectual co-operation, as in the previous year, was directed towards education, but that on this occasion it had a wider view. Education was evidently the most important instrument, since it made it possible to influence the rising generations, in whose hands the future lay. Work among the young should be pursued with insistence and intelligence, so that future generations might be better prepared to receive the instruction of the League of Nations and, above all, to support its work.

Count de Penha Garcia urged the necessity of taking the greatest possible advantage of the journeys of young men to foreign countries.

The question of extending the work of intellectual co-ordination was very important. A large number of associations, international and national, were studying or cultivating the sciences, literature and the arts. To bring them together and co-ordinate their efforts was of great importance to the future of the nations. The Committee on Arts and Letters had a fine piece of work before it.

Count de Penha Garcia also approved the idea of publishing a collection of Ibero-American classics. He recommended that a fairly large section should be reserved for Portuguese classics. Portuguese literature, very abundant and powerful, was one of the earliest literatures in Europe, and it had also taken root in Brazil.

Count de Penha Garcia welcomed the step taken by the Athens Conference, which should study problems connected with the conservation of historic monuments, and thought the Governments should follow that Conference's work.

With regard to the remarks made by the Swiss delegate on the Berne Exhibition, the Portuguese delegate made several observations about the importance of the popular arts, and stated that he would urge his Government to accept the invitation received from the city of Berne. The popular art of Portugal was full of grace and spontaneity, and he would be delighted to see it represented at Berne.

M. Fierlinger (Czechoslovakia) wished to make remarks on two points in the report. The first referred to the co-operation of institutes devoted to scientific research in political, economic and social questions. According to the report, it had been decided that these institutions should hold a study conference each year for the purpose of comparing their work.

In M. Fierlinger's opinion, this conference should be organised on the model of those held by the Institute of Pacific Relations at Honolulu and elsewhere, in which discussions took place, without votes or resolutions, on the American round-table system; this method had given excellent results. The Czechoslovak Government hoped this conference would be carefully prepared and would bring together as large a number as possible of institutions for political science.

The second point referred to the International Exhibition of Popular Arts at Berne. M. Fierlinger thought that as large a number as possible of States Members of the League of Nations should give a favourable reply to the Swiss Government's invitation. In this connection, he submitted the following draft resolution:

"The Assembly,
"Recalling its resolution of September 22nd, 1927, concerning the Popular Arts Exhibition and concerning the assistance to be rendered by League organs towards the success of this undertaking;
"Endorsing the proposals contained in the resolution of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation and bearing in mind the recommendation made by the Council in its resolution of September 4th, 1931:
"Draws the attention of States Members of the League of Nations to the initiative taken by the city of Berne and to the invitation sent by the Federal Government requesting States Members of the League to take part in this Exhibition;
"Would ask States Members to associate themselves with this great international demonstration and to take suitable measures to that end."

(The continuation of the discussion was adjourned to the next meeting.)
SEVENTH MEETING.

Held on Saturday, September 19th, 1931, at 9.30 p.m.

Chairman: M. Motta (Switzerland), then M. Costa du Rels (Bolivia).


Count Apponyi (Hungary) wished to draw attention to slight difficulties which had arisen owing to the refusal of certain neighbouring countries to permit the import of Hungarian printed matter—not merely newspapers, but scientific works as well. Such action was clearly opposed to the idea of intellectual co-operation, and he hoped that it would be possible to settle the question amicably. If, however, this should not be the case, he wished to reserve the right of Hungary to return to the matter later.

Mlle. Vacaresco (Roumania) gave an account of the work done by the Permanent Committee on Arts and Letters, particularly in connection with the cinema. She had raised that question herself four years previously, and the fact that there were at the present time 650,000 cinema halls in the world, holding something like 100 million persons, emphasised the importance of the question. The Permanent Committee had been working in co-operation with the International Educational Cinematographic Institute at Rome and had been pleased to learn that an annual prize for the best scenario dealing with peace and international friendship had been instituted. Referring to broadcasting, gramophones, etc., she emphasised the importance of using such machinery as a tool and not allowing it to dominate humanity. The real task of the Committee was to contribute towards setting up new standards of ethics and to make men not merely perfect but happy. She hoped the Committee would emphasise the importance of publicity for its work, both by the Press and by the League.

(The Chair was taken by M. Costa du Rels, Vice-Chairman.)

Mr. Burrell (Canada) noted that the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation had now so consolidated its position as to have gained recognition as an integral and highly important part of the League's organised activities. Congratulating those who had last year successfully worked out the best methods of securing success in the attainment of their ideals, he remarked that the remoteness of his country, and the fact that its constitutional arrangements divided federal from provincial activities, had, perhaps, hitherto prevented that close association with the practical programmes of the Committee which might otherwise have been the case. But it should be remembered that Canada, as a Member of the League from its inception, had never failed in its financial obligations, and had for many years been able, alone on the North American continent, to raise an authoritative voice on the general aims and ideals of the League. Into the details of the reorganised programme of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation he would not enter. His country approved such matters as exchange professorships, encouragement of travelling students, the use of that powerful modern agency, the cinematograph, and especially the widespread efforts for the education of the young. Canada had already released educational films from the burden of a Customs duty, and had in various ways helped to disseminate a wider knowledge of the League's aims and activities.

