

# LEAGUE OF NATIONS

*Official Journal*

---

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT No. 70

---

## RECORDS

OF THE

### NINTH ORDINARY SESSION

OF THE

## ASSEMBLY

---

### MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEES

---

## MINUTES

OF THE

## SIXTH COMMITTEE

(POLITICAL QUESTIONS)

GENEVA, 1928

°  
°  
CONTENTS.

	Page
LIST OF MEMBERS . . . . .	3
AGENDA . . . . .	5
 FIRST MEETING, September 4th, 1928, at 10 a.m. :	
1. Election of the Chairman . . . . .	5
2. Election of the Vice-Chairman . . . . .	5
3. Publicity of the Meetings . . . . .	5
4. Adoption of the Agenda . . . . .	5
5. Appointment of Rapporteurs . . . . .	5
 SECOND MEETING, September 5th, 1928, at 3.30 p.m. :	
6. Slavery Convention : Annual Report by the Council . . . . .	5
7. Appointment of the Rapporteur for the Question of Slavery . . . . .	6
 THIRD MEETING, September 12th, 1928, at 10 a.m. :	
8. Adoption of the Minutes of the First Two Meetings . . . . .	6
9. Inclusion of the Mandates Question in the Agenda . . . . .	6
10. Work of the International Committee and of the Institute for Intellectual Co-operation . . . . .	6
 FOURTH MEETING, September 13th, 1928, at 10 a.m. :	
11. Question of the Limitation of the Expenditure of the League : Resolution communicated by the Fourth Committee . . . . .	10
12. Work of the International Committee and of the Institute for Intellectual Co-operation ( <i>Continuation</i> ) . . . . .	10
 FIFTH MEETING, September 14th, 1928, at 10 a.m. :	
13. Mandates . . . . .	15
14. Appointment of the Rapporteur for Mandates Questions . . . . .	22
 SIXTH MEETING, September 15th, 1928, at 10 a.m. :	
15. Adoption of the Minutes of the Third and Fourth Meetings . . . . .	22
16. Work of the International Committee and of the Institute for Intellectual Co-operation : Draft Report of the Committee to the Assembly . . . . .	22
17. Appointment of the Rapporteur for Questions relating to Intellectual Co-operation . . . . .	26
18. Mandates ( <i>Continuation</i> ) . . . . .	26
 SEVENTH MEETING, September 17th, 1928, at 10 a.m. :	
19. Adoption of the Minutes of the Fifth Meeting . . . . .	29
20. Mandates : Draft Report of the Committee to the Assembly . . . . .	29
21. Appointment of a Rapporteur on Mandates Questions . . . . .	30
22. Slavery Convention : Annual Report to the Council : Draft Report of the Committee to the Assembly . . . . .	30
 EIGHTH MEETING, September 19th, 1928, at 10 a.m. :	
23. Adoption of the Minutes of the Sixth and Seventh Meetings . . . . .	31
24. Plan for the Establishment of Armenian Refugees in the Republic of Erivan . . . . .	31
25. Appointment of the Rapporteur for the question of the Establishment of Armenian Refugees in the Republic of Erivan . . . . .	34
 NINTH MEETING, September 22nd, 1928, at 3.30 p.m. :	
26. Plan for the Establishment of Armenian Refugees in the Republic of Erivan ( <i>Continuation</i> ) . . . . .	35
27. Close of the Session . . . . .	35
ANNEXES . . . . .	36
INDEX . . . . .	47

## LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE SIXTH COMMITTEE

---

*Chairman :* His Excellency M. VOISLAV MARINKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes).

*Vice-Chairman :* His Excellency M. VALDÉS-MENDEVILLE (Chile).

### *Members :*

- Abyssinia :* His Excellency the Bettoadded GUETATCHEOU.  
Ato Woldé MARYAM.  
Ato Guebré EGZABEHER.
- Albania :* His Excellency M. Mehdi FRASHERI.
- Australia :* The Honourable A. J. McLACHLAN.
- Austria :* Dr. F. MATSCH.
- Belgium :* His Excellency M. P. E. JANSON.  
M. LOUWERS.
- British Empire :* The Rt. Hon. G. LOCKER-LAMPSON.  
The Hon. Mrs. Alfred LYTTTELTON, D.B.E.  
Mr. A. Duff COOPER, D.S.O., M.P.
- Bulgaria :* His Excellency M. MOLLOFF.  
M. MIKOFF.
- Canada :* Dr. Walter A. RIDDELL, M.A., Ph.D.
- Chile :* His Excellency M. VALDÉS-MENDEVILLE (Vice-Chairman).
- China :* M. TSI-TCHE.  
Dr. LI KOUE-TSAI (Substitute).
- Colombia :* His Excellency Dr. A. J. RESTREPO.
- Cuba :* His Excellency M. R. MARTINEZ ORTIZ.  
M. R. Hernández PORTELA.
- Czechoslovakia :* His Excellency Dr. Ferdinand VEVERKA.  
Dr. Vladimír SLAVÍK (Substitute).
- Denmark :* His Excellency M. P. MUNCH.  
Mlle. Henni FORCHHAMMER.
- Dominican Republic :* Dr. Franco FRANCO.  
M. PARADAS (Substitute).
- Estonia :* His Excellency M. H. REBANE.  
General J. LAIDONER.
- Finland :* His Excellency M. Hj. J. PROCOPE.  
His Excellency Baron A. YRJÖ-KOSKINEN (Substitute).
- France :* M. Lucien HUBERT.  
M. R. SÉROT.
- Germany :* His Excellency Dr. C. VON SCHUBERT.  
Dr. F. GAUS.  
M. FROHWEIN.
- Greece :* His Excellency M. A. CARAPANOS.  
His Excellency M. N. POLITIS.  
M. R. RAPHAËL.
- Guatemala :* His Excellency M. José MATOS.
- Haiti :* His Excellency M. A. NEMOURS.
- Hungary :* M. Joseph VÉSZI.  
Count François HUNYADI.  
Baron Gabriel APOR.
- India :* Captain His Highness Sir Tale Muhammed Khan SHER MUHAMMED  
Khan, K.C.I.E., K.C.V.O., Nawab of Palanpur.  
Sir K. Venkata REDDI.

<i>Irish Free State :</i>	Mr. Ernest BLYTHE. Mr. Michael MACWHITE (Substitute).
<i>Italy :</i>	His Excellency Count BONIN-LONGARE. Count A. CIPPICO. M. E. AMICUCCI. M. G. POLVERELLI. Professor G. GALLAVRESI.
<i>Japan :</i>	His Excellency Baron FUJIMURA. His Excellency M. E. KIMURA (Substitute).
<i>Latvia :</i>	His Excellency M. A. BALODIS. Dr. P. OLINŠ (Substitute)
<i>Liberia :</i>	His Excellency Baron R. A. LEHMANN.
<i>Lithuania :</i>	His Excellency M. V. SIDZIKAUSKAS.
<i>Luxemburg :</i>	His Excellency M. Joseph BECH. M. Charles VERMAIRE.
<i>Netherlands :</i>	His Excellency Count J. VAN LIMBURG STIRUM.
<i>New Zealand :</i>	The Hon. Sir James PARR, K.C.M.G.
<i>Nicaragua :</i>	His Excellency M. T. F. MEDINA.
<i>Norway :</i>	Dr. Fridtjof NANSEN. Dr. Christian L. LANGE.
<i>Panama :</i>	His Excellency M. Octavio MENDEZ PEREIRA.
<i>Paraguay :</i>	Dr. Ramon V. CABALLERO.
<i>Persia :</i>	His Highness Mohammad Ali Khan FOROUGHI. His Excellency Hussein Khan ALA. M. Mohammad Khan CHAYESTEH (Substitute).
<i>Poland :</i>	M. Witold CHODZKO. M. Miroslaw ARCISZEWSKI (Substitute). M. Adam TARNOWSKI (Substitute).
<i>Portugal :</i>	His Excellency Dr. J. C. Franco FRAZÃO, Count DE PENHA GARCIA. M. Dias DE OLIVEIRA (Substitute).
<i>Roumania :</i>	His Excellency M. Nicolas Petresco COMNÈNE. M. Mircea DJUVARA. Mlle. Hélène VACARESCO (Substitute). M. Eugène FILLOTTI (Substitute).
<i>Salvador :</i>	His Excellency M. Gustavo GUERRERO.
<i>Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes :</i>	His Excellency M. Voislav MARINKOVITCH (Chairman). His Excellency M. Djordjé DJOURITCH.
<i>Siam :</i>	His Highness Prince VIPULYA. Khun PRASERT MAITRI (Substitute).
<i>South Africa :</i>	The Honourable A. J. WERTH.
<i>Spain :</i>	His Excellency M. J. QUIÑONES DE LEÓN. His Excellency M. L. PALACIOS-MORINI (Substitute). His Excellency Count DE SAN ESTEBAN DE CAÑONGO (Substitute). His Excellency M. Julio CASARES Y SÁNCHEZ (Substitute).
<i>Sweden :</i>	His Excellency Dr. T. M. HÖJER. M. K. I. WESTMAN (Substitute). M. J. LAGERBERG (Substitute).
<i>Switzerland :</i>	M. William RAPPARD. M. Walter BURCKHARDT (Substitute).
<i>Uruguay :</i>	His Excellency M. Pedro COSIO.
<i>Venezuela :</i>	His Excellency M. C. PARRA-PÉREZ. M. HURTADO-MACHADO (Substitute).

SIXTH COMMITTEE OF THE NINTH ORDINARY SESSION  
OF THE ASSEMBLY  
(POLITICAL QUESTIONS.)

---

AGENDA

1. SLAVERY CONVENTION : ANNUAL REPORT BY THE COUNCIL.
  2. REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE ON INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION.
  3. MANDATES.
  4. PLAN FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ARMENIAN REFUGEES IN THE REPUBLIC OF ERIVAN.
- 

FIRST MEETING

*Held on Tuesday, September 4th, 1928, at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman : M. MARINKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes).*

**1. Election of the Chairman.**

M. MARINKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) was elected Chairman of the Committee on Monday, September 3rd, at a meeting held in the Salle de la Réformation at 6 p.m.

**2. Election of the Vice-Chairman.**

His Excellency M. VALDÉS-MENDEVILLE (Chile) was elected Vice-Chairman.

**3. Publicity of the Meetings.**

*The Committee decided that its meetings would be public unless otherwise agreed.*

**4. Adoption of the Agenda.**

*The Committee approved its agenda, which included :*

1. Slavery Convention : Annual Report by the Council.
2. Report on the Work of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.

**5. Appointments of Rapporteurs.**

*The Committee appointed M. GALLAVRESI (Italy) Rapporteur for the work of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.*

The Rapporteur for the annual report by the Council on the Slavery Commission would be appointed later.

---

SECOND MEETING

*Held on Wednesday, September 5th, 1928, at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman : M. MARINKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes).*

**6. Slavery Convention : Annual Report by the Council.**

M. GUETATCHEOU (Abyssinia) stated that the Imperial Abyssinian Government was scrupulously carrying out the provisions of the Convention dated September 25th, 1925. Abyssinia had been more than willing to sign the Convention ; the fact that she had not yet ratified it was not preventing her from applying all its provisions. The Abyssinian delegation had just received certain supplementary information in addition to that furnished last year. This information would shortly be communicated to the members of the Committee (Annex 1).

Count BONIN-LONGARE (Italy) said that the Italian Government had deposited its ratification of the Convention with the Secretariat. Italy, however, had already applied the provisions of the Convention without awaiting the completion of this formality. In particular, the Italian Government had complied Article 7 of the Convention, which laid down that information concerning the steps taken to apply the Convention should be communicated to the League of Nations. The documents transmitted up to the present might seem to be meagre in substance, but this was due to the fact that cases of slavery were comparatively rare — thanks, doubtless, to the energetic steps instantly taken by the Italian Government to suppress slavery in all its forms.

On the CHAIRMAN'S proposal, *the discussion was adjourned until the members of the Committee had received the Rapporteur's report.*

#### **7. Appointment of the Rapporteur for the Question of Slavery.**

On the CHAIRMAN'S proposal, Mr. LOCKER-LAMPSON (British Empire) *was appointed Rapporteur for the question of slavery.*

### THIRD MEETING

*Held on Wednesday, September 12th, 1928, at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman : M. MARINKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes).*

#### **8. Adoption of the Minutes of the First Two Meetings.**

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that the Minutes only contained a summary of the discussions. Naturally, members were entitled to make any corrections they thought necessary. He submitted the Minutes of the first two meetings for approval.

*The Minutes of the first two meetings were adopted without comment.*

#### **9. Inclusion of the Mandates Question in the Agenda.**

The CHAIRMAN announced that the plenary Assembly had referred a third question — that of Mandates — to the Sixth Committee. This question would be placed on the agenda.

*Approved.*

#### **10. Work of the International Committee and of the Institute for Intellectual Co-operation.**

The CHAIRMAN invited Professor Gilbert Murray, Chairman of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, to make, as was customary, a statement regarding the work of this Committee.

Professor Gilbert MURRAY (Chairman of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation) said how glad he was to address the Sixth Committee.

In view of the numerous reports which had been prepared on the work of the International Committee, he would merely outline the general ideas underlying its work and refer to the hopes it entertained.

It had been observed in 1921 that some of the feelings of bitterness left by the war still lingered among the intellectual classes with perhaps greater force than elsewhere. It was then that Lord Balfour and M. Léon Bourgeois set themselves to examine the problem; their object was to strengthen the ties which should unite intellectual circles, notably by removing the embargo placed on nationals of certain countries by intellectual groups. Moreover, they had been struck by the distress in which the intellectual classes were living. Very praiseworthy and noble efforts had been made to remedy this painful situation. The period in question had been one of heroic struggle which could now be looked back upon with satisfaction. At the present time, it could truly be said that learned societies had become almost universal and that the acute distress among the intellectual classes had almost entirely disappeared.

Passing to the present activity of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, Professor Murray referred to some of its new tasks — in the first place, the work in connection with bibliography with a view to avoiding loss of time in scientific work.

He then referred to the question of co-operation, saying that one of the objects of intellectual co-operation was co-operation for its own sake or, more correctly, for its excellent psychological results — the spirit of understanding which it engendered. As an illustration of this, he said there at present existed numerous international associations of students, while relations between students of various countries were becoming more and more frequent, and had probably never been on so wide a scale since the Middle Ages. The Committee on Intellectual Co-operation would do all it could to encourage this movement.

Exchanges of teachers, students, and even pupils at secondary schools were also making progress. The Committee on Intellectual Co-operation had recently been considering a very interesting scheme for the exchange of secondary-school teachers between various groups

of countries. He was of the opinion that any sums of money which might be offered for the execution of this scheme should be placed at the disposal of the Council of the League.

He reminded his hearers that some of the first questions laid before the Committee had been technical ones — for instance, a question concerning asphyxiating gases and the preservation of paper. The Committee had been able to consult experts and give a reply on those two points.

With regard to intellectual rights, very important work had been accomplished, the details of which were set out in Professor Gallavresi's report. The most interesting point was perhaps that the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation had succeeded in obtaining recognition in the new Convention of the moral obligation to protect authors' rights.

He then passed to the question of the instruction of youth of all countries in the aims of the League of Nations. It was clear that all countries had to collaborate in this work. At first it had seemed rash to hope that a common plan might be prepared, but the results of the work, once published, had been received with approval everywhere. Quite recently the Secretariat had considered the possibility of publishing an educational survey on this subject. It might perhaps be possible to publish twice a year a résumé of activities in this sphere in order that each nation might learn what the others were doing. This plan would only cost the League a very small sum.

He hoped that in time the League would need to devote less of its energies to combating various evils, thus allowing the positive and constructive work of intellectual co-operation to be developed.

Finally, he paid a tribute to his predecessor, the late Professor Lorentz, who for nearly half a century had been one of the chief architects in rebuilding our conception of the universe. He had friends in every country and possessed great faith in the purifying influence of scientific work; he had been not only a scientist, but a man of the first rank.

The CHAIRMAN, on behalf of the Sixth Committee, associated himself with the tribute paid to Professor Lorentz.

He informed the Committee that M. Luchaire, Director of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, and M. Oprescu, Secretary of the Committee, were present and would answer any questions that might be asked.

M. GALLAVRESI (Italy), Rapporteur, joined in the tribute to the memory of Professor Lorentz, the tutelary genius who would continue to inspire the work of intellectual co-operation and maintain its impartial character. Nobody should forget his own individual civilisation, but great things could be done by bringing different civilisations into harmony. The Institute of Intellectual Co-operation had succeeded in safeguarding its international character. The presence of representatives of the Institute at international meetings was a guarantee of impartiality, and also gave an impulse to the advance of learning. The Rome Conference for the protection of authors' rights and the Oslo Historical Congress were evidence of this.

One of the most vexed questions was that of intellectual rights and scientific property. The Council of the League had given authority for a draft international convention on this subject to be communicated to Governments. The idea was therefore gaining ground.

In regard to university exchanges, the Rapporteur had little to add to Professor Gilbert Murray's statement. He would mention the holding at Berlin of a congress of institutions concerned with education for political life.

Attention had also been paid to the obstacles which hampered the free circulation of books. A publishers' congress was in contemplation.

Turning to the instruction of the young, he reminded his hearers that, in the Subcommittee of Experts, he had criticised this expression, which he regarded as being too narrow, since it was not only the young who needed instruction regarding the aims of the League. He then passed on to the subject of educational institutions, in regard to which the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation was not in a position to do very much. Every effort had been made to obtain a wide circulation for document A.26, and indeed he understood that, next to the report of the Economic Conference, this was the document with the largest sale.

This propaganda ought to be continued, and, in order that the Secretariat might be able to carry on the publication of documents which it would be a pity to discontinue, he proposed that the Committee dealing with finance should be asked to sanction a credit of 10,500 francs.

Mlle. VACARESCO (Roumania) congratulated the Rapporteur on the work he had done and on his statement. She traced the origin of the idea of intellectual co-operation.

The human mind, she said, shrank from repose; it lived, not on similarities, but on differences.

In opposition to the aggressive forms of nationalism, the Committee had succeeded in bringing to the front a kind of nationalism that was really necessary — that which represented the peculiarities of national temperaments. It was this kind of nationalism that was to be celebrated at the Congress of Popular Art organised by the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation.

She also congratulated the Committee on having conceived the idea of a congress of publishers — those curators of the museums of thought, who apart from the selections made by the different peoples would choose those works which could best bring the peoples into communion in the sphere of beauty.

She then referred to the lively discussions in the Sub-Committee for Arts and Letters. The spirit bloweth where it listeth, but that Sub-Committee had sought to transform the breath of the spirit into a life-giving breeze. Mention had been made there of the question of educational museums; perhaps that was a source from which a river would one day flow.

She then touched upon the question of artistic films. People were always talking about the education of the young, but they tended to forget the education of the masses. She had asked the Sub-Committee for Arts and Letters to call upon the Governments to encourage artistic films, and she would like the matter to be mentioned in the Sixth Committee's Minutes.

Finally, she remarked that the Sub-Committee for Arts and Letters had also considered how the appreciation of music might be encouraged.

M. VALDÉS-MENDEVILLE (Chile) congratulated Professor Gallavresi on his report (Annex 2). He also thanked Professor Gilbert Murray for his explanation of the objects aimed at by the Organisation for Intellectual Co-operation.

He began by dealing with that part of the report which concerned the instruction of the young in the aims of the League of Nations. He reminded the Committee that his country had always attached great importance to the question — above all, perhaps, to Recommendation 5 of the Sub-Committee of Experts for the instruction of youth.

The step taken by the International Bureau of Education at Geneva might be regarded as following out the recommendation in a very felicitous manner. More than 150 members of the teaching profession, belonging to twenty different countries, had attended the first special course during the summer, and had thus acquired the necessary knowledge to give instruction concerning the League.

The relations between this Bureau and Chile and the other Latin-American countries were becoming daily closer, as might be seen from the unanimous resolution adopted by the first Congress of Latin-American teachers which had met at Buenos Aires in January last.

He proposed that the following draft resolution — which he intended to elaborate during the general discussion — should be inserted in the report :

“ The Assembly notes with satisfaction the readiness with which professors and teachers have answered the appeal for co-operation addressed to them, and welcomes the organisation of courses of study with a view to their special requirements, not only on a national basis by various committees, but also internationally, as by the International Education Bureau at Geneva. It is glad of the support received from Governments by which, following the recommendations of the Sub-Committee of Experts of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, facilities have been offered to teachers for following courses of instruction at Geneva and, convinced of the paramount importance of the training of teachers for such teaching, it expresses the hope that similar facilities will be offered by the States Members of the League. ”

Speaking of intellectual rights, he referred to the Chilean Law of 1925, which applied the principles advocated by the Committee and established intellectual property by means of a register as perfectly authenticated as the land register.

The preliminary draft Convention on Scientific Property would be carefully considered by the Chilean Government, which had already sent the Secretariat an important memorandum on the subject.

He did not wish to go into the details of the valuable work which the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation was doing through the International Institute at Paris, whose activity he greatly admired. The Chilean Government was much impressed by this activity, and was co-operating actively through its representative attached to the Institute.

M. VÉSZI (Hungary) desired to draw the Committee's attention to the problem of the circulation of books.

In this connection, he referred to the following passages contained in the report by the Director of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation :

“ The problem of the obstacles to the international circulation of books is most important, and your Committee last year postponed the consideration of the question till this year. We can arrive at no practical conclusion with regard to certain points of this problem before establishing an agreement with other international bodies of an economic character. Although experience shows that such agreements are not always easy to conclude, this is no reason for relinquishing the task. ”

“ The problem also presents certain difficulties of a political nature. The free circulation of books may be opposed to certain national interests which demand supervision at the frontiers. Your Committee has always taken the attitude that political difficulties do not come within the scope of its jurisdiction and that they should be referred to the competent organs of the League of Nations. Nevertheless, our Organisation is naturally desirous that the existing obstacles in the way of the circulation of printed matter should as far as possible be removed. ”

M. Luchaire's statement presented the problem in its fullest aspect. The International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, during its tenth session, held at Geneva from July 25th to 30th, 1928, considered the report of the Institute containing the passage referring to the free circulation of all books or printed matter of a scientific, technical or professional



nature. In order to dispel any misunderstanding at the outset, he was anxious to emphasise the fact that his remarks in no way applied to political journals.

He hoped that the Committee would support the recommendations put forward by M. Luchaire, which would permit of the re-establishment of normal relations in the intellectual life of nations through the spread of knowledge.

M. Vészi proposed that the Committee should adopt the following amendment, which might be inserted in the draft resolution to be submitted to the Assembly :

“ From the sentence contained in the original report of the Institute, second sub-section of paragraph 39, the words : ‘ It is studying the problem of the international circulation of books ’ should be deleted and replaced by the following sentence : ‘ The Sub-Committee on Intellectual Rights, when dealing with the problem of the international circulation of books, has found that this is a highly important problem, and has very definitely expressed its opinion that it is most desirable that the obstacles at present hindering the diffusion of knowledge should as far as possible be removed ’ . ”

M. FUJIMURA (Japan) said he had listened to the discussion with the greatest interest, and pronounced himself entirely in agreement with the preceding speakers.

He desired to give a brief statement of the position in Japan with regard to intellectual co-operation. A Japanese Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, composed of eminent experts, had been appointed in April 1926. That Committee had undertaken the following work :

1. The translation of laws, beginning with an English translation of the commercial laws, a special committee having been appointed for that purpose in 1927.
2. A Year-book on Japanese art, published in English.
3. The compilation of a bibliography in French for the benefit of foreigners studying Japanese civilisation; there now existed : (a) a bibliography of literary, historical, philosophical, religious, etc., works published between 1868 and 1922; (b) a bibliography of all historical works from the earliest times to the middle of the nineteenth century; (c) a bibliography of important works on philosophy, history, literature, archaeology, anthropology, arts, etc., published in 1924, 1925 and 1926.
4. The Committee was in constant touch with the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation in Paris.
5. It had appointed correspondents to the various Japanese universities with a view to keeping in constant touch with the intellectual life of the whole country.

COUNT DE PENHA GARCIA (Portugal) said that his Government followed the work of the International Committee and of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation with great interest. This was proved by the fact that Portugal, in spite of her slender financial resources, was among the eleven nations at present supporting the Paris Institute.

Certain historical facts showed that Portugal had been to a certain extent the forerunner of intellectual co-operation, for it was the Portuguese who had brought back from the East a knowledge of art, science and literature, and had imparted Western knowledge in return.

At the present day, Portugal's participation in congresses and conferences relating to intellectual matters was continuous. She effected exchanges of university professors, organised vacation courses for foreigners, etc. In short, she had already realised a large number of the aims of intellectual co-operation.

The excellent report presented by M. Gallavresi had enabled the Portuguese representative to form an idea of the present position of the work of co-operation, and he was pleased to see that it rested on a really practical basis. It was a logical consequence that such efforts should have already begun to give important results.

It was now possible to see clearly that the work of intellectual co-operation, while based on high ideals, endeavoured in a practical way to strengthen this spirit of international understanding. In order to improve matters from the technical standpoint, the legal problems relating to intellectual property, international associations, etc., were being studied. Finally, endeavour was being made to develop a good international spirit, which, based on a large sense of nationalism, was the essential condition of peace.

M. SLAVIK (Czechoslovakia) expressed his admiration for the work of the Committee and of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation. It was one of the League's most important activities, since through it moral disarmament could be attained.

The speaker supported the amendment put forward by M. Valdés-Mendeville. He thought it would also be possible for him to support the amendment proposed by the Hungarian delegate. As he understood it, the aim was to remove every obstacle in the way of the diffusion of scientific knowledge. Hence, in order to be quite precise, he proposed, instead of saying “ present obstacles in the way of the diffusion of knowledge ”, to say “ to the diffusion of scientific knowledge ”.

The aim was to reach the point when the peoples liked each other better because they knew each other better. The members of the Committee were bound to approve of everything that brought the peoples closer together. On the other hand, he thought that all the members of the Committee, the Hungarian delegate first and foremost, would agree with him when he said that it was the duty of all the organs of the League, and of all those who worked within

the League's orbit, to oppose with the utmost energy any action likely to separate the nations or to stir up hatred and create distrust.

In consequence, the delegate for Czechoslovakia supported M. Gallavresi's report and the two proposed amendments.

M. VÉSZI (Hungary) remarked that he had taken the text of his amendment from a report of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation. He thought that this would satisfy M. Slavik. If not, he would propose to say "scientific, technical and professional knowledge".

M. GALLAVRESI (Italy), Rapporteur, suggested postponing questions of drafting until the end of the discussion.

M. OPRESCU (Secretary of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation) remarked that the report to which the Hungarian delegate had referred was not really a report by the Committee. It was a report by the Director of the Institute, of which the Committee had taken cognisance.

Sir K. Venkata REDDI (India) associated himself with the speakers who had paid a tribute to the Committee and to the Institute. He wished to put forward some suggestions, not criticisms.

Professor Gilbert Murray had said that the first step in bringing peoples together intellectually was to establish a link between the intellectuals of Eastern Europe. Such a link could certainly be extremely useful. But it would be even more useful if the Far Eastern countries were also linked.

With regard to methods of preventing war, India had had special experience. It was recognised as a principle in India long, long ago that non-violence was the supreme law. It was to be hoped that all peoples would come to recognise this principle. But the history of India might serve to point the way to peace.

With regard to the protection of intellectual property, the feeling in India was that great care should be taken to protect the interests of the public, while also assuring a proper reward to those who by their discoveries added to the stock of human knowledge.

The Government of India had been asked to form a National Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, but its powers in the matter were limited. In educational questions, each province was its own master. The Government had endeavoured to circumvent the difficulty by consulting the Inter-Universities Board, which represented sixteen universities. In this way it was hoped to reach an early solution.

With regard to exchanges of teachers, the poverty of many parts of India was an obstacle, as teachers in India often received starvation salaries which would not satisfy their foreign colleagues. The same reason applied to exchanges of students; but in connection with the education of children and even of adults, important steps had been taken to inculcate a knowledge of the aims of the League of Nations and of moral and intellectual co-operation between the peoples.

The speaker begged the Committee not to interpret his remarks as criticisms. India asked to be allowed to lend a helping hand along the path of human progress. However humble her services, she wished at least to co-operate with other nations.

*The remainder of the general discussion was postponed to the next meeting.*

#### FOURTH MEETING

*Held on Thursday, September 13th, 1928, at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman: M. MARINKOVITCH. (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes).*

#### **11. Question of the Limitation of the Expenditure of the League : Resolution communicated by the Fourth Committee.**

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the Fourth Committee, at its meeting of September 12th, had adopted a resolution in which it noted the rapid increase in the credits requested and urged that the need for a reasonable limitation of the League's expenditure should not be forgotten. It requested the other Committees to review the programme of conferences for 1929, and to limit them to such as could not be postponed to the financial year 1930.

The Chairman believed that everyone would wish to give the fullest possible consideration to these recommendations.

#### **12. Work of the International Committee and of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation (Continuation).**

Dr. CHODZKO (Poland) paid a tribute to the work of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation and of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation.

He agreed with the amendment proposed by the delegate of Chile. It was not sufficient to request teachers to instruct their pupils in the work and aims of the League of Nations; they must also be provided with means for doing so. If necessary, recourse must be had

to exhibitions similar to the one organised by the International Bureau of Education, whose first course, especially intended for teachers, was an initiative of the greatest interest, which deserved encouragement. It was accordingly natural that the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation should have included in its programme the instruction of youth in the aims of the League. The last report on this question showed that encouraging results had already been obtained in different countries. The propaganda had hitherto been largely concentrated on university circles. Yet this means of international propaganda presented difficulties: in the universities it was necessary to deal with people whose minds were already formed and set. To promote the aims of the League, an attempt ought therefore to be made to bring the propaganda for the *rapprochement* of peoples to those whose minds were readier to receive it, namely, secondary-school children.

These reasons had led to the setting up in Warsaw in 1927 of a voluntary association with the object of providing facilities for secondary-school children in Poland to gain a knowledge of foreign countries during the summer holidays, and to develop friendly relations among schoolboys of the different countries. The association's scheme of work also contemplated the organisation of visits to Poland during the summer holidays by secondary-school children from abroad. In 1928, 274 scholars, boys and girls, were sent to France, and the trip was such a success that the Polish association would attempt to extend its programme next year.

He was of opinion that an endeavour should be made to establish these exchanges on a firmer basis and to contemplate their organisation from an international standpoint, for there were certain questions which could best be settled by international regulation. Scholars on holiday in a foreign country should enjoy all the facilities granted to the scholars of the country itself. It was therefore to be desired that this very important movement should be placed under the auspices of the League.

This proposal did not involve any additional expenditure for the League, all travelling expenses being borne by the parents themselves and by the national associations. Poland would be glad to convene a preparatory conference at Warsaw for the purpose of discussing the necessary arrangements between the nations.

In accordance with the ideas just developed, the Polish delegation had the honour of submitting the following proposal:

" 1. The Assembly requests the States Members to take into consideration the necessity of organising the interchange of secondary-school children during the summer holidays in a systematic manner, with the object of developing the spirit of peace and international co-operation.

" 2. With that end in view, it would be desirable to organise national associations in each country.

" 3. The national associations for the exchange of schoolchildren during the summer holidays should get into contact with each other and, in order to facilitate their respective work, should meet from time to time in international conferences.

" 4. Convinced of the desirability of this international exchange of schoolchildren for promoting mutual understanding among the peoples, the Assembly recommends that arrangements be made between nations on this subject. It requests the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation to instruct the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation and the Secretariat of the League of Nations to facilitate the execution of these arrangements."

He informed the Committee that two days previously a meeting of the Associations of Secondary-School Teachers and Professors, convened at Warsaw, had given its unanimous support to the draft resolutions submitted by the Polish delegate to the Sixth Committee of the Assembly.

Dame Edith LYTTLETON (British Empire) said her Government followed the work of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation with great interest. She desired to comment on the Ruffini scheme for registering discoveries by scientific men so that claims could be made in the future if commercial use was made of their inventions. A draft convention had been submitted to the British Government on the subject and had been given very careful consideration, as a result of which the British Government felt it useless to pretend that any draft convention on the subject would be acceptable in England. There were objections to the basic idea. That idea was, of course, that anyone who registered with an international body a claim to a scientific discovery would have the right to claim compensation from persons utilising that discovery for commercial purposes. There were many practical objections to that proposal. An industrialist would not know how many people were going to make claims on him and the possibility of innumerable claims might check industrial enterprise. It was true that patents did not have that effect, but a patent dealt with a definite object or process.

Two questions would have to be solved in registering a discovery — the real originator and the probable value. That meant a vast enquiry. Everyone must sympathise with the desire that scientific men should benefit by their discoveries, but the British Government felt that the proposals in question were not practicable. As an instance, an application had recently been made for a royalty on a wireless set of a particular pattern containing a new sort of valve. The whole matter was exceedingly complicated and would involve discoveries

made by scientific men of all kinds from Clerk Maxwell to Hertz. To determine the amount of royalty in such a case would be very difficult indeed.

In England and, she believed, in many other countries, great reluctance was felt to the idea of asking scientific men to register their discoveries. Discoveries were rarely made by one mind; many contributed, and often two men hit upon the same idea at the same moment. The discovery of the planet Neptune had been made by Adams and Leverrier within a few days of each other. She instanced also Darwin and Wallace, who had both put forward the theory of evolution; and in the matter of wireless telegraphy Lindsay in 1814 had read a paper which foreshadowed the work of Lodge, Marconi and others.

For those reasons, the British Government had instructed her to say that, as far as it was concerned, it did not feel it would be able to subscribe to a convention on the lines suggested.

M. RAPPARD (Switzerland) thought the general discussion was intended mainly to elicit opinions on the problem of intellectual co-operation as a whole. The main objectives were to encourage intellectual work on the one hand and to effect an international *rapprochement* on the other.

The Committee should be congratulated on what had been accomplished to facilitate the work of scholars and scientists. This work had two quite distinct aspects. It was both individual and collective. It was the work of isolated investigators whose studious solitude should not be disturbed. On the other hand, every man of science utilised the work of other investigators, while his own work would in turn be used by his successors. Intellectual work in both of these aspects must be protected. It would be extremely useful to encourage the bibliographical studies now in progress, because the latter facilitated scientific co-operation.

Every encouragement should also be given to the improvement of international relations. He was glad to perceive that, under the auspices of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, relations were being developed in every direction. It was highly important that such meetings should take place in an atmosphere of complete confidence. Those who came to co-operate should have no misgivings as to their colleagues' motives. Certain national preoccupations, quite legitimate in themselves, should have no place in the work of intellectual co-operation. This was a danger which might certainly be avoided if Professor Gilbert Murray's good example were followed.

He thanked the Chilian representative for having raised the question of the International Bureau of Education, and also the speakers who had supported his proposal. This proposal had three points in its favour: it encouraged work which had been undertaken in an absolutely international spirit; it did not involve the League of Nations in any expense; nor did it exclude any other similar initiative.

The Hungarian proposal had seemed to him at first sight to be so modest and timid that to support it was rather like forcing the lock of an open door. As at present drafted, he did not think that it could justify the fears of those who were afraid that it might encourage some form of biased national propaganda, which the Committee would, of course, be the first to condemn.

Since the question of national propaganda has been touched upon, he ventured to say a few words as representative of a country which had been overwhelmed with propaganda on behalf of various countries. Experience proved that truth always triumphed and that exaggerations and lies condemned themselves.

The Committee on Intellectual Co-operation might perhaps be disturbed at a tendency which was apparent among jurists specialising in international law. When a dispute of an international nature arose, it was far too often followed by a general mobilisation of the most eminent lawyers in favour of the respective opposing contentions, and they were mobilised not as lawyers, but as scientific experts. That was a danger to the dignity of legal science and even to international peace, since the latter rested on confidence, and there would be no confidence in international law if, on every occasion, it was observed that its most eminent representatives publicly espoused conflicting national causes. He did not intend to submit a proposal, but he wondered whether the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation could not successfully use its influence to discourage eminent authorities on international law from placing their pens at the service of causes proposed to them under conditions which might give rise to doubt as to their perfect disinterestedness and complete independence.

Finally, in conformity with his Government's instructions, he urged the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation to concentrate on accessible objectives and to avoid dissipating its energies in other directions.

M. FROHWEIN (Germany) said that Germany was following the work of the Committee and the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation with the greatest interest, and was doing its utmost to co-operate. In proof of this he could quote the recent formation of a National Committee on Intellectual Co-operation in Germany.

He then passed to the question of the exchange of students and professors, a system which could not be too highly recommended. It would therefore be advisable, he said, for the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation to extend its work in this sphere, and in this connection he noted the Chilian delegate's proposal with the greatest satisfaction.

In a resolution published as an annex to the Committee's report (page 13 of document A.28.1928.XII), the Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters had emphasised the dangers which might result from the distribution of films conceived in a spirit antagonistic to that of the League. The effect of this kind of spectacle was much deplored by those who aspired to the reconciliation of the nations. Fortunately, there seemed to be a tendency among producers of films and managers of cinemas to eliminate such films. It might be a good thing if they were expressly encouraged to do so by a resolution of the Assembly. In this connection, he welcomed the paragraph devoted to this question by the Rapporteur in his draft resolution.

He entirely approved of the Hungarian delegate's proposal as to the diffusion of books. This was the outcome of a great ideal which Germany had always sincerely supported — that of the freedom of science. He agreed with M. Rappard that all nationalist propaganda should be excluded. This could easily be arranged in the drafting of the text.

M. CASARES (Spain) regretted Dame Edith Lyttelton's attitude with regard to the draft on scientific property. There was no need to reply to her objections in detail, since they referred to the original draft and not to the new draft drawn up in the previous December, which took into account the British Government's observations.

He wished to submit a draft resolution which would aim at fusing the two Conventions of Berne and Buenos Aires. The Rome Conference for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, held in the previous May, had referred on several occasions to the resolutions adopted by the Pan-American Conference at Havana in January 1928, revising the Buenos Aires Convention. The Brazilian delegation at the Rome Conference had drawn attention to the numerous points at which the Havana Convention and the Berne Convention touched, and stressed the practical advantages which a combination of the two systems might present. The Rome Conference had subsequently adopted a resolution to that effect.

The Sixth Committee would doubtless think that such a resolution would meet the wishes of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation. Accordingly, he proposed to submit to the Assembly the following resolution :

“ The Assembly, having in mind the identity of the general principles contained in the Berne Convention, revised at Berlin and subsequently at Rome, and in the Convention signed by the American States at Buenos Aires in 1910 and revised at Havana in 1928, for the Protection of Authors' Rights; Asks the Council to undertake, through its competent organs, the necessary investigations and consultations to prepare a general agreement with a view to the international unification of the laws and measures protecting the creations of the mind, in conformity with the recommendations adopted by the Rome Conference for the revision of the Berne Convention for the Protection of Authors' Rights. ”

By the words “ its competent organs ”, he had in view, of course, the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation and the Institute, but he preferred to use a general formula, for other League organs might prove to be concerned in the matter.

Dame Edith LYTTLTON (British Empire), replying to M. Casares's opening remarks, said that the British Government had already considered the latest draft Convention for the protection of scientific property, and her observations related to that draft.

M. CASARES (Spain) said that the British delegation's pessimism was not shared by other Governments. Indeed, the Spanish Government had just confirmed by law the principle of scientific property, and the French Government had recently appointed a committee to draft a law on this question.

Mr. WERTH (South Africa) said that he was highly interested in the statements that had been made in the Committee. His country had always paid particular attention to intellectual co-operation.

The South African Government had racial problems to settle, and the best means of settling them was to bring the young intellectuals of the different races together. M. Rappard had shown in his interesting statement that Switzerland had done strikingly successful work in this field. The best way of succeeding was, in the first place, not to try to hurry the work and, secondly, not to confine it to adults, whose personalities were already formed, whose ideas were fixed, and whose mentality could not easily be altered. The young, on the other hand, were more malleable, and could more readily be gained over to new ideas. In South Africa, they had spontaneously developed an interest in international questions.

The South African Government had replied to the circulars sent to it by the League, but its replies did not give an adequate idea of the work that had been done. Despite the remoteness of South Africa and the consequent difficulties, his Government had endeavoured to organise students' tours.

The first experimental tour had proved so satisfactory that it had been decided to make it an annual event. These tours were so highly appreciated that those wishing to take part had to give in their names a very long time in advance.

In the universities, teachers' training colleges and elementary and secondary schools there were special courses dealing with the work and influence of the League.

South-West Africa had also decided to introduce for the benefit of the young a " League of Nations Day ", specially devoted to the study of the League's work. He would be glad if this feature could be extended to the whole world.

M. PARRA-PÉREZ (Venezuela) reminded the Committee that he had already stated in the Fifth Committee that the Latin-American countries took an interest, and ought to take an interest, in the work of intellectual co-operation. He felt some trepidation in repeating this statement, for the efforts of most of these countries in this respect had not, on the whole, come up to expectations.

Out of twenty countries, four only had formed a National Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, and he was sorry to note that his own country was not one of those four. Nevertheless, the idea of intellectual co-operation had made great headway in public opinion. This progress should be encouraged and efforts redoubled to persuade Governments to direct the force of public opinion into the right channels and conform to its wishes.