He would be remiss in the discharge of his duty if he did not register his satisfaction with the Committee's expressed wish that progress should be made in the plans for disarmament and the promotion of international peace. The children of to-day would soon be bearing the responsibilities which now rest so heavily on older shoulders. It was upon the young, and upon the women of the world, that the long agony and bitterness of modern war must chiefly fall, and how was the present generation to meet the challenge of those accusing and questioning eyes if it failed in its great task? In every way possible the flow of those intellectual activities which fertilise and enrich all that they touch must be strengthened. If ignorance were banished, half the miseries of the world would disappear. It was the crass stupidity of war as a settlement of disputes which was so astonishing and appalling. It was only by the co-operation of intellect and heart that there could be an effective control of those disordered passions which from time to time gained ascendency over, and swayed the actions of, nations and men.

The League was not a vast and elaborate piece of machinery, creaking at times for lack of oil, its wheels revolving, now fast, now slowly, at the will of individual men, or groups of men, but rather was it a living thing, containing within it the power of growth—that power which differentiates the living from the dead. If it failed to reach its objectives as fast and as fully as some would wish, let them firmly believe that attainment would come, and that, in the end, an enduring peace among the nations of the world, and a greater happiness for all the peoples in its far-flung Member-States, would amply justify the existence of this great institution.

Mr. Bodrero (Italy) called attention to the dangers which should be avoided in what he might call the convalescent period of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation. In the first place,
intellectual co-operation should be officially recognised by the League; secondly, it should be realised that there were certain forms of intellectual work which were unsuitable for co-operative treatment, since they essentially demanded solitude for their execution. Thirdly, funds were necessary, and M. Bodrero did not think the sums requested should be diminished by a single franc.

He agreed that broadcasting was a matter which should be carefully watched by the Committee. He expressed on behalf of M. Rocco and M. de Feo their regret at their inability to be present at the meeting.

M. PUSTA (Estonia) noted that several delegations had called the attention of the Committees and the Assembly to the importance of broadcasting and the cinema in developing an international outlook and making known the work of the League. The Estonian delegation, for instance, had put a proposal of this kind before the Commission of Enquiry for European Union, and the Polish delegation, in a recent memorandum to the Secretariat of the League, had also emphasised the value of the cinema in connection with moral disarmament.

He desired to support M. Lange’s proposal that the efforts of those organisations which were following the same aims should be co-ordinated. In this connection, he pointed out, with regard to the educational cinema, that there was a private organisation in Paris—the International Committee for the Diffusion of Artistic and Literary Works by the Cinematograph—a voluntary committee composed of diplomats and scholars, which was doing work similar to that of the Rome Institute. That Committee, as Mlle. Vacaresco had pointed out, had instituted at its own expense a prize of 150,000 French francs for the best scenario of a film calculated to bring the nations together. He thought it would be useful to co-ordinate this measure with the work of the Rome Cinematographic Institute.

With this in mind, he proposed that the Committee should make the following recommendation to the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation:

“The Sixth Committee invites the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation to bear in mind the steps taken by the International Committee for the Diffusion of Artistic and Literary Works by the Cinematograph in connection with educational cinematography.

“The International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation is also requested to give its secretariat the necessary instructions to include this Committee in its consultations relating to the production and financing of educational films on the work of the League of Nations.”

Dame Edith LYTTELTON (British Empire) mentioned that she was a member of the National Committee on Intellectual Co-operation in her own country, which had already been able to do useful work. She desired to draw attention to the broadcasting experiments now being made in a number of countries. She would submit a resolution on the matter later. She understood that there were 100 million people in the world who were able to listen every day to the radio; of these, 50 million were in Europe; in England over three million homes had wireless sets.

Dame Edith Lyttelton had had an opportunity of listening to the broadcasting to America of a daily report on the work of the League, and emphasised the important effect of wireless in this particular case. In England, instructional talks were broadcast and were listened to by some five thousand schools. She had heard a broadcast before the payment. These talks interested children very much, particularly those which told them what was going on in the world; these she had heard herself and found extremely interesting. There were also in England thousands of wireless study groups of about fifty members which debated the talks given over the wireless. It was important to avoid commercialising broadcasting, and this was a matter which particularly concerned the Committee. She regarded the present time as one of very rapid evolution, and it was important that mankind should be prepared for the changed conditions of the near future.

Mirza Hussein Khan ALA (Persia) referred to the recent foundation in Paris of a society for the study of Iranian studies and Persian art which was open to orientalists and scholars of all countries. All the Persian students in Europe, most of whom were studying in France, were members of this society, which was seeking to advance the ideals of peace and co-operation of the League. It was, perhaps, not too much to say that the collection of objects of art sent by his Government to London, by awakening a strong interest in the artistic achievements of Persia in the course of 5,000 years, had assisted intellectual co-operation.

(M. Motta (Switzerland) took the Chair.)

Mlle. Pünßer (Germany) was pleased to recognise the successful reorganisation of the Committee. In view of the great amount of unemployment now prevailing, her delegation thought it highly important that the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation should co-operate with the International Labour Office to secure that workers should use their spare time in more intellectual pursuits. Her country sympathised with the efforts made to instil into the young the true spirit of international understanding, and was glad that one of its best experts had been sent to China to assist in the reorganisation of Chinese education.