He had been deeply impressed by M. Motta's reference in his speech in the Assembly to the spirit of co-operation which animated the Latin-American countries; these States highly appreciated the cordiality of M. Motta's sentiments.

He wished to ask for information on two points.

First, he would ask M. Luchaire why, up to the present, no nationals of the Latin-American countries had been included in the Institute's Committees of Experts.

He next asked M. Oprescu whether representatives of the Latin-American National Committees would be present at the meeting of delegates of the National Committees decided upon by the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.

Sir James PARR (New Zealand) said that the work of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation was greatly appreciated in his country. In watching the work of the League, people were sometimes struck by the slowness with which it seemed to be carrying out many of its essential tasks. In regard to disarmament, for instance, it was not the will that was lacking, but the right moral attitude. Moral disarmament must come first, and its promotion was one of the essential duties of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.

Great efforts should be made to educate youth, which was easily influenced in the right ideals. He suggested that it might be desirable to train missionaries of intellectual co-operation, who would go out to the Dominions — New Zealand, Canada, South Africa and Australia — and teach the aims and ideals of the League of Nations and the results it had already achieved. These missionaries might get into touch with the people who controlled the education departments in the different countries and try to enlist them as allies of the League. This would be a great advance towards moral disarmament. They must work among the children and young people, who were always most receptive to high ideals.

With regard to the question of school-books, he believed that there was no suitable textbook in existence. It was with the youth of the world that the future of the League lay, and a book ought to be prepared for its instruction.

Mr. McLACHLAN (Australia) expressed his appreciation of Professor Gilbert Murray's speech. Disarmament was certainly a very difficult matter; it would be useless, however, to abolish arms and implements of war unless such an act were accompanied by moral disarmament. The ideals of peace must be inculcated into the nations in order to make them pull together. This was one of the chief missions of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, which must seek to foster the will for peace.

He entirely shared the view of those members of the Committee who had said that the key to the results aimed at was the education of youth. There was no more important task. Young people must be made to understand that war was a crime. In Australia, a great deal was being done on these lines. Articles were published in educational periodicals and teachers were supplied with literature on the subject.

Finally, he regretted that he was unable to support the amendment proposed by the Chilean delegate relating to a private institute. In his opinion, unofficial ventures should not be referred to in the Committee's reports; the Committee's efforts should be confined to the organisations of the League.

M. MATSCH (Austria) said that the Austrian Government had not yet sent to the League its reply concerning the recommendations of the Sub-Committee of Experts, because the necessary preparatory work had not been completed. Nevertheless, some of the measures recommended had already been taken in Austria; among others, May 18th had been set apart to celebrate the League.

He was very glad to note that in most countries an " entente " movement was spreading daily among young people; this movement condemned contempt for other nations and demanded that every nation should be considered as being a part of humanity possessing equal rights with all the other nations.

Dr. RIDDELL (Canada) also thought that it was impossible to overrate the importance of educating children in the aims of the League. Among the enquiries for information which he received as Canadian representative to the League of Nations, many related to this matter. A publication would therefore be most useful if it gave a clear account of all that had been and was being done in this domain.

M. LUCHAIRE (Director of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation) said he wished to reply to one of the questions raised by M. Parra-Pérez. He explained that, in selecting the staff of the Institute, technical qualifications had to be the first consideration; but an endeavour was also made to ensure the representation of as many countries as the funds of the Institute would allow.

M. PARRA-PÉREZ (Venezuela) said that he had merely asked whether it would be possible to include American representatives on the Sub-Committees of Experts. He had not in any way raised the question of the appointment of officials in the Paris Institute.

M. LUCHAIRE (Director of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation) pointed out that he had nothing to do with the appointment of the experts.

M. OPRESCU (Secretary of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation) observed that M. Parra-Pérez had asked whether representatives of the Latin-American National Committees were to take part in the proposed meeting of representatives of the National Committees. He pointed out that a sum of only 20,000 francs would be available from the budget of the Institute. This sum would not be enough to defray the travelling expenses of representatives coming from thirty-three countries, some of them very distant. It had therefore been suggested that most of the expenses should be borne by the National Committees. The question was not yet settled. Another proposal was to divide the total credit available by the number of countries and place the same sum of money at the disposal of each National Committee.

M. GALLAVRESI (Italy), Rapporteur, thanked the speakers who had supported the recommendations embodied in the report. He also thanked the Swiss delegate for his suggestions.

As regards the question of scientific property, it was necessary to await the replies of the Governments.

He hoped that the unanimity of the speakers in asking for this small credit would influence the members of the Fourth Committee.

He accepted both the draft resolutions presented.

The CHAIRMAN declared the general discussion closed. He proposed to resume the discussion of this subject on Saturday.

*Agreed.*

---

## FIFTH MEETING

*Held on Friday, September 14th, 1928, at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman* : M. MARINKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes); followed by M. VALDÉS-MENDEVILLE (Chile).

### 13. Mandates.

COUNT DE PENHA GARCIA (Portugal) regretted that General Freire d'Andrade, a great authority on colonial matters, was prevented by illness from taking part this year in the work of the Sixth Committee. After paying a tribute to the efficiency of the Permanent Mandates Commission and to the extreme care with which the Mandates Section of the Secretariat had studied the questions entrusted to it, the speaker desired to associate himself with the regret expressed by the Mandates Commission at the death of Mme. Wicksell, who had been a leading member of that body.

At its thirteenth session the Permanent Mandates Commission had examined the reports of seven mandatory Powers on the administration of the territories committed to their care. The general part of the Commission's report on that session dealt with the problem of and the increase in the liquor traffic in certain territories. In the economic field, the Commission had very justly pointed out an omission in the Covenant and the mandates as regards the extension to the nationals and products of mandated territories of the benefit of Conventions in force between the mandatory Powers and States Members of the League. Count de Penha Garcia made a number of observations on the necessity for maintaining, as regards the territories under A and B mandates, the principles of economic equality assured by the Covenant. It was necessary to carry out a very close study of this serious problem, which was one of the economic and political bases of the mandates system.

The Commission's report and Minutes revealed the very impartial way in which petitions relating to the mandated territories were dealt with. Incidentally, the comparatively trifling number of petitions addressed to the League was worth noting.

Having expressed his approval of the Secretariat's work in preparing statistics on the mandated territories, the speaker expressed the wish that the extremely valuable and multifarious information contained in the respective reports of the mandatory Powers might be condensed in an analytical summary, so as to be more easily accessible to the institutions and persons interested. These reports were of great importance to those who were studying colonial administration.

He referred to the Council's discussions on mandates at its last session, especially the Agreement concluded by the British Government with the Emir of Transjordan; he was glad to note the solution reached. He observed, in closing, that as a rule the Assembly, which derives its authority from Article 3 of the Covenant, was bound to provide the necessary liaison between the States Members of the League and public opinion on the one hand, and the Permanent Mandates Commission and the Council on the other, in order to maintain the proper atmosphere of co-ordination, goodwill and mutual understanding. It was true that in other circumstances the rôle of the Assembly might become still more important but, in any case, the important work of the Assembly in normal times must not be forgotten.

The CHAIRMAN said the whole Committee would join in Count de Penha Garcia's tribute to Mme. Wicksell's work among them, and her loss would be deeply felt by all the delegations.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway) said that in few departments of the work of the League was publicity of more importance than in regard to mandates. The public were keenly interested in the subject and the number of publications upon it increased from day to day. In this connection he referred to the remarkable work just published by M. Van Rees, Vice-Chairman of the Mandates Commission. Moreover, the study of the question had also been taken up by several international associations and institutions.

The League of Nations was sometimes criticised for not admitting the public to the proceedings of the Mandates Commission. This was unfair, for although it was a fact that, for the many reasons set out in the Minutes of the tenth session of the Commission, the reports of the mandatory Powers had to be considered in private meetings, it was none the less true that the Minutes of the Commission were published a few weeks after the close of the sessions.

The speaker expressed his satisfaction at the steps taken by the Council and the Permanent Mandates Commission in pursuance of the Assembly recommendation of last year regarding the liquor traffic.

Lastly, he noted that the Government of South Africa did not wish to offer any comment on the Council's observations regarding the legal definition of the relationship between the mandatory Powers and the territories under their mandate.

M. RAPPARD (Switzerland), as a member of the Mandates Commission, thanked the previous speakers for the praise they had bestowed on the Commission. It must not be forgotten that the mandates were administered on behalf of the League, that was to say, on behalf of all its Members. It was therefore very important that, not only the Mandates Commission and the Council, but the Assembly also, which represented the League as a whole, should take an interest in the position of the mandated territories.

As regards the work of the Mandates Commission, M. Rappard observed that the reason why its comments were always listened to by the mandatory Powers was that they emanated from a body composed of disinterested persons acting independently, and not bound by the instructions of any Government. The confidence shown by the mandatory Powers in the Commission had steadily grown during the last few years. The accredited representatives of those Powers appearing before the Commission did not hesitate, at times, to inform it of certain administrative problems which it would obviously be scarcely desirable to communicate to the public.

As to the question of petitions, he thought it would be difficult to find an entirely satisfactory solution. While he did not minimise the importance of this question, he regarded petitions as only a secondary source of information, having regard to the very considerable volume of information which reached the Mandates Commission from many other sources.

After expressing appreciation of the very valuable works on mandate questions recently produced by M. Van Rees and M. Palacios, Vice-Chairman and member of the Commission, M. Rappard expressed his satisfaction with Dr. Nansen's remarks regarding the importance of publicity from the standpoint of the vitality of the mandates system. It had been suggested that, once the consideration of the mandatory Powers' reports was over, the Commission might discuss certain general questions in public. While unwilling actually to oppose this idea, he feared that this procedure, which had sometimes been followed by the Commission, was of comparatively little use in view of the over-academic character of such general discussions.

He next called attention to the manifold aspects of the problem of the liquor traffic in mandated territories and described some of the steps that had been taken to curtail the disturbing increase of the trade in certain areas. The Mandates Commission was fully alive to the gravity of the situation and was doing its best to remedy it.

After referring to the atmosphere of genuine cordiality that characterised the relations of the Mandates Commission with the mandatory Powers, he recalled that the Commission, at its last session, had been obliged, in connection with certain incidents that had occurred in Western Samoa, to emphasise that the deference due by the mandatory Powers to the League should not prevent them from doing their obvious duty in providing for the maintenance of order in the territories committed to their administration.



M. Rappard said, in conclusion, that the very satisfactory results so far obtained from the mandates system justified a spirit of optimism as regards the future.

Count BONIN-LONGARE (Italy) considered that the League's work had thrown into relief the vital importance of the settlement of economic relations between countries as a factor in the promotion of peace. What was true in a general way also applied to the colonies, which represented vast reservoirs of wealth. The object of the principle of economic equality was indeed to enable all mankind to benefit by the wealth of these territories. This principle had been recognised by the Powers invested with A and B mandates, and there could be no doubt as to their sincere intention of applying it. Nevertheless, and without wishing to make any complaint or point to any particular case, he desired to express the hope that these Powers would continue their efforts to ensure that their officials in the mandated territories respected this principle in its entirety.

He was glad to note that the definition given by the Council, on the proposal of the Netherlands representative, of the nature of the legal relations between the mandatory Power and the mandated territory had been accepted by the Government of the Power which had raised this question.

His Highness Mohammad Ali Khan FEROZKHAN (Persia) said that, according to the Minutes of the twelfth session of the Mandates Commission, a discussion had taken place on the relations between Persia and Iraq at the meeting on Tuesday, October 25th, 1927. This discussion did not show the state of affairs in its true light, and he was therefore bound to make certain explanations. Further, in the report to the ninth ordinary session of the Assembly on the work of the Council and Secretariat of the League, reference was made to the relations between Persia and Iraq, and regret was expressed that there were still certain difficulties in these relations.

In order, therefore, to enlighten the Committee as to the situation, the Persian delegate had ventured to address the Committee, and would thank the Chairman for giving him permission to do so.

M. Rappard having expressed surprise that Persia should have Consuls in Iraq although she had not recognised the Government of that country, M. Bourdillon, the representative of the mandatory Power in Iraq, had made the following reply :

" With regard to the recognition of Iraq in Persia, he believed the main obstacle to be the fact that Persians did not share the judicial privileges enjoyed by nationals of certain other foreign countries. Persia had protested against this state of affairs in 1924, when the matter had come before the Council in connection with the British Treaty with Iraq. The British representative on the Council, Lord Parmoor, had explained the position and had pointed out that such privileges were only given to the nationals of countries who had enjoyed them under the Turkish regime. It was obviously absurd to extend them further now that a better system of justice had been established in Iraq than had formerly been the case, and it was also impracticable to extend these privileges to Persians on account of the large size of the Persian population of Iraq. The British Government was quite prepared to support a proposal for reciprocal privileges, such as had existed between Turkey and Persia. Persia, however, had now abolished all privileges towards the nationals of any country, and would not consider any reciprocal arrangement. The British view of the case, as stated by Lord Parmoor, had been accepted by the Council of the League. So far, no cases of injustice towards Persians in the Iraq Courts had come to light. A few complaints of injustice had been made, but on careful investigation they had proved to be unfounded. The Iraq Government had shown great forbearance throughout in dealing with Persia, but he was afraid he must say that Persia had only co-operated with Iraq when it was clearly to her own advantage to do so."

The reply that had just been quoted called for several observations on the part of the Persian Government. In the first place, he would point out that it would have been possible to reply to M. Rappard that Persia did not keep any Consuls officially appointed as such in Iraq, but only agents in charge of Consulates who looked after the interests of the numerous Persians resident in that country.

As regards the statement that the main obstacle to the recognition of Iraq by Persia was the fact that Persians did not share the judicial privileges enjoyed by nationals of certain other foreign countries, that was quite correct : when, however, Mr. Bourdillon added that such privileges were only given to the nationals of countries which had enjoyed them under the Turkish regime, Persia was entitled to be surprised at his forgetting that, under that regime, Persians also enjoyed the same privileges in virtue of the most-favoured-nation clause which had been embodied in its treaties with Turkey. It was quite true, as the Persian representative had said to the Council in 1924, that Turkish nationals enjoyed the same privileges in virtue of the principle of reciprocity, which also operated as between Persia and Turkey. That, however, was no reason for alleging that Persians did not enjoy these privileges and that the granting of them under the Iraqi regime would amount to an additional extension of them.

It was particularly necessary for him to specify that the Persian Government had protested, and was still protesting, against the fact that the Anglo-Iraqi Treaty had made an unjustifiable discrimination in the treatment of foreigners in Iraq by stipulating that no nationals of Asiatic States should enjoy the judicial privileges except nationals of those

Asiatic States permanently represented on the Council of the League. This discrimination was contrary in itself to the principle of the equality of nations, but it was particularly wounding to Persia because in reality it affected that country alone. Of those Asiatic States that were not represented permanently on the Council, Persia was the only one with a large enough number of nationals in Iraq to suffer to any great extent from the judicial regime of that country.

Further, the actual text of the treaty which established this differential regime made it quite clear that, in order to deprive Persians of judicial privileges, it could not be held that they were not entitled thereto on account of their previous position, and it had therefore been necessary to resort to the subterfuge of assigning these privileges only to those countries which were permanently represented on the Council of the League of Nations, though no attempt was made to suggest why the possession of a permanent seat on the Council should confer on the nationals of those Powers more extensive rights than were granted to nationals of other countries.

Nor could the Persian Government understand the logic of Mr. Bourdillon's reasoning when he said that judicial privileges could not be extended to the Persians in Iraq because there were so many of them. In its opinion, it would be much fairer to take the contrary view; if the interests of foreigners in a country could not be properly safeguarded without privileges being conferred on them, his Government thought it would be much more natural and logical to grant those privileges to the nationals of a country which had some hundreds of thousands of nationals in Iraq who were responsible for a large part of the prosperity of that country than to limit them to countries whose nationals in Iraq did not number more than a few hundreds or even a score or two.

As to Mr. Bourdillon's statement that the British Government's view of the case had been accepted by the Council, the Persian delegate felt obliged to say that his Government had sought for any trace of such acceptance in the Minutes, and had sought in vain. All it had found was that the discussions on this question in the Council had ended in the resolution moved by the late M. Branting, expressing the hope "that an agreement may shortly be reached in regard to the position of Persian nationals in Iraq from the judicial point of view". The reason why the question of reciprocity had been raised during that discussion was that at that time — four years ago — the Persian Government had not yet decided that it was time to abolish the privileges enjoyed by certain foreigners in its own territory. Now, however, there could obviously be no more question of reciprocity, as indeed Mr. Bourdillon himself had admitted, since Persia granted no privileges to foreigners and did not wish to follow the example of Iraq in placing an affront on some countries by giving privileges to others.

Mr. Bourdillon had further asserted that a better system of justice had now been established in Iraq. Unfortunately, from information received, the Persian Government had gathered that this was not the case. Even if it were, why should not other foreigners renounce their privileges? It was to be observed that Persia laid no claim in Iraq to any superiority over the nationals of the country, as it imagined that some foreigners did. All it wanted was safeguards for the considerable interests that it had in Iraq, and Persia would be the first to renounce the judicial privileges as soon as it had been decided that they were no longer necessary. As long, however, as other foreigners regarded themselves as entitled to these privileges, his Government saw no reason why they should be refused to Persians. It had not recognised the Government of Iraq, for the simple reason that that Government persisted in refusing to Persia those judicial privileges that it had granted to countries which had no stronger claim to them than Persia.

Mr. Bourdillon had also stated that no case of a denial of justice to Persians had ever been noted in the Iraq Courts, adding that the Iraqi Government had always shown the greatest goodwill towards Persia, but that Persia had only co-operated with Iraq when it was obviously to her advantage to do so. The Persian delegate very much regretted to have to say that his Government believed the contrary of this to be far nearer the truth. First of all, a Government had rarely been seen to display goodwill towards another to the detriment of its own interests, and he did not think, unfortunately, that the time had yet come when the relations between Governments would be governed by purely altruistic sentiments. In the particular case before the Committee, there were, he thought, more proofs of Persian goodwill towards Iraq than of Iraqi goodwill towards Persia. Quite recently, when the Persian Government had established a new Customs tariff, it had agreed to apply to Iraq, provisionally during the current year, the minimum rates applied exclusively to foreign countries which granted to Persia most-favoured-nation treatment. This special favour showed that the Persian Government was not actuated by any feeling of hostility towards Iraq. But would this fact be taken into account?

Persians were treated by Iraqi authorities with such severity that the Persian Government would be very glad if an impartial enquiry could be instituted by the League of Nations itself with a view to establishing the soundness of its claims and its demand for protection against the various forms of injustice to which its nationals were exposed in Iraq instead of receiving the favourable treatment they deserved. The religious hate of the people of Iraq for Persians was stronger than ever. Whereas in Persia there was no longer any question of Shiah and Sunni, in Iraq the Persians who were Shiah were so looked down upon on account of their religion that, in the Courts of the country, Iraqis were unwilling to come forward as witnesses on their behalf, and even if certain conscientious persons were willing

to do so, they would be persecuted in turn and would not receive any protection from the Courts or authorities of the country.

In view of this situation, how could Persia have any confidence in the Iraqi judicial system ?

Another example of the ill-will of the Iraqi Government with regard to Persians was the taxes levied on foreigners, the burden of which fell with particular severity on Persians. He referred to the Jensiat tax, that was to say, taxes which had to be paid by foreigners born in Iraq who wished to maintain their nationality of origin. This tax was aimed particularly at the Persians who regarded Iraq as a holy land, proceeded thither very frequently in pilgrimage and often settled down to pass the remainder of their lives there. It was the children of these poor and pious men who had to pay these taxes on pain of losing their nationality. The burden was so heavy that the Persian Government had recently had to incur financial responsibilities in assisting those of its subjects who were unable to pay the tax but did not wish to change their nationality.

Contrary to what had been alleged, the Persian Government had adopted a very conciliatory attitude in this question of judicial privileges, but its most modest demands had been refused. It had proposed to the Iraqi Government that Shiah magistrates should be appointed in localities in which there were a large number of Persians in order that the latter might at least be protected from religious persecution, but in this respect also the Persian Government had not obtained any satisfaction.

Reference had also been made in the Mandates Commission to incursions into Iraq by bands of brigands from the other side of the frontier. The Persian delegate regretted that on this occasion Persia had had no representatives on the Commission; otherwise his Government could have proved that it had always complained of the fact that the Iraqi territory had served as a basis of operations for brigands and rebels making incursions into Persia. How was it that the famous Sheik Mahmoud was living tranquilly in Iraqi territory in spite of his misdeeds? Further, was not that sinister individual Semitko, who had in recent years been a cause of grave anxiety to the Persian Government, enjoying asylum in Iraq at the very time when Mr. Bourdillon had been replying at Geneva to M. Rappard's questions? Two years ago, had not the Pusdari tribes crossed from Iraq into Persia, committed considerable damage and forced the Persian Government to organise an expedition against them?

Finally, Mr. Bourdillon had stated to the Commission :

“ The Persian Government has recently prohibited its nationals from entering Iraq, on the pretext that there were at Basra a certain number of cases of cholera, although the Persians cross the frontier some hundreds of miles to the north of this town and proceed principally to the holy cities which are not in any way affected by the disease. It may be stated, by the way, that the cases of cholera which have occurred in Basra come from Persia. ”

In this connection, the Persian delegate would state that the Persian Government had forbidden its nationals to proceed to Iraq, not on account of the one or two cases of cholera reported at Basra, but because cases of plague had been notified at Bagdad, the capital of Iraq, through which city all persons proceeding from Persia to the holy cities had to pass. It was, moreover, common knowledge that cholera and plague were two terrible diseases which had their foci in India and entered Persia almost invariably via Iraq — a fact which obliged the Persian Government to expend huge sums each year and to take very energetic steps to prevent widespread epidemics.

In conclusion, the Persian delegate would venture to repeat that, in spite of all he had said, the feelings of Persia towards Iraq were friendly and brotherly, and Persia desired nothing better than the establishment between the two countries of the best possible relations. But Persia desired Iraq to show similar sentiments towards that country and not always to take one-sided views.

M. VALDÉS-MENDEVILLE (Vice-Chairman, replacing the Chairman) was sure that the Committee had heard the Persian delegate's statement with great interest. He did not doubt that the competent organs of the League, the Council and the Permanent Mandates Commission, would examine this question, which had in fact already come before the Mandates Commission.

Mr. LOCKER-LAMPSON (British Empire) pointed out that the statement made by the Persian delegate had come as a complete surprise, for he had had no idea that such a statement was to be made. As the Chairman had said, this was no doubt a question for the Mandates Commission, but he did not wish it to be thought that he had any desire to avoid a discussion on the subject; in fact, he was anxious to reply to the points raised in the statement. He was entirely in the hands of the Committee, and was prepared to do whatever was thought best; but he would be glad if an opportunity could be given him at a later date, after he had been able to read the verbatim report of the Persian delegate's statement, of replying to it.

He would add that every territory under British mandate had, up to the present, had the best relations with its neighbours, the only exception being the relations between Persia and Iraq.

Sir K. Venkata REDDI (India) said that he had been very much taken aback by the charge levelled against his country to the effect that plague and cholera had been introduced into Persia from India. He had no official information on the subject, as this was the first time that it had been brought to his notice. He would, however, make enquiries in regard to it. At the same time, he would be glad to know if the Persian Government had made any representations to the Government of India on the matter. So far as he was aware, his Government took the utmost care in the matter of quarantine and other health rules so far as the pilgrims that left India for Arabia or Persia were concerned. If, however, there was any foundation for the charges made, he would be glad if the Persian Government would refer them to the Indian Government and obtain the necessary explanations.

His Highness Mohammad Ali Khan FOROUGHİ (Persia) regretted that a misunderstanding had arisen. He had not wished to give the impression that cholera and plague were introduced into Persia by Hindoos.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway) proposed that the matter should be adjourned in order to give the British delegate an opportunity of replying to the Persian delegate's statement, as he was anxious to do. He thought it would be unwise to attempt to avoid a discussion.

Mlle. VACARESCO (Roumania) supported this proposal.

M. RAPPARD (Switzerland) agreed with Dr. Nansen. Each of the two parties should be given an opportunity of expressing its opinion, but, at the same time, it would not be advisable for a dispute to be submitted to the Assembly which, for the time being, only concerned two Powers, especially as the latter were at liberty to apply to the Council should they not succeed in reaching an agreement.

On the VICE-CHAIRMAN'S proposal, *the Committee decided to adjourn the discussion in order to give the British delegation an opportunity of replying to the Persian delegation's statements.*

Dr. RIDDELL (Canada) expressed his appreciation of the large measure of success which had attended the administration of the mandated territories, and of the work of the Mandates Commission in assisting the interested Governments to fulfil their responsibilities under the mandates system.

He then informed the Committee that the President of the International Alliance of Women for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship had requested that certain questions should be asked concerning the mandate of Great Britain in Palestine. These questions were as follows :

1. Was it true that, on December 14th, 1925, a Government Commission, presided over by the Chief Justice, to consider certain amendments to the laws concerning offences against women and children and against decency, passed unanimously the following resolution ?

" The Chief Justice proposed that all members should agree to urge upon the Government to call a special conference of the heads of the religious communities to consider the alteration of the present rules and customs as to child marriage. "

2. When was this conference called ?

3. What was its report ?

Mr. LOCKER-LAMPSON (British Empire) said that, since the Canadian delegate had given him due warning that he intended to raise these questions, he was able to make the following statement in reply, on the instructions of his Government :

" At the time when the conference of the heads of religious communities to which the representative of Canada refers was proposed to the High Commissioner for Palestine, he decided, after the most careful consideration of this problem in all its aspects, that such a conference would be inopportune, and none has therefore been held.

" A fresh demand for legislation on child marriage has, however, now been received by the High Commissioner for Palestine, who informs me that he will review the question of summoning the conference in question. "

Mr. Locker-Lampson trusted that this reply would be satisfactory to the Canadian delegate. No doubt, the members of the Committee would realise that the differences in religion and custom among the various communities in the mandated territories in Palestine were very marked and deep, and that if an attempt were made to interfere with them the most violent animosity would be aroused. He mentioned this in order to show that this was a question which should be dealt with very carefully.

M. Leopoldo PALACIOS (Spain) wished to endorse what other speakers had said of the work done by the Mandates Commission and in regard to Mme. Wicksell and M. Freire d'Andrade. He wished also to thank the Secretariat for its valuable assistance to the Mandates Commission. He agreed with Dr. Nansen and M. Rappard in emphasising the part played by the Assembly in the question of mandates.

History and the definitive wording of Article 22 of the Covenant showed that, for the very prestige of the mandates system, the Assembly should intervene.

He pointed out how important it was that public opinion should be enlightened with regard to mandates questions. Publicity should be encouraged. Since, however, the Commission, as an advisory organ of the Council, was more in the nature of a workshop than

a Parliament, the discussions of the Council and of the Assembly were those which should receive the widest publicity.

The work of the Commission was clearly brought out in its Minutes, which must be read if the resolutions were to be clearly understood. The Council's decisions were not always identical with the Commission's recommendations. But if all the phases of the various questions were studied, it would be seen that in most cases the differences were very slight. Press accounts — often incomplete — did not always give the same impression. Quite recently, the discussions in the Council on the Treaty concluded between Great Britain and the Amir of Transjordan, and M. Paul-Boncour's speech on the Commission's conclusions with regard to Syria, might, as reported in certain newspapers, had given quite an erroneous impression. In the first case, the Commission, in its unswerving determination to see that the Covenant and the mandates were observed both in the letter and in the spirit, felt bound to draw the Council's attention to an interpretation of Article 25 of the mandate which distinctly urged the Council to take action. The Council, however, had inclined towards the view taken by the mandatory Power. But the discussions in the Commission, and the wording of the Commission's conclusions, and of those of the Council, showed on how broad a basis agreement had been reached.

In the second case, it was impossible to discover in the Minutes of the Mandates Commission any opposition, however slight, by any of its members to the legitimate and liberal aspirations of the mandated territory. The Commission's resolution had been determined by the statements of the French accredited representative.

Coming finally to the question of Western Samoa, to which M. Rappard had referred, he wished to observe that, although the Commission had been unanimous in declaring that it was for the mandatory Power to maintain law and order in the islands, it had not been absolutely unanimous with regard to other aspects of the same question. He had himself abstained from expressing an opinion for reasons of principle, as would be seen on reading the Minutes of the discussion.

He supported Count Bonin-Longare in emphasising the importance of the economic aspect of the mandates system. One of the very foundations of this system was economic equality. He referred in turn to the great interest taken in the question of the control of tropical territories, to pre- and post-war propaganda, to international conferences and conventions such as the Treaty of Berlin (1885), Brussels (1890) and St.-Germain-en-Laye (1919), and the texts of the Covenant and the mandates. Here were a number of interdependent and sometimes thorny problems. The various texts were not always concordant *inter se*, even those which applied to one single category of mandates — for instance, A mandates. With regard to C mandates, which contained no clause on economic equality, statements had been made and agreements had been concluded between the countries concerned.

When the interests at stake were taken into consideration : those of the native populations, those of the mandatory Powers, those of States Members of the League, and even those of other countries such as the United States of America ; if the various aspects of the question were examined : taxes and dues, Customs unions, differential Customs and postal tariffs, public works and services, monopolies and concessions, labour, etc. — it would be realised that these problems hardly lent themselves to rapid solution. The rights to which all the beneficiaries were entitled could not be secured without great perseverance and energy ; yet all action must be tempered by great prudence and a lively sense of realities. That was an opinion which had already been expressed by the Commission and the Council.

He reserved the right to consider the Persian delegate's statement in due course.

M. FROHWEIN (Germany) paid a tribute to the work done by the Mandates Commission. He also dwelt on the importance of the various aspects of the problem of economic equality, and hoped that this equality would be ensured, not merely by the legislative, but also by the administrative, measures adopted in the mandated territories. In regard to liquor traffic, he was in entire sympathy with the efforts made to prevent excessive indulgence in spirituous beverages by natives. In regard to the juridical relations between the mandatory Powers and the mandated territories, the German delegate could only approve the remarks made by Dr. Nansen on that subject.

Sir James PARR (New Zealand), speaking as the accredited representative of one of the mandatory Powers before the Mandates Commission, referred to the worldwide extent of that system. Palestine had been mentioned, Iraq and Persia, South Africa and so forth.

The Commission was engaged upon a very important duty, and, after close acquaintance with the working of the system, in his judgment it was working satisfactorily and with success. He paid a tribute of respect to the Mandates Commission for the very excellent and thorough work it was doing. The system under which a Power, instead of taking a territory to itself, was made a trustee and a guardian, supervised by the League of Nations, was a thing which has been unknown in the history of the world. He could not speak too highly of the honesty of purpose and of the care with which the Mandates Commission investigated every incident in mandated territories. The world should know that the Mandates Commission was not a body of nonentities, but that it consisted of experienced men, many of whom had been Governors of colonial territories, and of others distinguished in other ways.

He felt that he would be ungracious, as the representative of one of the mandatory Powers, if he did not at the same time express his satisfaction with the work done by the Mandates Section of the Secretariat. The distinguished Director was not a countryman of

his; but he would like to say that, in his humble judgment, no more capable or competent man could be found for the job.

He welcomed the remarks which had been made with regard to Samoa. There had been some difficulty there. It was quite clear that the New Zealand Government, far from being harsh, had been too easygoing with the natives. Its attitude had been one of utmost benevolence as regarded their education, health and welfare. However, its efforts had not been appreciated as they might have been, he would not say by the natives, but by a handful of agitators who worked up mischief. Happily, the whole system had been investigated, and the truth of the position was known.

He particularly welcomed the remarks made by M. Rappard, and agreed that it was the duty of the mandatory Power to govern with firmness, and he was glad that the idea which obtained in many quarters that the mandatory Power was precluded from firm action had been dispelled. That statement would have a very valuable effect in the Pacific Islands.

Dealing with the question of liquor, he would point out that quite a drastic system had been adopted in Samoa, namely, total prohibition for the whites and the blacks. The Administration had preferred to consider the interests of 40,000 natives, to whom incalculable harm would be done by allowing any liquor system. Naturally, that did not please the white population, and there was dissatisfaction on that account, but the New Zealand Government was resolved to maintain universal prohibition in Samoa in the interests of the natives. In his opinion, the dominant idea was the interests of the native population.

Mlle. VACARESCO (Roumania) expressed "professional" admiration for the remarkable statement made by the delegate of Portugal. She laid stress on the importance of striving to repress alcoholic excesses in the mandated territories. On the question of petitions, Mlle. Vacaresco thought it advisable to avoid encouraging the populations concerned to multiply their claims, and endlessly to repeat complaints tending to throw the blame for errors committed on those responsible for the administration. The populations must not be led to believe that, by indulging in the desire to complain, which is so deeply rooted in human nature, they would obtain from pity what they could not expect from justice. For justice and equity were the ruling principles of the Commission.

The delegate of Roumania also paid a moving tribute to the memory of Mme. Wicksell.

#### 14. Appointment of the Rapporteur for Mandates Questions.

On the proposal of the VICE-CHAIRMAN, COUNT DE PENHA GARCIA (Portugal) was appointed Rapporteur for mandates questions.

### SIXTH MEETING

*Held on Saturday, September 15th, 1928, at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman: M. MARINKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes).*

#### 15. Adoption of the Minutes of the Third and Fourth Meetings.

The CHAIRMAN asked if the Minutes of the third and fourth meetings of the Committee were approved.

M. RAPPARD (Switzerland) reminded the Committee that it had been agreed that members should have the right to revise the records of their speeches.

*The Minutes of the third and fourth meetings were approved.*

#### 16. Work of the International Committee and for the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation : Draft Report of the Committee to the Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should examine M. Gallavresi's report and the resolutions contained therein (Annex 2).

M. GALLAVRESI (Italy), Rapporteur, stated that, as the general discussion was at an end, he thought that the resolutions should be adopted. As he had already mentioned, he had taken into consideration the various suggestions submitted to him. If there were any further suggestions, he was willing to incorporate them in the text under discussion.

(The Rapporteur read the draft resolutions paragraph by paragraph.)

Dr. LANGE (Norway) proposed an amendment of form. To avoid repetition, he suggested that the words "other countries" in the second paragraph of the resolution should be replaced by "new countries".

*The first two paragraphs were adopted with the amendment proposed by Dr. Lange.*

Mr. McLACHLAN (Australia) asked for information regarding the statement: "a handbook devoted to these questions", in paragraph 6. He wished to know if his previous remarks on this handbook had been taken into account.

M. OPRESCU (Secretary of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation) replied that the handbook would be in two parts — an official part, indicating what had been done by the various countries to give effect to the recommendations of the experts, and another part, of a pedagogical character, prepared by persons conversant with educational questions, and indicating the methods to be employed for the instruction of the young in the aims of the League of Nations.

He stated that this handbook could not be published unless the sum of 10,500 francs mentioned in the report was approved by the Fourth Committee.

Sir James PARR (New Zealand) said that he regarded the publication of such a handbook as most important. He had spoken very seriously with the delegate of his Government on the Fourth Committee, and the latter knew very well how he was to vote.

Dame Edith LYTTETON (British Empire) stated that the handbook ought to be devoted exclusively to the instruction of the young in the aims of the League of Nations.

Mr. MCLACHLAN (Australia) stated that, in the report, mention had been made of a series of statements intended for teachers. In his opinion, the handbook should not be for teachers — who required no instruction — but for the unenlightened.

M. RAPPARD (Switzerland) said that he found himself in a difficult position. He was also a member of the Fourth Committee, which had passed a very strong resolution — with which he agreed — not to grant additional credits.

He thought highly of M. Gallavresi's proposal, but to avoid the reproach of double-dealing, he would refrain from voting.

The CHAIRMAN understood that the Fourth Committee, which was very anxious to stabilise the budget of the League for the next year, had decided not to embark upon any fresh expenditure.

It was therefore to be feared that, while note would be taken of the Committee's decision, its execution must be postponed to the next year.

M. GALLAVRESI (Italy), Rapporteur, hoped that, in spite of the fears expressed by the Chairman, the very modest credits asked for by the Sixth Committee would not be refused.

M. OPRESCU (Secretary of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation) stated that, in accordance with the recommendations of the experts, there would be two publications :

1. A reference book, the text of which was prepared on the responsibility of the Secretary-General, intended for teachers and containing a summary of the objects of the League. This summary would be included in the documents given to teachers who had to speak on the League.

2. A handbook — of which he had just spoken — for the use of all grades of the teaching personnel.

The following addition to the resolution proposed by the Hungarian delegation was read :

“ The Assembly recognises the importance of the problem of the international circulation of books and hopes that the obstacles in the way of the circulation of scientific and technical publications may, as far as possible, be removed. ”

M. COMNÈNE (Roumania) said he accepted the Hungarian delegate's amendment.

He merely desired to point out that the Minutes of the meeting of September 12th, 1928, had been very brief on one important point. M. Slavik had stated, in the course of the discussion, that it was understood that the amendment in question referred to technical and scientific works not in any way of a subversive character. The Hungarian delegate had very loyally intimated his agreement. Unfortunately, the Minutes in question did not mention this declaration.

He asked that note should be taken of the following declaration, which he desired to make : It is understood that this amendment refers to technical and scientific books, and not to books, tracts or pamphlets of a subversive character, written in a spirit antagonistic to the aims of the League ; these latter books are for the most part printed abroad, and sometimes threaten to flood certain countries.

The Roumania delegate again said that he accepted the text submitted to the Sixth Committee without any other condition. He also unreservedly concurred in M. Valdés-Mendeville's proposal, being convinced that it was in complete agreement with the object of the League.

M. VÉSZI (Hungary) merely wished to state that he was not, of course, responsible for the drafting of the Minutes. He still adhered to what he had said in reply to the Czechoslovak delegate. He noted M. Comnène's declaration and approved the Chilean delegate's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that the Bureau was responsible for preparing the Minutes. There had been no intention whatever to convey a wrong impression, and the misunderstanding was entirely due to a desire to be brief. The statements of M. Comnène and M. Vészi would appear in the Minutes of that day's meeting.

*The paragraph proposed by the Hungarian delegation was adopted.*

The following draft resolution proposed by the Hungarian delegation was read :

“ The Assembly,

“ In view of the general identity of principles between the Convention of Berne, as revised first at Berlin and then at Rome, and the Copyright Convention signed in 1910 at Buenos Aires by the American States, and revised in Havana in 1928,

“ Requests the Council to have its competent organs make all the necessary investigations and consultations with a view to a general agreement having for its object the unification, on an international basis, and in full conformity with the wish expressed at the Rome Conference for the Revision of the Berne Copyright Conventions, of all laws and measures for the protection of intellectual property.”

• Dame Edith LYTTTELTON (British Empire) proposed a small amendment to the second paragraph. The English text said : “ make all the necessary investigations and consultations with a view to a general agreement ”. She would prefer to say : “ with regard to the desirability of a general agreement ”.

• M. GALLAVRESI (Italy), Rapporteur, accepted this amendment.

*The draft resolution as amended was adopted.*

M. Lucien HUBERT (France) noted that, in paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, on the one hand, the words “ on a national basis by various Committees ” were used, and, on the other hand, the words “ also internationally as by the International Education Bureau at Geneva ”. Was there not a risk of somewhat discouraging these “ various Committees ” by leaving them anonymous while another organisation was mentioned by name ? Were there definite reasons for mentioning this latter body ?

• M. MUNCH (Denmark) suggested that the words “ as by the International Education Bureau at Geneva ” should be omitted. There was no reason for referring to a special organisation in the report : one should not be mentioned without the others.

• M. RAPPARD (Switzerland) said he desired to congratulate the author of the report for having retained the Chilian delegate's proposal. There was naturally no question of excluding anybody, and if other associations of equal interest were to ask for this proof of goodwill which it had been proposed to offer to the International Education Bureau at Geneva, he would be the first to concur. But he would be sorry if the reference to the International Education Bureau at Geneva were to be deleted, as the Bureau had rendered great services and only asked for a word of encouragement.

To take another point — the report referred to courses for professors and teachers. He did not know whether there were any courses for university professors, but he thought that it would be preferable to say “ schoolmasters and teachers ”, or, in any case, to avoid in the English text the use of the term “ professor ”, which was usually applied only to university professors.

Mr. McLACHLAN (Australia) thought that there was no need to repeat the reasons, which he had already given at a previous meeting, for omitting a reference to a special body. There was no reason why the League's searchlights should play upon a particular organisation. This was a question of principle. However admirable the institution in question, he thought that a reference to it should be omitted.

• M. VALDÉS-MENDEVILLE (Chile) said that he thought M. Hubert's statement was based on a misunderstanding. A distinction must be made between two kinds of courses — those carried out on a national basis and those which were international in character. While recognising that there existed on a national basis — for example, in Great Britain — courses of study for teachers, it would be advisable to give special encouragement to an institution which worked on international lines. Moreover, he did not exclude anyone, since his text contained the words “ as by ”. The courses at the International Bureau corresponded exactly to Recommendation No. 5.