In Germany, much importance was attached to the deletion of objectionable passages from school textbooks and to the teaching of history, geography and languages in such a way as to help international understanding. Mlle. Pünßer suggested that an international conference of school-teachers should be held on the subject as soon as possible, and her delegation hoped that the Committee would endorse this proposal.
Dr. CHODZKO (Poland) congratulated all concerned on the successful reorganisation of the Committee. He was glad to see that an enquiry had been made regarding methods of international exchange of secondary-school children. This subject had first been submitted to the 1928 Assembly as the result of the Polish proposal.

He had been asked to present the following resolution passed by the Fifteenth Plenary Congress of the International Federation of League of Nations Societies, concerning the convening of a world conference on training in world citizenship.

“The Fifteenth Plenary Congress requests the League of Nations:

(a) To summon at the earliest opportunity a world conference on training in world citizenship;

(b) To invite to that conference administrators and teachers as well as representatives of voluntary educational organisations (including the League of Nations Associations), such administrators and representatives to be nominated by, but not representatives of, their respective Governments;

(c) To ask the conference to consider how best:

(1) By administrative action;

(2) Through the courses of instruction in history, geography and other subjects;

(3) With the assistance of voluntary organisations,

to give further effect in the training colleges and schools to the recommendations of the League’s Sub-Committee of Experts upon how to make the League of Nations known and to develop the spirit of international co-operation.”

It was proposed that this conference should include administrators and teachers, as well as representatives of voluntary educational organisations, to be nominated by, but not representatives of, their respective Governments. He handed in the text of this resolution, which he hoped would be adopted by the Sixth Committee, since no expenditure was involved.

In a report submitted to the Assembly in 1930 by M. Fierlinger, it was proposed that an enquiry into the methods of teaching in secondary schools should be undertaken as part of a wider enquiry into intellectual life. At the meeting of the Second Committee on September 24th, 1930, the Polish delegate had asked for an enquiry on the methods of teaching in secondary schools in various countries in relation to higher education. The report of the Director of the Institute, while drawing attention to the Educational Information Centre, apparently proposed to exceed the limits of the work already being undertaken by the International Bureau of Education, and he hoped that there would be no overlapping between the two bodies. He drew attention to the great value of the work of the Committee of Scientific Advisers, and stressed the importance of the question of intellectual and technical relations. Every effort must be made to avert the threatened mechanisation of humanity. Gina Lombroso had pointed out that the resistance of the French peasant to these methods had considerably assisted France in the present economic crisis.

The Polish Government had raised the question of the League of Nations literary prize offered by the Congress of P.E.N. Clubs, and in more favourable circumstances it would be happy to make its contribution. Poland had been pleased to be able to send M. Falski, Director of Primary Education, to take an active part in the great work of the modernisation of China.

He suggested that the reports from the Committee and from the Institute would be more valuable if they were accompanied by an analytical table showing: (1) resolutions passed by the Committee, Assembly or the Council; (2) action taken by the Institute on these resolutions; (3) any results (if possible).

Dame Edith LYTTELTON (British Empire) wished to support the draft resolution regarding the World Conference for Education.

Dr. HYDER (India), speaking, not as a delegate representing a Government, but as a representative of the people to whom he belonged, said that his country took a very great interest in intellectual co-operation; intellectual co-operation was in consonance with the whole philosophy of India. It was, indeed, the essential element of the League, and he was anxious that it should not be obscured by the necessary work of organisation and by preoccupation with practical problems. These practical problems could not be solved if the spirit of co-operation were absent. He therefore proposed that a systematic effort should be made to educate the masses in the aims of the League, and, in order to avoid any tendency to sentimentalism, these efforts should be accompanied by written or oral examination at various stages.

It was true that there was no national committee in India, but there were national organisations, inter-university boards, and boards for secondary and primary education. A university, the name of which he could give if desired, was prepared to publish gratis a translation of the League publication, “Aims and Organisation of the League”, and other Indian universities would be found willing and anxious to assist the League in its work. Free interchange of ideas and free intercourse between East and West would be wholeheartedly supported by the people of India.

M. GARAY (Panama) mentioned that he had first heard of the proposed Berne Exhibition of Popular Arts when he was in Paris in 1929 in connection with a work he was undertaking on the
subject of the folklore of his country. He had since done his best to persuade his Government to participate in this Exhibition and he hoped that he would shortly be able to inform the Assembly that his efforts had been successful.

Count Mensdorff (Austria) referred to the remarks in M. Sato’s report on the subject of National Committees. The Austrian National Committee had been instituted seven years previously on the same lines as the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation at Geneva. Since that time the Austrian Committee had endeavoured to get into touch with the Austrian organisations and institutes dealing with questions of intellectual co-operation. That collaboration had given very satisfactory results, and he therefore ventured to suggest that the Rapporteur should, if he thought fit, mention in the Committee’s report the value of active collaboration between the National Committees on intellectual co-operation and the organisations and institutes in the various countries dealing with questions relating to the organisation of intellectual co-operation. He had in mind associations for the exchange of professors and students, for propagating the ideas and aims of the League of Nations, etc.

M. Valdés-Mendeville (Chile) referred to the progress which had been made since the days when the Committee had been chiefly occupied with the crisis threatening intellectual workers. The work of intellectual co-operation was free from the reproach that it was becoming regional in character, as was sometimes alleged in connection with other activities of the League. He welcomed the Ibero-American publications, and hoped that his Government would be able to participate in the Berne Exhibition. He endorsed what had already been said regarding the importance of avoiding overlapping.

The Chairman, on behalf of his country, desired to thank those speakers who had referred so kindly to the Exhibition of Popular Arts to be held at Berne in 1934.

M. de Reynold (Member of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation), referring to points which had been raised in previous speeches, said, in reply to the remarks of M. Petsche, that the Committee had no intention or desire to separate itself from other international bodies, but hoped to increase its co-operation with them in the future. The International Federation of Intellectual Workers would be welcomed at the meetings of the Committee, as would also all international intellectual bodies which might be created in future.

There was some slight misunderstanding on the subject of the Educational Information Centre, for which its title was perhaps responsible. This body had branches both in Geneva and Paris, whose respective spheres of work had been carefully defined. The Geneva body would deal with the preparation and execution of work connected with the instruction of youth in the aims of the League, and the Paris body would deal with general pedagogical questions, or matters specifically concerning educational methods. Every effort would be made to avoid overlapping, competition or trespassing on the special territory of education.

Owing to the limited means at the disposal of the Committee, very careful consideration was necessary before taking up fresh subjects. The Committee had already decided to enquire into the question of broadcasting, and he was glad to receive the support of the British and French delegations on this matter. The Committee was also studying the proposal of the International Federation of League of Nations Societies, to which reference had been made. The question of the influence of the cinema was now under consideration by the Committee, which would meet next July. Meanwhile, the International Institute at Rome was working on the subject.

In reply to the delegate of India, he mentioned that negotiations were being carried on for the translation of the League text-book into the five principal languages of India. He would be glad if the remarks of Count Mensdorff might be incorporated in the report of M. Sato. He thanked the Committee for the interest and support it had shown.

M. Bonnet (Director of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation) wished to remove any misapprehensions which might exist on the subject of overlapping. Work was often undertaken by the International Institute in response to a request from a Government department or inter-governmental body, and was always submitted to the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation. The work was entrusted to the officials concerned, who submitted the result of their researches to the various committees of experts and organs of the League of Nations. There were no doubt other bodies well able to assist in such matters, and he could assure the Committee that every possible use would be made of them in the future, as had been done in the past. In this connection, he referred particularly to enquiries such as that on the exchange of school-children and the use of broadcasting. The result of these various enquiries would subsequently be submitted to the Council and the Committee, and there was therefore no real danger of any overlapping. It would be a simple matter to study the suggestions of the British and French delegations regarding broadcasting at the same time as other matters of the same kind which were already under consideration by the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.

M. Sato (Japan), Rapporteur, wished to thank the members of the Committee for the welcome they had given to his report. He would endeavour to draw up a summary of the very interesting observations which had been made in the course of the discussion, and would prepare a draft resolution for submission to the Assembly.
M. Lange (Norway), Rapporteur, read his report (Annex 6).

Mirza Hussein Khan Alā (Persia) expressed his regret that he had been prevented by indisposition from attending the meeting on September 18th. In reading the Minutes of that meeting he had been surprised to note that the French delegate, when referring to the declarations of the Persian representative on the Council on the subject of the grant of guarantees to Persian subjects in Syria and Lebanon in judicial matters, had spoken of a “misunderstanding”, and had made a formal declaration that no discrimination to the detriment of Persian subjects was made in countries under French mandate.

He felt bound to remove this further misunderstanding, and he repeated respectfully but definitely the statements he had made to the Council on September 4th. He did not wish to deal with economic matters, although on that subject the Persian Government had good ground for complaint, as Persian products were subject to heavy, he might almost say prohibitive, duties and taxes in Syria. Confining himself to the legal question, he stated that Persian subjects in Syria and Lebanon were compelled to have recourse to native courts, whereas nationals of other States Members of the League could apply to the mixed tribunals.

It was not unreasonable of Persia to demand that all Members of the League should be treated on a footing of absolute equality. Persia was, at the present moment, the only Member of the League whose subjects were placed in an inferior position in Syria and the Lebanon, and this in spite of the fact that, before the war, Persian nationals resident in Ottoman territory enjoyed the privilege of consular jurisdiction, receiving in that respect “most-favoured-nation” treatment.

After the war, and following on the exercise by France, on behalf of the League, of the mandate over Syria and the Lebanon, these consular jurisdictions were replaced by mixed tribunals, which were intended to provide foreigners with guarantees of justice equal to those which had been given by the consular jurisdictions. In requesting that its nationals should have access to these mixed tribunals, the Persian Government did not claim that its position as an ex-capitulatory Power gave it any further rights than those which its nationals had enjoyed under the Ottoman regime. The Persian Government merely asked that its nationals should, like those of all other ex-capitulatory Powers (and several others), continue to enjoy the legal guarantees which had previously been provided by the capitulatory system and which, under the mandates system, took the form of mixed tribunals.