The Committee, in adopting the resolution submitted to it, would not have to concern itself with any possible financial repercussion ; the resolution would not in any way affect the League budget, while the handbook of which M. Oprescu had spoken, and the object of which was the same, required agreement on the part of the Fourth Committee.

Finally, the Chairman of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation had informed him that he had accepted his draft.

Dr. RIDDELL (Canada) was of the opinion that the report of the Committee should not name any institution which was not connected with the League, however excellent its work. He could not recall a precedent for such action ; but, if this had been done before, it was a mistake which there was still time to rectify. He therefore advised the omission of the words in question.

M. CASARES (Spain) supported M. Valdés-Mendeville's resolution.

Dame Edith LYTTTELTON (British Empire) did not think that the International Education Bureau was the only institution of its kind. Other institutions had organised courses for teachers — for example, the League of Nations Unions. It was therefore somewhat unwise to congratulate one institution only.



M. Lucien HUBERT (France) pointed out that the Chilian delegate, though inserting into his text the words "as by", stated that the International Education Bureau was the only one of its kind. In these circumstances, the words "as by" were not correct. They should therefore be deleted. But this would result in one institution being singled out and the League would thus be obliged to adopt a similar course in connection with any bodies which might subsequently be founded.

COUNT DE PENHA GARCIA (Portugal) confessed that he thought it difficult to make a special exception in the case of an isolated institution, but proposed that this might be done in favour of the International Education Bureau since it was the only one of its kind and had its headquarters at Geneva.

M. SLAVIK (Czechoslovakia) asked M. Valdés-Mendeville whether, if similar institutions to the International Education Bureau were brought to his notice, he would consent to their being mentioned in his report.

M. MUNCH (Denmark) said he remembered that similar efforts had already been encouraged, but he did not recollect whether any given institution had been mentioned by name. In any case, if this had been done, it was a mistake that should not be repeated. Moreover, the International Education Bureau was not the only body which had benefited by courses or lectures given by members of the Secretariat. He advised the deletion of the words in question.

COUNT BONIN-LONGARE (Italy) supported M. Hubert's proposal. His reason for doing so was entirely a question of principle, for he had great admiration for the International Education Bureau at Geneva. He thought it dangerous, however, to place any institution, as it were, in a privileged position.

He thought that the proposal would create a distinctly dangerous precedent. He was glad to note, however, that the Committee had already paid a thoroughly deserved tribute to the International Education Bureau; all the speakers, even those who had supported the amendment, had fully recognised the League's indebtedness to that institution.

Dr. LANGE (Norway) urged the authors of the amendment, in the interests of the International Education Bureau itself, not to insist upon this notion. He entirely shared the opinion which had been expressed as to the undesirability of singling out a special body, and he rather doubted the utility of encouraging the multiplication of the courses in question. There would be some risk of overlapping and, to a certain extent, a waste of effort and money. He was of the opinion that it would be preferable rather to aim at co-ordination.

M. GALLAVRESI (Italy), Rapporteur, bearing in mind the statements made, proposed to amend as follows the beginning of the paragraph in question:

"The Assembly notes with satisfaction the readiness with which teachers in secondary and primary schools have answered . . ."

As regards the reference to the International Education Bureau at Geneva, which he had introduced into his report at the Chilian representative's request, but only with the addition of the words "as by", he noted that a large number of the members of the Committee were not inclined to retain it. In order to avoid rejection by the Sixth Committee, he proposed to redraft the passage in question as follows: "on an international basis at Geneva and elsewhere". The words "at Geneva" in the following sentence would be deleted.

By the words "at Geneva", a special tribute would be paid to the spirit of Geneva and the work carried on there.

The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the fact that, though a resolution could be adopted by a majority in the Committee, unanimity was required in the Assembly. It would be regrettable if the whole resolution were in the end rejected for lack of agreement on a special point.

M. PARRA-PÉREZ (Venezuela), noting the opposition to the reference to the International Education Bureau at Geneva, asked whether the Committee would not be prepared to mention this institution in the text of the report instead of in the resolution.

M. GALLAVRESI (Italy), Rapporteur, regretted that he could not accept this proposal, for it would then be necessary to reject the whole resolution proposed by M. Valdés-Mendeville and which, he thought, was excellent apart from the reference which had just been discussed.

M. PARRA-PÉREZ (Venezuela) accordingly withdrew his proposal.

M. VALDÉS-MENDEVILLE (Chile) regretted that the Committee was not prepared even to mention in the report the International Education Bureau at Geneva; this would have been a welcome encouragement to the Bureau, which was of particular interest to the countries of Latin America. He could not, therefore, do otherwise than support the Rapporteur's proposal, though he hoped that this refusal would not lessen the interest

taken by the educational circles in these countries in the work as a whole in which the League was interested.

*Paragraph 7, together with the amendments proposed by the Rapporteur, was adopted. Paragraphs 8 and 9 were adopted without discussion.*

Dame Edith LYTTTELTON (British Empire) asked what was the Information Bureau referred to in paragraph 10.

M. OPRESCU (Secretary of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation) said that the Committee had contemplated the possibility of establishing some co-ordination among the libraries. With that object, it had convened the librarian members of its Sub-Committee for Science and Bibliography, as well as a few directors of national libraries. These representatives had agreed on the principle that in every national library of importance there should be an information bureau whose duty it would be to guide students engaged in research on a particular subject, and let them know the libraries where the documents and publications necessary for their work could be found. In addition, there would be a department at the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation in Paris which would form the *liaison* between the national bureaux and would forward to them for an answer the applications which might be received from students in every part of the world.

*Paragraph 10 was adopted.*

M. MÜNCH (Denmark) proposed to add, after the words "cinematograph performances" in paragraph 11, the words "and broadcasting", for wireless had a very great influence on public opinion.

*Paragraph 11 as amended, was adopted.*

M. GALLAVRESI (Italy), Rapporteur, stated at the last moment that he had received from the Polish delegation the following proposal which it had not been possible to distribute :

"The suggestion submitted to the sixth ordinary session of the Assembly by the Polish delegation with a view to the universal diffusion of literary and artistic works particularly in keeping with the principles of the League of Nations should also be borne in mind."

In order to gain time, the Polish delegation had requested the Rapporteur to insert that proposal in the report after the paragraph :

"The Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters, bearing in mind . . . by a spirit at variance with that of the League."

• *This proposal was adopted.*

Bearing in mind Dame Edith Lyttelton's request, M. GALLAVRESI (Italy), Rapporteur, proposed to give greater precision to the first resolution of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation (page 49 of the report) by saying : "The creation in the national or central library of every State of an Information Bureau". For every State did not possess a national library.

• *This proposal was adopted.*

As the report had been altered and amended in several places, M. GALLAVRESI (Italy), Rapporteur, asked for authorisation to revise the text from the point of view of style.

• *This proposal was adopted.*

• • The CHAIRMAN proposed the adoption by the Committee of the report as a whole subject to the modifications which would become necessary if the credit of 10,500 Swiss francs applied for were refused.

*The report was unanimously adopted with that reservation.*

## 17. Appointment of the Rapporteur for Questions relating to Intellectual Co-operation.

The CHAIRMAN proposed to appoint M. GALLAVRESI as Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee to the Assembly on intellectual co-operation.

*This proposal was adopted.*

## 18. Mandates (Continuation).

Before calling on the delegate of the British Empire to reply to the observations put forward at the meeting of the previous day by the delegate of Persia, the CHAIRMAN expressed, in the name of the Bureau of the Committee, the wish that there should be no general discussion on that subject, for the points raised by the delegate of Persia were of a particular order. As it had been reminded at the meeting on the previous day, the Sixth Committee, in accordance with a well-established tradition, only dealt with mandates questions in their general aspect. Everybody was aware that there were other League organs competent to deal with particular questions.

Mr. LOCKER-LAMPSON (British Empire) said he was very grateful to the Committee for giving him an opportunity of replying to the observations made by the Persian delegate at the previous meeting. He would make his reply as brief as possible, but pointed out that

the Persian delegate had covered a good deal of ground, with which he felt it necessary to deal. Further, as the delegate for Persia had gone into certain detailed points and had been very precise in his speech, it would be necessary for him to be equally precise.

The Persian delegate had been correct in informing the Committee on the previous day that the relations between his country and Iraq were at present unsatisfactory. Mr. Locker-Lampson ventured, however, to doubt whether his statement or the manner in which it had been couched was likely to improve those relations. It was understood that the Persian Government had made its recognition of Iraq dependent upon the extension to its nationals in Iraq of the judicial privileges enjoyed by certain other foreigners under the Judicial Agreement of 1924, which was based on Article 9 of the Anglo-Iraq Treaty of October 10th, 1922. The relevant provisions of this article read as follows :

“ His Majesty the King of Iraq undertakes that he will accept and give effect to such reasonable provisions as His Britannic Majesty may consider necessary in judicial matters to safeguard the interests of foreigners in consequence of the non-application of the immunities and privileges enjoyed by them under capitulation or usage. These provisions shall be embodied in a separate agreement which shall be communicated to the Council of the League of Nations. ”

The relevant article of the Judicial Agreement of March 25th, 1924, to which the Persian delegate had taken exception, read as follows :

“ The expression ‘ foreigners ’ means the nationals of any European or American State which formerly benefited by capitulations in Turkey and did not renounce the same by an agreement signed before July 24th, 1923, and of any Asiatic State which is now permanently represented on the Council of the League of Nations. ”

The Committee would thus note that, not only Persian nationals, but also nationals of other countries, were excluded in Iraq from the benefits of the Judicial Agreement of 1924. The Persian delegate had maintained that his compatriots had a legal and moral right to judicial privileges in Iraq; first, because they enjoyed a special judicial regime in that country under Turkish rule and, secondly, because all the Members of the League of Nations should, in such matters, receive equal treatment.

On the other hand, the Government and people of Iraq did not desire that the scope of the Judicial Agreement of 1924 should be extended, and were not prepared to consent to its extension to the Persian colony in Iraq. From a practical point of view, such extension could not be effected without the complete disorganisation of the whole legal system of the country, in view of the fact that these privileges have hitherto been enjoyed only by certain small groups of foreigners, while the Persian residents number about 200,000. Moreover, the psychological effect of this demand of the Persian Government on the inhabitants of the Kingdom of Iraq must be borne in mind. Those inhabitants found it difficult to understand why Persia should peremptorily demand privileges of a capitulatory nature in Iraq at the very time when all such privileges were radically being abolished in Persia, thus claiming rights which she was not prepared to give in return. It was the considered opinion of the British Government, whose representatives had acted as intermediaries between Persia and Iraq, that this problem could be solved if goodwill were shown, and a compromise acceptable to all concerned could be secured.

The Persian delegate, in his statement, had mentioned a proposal made by his Government that Shiah magistrates should be appointed in the areas most inhabited by the Persian residents. This proposal had received most careful consideration, and the responsible authorities regretted to find that it was impracticable, as it would necessitate the creation of a special corps of Shiah magistrates and judges, and it would be a distinct set-back to the judicial system of Iraq to have to introduce a religious test as a necessary qualification for judicial appointments, and to have to fill vacant appointments with Shiahs, even if there were suitable candidates, from the point of view of legal attainments, who did not happen to belong to the sect.

The Persian delegate had expressed doubts whether the Council had accepted the views of His Majesty's Government in Great Britain on September 27th, 1924, when it had considered a communication from the Persian Government regarding the judicial situation of Persians in Iraq. Mr. Locker-Lampson had looked up the Minutes of that meeting, and had found that the Council had taken note of the declarations of the representatives of Great Britain and Persia, and had expressed the hope that an agreement would soon be reached on the judicial situation of Persian nationals in Iraq, but at the same meeting the Council had unanimously adopted a decision approving the terms of a communication from His Majesty's Government in Great Britain to which the Judicial Agreement of 1924 was an annex. It would thus be seen that the Council had, in fact, approved the terms of that agreement. He would invite the attention of the Committee and of the Persian delegate to that important point.

As regarded the hope expressed by the Council that an agreement would soon be reached on the judicial situation of Persian nationals in Iraq, Mr. Locker-Lampson could say with complete confidence that no effort had been or would be spared by His Majesty's Government in Great Britain and by the Iraq Government to reach such an agreement, which would be most welcome to them.

The Committee had heard on the previous day that Persia had no fully commissioned consuls in Iraq, but only agents in charge of consulates who looked after the interests of

the Persian residents. He understood, however, that these agents were provisionally recognised by the Iraq Government as consuls and received the same facilities as would be granted to fully commissioned consular officers.

There was another point in the Persian delegate's speech to which he would like to refer, namely, the tax called "djensiate". Mr. Locker-Lampson understood that this was a payment which all persons of foreign nationality residing in Iraq were required to make if they desired to maintain their foreign nationality. The payment of this tax was, however, only required by persons whose parents and grandparents had resided in Iraq, that was to say, by those of the second generation. The tax had originally been fixed at a single payment of 50 rupees, but, in response to a request made by the Persian Government, it had been reduced to a single payment of 10 rupees. In any event, he understood that all foreigners were treated alike.

Mr. Locker-Lampson turned next to the allegations made by the Persian delegate in regard to frontier incidents. Frontier incidents had unfortunately occurred, owing to the nature of the districts on both sides of the Persia-Iraq frontier, and owing to the fact that these districts were, to a great extent, peopled by tribes over which control was no light task. Many of these were migratory and spent half the year in Iraq and half in Persia. Border raids and local disturbances had unfortunately been fairly common for many years past and were no recent phenomena in these districts. He could, however, assure the Committee that the Iraq Government had left no stone unturned to ameliorate the situation, and prided itself on the fact that this situation had indeed improved during the past two years.

He regretted that, as he was not accompanied by a representative of the Iraq Government or by an expert on the conditions prevailing in that kingdom, he had been unable to furnish as complete and as detailed a reply to the statement of the Persian delegate as he would have desired. Nevertheless, he felt confident that, when the annual report on Iraq for 1927 was examined by the Permanent Mandates Commission, that body would bear in mind the statements made by the Persian delegate and would receive precise and satisfactory replies from the accredited representative of Great Britain.

Before concluding his statement, Mr. Locker-Lampson ventured to draw the Committee's attention to the broader aspect of this exchange of statements between the Persian delegate and himself. Were they likely to improve the present unfortunate situation? He doubted it. The deliberations of the Committee were attended with the utmost publicity. Versions of the statement made by the Persian delegate had probably by now appeared in the Iraq Press. Local feeling might thus be aroused and the attempts of the British representatives and of the Government of Iraq to reach a satisfactory settlement might be seriously impeded.

In this connection, he remembered hearing of a statement made by the representative of another country during the seventh ordinary session of the Assembly of the League in connection with an incident which had at that time been the subject of negotiation in the same way as the problems which formed the subject of the Persian delegate's speech were now under negotiation. Viscount Cecil had replied to the effect that, whilst he was unaware that the matter in question was to be raised, he happened to know sufficient about the facts to say at once that he did not agree with the statement that had been made, and that his view of the incident was entirely different from that which had been laid before the Assembly. Viscount Cecil went on to say that he could not, however, think that a statement such as that which had just been made was in any way likely to assist in attaining a peaceful and friendly settlement of the question.

Mr. Locker-Lampson submitted that similar considerations applied to the present case, and, whilst he trusted that the Committee would have understood from his statement that the views expressed by the Persian delegate at the last meeting were not only based on a misconception of the facts, but also embodied only one aspect of this question, he believed that his colleagues would agree that it was one which was more suitable for negotiation than for public debate in this Committee, and one which, he trusted, would be settled by such negotiation, and would not have to be brought before the Council.

In conclusion, Mr. Locker-Lampson thanked the Chairman and members of the Committee for having given him an opportunity of making the foregoing statement.

Sir K. Venkata REDDI (India) said that, when he had protested the previous day against a statement made by the Persian delegate, he had been under the impression that the charge made was that cholera and plague reached Persia from India. He found from the Minutes that India was described as the focus of those diseases, which were said to enter Persia through Iraq. A focus could be centrifugal or centripetal. If the suggestion was that those diseases emanated from India, he challenged the statement. It had been proved historically that the plague did not originate in India, and, when it appeared in that country, that the Government of India had done its best to put it down. India had often suffered from cholera, but cholera might occur anywhere where there was an aggregation of people and a sanitary water supply was not available; it need not come from another country, and there was no reason why India should be held responsible for cholera entering Persia. The remarks he had made on the previous day were a sufficient answer to the accusation which had been made.

The CHAIRMAN noted that several other members of the Committee had intimated a wish to speak on this question. He thought, however, that the discussion was only

remotely connected with the agenda. Every country had diplomatic difficulties. If all these difficulties were discussed before the League of Nations, it would be overwhelmed with work. Each Government must try to solve its own difficulties by direct negotiations, and not refer them to the League unless the negotiations failed. He therefore proposed to declare that the discussion on this question was closed.

M. Hussein Khan ALA (Persia) said that the first delegate of Persia, who was a member of the Sixth Committee, was at that moment attending a meeting of the Council. The speaker could only uphold the declaration made by his delegation at the previous day's meeting and reserve the right of His Highness Mohammad Ali Khan Foroughi to reply later to the British delegate's remarks.

At the CHAIRMAN's suggestion, the Committee decided to close the discussion of this question and to pass to the next item on the agenda.

COUNT DE PENHA-GARCIA (Portugal), Rapporteur, suggested, in view of the lateness of the hour, that the Committee should postpone the examination of the draft report (Annex 3) he had submitted to his colleagues.

*This proposal was adopted.*

## SEVENTH MEETING

*Held on Monday, September 17th, 1928, at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* M. MARINKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes).

### 19. Adoption of the Minutes of the Fifth Meeting.

*The Commission adopted the Minutes of the fifth meeting.*

### 20. Mandates : Draft Report of the Committee to the Assembly.

COUNT DE PENHA GARCIA (Portugal), Rapporteur, said he wished to point out that, in drawing up his draft report to the Assembly (Annex 3), he had endeavoured to convey an impression of the discussions which had taken place in the Committee both on individual questions and on the general problems connected with the mandates system. He hoped he had faithfully expressed the views of the various delegations. He would, however, be happy to make any alterations in or additions to the text that might be suggested, if these were approved by the Committee. He considered the reports as a collective work the essential idea of which was an agreement of opinions.

The Rapporteur read the draft report of the Committee to the Assembly.

M. KIMURA (Japan), referring to the passage in the draft concerning the principle of economic equality applied to A and B mandated territories, said he wished to remind the Committee that, at the meeting of the eleventh session of the Council, held on December 17th, 1920, Viscount Ishii (Japan) had made the following statement :

" From the fundamental spirit of the League of Nations and as the question of interpretation of the Covenant, His Imperial Japanese Majesty's Government have a firm conviction in the justice of the claim they have hitherto made for the inclusion of a clause concerning the assurance of equal opportunities for trade and commerce in C mandates. But from the spirit of conciliation and co-operation and their reluctance to see the question unsettled any longer, they have decided to agree to the issue of the mandate in its present form. That decision, however, should not be considered as an acquiescence on the part of His Imperial Japanese Majesty's Government in the submission of Japanese subjects to a discriminatory and disadvantageous treatment in the mandated territories ; nor have they thereby discarded their claim that the rights and interests enjoyed by Japanese subjects in these territories in the past should be fully respected. "

He asked that the above text should be inserted in the Minutes of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN assured him that this would be done.

*Count de Penha Garcia's draft report and the draft resolution to be submitted to the Assembly were adopted with certain minor alterations.*

The text of the draft resolution thus amended was as follows :

" The Assembly,  
" Having taken note of the work accomplished by the mandatory Powers, the Permanent Mandates Commission and the Council in execution of Article 22 of the Covenant,

" Desires to convey to them its admiration for their continued efforts and for the spirit of co-operation which has characterised their work ; and

" Trusts that this will always continue to be the case.

" The Assembly :

" (a) Expresses the hope that the Permanent Mandates Commission's work on the question of the application of the principle of economic equality will be actively pursued, and that the mandatory Powers will supply all the information requested ;

" (b) Hopes that the study of the question of the liquor traffic will, with the help of the mandatory Powers, lead to effective results ;

" (c) Expresses the opinion that it is desirable that the mandatory Powers should furnish and keep up to date all the particulars necessary to complete the statistical tables already compiled by the Secretariat."

**21. Appointment of a Rapporteur on Mandates Questions.**

On the CHAIRMAN'S proposal, COUNT DE PENHA GARCIA *was appointed Rapporteur.*

**22. Slavery Convention : Annual Report to the Council : Draft Report of the Committee to the Assembly.**

Mr. LOCKER-LAMPSON (British Empire), Rapporteur, read his draft of the Committee's report to the Assembly (Annex 4).