Mirza Hussein Khan Alā quoted Articles 5 and 6 of the Mandate for Syria and the Lebanon, dated July 24th, 1922. He stated that, with the object of providing a fresh legal system which should give foreigners guarantees equal to those under the capitulatory system, the mandatory Power had drawn up in 1921 various plans which had finally taken the form of the Decrees of July 7th, 1923. These Decrees set up a kind of mixed tribunal for matters in which one of the parties was of foreign nationality, no discrimination being made between foreigners. They also gave to natives the power to lay a matter before the mixed tribunal, even when neither of the parties was of foreign nationality. This system had been modified in Syria by a Decree of the High Commissioner dated February 17th, 1928, and in the Lebanon by a law of the same date. These Decrees introduced distinctions between foreigners and set up classes of foreigners who were entitled to apply to the mixed tribunals for matters in which foreigners were concerned. The result was that the mixed tribunal, which until then had been open to all foreigners without exception, and without any stipulation for reciprocity, was limited to the classes of foreigners mentioned in the Decree and the Law (Article 8). Persia did not appear in any of these lists, and thus without her consent had been deprived in 1928 of the benefits of a legal system which, when first set up (1921), had been intended to take the place of the old capitulatory system, during such time as might be necessary for a thorough reorganisation of the national jurisdiction, which reform had not yet been completed.

The Mandates Commission, when laying down the general conditions to be fulfilled at the time of the termination of the mandatory system in any given country, had recommended the conclusion of preliminary agreements between the mandatory Power and the country under mandate, in order that all the Members of the League might be placed upon a footing of perfect legal equality, as had been done in the Anglo-Iraqi Agreement. This procedure would entail a possible delay of some years, but a continuation of the present state of affairs could not be regarded as satisfactory, as it might lead to friction and to the impairment of good relations between the two countries.

On several occasions, therefore, particularly at the Council meeting of September 4th, he had begged the French Government to put an end as soon as possible to the system which discriminated unfairly between his compatriots and the nationals of other States Members of the League. Her renewed that request to-day. The object in view might be attained by a special Convention, for which provision was made in Article 8 of the Lebanon Law of February 17th, 1928, and in the Decree No. 1820 of the High Commissioner of Syria of the same date.
Mr. Te Water (Union of South Africa) stated that his Government, in its position as the mandatory Power for South West Africa, was directly interested in the conditions to be laid down for the termination of existing mandates, and wished to draw attention to the fourth paragraph of the draft report as follows:

"The Sixth Committee has approved the rules laid down in the Council's resolution of September 4th, 1931, with regard to the general conditions to be fulfilled before the mandate regime can be brought to an end in respect of a country placed under that regime. Like the Mandates Commission and the Council, it considered that the emancipation of the territories covered by Article 22 of the Covenant should be made dependent on the fulfilment of certain de facto conditions and on the existence of certain guarantees stipulated in the interests both of the territories concerned and of the international community."

Major Pienaar, who had represented South Africa at the meeting of the Council held on September 4th, 1931, had made some reservations regarding the Council resolutions on this point. After reading the declarations of Major Pienaar at the second meeting (September 4th) of the sixty-fourth session of the Council, Mr. te Water reiterated that his Government could not accept the report presented that day to the Committee without making the same reservations. The delegation of the Union of South Africa did not regard the rules referred to in the fourth paragraph of the draft report as applicable the case of C mandate, and reserved its right to demand modifications for mandates of this class. In order to avoid delay, he merely asked that his reservations should be mentioned in the Minutes. In the name of his Government, he supported the views expressed in the third paragraph of M. Lange's report.

M. Petsche (France) approved, in the name of his delegation, the draft report. He added that he had taken note of the declarations of the Persian delegation and would transmit them to his Government. He regretted that he was not able to make any further remarks at present and was glad to state that the Persian and French Governments were now in agreement regarding the future treatment of the question.

Mirza Hussein Khan Ala (Persia) could only repeat the request which he had already made that something should be done at once to meet the wishes he had expressed. It seemed the easier to meet this request in that the laws and treaties of Syria and the Lebanon provided expressly for the conclusion of special agreements with the object of giving to nationals of foreign States the right to appear before mixed tribunals. Persia asked for no special privileges. If, as the result of a general agreement, all privileges were suppressed, Persia would be the first to agree to the new state of affairs.

The draft report submitted by M. Lange was approved, and M. Lange was appointed Rapporteur to the Assembly.

22. Work of the Commission of Enquiry for European Union (continuation) : Letter from the Chairman of the Second Committee to the Chairman of the Sixth Committee.

The Chairman read a letter from the Second Committee (Annex 7), and pointed out that it was in agreement with the resolution of the Sixth Committee. It therefore only remained for him, as Rapporteur, to make any short explanations to the Assembly which might be necessary. There remained the special resolution which must be passed regarding the Pact of Economic Non-Aggression, and he proposed to submit a resolution on the following lines:

"1. The Assembly approves the proposal of the Commission of Enquiry for European Union that a special committee should be set up by the Commission for examining the Pact of Economic Non-Aggression.

2. The Assembly decides that the following States shall be invited to take part in the work of this special committee on an equal footing with the members which the Commission of Enquiry may appoint: Australia, China, India, Japan and Uruguay.

3. The Council of the League might also be asked to invite the United States of America to join this committee."

M. Valdés-Mendoza (Chile) pointed out with regard to paragraph 2 of the draft that the American continent was insufficiently represented amongst the non-European States proposed as members of the special committee. It was not known whether the United States of America would accept an invitation to share in this work; but, failing such acceptance, Uruguay would be the only representative of the American continent as against three representatives of great Asiatic Powers. He therefore proposed to add to the five countries mentioned in paragraph 2 Canada and one other American country.