M. RAPPARD (Switzerland) said that his Government, although it took a sincere interest in the suppression of the last vestiges of an odious past, had no intention of introducing in Parliament a Bill for the accession of Switzerland to the Slavery Convention, because public opinion did not feel that there was any necessity to do so; the Committee could be quite sure, however, that, if the accession of Switzerland could in any way facilitate the application of the Convention, the Swiss Government would not fail to take the necessary steps.

He then said that he wished to draw the Committee's attention to the rapidity with which the laws of the British Protectorate of Sierra Leone had been brought into harmony with the Convention for the Suppression of Slavery. It had been noted last year that a decision given on final appeal on July 1st, 1927, by the Courts of this territory had upheld the rights of certain slave-owners. In a recently published White Book, the British Government stated that, at an extraordinary session convened for the purpose, the Sierra Leone Legislative Council had, on September 22nd, 1927, passed an Act suppressing slavery as from January 1st, 1928.

He was sure that the Committee would wish to congratulate the British Government on the results of this measure and the rapidity with which the decision had been taken. It was probable that the moral influence of the League of Nations had helped to bring about this reform, which would benefit more than 200,000 natives. He hoped that the British Government would inform the next Assembly of the social and economic effects produced by the application of this law.

Mr. LOCKER-LAMPSON (British Empire) said that his Government would certainly appreciate the Committee's satisfaction as expressed by M. Rappard. It was certain that the moral influence of the League had had not a little to do with the adoption of the new Sierra Leone Act. The members of the Legislative Council of this Protectorate and those of the population for whom this Act entailed a real sacrifice would also be pleased when they learned of the Committee's opinion.

Finally, he would convey to his Government the Swiss delegate's suggestion to the effect that it should next year furnish the Assembly with information concerning the effects of the Act suppressing slavery in Sierra Leone.

*Mr. Locker-Lampson's draft report and the draft resolution to be submitted to the Assembly were adopted with two minor modifications.*

The text of the draft resolution thus amended was as follows :

" The Assembly notes the report of the Council regarding slavery (documents A.24.1928.VI and A.24(a).1928.VI) containing communications from the Governments of Great Britain, India, Italy and the Sudan and also notes a list submitted by the Abyssinian delegation.

" The Assembly hopes that no effort will be spared to furnish similar information in the future, as it is of considerable interest and utility to the States Members of the League.

" The Assembly notes with satisfaction that the number of ratifications and accessions to the Convention of September 25th, 1926, has appreciably increased since its last session, and expresses the hope that all countries affected by this question will ratify or accede to the Convention in the immediate future."

---

## EIGHTH MEETING

*Held on Wednesday, September 19th, 1928, at 10 a.m.*

*Chairman:* M. MARINKOVITCH (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes).

### 23. Adoption of the Minutes of the Sixth and Seventh Meetings.

*The Minutes of the sixth and seventh meetings were adopted.*

### 24. Plan for the Establishment of Armenian Refugees in the Republic of Erivan.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the Assembly had referred the question of the establishment of Armenian refugees in the Republic of Erivan, submitted to it by the Council, to the Sixth Committee.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway) summarised the previous history of the question (see documents C.377.1928.IV and A.VI.6.1928).

He said that he had at one moment given up all hope of carrying out this scheme. Since last year, however, certain new facts had caused him to change his opinion. In the first place, the contribution of the Armenian organisations in Europe had amounted to £100,000, which, with the other sums already obtained, would make it possible to settle more than half the number of refugees originally contemplated.

In addition, most encouraging results had been obtained in Syria, where the Armenians had proved themselves to be excellent colonists. Loans were being repaid punctually and the position was most satisfactory.

To enable this work to be continued, the Committee should decide in principle that the establishment of Armenian refugees in the Republic of Erivan should be effected under the auspices of the League; that the Council should be requested to continue its efforts to obtain credits from Governments; and that the Fourth Committee should be asked to allocate in the League budget a sum for administrative expenses, which he estimated at approximately 65,000 francs.

M. FROHWEIN (Germany) stated that Germany was ready to keep her promise to grant a credit in goods of 1,000,000 Reichsmarks, *i.e.*, £50,000, provided that five Governments at least took a share in the work and that the Armenian organisations contributed a sum of £100,000. The administrative expenses should be borne by the League, as Dr. Nansen suggested; otherwise it was doubtful whether the scheme could be carried out at all.

It would be highly detrimental to the League's prestige if the hopes which the Armenians had for so long placed in the League were to be disappointed.

M. SÉROT (France) reminded the members that, as regards this painful question of the Armenian refugees, the French delegation's point of view had already been explained by M. Viviani, M. Pams and, more recently, by M. Briand. Its attitude had not changed. While fully appreciating Dr. Nansen's efforts, the French Government's co-operation would necessarily be confined to the work directly undertaken by it in Syria.

The French Government proposed to settle 100,000 Armenian refugees in the mandated territories. Of this number, 60,000 had already been established. During the past year, 7,000 refugees had been transferred from the camps at Aleppo, Beirut and Alexandretta to the agricultural districts.

The French Government was obliged to concentrate on this task, which it would pursue unremittingly.

Mlle. FORCHHAMMER (Denmark) said she knew that all over the world Armenians watched this question with hope and anxiety; in their eyes Erivan was now the only place where they could find the national home so often promised them by the League. Therefore it was highly desirable that the plan should be carried out under the auspices of the League.

Mr. Duff COOPER (British Empire) thought that the British Government, like the French Government, could point with some satisfaction to its own record in this matter.

It had already spent a sum of approximately £5,500,000 on the settlement of Armenian refugees in Iraq. Moreover, this sum only represented a negligible fraction of the £60,000,000 which it had spent since the war in order to relieve refugees throughout the world.

His Government admitted that, from the outset, it had not been very enthusiastic about the scheme for settling Armenian refugees in Erivan — a scheme which Dr. Nansen had at one time himself abandoned. If a year ago the prospects of this scheme were doubtful, they were still more doubtful this year in view of the most discouraging results of the Council's appeal.

Dr. Nansen had stated that there were new factors to be considered. He had mentioned the gift of £100,000 from Armenians. But since this sum had been put unconditionally at Dr. Nansen's disposal, why should it not be drawn on for the 60,000 francs required for administrative expenditure instead of application being made to the League of Nations?

Dr. Nansen had also stated that the Armenians had proved to be excellent colonists. This was no new discovery. Armenians had always been considered remarkable for their courage and tenacity, and history demonstrated their capacity to adapt themselves to the most difficult circumstances.

He granted that this was a humanitarian work deserving of all respect and encouragement, but it must be asked whether it was really the business of the League of Nations to act as a universal charitable organisation.

Then it must not be forgotten that the Fourth Committee had requested all the other Committees to be as careful as possible with League funds. If the League of Nations were to be concerned in this plan, it would have to be convinced that the scheme offered every prospect of success from the political point of view.

He thought it advisable to leave the work to be carried on by means of voluntary contributions.

M. LOUWERS (Belgium) stated that, since he had not received any instructions from his Government, he could only express his personal views on the subject.

The Committee did not need to decide whether States Members of the League should assist in raising the funds required for carrying out the proposed scheme. The Assembly merely had to decide whether the League of Nations should share in the administrative expenditure of the Bureau, which was to be set up under the auspices of the League in order to enable those interested in the work to continue their activities.

He wished to put the following questions :

1. How many Armenians would benefit by the work to be undertaken ?
2. Was there still a large number of Armenians to be settled in a national home ? Where were they ?
3. What was the exact situation of this Republic of Erivan where the scheme was to be carried out ? Under whose sovereignty was it at the present time ? Was there any chance that the Armenians in this territory would be able to set up an autonomous Government ?

Furthermore, he would put the following question to the representatives of the British Empire and France : Were these two States in a position to increase the scope of the relief work on behalf of the Armenians in the territories where such schemes were already in operation ?

M. BONIN-LONGARE (Italy) asked the originator of the proposal under discussion what action would be taken by the local Government, and what attitude might be expected from the Governments which would have to be consulted concerning the transport of refugees through their territories.

Referring to the discussion regarding the necessary funds, he would observe that the Governments and the League of Nations were being asked to contribute. Notwithstanding the great sympathy felt by the Italian Government with any effort that might be made on behalf of the Armenians, M. Bonin-Longare, taking into account the reservations made by other Governments, thought that the Italian Government would be unable to undertake at present to make any contribution.

The question of the contribution payable by the League of Nations should be referred to the Fourth Committee. He did not see any objection to the Sixth Committee asking the Fourth Committee favourably to consider the request.

M. RAPPARD (Switzerland) stated that there were few more distressing problems than the fate of the Armenian people. The Swiss Government had indeed already given practical proof of its sympathy.

From the financial point of view, the Nansen scheme appeared to be very attractive for the League. It might be summed up by saying that the League of Nations, by contributing 65,000 francs, would reap the moral reward of having secured £100,000 for the use of the Armenians. Nevertheless, this fact was not sufficient to remove the very great difficulties in the way of the Nansen scheme.

He would like to put a few questions to Dr. Nansen on this point. First, if the scheme were approved, what were the actual chances of reaching a definitive solution of the problem ? In practice, the moral reward would only accrue to the League if the solution of the problem were found under its auspices, but the situation would perhaps be quite different if the League succeeded only in prolonging the agony of a people.

Again, was Dr. Nansen in a position to guarantee that the patronage of the League would facilitate the establishment of these Armenians in Erivan, or was there not, perhaps, a danger that its patronage might compromise the situation, in view of the possible relations between the League and the political authorities under which the work would be carried out ? Finally, from the financial point of view, were the sums contemplated sufficient to justify optimism ?

On behalf of the Swiss Government, he assured Dr. Nansen that, if the necessary guarantees and encouragement were forthcoming, it would not fail to examine the Nansen proposal with all the attention it deserved.

Mr. McLACHLAN (Australia) was sure that, if they looked only at the humanitarian aspect of the problem of the Armenian refugees and their establishment in Erivan, they would all be entirely of one mind, but he had read the Minutes of the Council meeting and had seen



the replies from the various Governments. The procedure adopted by the Council appeared to him to be somewhat embarrassing.

The question had now been referred to the Sixth Committee, but no information had been placed at its disposal. Like M. Rappard, he felt that the prestige of the League was at stake: if the scheme succeeded, its prestige would be enhanced; but, if it failed, its prestige would suffer.

Further — and Dr. Nansen himself had felt the difficulty — was it right for the responsibility in this matter to be thrown upon the Sixth Committee? This was not a question of expenditure; the success or failure of a scheme was in the balance. Who ought to take the responsibility?

Referring to the actual words of Dr. Nansen's report to the Council, he asked whether it was right for the Sixth Committee to take the responsibility of action without possessing any other information than that which Dr. Nansen had already given to the Council or might give to the Committee.

In short, he felt it was for the Council, which was familiar with the question, to take the responsibility and say what ought to be done. Like the representative of Italy, he had the feeling that the question should not have been submitted either to the Sixth Committee or to the Assembly.

M. RAPHAËL (Greece) supported Dr. Nansen's proposals. He represented a Government which had actual experience of the problem of settling Armenian refugees and had largely contributed to the solution of this problem by sheltering some 10,000 of these unfortunate people and expending £300,000 on their relief, in spite of the enormous expenditure involved in maintaining its own refugees.

He agreed with Dr. Nansen that the League of Nations was morally bound to provide Dr. Nansen with means to continue the humanitarian task which he had undertaken.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway) thanked the German Government for the attitude it had adopted and for its offer. He also thanked the French representative and reminded the Committee that last year M. Briand in the Council had begged him not to abandon his task. The French Government was helping in the settlement of Armenian refugees in Syria.

In reply to the British delegate, who had asked him whether there had been any change in his attitude, he observed that, since last year, he had received the German Government's offer and, with the £100,000 provided by the Armenians, could now count on more than half the sum required. This encouraged him to continue. The experiments conducted in Syria had also encouraged him. All experts who had examined the scheme had approved it and it would now be possible to carry out part of that scheme. He was ready to help, provided the League of Nations supported his efforts. In that case the necessary funds would be found.

This question could not be compared with any other humanitarian undertaking. The great Powers had made a formal promise to the Armenians. Relying on this promise, 200,000 Armenians had met their death. When the time came to establish the national Armenian home, the promise made to the Armenians had not been fulfilled.

The problem had unfortunately been partially solved in that many Armenians were dead and many others were dying. But that did not alter the fact that promises had been made and that these promises ought to be fulfilled. The only place in which they could be fulfilled was Erivan.

There were over 45,000 Armenian refugees in Greece, of whom one-fourth were absolutely destitute and ought to be transferred elsewhere.

As the experience gained in Syria had shown, the settlement of a refugee family cost, from £40 to £45. At Erivan it might perhaps cost £50. It would thus be possible to settle from 10,000 to 12,000 individuals. He regarded the money placed at his disposal as a working capital fund: in other words, the money used to establish families would be repaid after several years by these same families in order that other families might be established in turn.

With regard to the situation of the Republic of Erivan, he would point out that it was free to use its own language and manage its own internal affairs. It formed part of the Republic of Transcaucasia, which itself formed part of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

In reply to the Swiss delegate, he stated that the Armenians who would be sent to Erivan would be safe. They might engage in agriculture and thus support themselves and their families. Moreover, all Armenians, whether Whites or Reds, declared that the only solution was settlement in the Republic of Erivan.

The approval of the League of Nations was of very great importance in this matter. It would allow of public control, and, when work of this nature was undertaken under the auspices of the League, it made a very great difference in transport questions and relations with the various authorities.

In reply to the Australian delegate, he stated that he was not buying a pig in a poke. The scheme had been most carefully studied. It was true that only part of the scheme would be carried out, but the various enquiries which had been conducted applied as well to the part as to the whole.

If the League of Nations gave its approval, he felt certain that success would finally be achieved.

Sir K. VENKATA REDDI (India) said he had great sympathy for the Armenians, but would nevertheless like to ask for definite information on one or two points. He would like to

know whether any Armenians who had taken refuge in other countries had already been settled at Erivan. Moreover, how long a period would elapse before the working capital fund of £100,000 was reconstituted? Supposing ten years were required, would the League of Nations continue to be responsible for this question during the whole of that period? If the reconstituted fund were used again, until when would such responsibility last?

He did not wish to haggle over the funds required for administration, but he thought that, for the sake of the League's prestige, it was essential that the League should be successful in all its undertakings. A certain Mr. Keller, an American citizen, had published a book in which he asserted that the League had already suffered a dozen failures. He himself did not endorse that statement, but he thought it ought to be clear what the League was undertaking to do.

Dr. RIDDELL (Canada) said that, in 1925, he had been a member of a sub-committee appointed to study the scheme which was at present under discussion. It had been thought that the scheme could not be financed by a loan and that recourse must be had to private philanthropy. Last year, the Council had made a final appeal to the Members of the League for contributions; the response to this appeal was before the Committee, and he did not propose to comment on it. He was pleased that Dr. Nansen still desired to go on with the work.

The Canadian delegation agreed with Dr. Nansen on two points: (1) that the scheme should be carried out under League control; and (2) that the administrative expenses, amounting to about 65,000 francs, should be defrayed out of the League budget.

He did not, however, agree with Dr. Nansen that the Council or the Assembly should be asked to make a further appeal for funds to Governments.

Dr. NANSEN (Norway), replying to the delegate of India, said that the State of Erivan had 1,000,000 inhabitants, of whom 400,000 were Armenians who had taken refuge there during the war. A large number of Armenians from Greece and Constantinople were going to Erivan in the hope of settling there. The proportion would increase when the irrigation works undertaken by the local Government were completed.

Speaking of the working capital fund, he hoped that this was now secure. The fund had been handed over to him personally by Armenians.

The League's responsibility would cease as soon as the funds advanced by Members of the League had been repaid, which could be done very quickly, seeing that, in the case of Greece, certain refugees had succeeded in repaying the loans made to them in two years.

Replying to the Canadian delegate on the subject of the request for action by the Council, he observed that the only question at issue was that of the exact meaning of certain replies, which did not seem to be very clear. He himself could not go and ask Governments for explanations. That seemed to be the business of the Secretary-General.

The British Government itself had sent 7,000 refugees from Iraq to the Republic of Erivan. It was true that a large proportion of these refugees had died as the result of malaria. Nevertheless, the British Government seemed anxious to see Armenian refugees settled in the Republic of Erivan.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that a vote should at once be taken on Dr. Nansen's three proposals. A Rapporteur to the Assembly might then be appointed. If the third proposal were adopted, the question would be laid before the Fourth Committee.

He put to the vote Dr. Nansen's first proposal, reading as follows:

"The Sixth Committee is of opinion that the work of establishment should be done under the auspices of the League of Nations."

*Adopted.*

He then put to the vote the second proposal, reading as follows:

"The Assembly requests the Council to continue negotiations with those Governments which have offered to help, in order that the conditions attached to the German Government's offer may be fulfilled."

*Adopted.*

He then put to the vote the third proposal, reading as follows:

"It requests the Fourth Committee to allot 65,000 Swiss francs to meet the administrative expenses of settlement."

*Adopted.*

*The draft resolutions of Dr. Nansen were adopted as a whole.*

The CHAIRMAN observed that it would be left to the Rapporteur to establish the final text.

## 25. Appointment of Rapporteur for the Question of the Establishment of Armenian Refugees in the Republic of Erivan.

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, Dr. RIDDELL (Canada) was appointed Rapporteur to the Assembly for the question of the establishment of Armenian refugees in the Republic of Erivan.

The RAPPORTEUR and Dr. NANSEN were requested to represent the Sixth Committee in the Fourth Committee, in support of the request for a credit of 65,000 francs.

NINTH MEETING.

*Held on Saturday, September 22nd, 1928, at 3.30 p.m.*

*Chairman: M. VALDÉS-MENDEVILLE (Chile).*

**26. Plan for the Establishment of Armenian Refugees in the Republic of Erivan (continuation).**

Dr. RIDDELL (Canada), Rapporteur, announced that the Fourth Committee had decided to recommend the Assembly to grant a credit of 50,000 francs for the administrative expenditure.

He read his draft report and resolution (Annex 5)

He explained that in the resolution the sentence in the second paragraph: "requests the Council to continue negotiations", meant that, according to Dr. Nansen's idea, the Council would request the Secretary-General to write to the Governments which had already expressed a desire to assist in the work.

*The draft report and resolution were adopted.*

**27. Close of the Session.**

The CHAIRMAN stated that the Sixth Committee had ended its work, and renewed the thanks which M. Marinkovitch had already expressed to the members of the Committee.

Sir K. VENKATA REDDI and Count BONIN-LONGARE thanked the Chairman on behalf of the members of the Sixth Committee.

---

LIST OF ANNEXES.

	Page
1. Information deposited with the Secretariat on September 10th, 1928, by the Delegation of Abyssinia, as an Annex to the Statement made by its Representative on the Sixth Committee on September 5th, 1928 . . . . .	36
2. Work of the International Committee and of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation : Draft Report of the Sixth Committee to the Assembly, presented by M. Gallavresi (Italy) . . . . .	41
3. Mandates : Draft Report of the Sixth Committee to the Assembly, presented by Count de Penha Garcia (Portugal) . . . . .	44
4. Slavery Convention : Annual Report by the Council : Draft Report of the Sixth Committee to the Assembly, presented by the Rt. Hon. G. Locker-Lampson, M.P. (British Empire) . . . . .	45
5. Plan for the Establishment of Armenian Refugees in the Republic of Erivan : Draft Report of the Sixth Committee to the Assembly, presented by Dr. W. A. Riddell (Canada) . . . . .	45

A.VI./2.1928.

ANNEX 1.

INFORMATION DEPOSITED WITH THE SECRETARIAT ON SEPTEMBER 10TH, 1928, BY THE DELEGATION OF ABYSSINIA, AS AN ANNEX TO THE STATEMENT MADE BY ITS REPRESENTATIVE ON THE SIXTH COMMITTEE ON SEPTEMBER 5TH, 1928.

*Note by the Secretary-General.*

The Secretary-General has the honour to communicate to the Sixth Committee the following information which was handed to the Secretariat on September 10th, 1928, by the delegation of Abyssinia, as an annex to the statement made by its representative on the Sixth Committee on September 5th, 1928. The data concerning slavery which were furnished by the Abyssinian delegation in 1927 are contained in document A.37(b).1927.VI.

Office of Addis-Ababa.