The Chairman pointed out that the Commission of Enquiry was a committee of the League, and had to submit its report and conclusions to the League organs, and that it did not appear absolutely essential that a large number of States should be asked to examine the question. It was none the less true that the American continent, in view of its economic importance, might be
represented in greater strength on the special committee, and he therefore proposed to add Canada and Chile to the five countries already named.

The Chairman's proposal was adopted.
The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted.


Baron Yrjö-Koskinen (Finland), Rapporteur, read his draft report (Annex 8). He had not prepared any draft resolutions, as he had merely been called upon to make as correct a summary as possible of the discussion which had taken place in the Committee.

The draft report was adopted, and Baron Yrjö-Koskinen was appointed Rapporteur to the Assembly.


M. Sato (Japan), Rapporteur, drew attention to the various additions he had incorporated in his report (Annex 9).

He declared that, when drawing up the resolution to be submitted to the Assembly after approval by the Sixth Committee, he had endeavoured to give as full an account as possible of the discussion which had taken place on the subject. He had been much struck with the number of suggestions dealing with the importance of educational matters. He might instance the remarks of Mlle. Pinder, M. Petsche, M. Casares, M. Costa du Rels, M. Lange, Mr. Burrell, Count de Penha Garcia, Dr. Chodzko and M. Hyder.

The proposals of the British delegation and M. Petsche regarding broadcasting could be suitably combined in a sentence of the resolution. The Committee on Intellectual Co-operation had already asked the International Institute to undertake an enquiry into the educational side of broadcasting. The Sixth Committee might ask it to broaden the basis of this enquiry, so that it would deal with the use of wireless for increasing good understanding between the peoples. These suggestions might later on be extended, as M. Petsche had requested, to the cinematograph and to television.

M. Sato hoped that the terms of the resolution would meet the wishes of M. Gorgé, M. Garay and M. Fierlinger as regards the Exhibition of Popular Arts at Berne, and those of Mlle. Vácresco concerning the completion during the year of the programme drawn up by the Permanent Committee of Arts and Letters. A further paragraph would pay a tribute to the activity of the International Educational Cinematographic Institute.

He had borne in mind, in drawing up his report, the remarks of Count Mensdorff on the part to be played by National Committees, and also those of Mlle. Pinder regarding workers' spare time. Count Apponyi had reserved the right to refer at a later date to the question of the free circulation of literary and scientific works.

The suggestion of M. Petsche that the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation should keep in touch with associations of intellectual workers would no doubt be borne in mind by the Secretariat. M. Sato was sure that, in any enquiries which the International Institute and the Secretariat might carry out, they would, whenever possible, make use of the assistance of competent private bodies, as had been requested by M. Lange, M. Pusta and M. Valdés-Mendeville. An endeavour would be made next year to simplify the arrangement of the report of the Committee, as had been suggested by Dr. Chodzko.

At the suggestion of Dr. Chodzko (Poland), the sentence relating to the suggestion for a world conference of educators should be amended to read as follows:

"... and according to which the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation would be requested to study the suggestion of the Union of League of Nations Societies for a world conference..."
circulation of intellectual and technical literature. Until M. Fotitch was able to prove that the Review of Classical Philology, the Review of Higher Mathematics, or the Review of the Hungarian Shoemakers' Association, periodicals published in Budapest which were not permitted to enter Roumania, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, endangered the safety or public order of the State, the Hungarian delegation would be forced to continue to raise the question.

M. Lange (Norway) regretted that the draft report made no reference to the observation which he had made at the previous meeting on the necessity of avoiding overlapping. He would like, for instance, to see inserted at the end of the paragraph closing with the words "well planned and well equipped organisation", a phrase to the following effect:

"The Committee desires to emphasise the fact that the International Committee is essentially a co-ordinating body, and that it will doubtless avoid any overlapping by making use of existing associations and spreading the knowledge of their work."

M. de Reynold (Member of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation) said, in reply, that it must in any case be clearly understood (1) that the whole reform of the Intellectual Co-operation Organisation had been carried out with the main object of avoiding overlapping; (2) that any fresh passage inserted in the report would merely emphasise this intention. He was anxious that the proposed addition should be drawn up in such terms as to make it clear that there was no question of censuring the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.

M. Lange (Norway) said that a sentence of this kind would meet his wishes entirely. 

M. de Reynold's suggestion was approved.

M. Sato (Japan), Rapporteur, turning to the resolution, stated that the Australian delegation had suggested an addition to the section dealing with broadcasting.

After remarks by M. Bodrero (Italy) and M. Petsche (France), it was decided, on the suggestion of M. Bonnet (Director of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation), that the additional phrase should be worded as follows:

"Requests the Institute to get into touch for that purpose with the principal national and international broadcasting organisations."

M. Petsche (France) referred to the previous remarks of the French delegation concerning the various international problems arising out of broadcasting. He thought that these remarks had received the support of the British delegation and proposed to replace the third paragraph of the resolution in question by the following:

"Recommends that this enquiry should cover all international questions raised by broadcasting and, in particular, in regard to the possibility of its use as a means for establishing good international relations."