Abyssinian Year 1919  
(1926-27 New Style<sup>1</sup>)

LIST OF NATIVES LIBERATED

1919 (1926-27)

Date 1926	Names	Sex	Article of the Regulation applied
October	18 Ambebo . . . . .	Male	6
	18 Chemené . . . . .	Female	6
	18 Terfé . . . . .	"	6
	18 Amde Wolde Maryam . . . . .	"	6
	18 Arerou . . . . .	Male	6
	27 Amete Maryam . . . . .	Female	6
	27 Demané . . . . .	"	6
	27 Tensé Wolte Maryam . . . . .	"	6
	27 Amartch . . . . .	"	6
	27 Ibataou . . . . .	Male	6
	27 Bedissé Assede . . . . .	Female	6
	27 Ifenech . . . . .	"	6
	27 Djifaré . . . . .	"	6
	27 Ando Dina . . . . .	"	6
	27 Ameti Maryam . . . . .	"	6
	27 Amlak Tereda . . . . .	"	6
	27 Adané . . . . .	"	6
November	18 Aissassame Idchou . . . . .	Male	6
	18 Denkitou . . . . .	Female	6
	18 Wolete Maryam . . . . .	"	6
	18 Denkitou Alito . . . . .	"	6

<sup>1</sup> The Abyssinian year differs by four months from the New Style.

Date 1926		Names	Sex	Article of the Regulation applied	
November	18	Denkitou Ambo . . . . .	Male	6	
	18	Guebre Micael . . . . .	"	6	
	18	Desta . . . . .	"	6	
	18	Kedjela . . . . .	"	6	
	18	Felati . . . . .	"	6	
	18	Ameti Maryam . . . . .	Female	6	
	18	Guedeto . . . . .	Male	6	
	18	Desta . . . . .	Female	6	
	28	Kounfo . . . . .	"	6	
	28	Somano . . . . .	"	6	
	28	Chameno . . . . .	"	6	
	28	Desta . . . . .	"	6	
	28	Eumamneou Ydem . . . . .	"	6	
	28	Atatou . . . . .	"	6	
	28	Amino . . . . .	"	6	
	28	Wolde Maryam . . . . .	Male	6	
	28	Wolete Mescal . . . . .	Female	6	
	December	28	Hameti Maryam . . . . .	"	6
		3	Guebre Maryam . . . . .	Male	6
		3	Guebre Selassié . . . . .	"	6
		3	Hameti Maryam . . . . .	Female	6
		3	Zenebetch . . . . .	"	6
		3	Ayeb . . . . .	Male	6
		3	Fetalo . . . . .	Female	6
		3	Terfé . . . . .	"	14
		3	Azmi . . . . .	"	7
		3	Irba . . . . .	"	7
		3	Setegne . . . . .	Male	6
3		Betassa . . . . .	"	6	
14		Tchoita . . . . .	"	6	
14		Borato . . . . .	"	6	
14		Delisso . . . . .	"	6	
14		Wolete Maryam . . . . .	Female	6	
14		Deguintou . . . . .	Male	6	
14		Arerou . . . . .	"	6	
14		Fantoé . . . . .	Female	6	
14		Workou . . . . .	Male	6	
14		Arerou . . . . .	"	6	
14		Desta . . . . .	Female	6	
14		Kablets Imer . . . . .	Male	6	
14		Mamité . . . . .	Female	6	
14		Zenbetch . . . . .	"	6	
26		Guebre Eustifanos . . . . .	Male	6	
26		Abetou . . . . .	"	6	
26		Demté . . . . .	"	6	
28	Guemeché . . . . .	"	6		
28	Abo . . . . .	"	6		
<b>1927.</b>					
January	3	Eudem Aïnesseou . . . . .	"	6	
	3	Chacho . . . . .	"	6	
	3	Gueleta . . . . .	"	6	
	3	Guebré Kidan . . . . .	"	6	
	3	Mamo . . . . .	"	6	
	3	Madjora . . . . .	"	6	
	3	Wolete Micaël . . . . .	"	6	
	3	Ameti Micaël . . . . .	Female	6	
	24	Wolete Sadik . . . . .	"	6	
	24	Arerou . . . . .	Male	6	
	24	Denguéti . . . . .	Female	6	
	24	Wetaba . . . . .	Male	6	
	24	Andjï . . . . .	Female	6	
	24	Wailletou . . . . .	"	6	
	24	Wolete Sadek . . . . .	"	6	
	February	8	Ameti . . . . .	"	6
12		Wolete Aregai . . . . .	"	6	
12		Amete Sadek . . . . .	"	6	
24		Woletou . . . . .	"	6	
24		Wolete Maryam . . . . .	Male	6	
24		Doubale . . . . .	"	6	
24	Abissé . . . . .	"	6		

Date 1927		Names	Sex	Article of the Regulation applied	
February	24	Guedami . . . . .	Female	6	
	24	Askale . . . . .	"	6	
	24	Guebre Wolete . . . . .	Male	6	
	24	Chemané . . . . .	Female	6	
	24	Arerou . . . . .	Male	6	
	24	Bougnaro . . . . .	"	6	
	27	Weleta . . . . .	"	6	
	27	Demané . . . . .	Female	6	
	27	Gnoura . . . . .	Male	6	
	27	Michéré . . . . .	Female	6	
	27	Ameti Maryam . . . . .	"	6	
	27	Wak Kéné . . . . .	Male	6	
	27	Ibarguegne . . . . .	"	6	
	27	Gueté . . . . .	Female	6	
	March	3	Wolete Micael, and 6 children. . . . .	"	6
		9	Eukete Micael . . . . .	"	6
		16	Ayantou . . . . .	"	6
		16	Arbeillé . . . . .	Male	6
		16	Béregua . . . . .	"	6
		16	Aouesso . . . . .	"	6
16		Feredja . . . . .	"	6	
16		Koulati . . . . .	"	6	
16		Desta . . . . .	Female	6	
16		Merga . . . . .	Male	6	
16		Andjé . . . . .	Female	6	
16		Wolete Senbete . . . . .	"	6	
16		Kabtich Imer . . . . .	"	6	
19		Tim . . . . .	Male	6	
19		Wolete Guiorguis . . . . .	Female	6	
19		with child . . . . .	"	6	
19		Guebre Maryam . . . . .	Male	6	
19		Guebré . . . . .	"	6	
May		19	Ameteillesse . . . . .	Female	6
		19	Kassa . . . . .	Male	6
	19	1. muer . . . . .	Female	6	
	2	Beillentets . . . . .	"	3	
	27	Dembaré . . . . .	"	6	
	27	Kosmo . . . . .	"	5	
	27	Ameteillesse . . . . .	"	5	
	27	Tasso . . . . .	"	6	
	27	Agouni . . . . .	Male	6	
	27	Guebré . . . . .	"	6	
	27	Ailleza . . . . .	"	6	
	27	Guebre Selassié . . . . .	"	6	
	27	Keflé . . . . .	"	6	
	27	Guebre Yés . . . . .	"	6	
	27	Milco . . . . .	"	6	
	27	Adaré . . . . .	"	6	
	27	Demgueté . . . . .	Female	6	
	27	Yaguebaw-Gueneth . . . . .	"	6	
	27	with her boy . . . . .	"	6	
	27	Matchana . . . . .	"	6	
July	2	Yetaguegnehou . . . . .	"	6	
	May	9	Wolete Micael . . . . .	"	6
		9	Alena . . . . .	"	6
		9	Cabteh-Ymer . . . . .	Male	6
		9	Woleteyes . . . . .	Female	6
		9	Eundalew . . . . .	Male	6
		9	Desta . . . . .	"	6
		9	Cabtech-Imer . . . . .	Female	6
		9	Almbo . . . . .	Male	6
		9	Cabtech-Imer . . . . .	Female	6
		9	Amele Work . . . . .	"	6
	9	Belethé . . . . .	"	6	
	9	Adoré . . . . .	"	6	
	9	Amete Maryam . . . . .	"	6	
	July	21	Workenech . . . . .	Female	6
		21	Mogno . . . . .	Male	6
		21	Houlou Wodachou . . . . .	"	6
		21	Setegne . . . . .	"	6
		21	Desta . . . . .	"	6

Date 1928	Names	Sex	Article of the Regulation applied	
July	27 Haib Mariam . . . . .	Male	6	
	27 Medi . . . . .	"	6	
	27 Desta . . . . .	Female	6	
	27 Cabtch Imer . . . . .	"	6	
	27 Guebré . . . . .	"	6	
	27 Wolde Yiohanes . . . . .	Male	6	
	27 Guebre Mariam . . . . .	"	6	
September	6 Telatou . . . . .	"	7	
	8 Chaméni . . . . .	"	4	
	13 Desta . . . . .	"	4	
October	7 Berkenech . . . . .	Female	5	
	14 Terfe . . . . .	Male	6	
November	30 Desta Wolete Mariam . . . . .	Female	6	
	2 Beda . . . . .	Male	6	
	2 Zelek . . . . .	"	6	
	4 Desta . . . . .	Female	3	
	6 Gourja Tchquelo . . . . .	Male	4	
	19 Desta . . . . .	"	6	
	19 Chamné . . . . .	"	6	
	19 Ated . . . . .	"	6	
	19 Cabtch-Imer . . . . .	Female	5	
	19 Wolete Mariam . . . . .	Male	6	
	19 Cabtch-Imer . . . . .	Female	6	
December	16 Baiqueda . . . . .	Male	6	
	30 Setegne . . . . .	"	6	
	30 Gamo . . . . .	"	6	
	30 Aldadi . . . . .	"	6	
<b>1928.</b>				
January	3 Guebrou . . . . .	"	6	
	10 Yemekonen Alga . . . . .	"	6	
February	19 Wolete Mariam . . . . .	Female	6	
	19 Woletou . . . . .	"	6	
	19 Ameti Mariam . . . . .	"	6	
	20 Dourami . . . . .	"	6	
	6 Aïssasam-Idjou . . . . .	"	7	
March	8 Wolete Sadik, with her child . . . . .	"	6	
	13 Zebouti . . . . .	"	4	
	13 Wac-Quené . . . . .	Male	6	
	13 Mamité . . . . .	Female	6	
	13 Massaou . . . . .	Male	6	
	13 Wolde Mariam . . . . .	"	6	
	13 Ameti Guiorguis . . . . .	Female	6	
	13 Chamné Ameti Mariam . . . . .	"	6	
	13 Dengueti . . . . .	"	6	
	April	16 Tassew . . . . .	Male	6
		16 Metek . . . . .	"	6
16 Guebre Selassé . . . . .		"	6	
29 Ameti Mariam . . . . .		"	6	
29 Setegue . . . . .		"	6	
29 Askal . . . . .		Female	6	
29 Maquelo . . . . .		Male	6	
May	7 Guafero . . . . .	"	6	
	7 Cabtch-Imer . . . . .	"	6	
	9 Wolete Guiorguis . . . . .	Female	6	
	9 Aguegnehou . . . . .	"	6	
	11 Ayané . . . . .	"	6	
	11 Soumamé . . . . .	"	6	
	23 Tola . . . . .	Male	31	
	23 Ayantou . . . . .	"	31	
	23 Desta, and her child . . . . .	Female	31	
	23 Eundaltcheguere . . . . .	"	31	
	23 Guebré . . . . .	"	6	
	28 Cabtch Imer . . . . .	Male	6	
	28 Arerou . . . . .	"	6	
	28 Wolete Guiorguis . . . . .	Female	6	
	28 Baiqueda . . . . .	"	6	
	28 Guetené . . . . .	"	6	
	28 Chetcho . . . . .	"	6	
28 Chamné . . . . .	"	6		
28 Sada . . . . .	"	6		

Date 1928		Names	Sex	Article of the Regulation applied
June	16	Beza Woletaou . . . . .	Male	6
	18	Abebetch . . . . .	Female	6
	18	Mameti . . . . .	"	14
	21	Feleketch . . . . .	"	13

Abyssinian year 1919 (1927 New Style).

**TABLE OF NATIVES LIBERATED IN THE PROVINCES**

Province	Number of liberations
Wolega Tederou . . . . .	27
Bouno . . . . .	13
Nouo . . . . .	19
Acheleya . . . . .	2
Kanbata . . . . .	42
Toki . . . . .	60
Iloubabor . . . . .	26
Ankober . . . . .	41
Koulo . . . . .	9
Kefana Madji . . . . .	71
Sidamo . . . . .	7

Office of Addis-Ababa  
1919-20  
(1926-27-28).

Abyssinian Year 1919-20  
(1926-27-28 New Style).

**LIST OF DELINQUENTS SENTENCED TO FIFTEEN YEARS' IMPRISONMENT FOR OFFENCES AGAINST THE REGULATION.**

Date 1927		Names	Article of the Regulation applied
June	7	Guebre Selassié . . . . .	31
	18	Zelek . . . . .	31
July	29	Wolde Maryam and Haib Mariam . . . . .	31
August	11	Selassié Talou . . . . .	31
	14	Guebre Maryam . . . . .	31
	14	Melesse . . . . .	31
	17	Wolde Mariam . . . . .	31
	19	Solola Berga . . . . .	31
	19	Desta . . . . .	31
		Achengo . . . . .	31
	September	4	Assegahegen . . . . .
	5	Tchemeda . . . . .	31
December	30	Guesavn . . . . .	31
<b>1928</b>			
January	27	Yehouwala Icheti . . . . .	31
February	3	Woutcho . . . . .	31
	19	Ticsé . . . . .	31
	20	Moumtcha . . . . .	31
March	26	Abeb . . . . .	31
	1	Zelek . . . . .	31
	3	Fetene . . . . .	31
	3	Moulatou . . . . .	31
	3	Abeb Bezabch-Guebremariam . . . . .	31
	3	Eha . . . . .	31
	8	Zelek . . . . .	31
	8	Wata . . . . .	31
	8	Assela . . . . .	31
	8	Guebre Mariam . . . . .	31
	8	Seyfou . . . . .	31
	10	Ibailé . . . . .	31
	10	Barquen . . . . .	31
	10	Menguestou . . . . .	31
	17	Ayano . . . . .	31
May	27	Tadiké . . . . .	31
	3	Yiossouf . . . . .	31
	18	Alemou . . . . .	31
	21	Amdé Abassoré . . . . .	31



Date 1928		Names	Article of the Regulation applied
May	21	Doulo . . . . .	31
	21	Lessa . . . . .	31
	21	Negatch . . . . .	31
	23	Belesso . . . . .	31
	28	Gueleta . . . . .	31
	28	Gourmissa . . . . .	31
	28	Aga . . . . .	31
	29	Tolassa . . . . .	31
June	2	Guebre Maryam . . . . .	31
		Kassa . . . . .	31
	18	Boino . . . . .	31

ANNEX 2.

A.VI/1(2).1928.

DRAFT REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE ON INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION AND THE INSTITUTE OF INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION.

*Rapporteur*: M. GALLAVRESI (Italy).

It would be impossible to enter upon a discussion upon intellectual co-operation without paying a respectful tribute to the memory of the great scientist who, at this time last year, held the Committee of the Assembly under the sway of his personality, Professor Lorentz, who presided over this difficult and far-spreading work with such striking success as will doubtless likewise attend the efforts of his distinguished successors, Professor Gilbert Murray, the new Chairman of the Committee, and Mme. Curie and M. Destrée, Vice-Chairmen.

It is needless to point out that the leading idea when the League of Nations began its work in the field of intellectual co-operation, where the peculiar tendencies and traditions of different peoples are of dominant importance, was to co-ordinate the various endeavours, so efficiently as to offer every promise of mutual understanding. Inasmuch as an active intellectual life in the different countries is the essential condition of any fruitful co-operation, the development of local bodies must be held with the greatest satisfaction. We must therefore see a decisive step in this direction in the formal establishment of National Committees on Intellectual Co-operation in Germany, Spain and Great Britain, and the almost entire reorganisation of the Italian and certain other National Committees. The assistance of the permanent League organisations, such as the Economic Committee and the International Labour Office, has not failed the Committee. This is especially true in the case of the Sub-Committee for Intellectual Rights, which has to overcome obstacles which keep rising afresh, since it is striving to define the legal status of international associations and foundations and to draw up a model contract of publication. It has also studied the problem of the international circulation of books and, having recognised the importance of that problem, expresses the wish that all obstacles to the circulation of scientific and technical publications should be removed. The same Sub-Committee also endeavours to embody in the practice of the future the principle of scientific property postulated by Professor Ruffini as long ago as 1922. The Assembly of the League of Nations cannot but await with confidence the result of the enquiry which is being conducted among Governments in regard to the preliminary draft International Convention, which the Secretary-General has been authorised to transmit to the Governments for their opinion. The Sub-Committee took note, with a satisfaction in which the Assembly will share, of the results of the Rome Conference on Copyright, at which the moral right of an author over his work at length obtained recognition, thus crowning the protracted efforts of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, as M. Paul-Boncour lately observed at the last session of the Council of the League. The Congress of Statisticians at Cairo likewise gave an impetus — and, we should like to think, a decisive impetus — to the negotiations which the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation is conducting with the object of securing the adoption by Governments of identical rules in the matter of intellectual statistics.

Referring now to the activities under the supervision of the Sub-Committee for University Relations, grateful mention should be made here of the generous contribution by the National Council on Education of the United States of America, with the help of which it has been possible to compile a *Handbook of University Exchanges in Europe* — an innovation which is to be repeated next year.

The organisation of holiday courses and of instruction tours, as well as the possibility of extending these advantages to secondary schools, has been considered by the Sub-Committee for University Relations and by certain Governments, e.g., the Polish Government.

The Artistic Relations section of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation has displayed its activity principally through the International Museums Office, a particularly successful creation of the International Committee. The work of this office is likely to increase continually in importance, and the practical establishment of the Advisory Committee of the Office, which has not yet been convened, would therefore be justified. The question of the educational value of museums was exhaustively discussed at the last session of the Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters, but no definite conclusions were reached, since, as in all educational problems, such conclusions are particularly difficult to arrive at when the problems are considered from an international point of view.

The subject of the safeguards that may legitimately be required in connection with translations of literary works is one of the most complex and, at the same time, one of the most vexed questions that have come before the distinguished men whose assistance in the field of intellectual co-operation the League has secured. An agreement has been brought about between the Paris Institute and the Federation of "Pen" Clubs. The resumption of the former International Publishers' Congresses, as proposed by the Director of the Insel-Verlag of Leipzig, seems eminently calculated to lead to satisfactory results in the direction desired by the Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters. The Sub-Committee has made careful preparations for the Popular Arts Congress to be held at Prague; but, although this seems destined to be successful, there is some doubt whether the Committee will be able in future to assume responsibility for such practical manifestations.

The Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters, bearing in mind the profound artistic and educational importance of the development of the cinematograph, has also drawn the attention of the Assembly to the danger of cinematograph performances inspired by a spirit at variance with that of the League.

The Sub-Committee on Science and Bibliography is still confronted with problems which do not readily lend themselves to immediately successful solution, though these problems are such that their solution would lead to true co-operation among men of science throughout the world. While we must await the results of the enquiry into the resources available for scientific research, meetings of experts convened by the Paris Institute, whose work was carefully prepared beforehand, have drawn up draft resolutions concerning the co-ordination of the work of libraries and scientific museums, the best inks and paper for the conservation of documents, the question of dying languages, and the bibliography of science on a single basis, which has now been extended to the science of languages.

All this work, as has been pointed out on several occasions, has been carried out with a remarkable measure of success by the Paris International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation. An examination of the reports by the Director of the Institute and by Dr. Krüss, who spoke on behalf of the Governing Body, the experience acquired by the members of the Committee of Directors and the detailed discussion which recently took place at the plenary session of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation can but confirm the opinion, expressed last year by M. Breitscheid in his report to the Second Committee, on the great utility of such an executive organ placed at the disposal and under the authority of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation. This organ is truly international in character, an aspect which has been accentuated by the grants now being accorded by various countries in addition to the basic and original financial support given by the Government of the French Republic.

By a decision of the Assembly, the Sub-Committee of Experts convened two years ago to offer suggestions regarding the instruction of youth in the existence and aims of the League of Nations was also placed under the auspices of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation. The title given to the Sub-Committee seemed likely to confine its work within limits which have happily been enlarged in the course of its various sessions. The work itself has been summarised in an excellent report by M. Destrée which the last session of the Assembly approved. As a result, an Educational Information Centre has now been established, and the effects which its work has produced on public opinion, particularly in quarters devoted to propagating the ideals of the League of Nations, might warrant the convening next year, if not of the whole Sub-Committee of Experts, at least of the smaller Sub-Committee — chosen from among members of the plenary Sub-Committee. This smaller body has already assisted M. Destrée in drawing up a document that has become a sort of handbook for friends of the League.

It has also been suggested that a *Survey* should be published, on the responsibility and under the supervision of the Secretary-General of the League. This *Survey* would be prepared by an Advisory Committee consisting of one representative each for the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, the Secretariat of the League of Nations and the Paris Institute. The *Survey*, which would be intended primarily for professors, would be prepared in the same spirit which has governed the work of the Sub-Committee of Experts.

For the publication of such a *Survey*, the sum of 10,500 francs would be necessary. It would be included in the budget of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation if the Fourth Committee of the Assembly accepts this proposal. The Sixth Committee requests its Chairman to be good enough to ask the Chairman of the Fourth Committee to submit this request to the Supervisory Commission in order that the Fourth Committee may take a decision on the matter.

The Sixth Committee requests the Assembly to adopt the report on the work of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation and to approve the following resolution :

“ The Assembly has taken cognisance of the reports submitted by the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation and the Governing Body of the Institute. It is pleased with the results obtained by the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation as well as with the work of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation during the past year.

“ The Assembly notes that its recommendations in preceding years in regard to eventual contributions from other States to the budget of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation have been acted on, that other countries have granted subsidies, while France itself has increased its contribution by 500,000 French francs, so that the budget of the Institute for the year 1929 now amounts to 2,896,000 French francs.

“ It takes note of the progress made in regard to certain important questions :

“ Scientific property, co-ordination of bibliography for several sciences, co-ordination of institutes of higher political and social studies ;

“ The work of the International Museums Office and the contemplated extension of its work in favour of scientific museums and similar establishments ;

“ The part played by the representatives of the Committee and of the Institute at the recent Rome Conference for the Revision of the Berne Copyright Conventions, and especially in the discussions which culminated in the recognition of the moral rights of authors, recommended by the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation ;

“ The action taken by several States in pursuance of the recommendations of the Sub-Committee of Experts for the Instruction of Young People in the Aims of the League ; the beginning of the work of the Scholastic Information Centre in Geneva and Paris ; and the contemplated publication of a handbook devoted to these questions.

“ The Assembly notes with satisfaction the readiness with which professors and teachers have answered the appeal for co-operation addressed to them, and welcomes the organisation of courses of study with a view to their special requirements, not only on a national basis by various committees but also internationally, as by the International Education Bureau at Geneva. It is glad of the support received from Governments by which, following the recommendations by the Sub-Committee of Experts of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, facilities have been offered to teachers for following courses of instruction at Geneva, and, convinced of the paramount importance of the training of teachers for such teaching, it expresses the hope that similar facilities will be offered by the other States Members of the League.

“ The Assembly requests the States Members to take into consideration the need for the systematic organisation of the exchange of children in secondary schools during the summer holidays with a view to developing the spirit of peace and international co-operation, for which purpose the existing University Offices should be utilised on special organisations created.

“ Convinced that this international exchange of schoolchildren would greatly promote mutual understanding among peoples, the Assembly recommends that arrangements be made between different countries on this subject, and it begs the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation to instruct the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation and the Secretariat of the League to facilitate the execution of such arrangements.

“ It draws the special notice of Governments and requests them to give the greatest possible effect to the resolutions of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation in regard to :

“ (1) The creation in the National Library of every State of an information bureau ;

“ (2) The preservation of prints and manuscripts ;

“ (3) The suppression of Customs duties on prints sent to libraries and recognised institutes ;

“ (4) The adoption of the necessary measures for the preservation and the study of primitive languages which are dying out.

“ Finally, it calls the attention of Governments to the danger of cinematographic performances inspired by a spirit contrary to that of the League.”

---

MANDATES : DRAFT REPORT OF THE SIXTH COMMITTEE  
TO THE ASSEMBLY.

*Rapporteur*: COUNT DE PENHA GARCIA (Portugal).

The Sixth Committee has examined the reports and Minutes concerning the execution of the provisions of Article 22 of the Covenant in the mandated territories during the period which has elapsed since the last meeting of the Assembly.

Through several of its members, it has paid a deserved tribute to the work of the Council, the Permanent Mandates Commission and the Mandates Section of the Secretariat. It greatly appreciated the competence, impartiality and commonsense with which this work was carried out.

The good judgment of the Mandates Commission and the wisdom displayed by the Council have been instrumental in removing many of the difficulties presented by the application of the mandates system — which constitutes an innovation and which relates exclusively to certain territories specified in the Covenant, whose political, social and economic situations differ greatly from one another. At the same time, the Committee recognises the spirit of co-operation which inspires the various mandatory Powers, and which is evidenced by the assistance given to the Commission by past or present administrators of the mandated territories. The Committee notes with satisfaction this state of affairs, which is greatly to the credit of the League of Nations.

The Sixth Committee has noted the growing interest displayed by public opinion in the mandates system, and views with satisfaction the growth of the literature concerning mandates, which has recently been enriched by two important works by members of the Mandates Commission.

Among the general questions discussed, three deserve the Assembly's special attention, namely, economic equality, the liquor traffic and the systematic and scientific organisation of the work of the Mandates Commission and of the Mandates Section of the Secretariat.

Economic equality is indeed one of the fundamental principles of the mandates system. The Covenant and the mandates desired to place the territories subject to A and B mandates under a regime of complete economic equality. The Mandates Commission is pursuing a detailed study of the application of this principle, and to this end the Council, at the Commission's suggestion, has requested the mandatory Powers to supply it with certain information.

The question of the increase in the liquor traffic in certain territories under mandate has from the outset engaged the Commission's attention, and it has already carried out important technical and statistical work in connection with this serious problem. The Council has requested it to pursue its enquiry, and has forwarded to the mandatory Powers requests for data with a view to revising the statistics, obtaining information on Customs tariffs and determining the territories or parts of territories under mandate to which Article 4, paragraph 2, of the St. Germain Convention on the Liquor Traffic is applicable.

As regards the systematic and scientific organisation of the work of the Mandates Commission, great progress has already been achieved; but more remains to be done before perfection can be attained. Thanks to the efforts made by the Secretariat, in pursuance of the resolution adopted at the fifth ordinary session of the Assembly, the documents concerning the administration of the mandated territories are published each year, and constitute excellent material for study and for making the system more widely known. An analytical index kept up to date would facilitate the study of these numerous and bulky reports, and the Sixth Committee considers that such an index could without great difficulty be compiled by the authors of the reports themselves.

The Mandates Commission's reports contain a considerable number of requests for information, observations or conclusions concerning the seven annual reports it has examined. The Council has instructed the Secretary-General to forward them to the Governments of each of the mandatory Powers concerned. The same has been done as regards certain petitions examined by the Commission. The mandatory Powers will no doubt make a ready response to these observations and requests for information, so as to permit of the gradual solution of the difficulties noted and the elucidation of the questions which occupy the Commission's attention.

Thanks to the spirit of co-operation which inspires the activities of the various agents of the mandates system, a great work of peace and progress is in process of achievement for the benefit of the inhabitants of the territories under mandate and of the community of nations in general.

*Draft Resolution.*

" The Assembly, having taken note of the work accomplished since its last session by the mandatory Powers, the Permanent Mandates Commission and the Council in execution of Article 22 of the Covenant, desires to convey to them its admiration for the spirit of co-operation which has presided over their work, and trusts that this will always continue to be the case.

“ The Assembly :

“ (a) Expresses the hope that the Permanent Mandates Commission's work on the question of the application of the principle of economic equality will be actively pursued, and that the mandatory Powers will supply all the information requested;

“ (b) Hopes that the study of the question of the liquor traffic will, with the help of the mandatory Powers, lead to effective results;

“ (c) Expresses the opinion that it is desirable that the mandatory Powers should furnish and keep up to date all the particulars necessary to complete the statistical tables already compiled by the Secretariat.”

---

#### ANNEX 4.

A.VI/4.1928.

#### SLAVERY CONVENTION: ANNUAL REPORT BY THE COUNCIL: DRAFT REPORT OF THE SIXTH COMMITTEE TO THE ASSEMBLY.

*Rapporteur:* The Rt. Hon. G. LOCKER-LAMPSON, M.P. (British Empire).

The Sixth Committee had under consideration information communicated to the League of Nations by certain Governments respecting the progressive abolition of slavery and conditions analogous thereto. This information was forwarded in response to a resolution adopted by the seventh ordinary session of the Assembly on September 25th, 1926, and consisted of communications from the Governments of Great Britain, Italy, India and the Sudan. During the course of the discussion in the Sixth Committee, the Abyssinian delegation handed to the Secretariat a list of certain persons freed from slavery and of persons convicted of offences under the Slavery Laws of Abyssinia. This list forms an annex to a statement made by the Abyssinian representative on the Committee.

Since the Sixth Committee of the eighth ordinary session of the Assembly considered the question of slavery in 1927, the number of ratifications or final accessions to the Slavery Convention of 1926 has increased from fourteen to twenty-six. The following States have ratified or acceded to the Convention during the past year: Belgium, Canada, Republic of San Domingo, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Italy, Monaco, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway and Sweden. Nevertheless, there are still several States whose ratification or accession is most important to ensure the universal application of the Convention and which have not yet taken this step.

Apart from the communication of laws and regulations enacted to cope with the problem of slavery and conditions analogous thereto, the transmission of information to the League is not obligatory upon the States signatories of the Convention of 1926. Nevertheless, the Sixth Committee considers that the various Governments should spare no effort to furnish such general information on this subject in order to provide other States with the benefit of their experience.

The Committee submits the following resolution for adoption by the Assembly :

“ The Assembly notes the report of the Council regarding slavery (documents A.24.1928.VI and A.24(a).1928.VI), containing communications from the Governments of Great Britain, India, Italy and the Sudan and also a list submitted by the Abyssinian delegation. The Assembly hopes that no effort will be spared to furnish similar information in the future, as it is of considerable interest and utility to the States Members of the League.

“ The Assembly notes with satisfaction that the number of ratifications and accessions to the Convention of September 25th, 1926, has appreciably increased since its last session, and expresses the hope that all countries interested in or affected by this question will ratify or accede to the Convention in the immediate future.”

---

#### ANNEX 5.

A.VI/7.1928.

#### PLAN FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ARMENIAN REFUGEES IN THE REPUBLIC OF ERIVAN: DRAFT REPORT BY THE SIXTH COMMITTEE TO THE ASSEMBLY.

*Rapporteur:* Dr. W. A. RIDDELL (Canada).

At the Council meeting held on September 22nd, 1927, the High Commissioner for Refugees, Dr. Nansen, asked the Council whether there was any hope that contributions towards the realisation of the scheme for the settlement of Armenian refugees in the Republic of Erivan would be forthcoming. On the proposal of the representative of

Roumania, the Council decided to make a further appeal to all the Members of the League with a view to obtaining their financial support in favour of the scheme in question.

This decision was communicated to the various Governments by a letter from the Secretary-General of October 31st, 1927. Seventeen Governments have so far replied to this appeal. Of these, the Governments of Germany, Greece, Norway and Roumania have declared themselves disposed to contribute to the realisation of the plan. The German Government is prepared to give a deficiency guarantee to provide the organisation set up for carrying out the work with a long-term credit for the purchase in Germany of tools and machinery for the use of Armenian refugees settling in Erivan up to an amount of 1,000,000 Reichsmarks, or £50,000. This offer is made provided four other Governments at least take part in the work, that the Armenian organisations contribute £100,000 and that the work of settlement of the refugees is carried through under the auspices of the League. The Greek Government is prepared to contribute part of the cost of transporting the refugees from Greece to the Caucasus. The Norwegian Government is prepared to contribute a credit of £2,000 for the purchase in Norway of merchandise and materials which can be utilised for the proposed settlement.

The Roumanian Government is prepared to offer £1,000.

Further, the Governments of Luxemburg and the Netherlands have indicated that it may be possible for them to make some contribution.

The question was again considered by the Council on September 17th, 1928, when Dr. Nansen stated that he had received from the Armenians in Europe the sum of £100,000 towards the realisation of the scheme. In view of the help promised by the Governments of Germany, Greece, Norway and Roumania, and in view of the amount of money made available by the Armenians themselves, he would be willing to continue the work under the auspices of the League on two conditions :

(1) That the Council was able to meet the conditions made by Germany, and induce those Governments which have held out hopes of assistance to turn those hopes into definite assistance; and

(2) That the Council should obtain from the Assembly the necessary money for the administrative part of the work.

The Council decided to refer the whole question to the Assembly.

The Sixth Committee, to which the question was referred by the Assembly for consideration, adopted the following resolutions :

" I. The Sixth Committee is of opinion that the work of establishment of Armenian refugees in the Republic of Erivan should be carried on under the auspices of the League of Nations.

" II. The Council should be requested to continue negotiations with those Governments which have offered to help, in order that the conditions attached to the German Government's offer may be fulfilled.

" III. The Sixth Committee requests the Fourth Committee to allot 65,000 Swiss francs to meet the administrative expenses of the settlement."

The Fourth Committee examined the question on September 21st and decided to recommend to the Assembly to approve the insertion in the 1929 budget of 50,000 francs for this purpose.

The Sixth Committee therefore has the honour to propose to the Assembly the adoption of the following resolution :

" The Assembly decides that the work of establishment of Armenian refugees in the Republic of Erivan shall be carried on under the auspices of the League of Nations ;

" Requests the Council to continue negotiations with those Governments which have offered assistance in this work, in order that the conditions under which other offers have been made may be fulfilled ;

" Approves the inclusion in the budget of the sum of 50,000 Swiss francs to meet the administrative expenses of this work."

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### of Minutes and Annexes of Committee No. 6

#### Abbreviations

Cttee. = Committee.  
Int. = International.  
Resol. = Resolution.

	Pages		Pages
<b>Abyssinia</b>		<b>Intellectual Co-operation</b>	
Information from Abyssinian Govt. re application of provisions of Slavery Convention .....	5, 36-41, 45	Committee, work of <i>see below</i> Work of Committee, etc.	
<b>Agenda of Committee</b>		Institute, Int.	
Adoption and list of items .....	5	Contributions and subsidies to budget .....	43
Inclusion of mandates question .....	6	Work, <i>see below</i> Work of Cttee. and Institute.	
<b>Armenian Refugees, Plan for Establishment in Republic of Erivan</b>		National Committees	
Discussion in Committee .....	31-4	Establishment in certain countries and reorganisation in others ....	41
Rapporteur, appointment .....	34	Japanese, activities .....	9
Report and resol. of Sixth Cttee. ....	45-6	Meeting of representatives (proposed) .....	14
Presented by Dr. Riddell .....	35	Propaganda .....	7, 11, 12
Resolutions of Sixth Committee		Rapporteur, appointment .....	5, 26
Proposed by Dr. Nansen .....	34	Resolutions of Sixth Committee	
Proposed by Dr. Riddell .....	35, 46	Text adopted with amendments ..	22, 46, 43
<b>Arts and Letters</b>		Work of Committee and Institute	
Diffusion of literary and artistic works .	26	Discussion, general .....	6-10, 10-15
Work of Sub-Committee .....	8	Draft report of Sixth Cttee. submitted by M. Gallavresi	
<b>Associations and Foundations, Int. . .</b>	41	Discussion .....	22-6
<b>Authors' Rights, Protection of</b>		Text .....	41-3
Revision of Berne Conventions .....	13, 24, 43	<b>Intellectual Rights</b>	
<b>Bibliography of Science, Co-ordination</b> .....	42, 43	Discussion .....	7, 8, 10
<b>Books, Obstacles to the Int. Circulation of</b> .....	7, 8-9, 13, 23, 41	Revision of Berne Conventions for protection of authors' rights .....	13, 24, 43
<b>Bugge-Wicksell, Madame</b>		Work of Sub-Committee .....	41
Tributes from members of Committee ..	15, 16, 20, 22	<i>See also</i> Scientific property.	
<b>Chairman of Committee</b>		<b>Iraq, Relations with Persia</b>	
Election .....	5	Statement by Persian delegate .....	17-19
<b>Cinematograph</b>		Discussion .....	19-20, 28-29
Artistic films, encouragement .....	8	Reply by British delegate .....	27-8
Films inspired by spirit at variance with that of League .....	13, 42, 43	<b>Latin-America</b>	
<b>Close of Session</b> .....	55	Representation on Expert Sub-Committees for intellectual co-operation .....	14, 15
<b>Documents, Preservation of</b> .....	42, 43	<b>Libraries, National or Central</b>	
<b>Education Bureau, Int., Geneva</b> ..	8, 12, 24, 25, 42, 43	Creation of Information Bureau .....	26, 43
<b>Erivan Republic, Settlement of Armenians in</b>		<b>Limitation of League Expenditure</b>	
<i>See</i> Armenian refugees, etc.		Resolution communicated by Fourth Committee .....	10
<b>Institute, Int., for Intellectual Co-operation</b>		<b>Literary and Artistic Works, Diffusion</b> .	26
<i>See</i> Intellectual Co-operation—Work of Committee and Institute.		<b>Lorentz, Professor</b>	
<b>Instruction of Youth in the Aims of the League</b>		Tributes to his memory .....	7
Discussion and account of state action taken in pursuance of recommendations of Sub-Cttee. ....	7, 8, 10-11, 14	<b>Mandates</b>	
Sub-Committee of Experts, work .....	42	Discussion, general .....	5-22, 26-29
Text book, proposed preparation ...	7, 14, 22-3, 42, 43	Commission, Perm.	
		Publicity of proceedings .....	16, 20
		Work, organisation of .....	44
		Economic equality in mandated territories, principle of	
		Discussion .....	15, 17, 21, 29, 44
		Resolution of Sixth Cttee. ....	30
		Inclusion of question on agenda of Committee .....	6
		Iraq, relations with Persia	
		Statement by Persian delegate ....	17-19
		Discussion .....	19-20, 28-29
		Reply by British delegate .....	27-8

	Pages		Pages
<b>Mandates (continued).</b>		<b>Publishers, Congress of</b> .....	7
Liquor traffic and consumption		<b>Rapporteurs, Appointment of</b> 5, 6, 22, 26, 30, 34	
Discussion .....	15, 16, 21, 22, 44	<b>Refugees, Armenian</b>	
Resolution of Sixth Cttee. ....	30	<i>See</i> Armenian refugees, etc.	
Palestine		<b>Science and Bibliography</b>	
Questions raised by Int. Alliance		Work of Sub-Committee .....	42
of Women for Suffrage and Equal		<b>Scientific Property</b>	
Citizenship .....	20	Draft int. convention ...	7, 8, 11, 13, 15, 41, 43
Petitions, general question of .....	15, 16, 22	<b>Secondary Schools</b>	
Rapporteur, appointment .....	22, 30	Exchange of children in .....	6, 11, 43
Report (draft) of Sixth Committee sub-		<b>Sierra Leone</b>	
mitted by Count de Penha Garcia		Measures taken by British Govt. <i>re</i>	
• Discussion and adoption with		slavery .....	30
amendments .....	29-30	<b>Slavery Convention, Int.</b>	
Text .....	44-5	Application of provisions	
Resolution of Sixth Committee, Sept.		Information from Abyssinian deleg-	
17th, 1928 .....	29-30	ation <i>re</i> progress of abolition	
Statistical tables compiled by Secre-		Communicated to Sixth Cttee. by	
tariat		Abyssinian delegate .....	5
Report and resol. of Sixth Cttee..	30, 44, 45	Text .....	36-41
Transjordan, Agreement concluded with		Report (draft) of Sixth Cttee., sub-	
Great Britain .....	16, 21	mitted by M. Locker-Lampson	
Western Samoa, incidents in .....	16, 21, 22	Discussed and adopted .....	30
<b>Members of Committee, List of</b> .....	3-4	Text .....	45
<b>Minutes of Committee, Adoption of</b>		Resolution of Sixth Cttee., Sept.	
6, 22, 29, 31		17th, 1928 .....	30
<b>Museums</b>		Rapporteur, appointment .....	6
Educational value .....	8, 42	Ratifications and accessions .....	30, 45
Int. Museums Office, activity .....	42, 43	<b>Teachers, Exchanges of</b> .....	6, 10, 43
<b>Palestine</b>		<b>Transjordan</b>	
Child marriage in, and laws <i>re</i> offences		Agreement concluded with Great Brit-	
against women and children .....	20	ain .....	16, 21
<b>Persia</b>		<b>Translations of Literary Works</b> .....	42
Relations with Iraq, <i>see</i> Iraq, relations		<b>University Exchanges</b>	
with Persia.		Discussion .....	7, 12, 13, 24
<b>Popular Art, Congress of</b> .....	7	<i>Handbook of University Exchanges</i> ...	41
<b>Primitive Languages, Preservation</b>		<b>Vice-Chairman, Election</b> .....	5
<b>and Study of</b> .....	42, 43	<b>Western Samoa, Incidents in</b> .....	16, 21, 22
<b>Prints</b>		<b>Wicksell, Madame</b>	
Customs duties on, suppression .....	43	<i>See</i> Bugge-Wicksell, Mme.	
Preservation of prints and manuscripts.	42, 43		
<b>Publicity of Meetings of Committee</b> ...	5		
<b>Publicity of Proceedings of Mandates</b>			
<b>Commission</b> .....	16, 20		