This proposal was accepted in principle, and it was understood that M. Petsche should agree with M. Sato on a final form of words.

M. Gorge (Switzerland) thought that the last section of the draft resolution, which dealt with the Berne Exhibition of Popular Arts in 1934, was perhaps somewhat too compressed, and he suggested the insertion between the two paragraphs in question of the following paragraph:

"Having regard to the Council's resolution of September 2nd, 1927, and the Assembly's resolution of the 22nd of the same month . . . ."

M. Sato (Japan), Rapporteur, accepted this addition.

M. Fierlinger (Czechoslovakia) supported the proposal of M. Gorge.

M. Gorge's proposal was adopted.

M. Valdés-Mendeville (Chile) suggested (1) that, in paragraph 4 of the first section of the draft resolution, the following words should be added after the words "among the young"; "and a spirit of cordiality among the peoples"; (2) that the paragraphs of the draft resolution should be numbered for convenience of reference.

These two proposals were accepted, subject to a modification as regards (1) on the suggestion of the Chairman, as follows: replace the words "spirit of cordiality" by the words "mutual understanding".

M. Pündler (Germany) enquired, in view of the intention of her country to summon an international conference of teachers, whether the paragraph under discussion referred to the proposal of Dr. Chodzko, the Polish delegate.
M. SATO (Japan), Rapporteur, stated that the resolution in question referred to the past. The Polish proposal, which referred to the future, was mentioned in the report. There had been considerable difficulty in reaching agreement on this point, and he hoped that Mlle. Pünder would agree to let the present wording stand.

Dr. CHODZKO (Poland) did not know what would be the fate of Mlle. Pünder's proposal, but he was anxious to express his thanks to her for having raised the question.

The CHAIRMAN, in view of the slight misunderstanding which had arisen recently on this point, said that the Minutes of the Sixth Committee would no doubt be carefully considered by the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, which would also take account of the suggestions of the Federation of League of Nations Societies. The Committee had not taken up a definite position owing to the great difficulty of reaching an agreement. He therefore suggested to the German and Polish delegates that things should be left as they were.

Dame Edith LYTTELTON (British Empire) was in agreement with the German delegate, and thought that the passage concerned was rather vague, and would be improved by the addition of the words "for a world conference" after the words "that a plan".

The CHAIRMAN agreed that the present wording was vague, but the vagueness was intentional. It would be difficult to reach an agreement on the proposal itself, and for that reason the report merely mentioned the Polish suggestion. If the Committee made the resolution less vague, it would no longer be in agreement with the report, which had avoided a definite statement.

M. DE REYNOLD (Member of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation) said that the International Committee had been dealing with problems of this kind for years and had been compelled to reject several similar requests last year. The Committee would none the less examine very carefully any suggestions which might be put before it. The International Committee had not at the present time the funds necessary for such large congresses, for which it had substituted a less costly, speedier and more reliable method.

The CHAIRMAN, summing up the discussion, stated that the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation would examine carefully the suggestions of the Polish delegate, which had been supported by Dame Edith Lyttelton and Mlle. Pünder, and would see whether it was possible to take action upon them. Nevertheless, in view of the difficulty of the question, the seriousness of the present financial situation and the doubts of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, it was not possible for the Sixth Committee to take an immediate decision.

Dame Edith LYTTELTON (British Empire) withdrew her suggestion, but remarked that they had been asked not to insist on their point of view because the question could not be discussed, but it had apparently been settled in a negative sense.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Dame Edith Lyttelton for withdrawing her suggestion, but stated that the matter was not settled. It remained a completely open one and might be taken up at a later session, on due notice being given by the International Committee after consideration of the subject.

Dame Edith LYTTELTON (British Empire) requested that the Chairman's remarks might be inserted in the Minutes.

The draft report and resolution were approved.

M. SATO (Japan) was appointed Rapporteur to the Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN pronounced the session closed.
ANNEXES

ANNEX 1.

A.VI/4.1931.

WORK OF THE COMMISSION OF ENQUIRY FOR EUROPEAN UNION.

DRAFT LETTER FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE SIXTH COMMITTEE TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE, SUBMITTED BY THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE.

The Sixth Committee, at its meeting on September 16th, decided to refer for study to the Second Committee the technical questions—particularly economic and financial questions, as well as questions of transit and communications—dealt with in the reports of the Commission of Enquiry for European Union to the Assembly. The Sixth Committee assumes that the Second Committee, in presenting its reports, will take into consideration the material furnished by the work of the Commission of Enquiry.

The Sixth Committee reserves the right to submit to the Assembly proposals as to the constitution, organisation and methods of work of the Commission of Enquiry. In this connection, it may be observed that, in the course of the past year, the Commission of Enquiry has had to create several special committees for the study of certain economic questions whose urgency appeared to require this mode of procedure.

The report of the Organisation Sub-Committee set up by the Commission of Enquiry and now submitted for the consideration of the Sixth Committee, indicates the conditions under which the Commission of Enquiry may have recourse to the co-operation of the technical organs and advisory committees of the League of Nations (see document A.I7, page 18, Section 2, paragraph 2), a right of which it has already availed itself with the authorisation of the Council of the League.

The Sixth Committee, being aware of the desire of the Commission of Enquiry to limit as far as possible the setting up of special committees and to utilise as a general rule the existing organs of the League, would be grateful to the Second Committee if this latter would give it an assurance that the permanent organs of the League will be in a position to satisfy, with the flexibility and promptitude which may be necessary, any demands the Commission of Enquiry may make.

ANNEX 2.

A.VI/5.1931.

SLAVERY.


Geneva, September 14th, 1931.

You may recall that, when I spoke in the Assembly, I stated I desired to bring under the notice of the Sixth Committee a letter regarding slavery from His Majesty the Emperor of Abyssinia, and the letter from the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society which evoked it.

I now have the honour to transmit to you two copies of each letter, with a view of their being circulated to the members of the Committee.

(Signed) Thomas M. Wilford.

A LETTER FROM THE ANTI-SLAVERY AND ABORIGINES PROTECTION SOCIETY TO THE EMPEROR OF ABYSSINIA, DATED 20TH MAY, 1931.

Our Committee has received, through Sir Sidney Barton, Great Britain's Minister, accredited to your Imperial Majesty, the welcome intimation of your resolute intention to attempt the great task of the abolition of slavery throughout your dominions.

We desire to thank you for your intimation, and we are confident that, in expressing our appreciation of your decision, we voice the views of the whole British people, who desire only the
peace and prosperity of your country and the establishment of complete goodwill between the British and Abyssinian peoples.

Sir Sidney Barton has emphasised to our Committee the immensity of the task before your Imperial Majesty and the need for wisdom on your part and patience on the part of others. We are glad to have this further evidence of your belief in the words of your great traditional ancestor, King Solomon, that “it is righteousness that exalteth a nation”, and we trust that to you may be given the full measure of wisdom of that great ruler, which has become common currency in the language of all nations.

We understand from Sir Sidney Barton that you would like to be informed of action taken on the part of our Committee with other Governments, and of what help British people can give you in the great task you have undertaken.

In the first place, we would point out that our society is composed of people drawn from all sections of British public life. It includes members of all political parties, of all religious denominations, and leading men unattached either to any political body or any religious denomination. We are entirely disinterested as a body in any commercial development of overseas territories, and are dominated by a single objective—namely, that of the abolition of slavery in all its forms and of assisting backward races in their striving after progress. The assistance we are able to render must necessarily take different forms according to the peculiar features possessed by any subject which comes before us.

We can best illustrate the society’s work by submitting for your consideration a few of the questions in which we have been concerned during the hundred years’ efforts of the society. The first two of these illustrations concern your own country of Abyssinia.

Abyssinia, 1875.

In 1875, Abyssinia and Egypt were in conflict. Our Committee did not enter into the merits of this conflict, but they were concerned deeply that there should be no alienation of Abyssinian territory. They decided in these circumstances to send an important deputation to Lord Derby, the British Foreign Minister. This deputation, of which we can forward you, if desired, a full account, waited upon Lord Derby on December 3rd, 1875, and set forth reasons why the British Government should take some action if there was any danger of the annexation of Abyssinian territory. The British Minister, replying to our deputation, gave eminently satisfactory assurances, which included the following declaration:

“I do not at all hesitate to say that, if there were any intention to conquer and annex the country, I think it would be an unwise proceeding on the part of the ruler of Egypt...”

“I should be quite prepared to advise the abandonment of any scheme for the annexation of Abyssinia, if I had reason to believe that any such scheme were in prospect.”

In 1879, our society received the following letter, dated December 14th, 1878, from the Emperor Menelik, who was then King of Shoa. This letter was received in July 1879.

“May this writing of Menelik, King of Shoa, safely reach my friends of the Anti-Slavery Society in London. With the greatest respect I ask you how it goes with you. I, my people, and my army are well. God be praised therefore.

“Dear Friends,—You formerly wrote to me and advised me that, for a Christian King, the institution of the slave-trade in his kingdom was an inconsistency. Herewith I send you the joyful message, as answer, that I have abolished the slave-trade, in my whole kingdom and in its borders, for I am a Christian. Therefore, consider me, henceforth, with all goodwill, as your friend.

“My country is far distant from your country. My road to the coast, to Zeyla, Tajura, and Aden is at present closed to me by the Mussulmans—to wit, the Egyptian Government. They prevent my receiving into my country either provisions, arms, agricultural implements, artisans, or even messengers of the Gospel. Will you kindly raise your powerful voice in order that I may have this way opened to me, for I desire to inaugurate in my kingdom European civilisation, intelligence and art.”

The Committee, under the signatures of Joseph Cooper and Edmund Sturge, at once forwarded a memorandum to the Marquis of Salisbury, a full copy of which we could, if desired, send to you, in which the Committee urged the British Foreign Minister “most earnestly” to “move at once”, in order to secure the removal of the restrictions to which the King of Shoa referred. The society received in September of the same year a most satisfactory reply from the Marquis of Salisbury, in the course of which he stated that:

“I am, in reply, to request that you will state to the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society that negotiations are at present going on between King John of Abyssinia and the Egyptian Government with the view to arrive at an arrangement satisfactory to both parties in regard to the trade to be carried on between Abyssinia and the outer world. Her Majesty’s agent and Consul-General in Egypt has been authorised to address a communication to King John, tendering the good offices of