"It is desirable that the Assembly, in electing the six non-permanent Members of the Council, should make its choice with due consideration for the main geographical divisions of the world, the great ethnical groups, the different religious traditions, the various types of civilisation and the chief sources of wealth."

The Agenda Committee states that the Assembly has already on two occasions unanimously approved the recommendation contained in the Chinese motion, there is no doubt as to your assent.

There is therefore no need to refer this motion to a Committee again; I think the best course would be for the Assembly to deal with it direct. (Asent.)

It will therefore be placed on the agenda of the next meeting.

The Assembly rose at 1.25 p.m.

EIGHTEENTH PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, September 23rd, 1924, at 10 a.m.

CONTENTS:

68. INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION:
   Report of the Second Committee.
   Resolutions.

President: M. Motta

68. — INTELLECTUAL CO-OPERATION:
   REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE:
   RESOLUTIONS.

The President:

Translation: The first item on the agenda is the examination of the Second Committee’s report on the work of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation. (Annex 10, Document A. 79 (1). 1924. VII.) The Chairman of the Second Committee is unable to attend the Assembly to-day owing to illness. I would like to offer to M. Garay our best wishes for an early recovery.

In the absence of M. Garay, I call upon M. de Brocquère, Vice-Chairman of the Second Committee, and upon the Rapporteur for this question to take their places on the platform.

M. de Brocquère, Vice-Chairman of the Second Committee, and Professor Gilbert Murray, Rapporteur, took their places on the platform amidst the applause of the Assembly.

The President:

Translation: The Rapporteur will address the Assembly.

Professor Gilbert Murray (British Empire), Rapporteur: Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen— I think there is no need for me to address the Assembly at any length on the resolutions contained in the report of the Second Committee on the work of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation. These resolutions have been very carefully discussed in the Second Committee. Moreover, as perhaps you have already noticed, the cold which has been travelling through the Assembly during these last few weeks has now made me its victim, so that I shall not be able to make myself heard at any distance.

The resolutions are rather numerous—you will see that there are ten of them and one recommendation—but there is only one question, I think, about which there has been any serious difference of opinion. I refer to the recommendation. The delegation which took the strongest view in opposition to the recommendation in the Second Committee has now been kind enough to assure me that it will not press the matter. I now therefore have pleasure in moving en bloc the resolutions and recommendation contained in document A. 79 (1). 1924. XII.

The President:

Translation: Professor René Cassin will address the Assembly.

Professor René Cassin (France):

Translation: Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen—You have just heard the report—unfortunately abridged—submitted by Professor Gilbert Murray, the distinguished delegate of the British Empire. The French delegation is glad to support all the conclusions of the Second Committee, the object of which is to enhance the utility of the work done by the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.

The French delegation is, moreover, convinced that the Assembly will recognise, as the Council has already recognised, the true purpose of the French Government, and that the League will thus shortly find in the International Institute, which is to be its property, the requisite instrument for the success of the Committee’s work.

May I, although a newcomer to this Assembly, be allowed to associate with your resolution the French disabled soldiers and ex-combatants, whose
Associations are, for the first time, represented here in the national delegation! The all-powerful resources of these federations being then to co-operate in your work could not but be fully realised by the accredited delegates of nearly all the nations of the world who constitute this Assembly.

Our disabled soldiers and ex-combatants feel that the League, in virtue of a very special bond of sympathy and by a real sentiment of solidarity. This bond is due to the fact that intellectual work is, like their own sacrifice, disinterested, and still more to the tragic condition to which both have been reduced by the war.

It is sad to record, but it is a fact which should not be overlooked, that in the countries which are slowly recovering from the appalling disaster that overtook us ten years ago, those inevitably precious gifts, human thought and human life, are at a greater discount than ever, and the undeserved suffering which has directly befallen the individual is fated to be alleviated last of all, if ever.

But out of the midst of our common misery a great hope has arisen. It seems impossible that the League, which was founded to establish justice and right, and which owes its very existence to the great thinkers who so long ago dreamed this idea among the peoples, and to the humble heroes with whose blood the League was baptised—it seems impossible, I say, that the League can live so long on the continued injustice from which these two great classes suffer. It is for the League to assist in preventing ruthless oppression by material interests.

We hope, therefore, that the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation will at last be placed in position, and that it will allow for the first time in protecting learning by means of learning, and to prevent a further reduction in the number of intellectual workers in Europe, which would be a grievous loss to civilisation.

At the same time, however, the League can and must see that at least the work of economic restoration which it has undertaken in certain States does not entail any diminution of the pensions due to disabled soldiers or the survivors of the fallen. This is the very deep and genuine wish of our French disabled soldiers.

Since the League guarantees to the different peoples a peace based on good faith, respect for treaties and an equitable distribution of burdens, they are entitled to assume that we have all the more reason to try by the war to recover gradually from their wounds, and that they will permit the innocent victims to obtain from their debtors reparations which in truth are but a dole, but all the more sacred on that account.

Nevertheless—and this is a point which I cannot over-emphasise—the hundreds and thousands of men whose sentiments I have the honour to represent here are not standing still in egoistic contemplation of their welfare but are working assiduously to attend wounds. Looking towards the future, they have vowed, despite their suffering—I should say by the very reason of their suffering—to persist in their triumphant efforts for the coming of a new world. No sooner were their arms laid down than they sought to fulfil the promises made to their brothers who fell in the cause of right, and they have co-operated in all sincerity in the work of peace undertaken by that great man, President Wilson, in the name of the Allies of the peace.

Ignoring the sceptics, they have not hesitated especially in France—to give their support and faith to those whose mission it is to combat ignorance and mistrust, the commonest sources of war and hatred; they have given their help freely to the intellectuals, the seekers, the educators, in short, to all who keep alive the flame of the spirit that has been extinguished by the war, and who in future will ensure that there will be no repetition of the intolerable suffering, and give an example of co-operation which shall become one of the most solid foundations of peace among the nations.

For this reason our associations, and among them the French Federation, have systematically co-ordinated their efforts with those of the leaders of thought and University students. This is why we are trying to make the many, alas! too many, war orphans understand the sublime sacrifice of their fathers and to make them realise what is meant by the League, the supreme motive for that sacrifice. This is why at congresses of every kind, at Brussels, Belgrade, Vienna, London, Geneva and even in America, at New Orleans, we have advocated the cause of the League before veterans of every country that fought in the war and have urged them, although, I must admit, not yet with complete success, to carry on work similar to ours.

Your cause is now being followed, even in the most remote parts of France, with the keenest attention and the greatest confidence. Those who have lived through the horrors of the war naturally cling to the three-fold and inseparable shield that alone can prevent a recurrence of war—arbitration between States, sanctions against the violators of the Covenant and the reduction of armaments, facilitated by security. Any stable work that the League can do in this connection will find in them the firm support, the support which may be expected from those who have suffered greatly and are the more fully alive to realities.

Our disabled soldiers and ex-combatants, to whom love of country is perfectly consistent with the wider love of other peoples and of peace, attach a different value to the immediate material results, even the finest, of an Assembly such as this, from the one they attach to the general questions which are essential to the development of the League and to cope with all the scourges that beset mankind.

The discussion to-day reaches, although in an almost entirely technical form, the very fount of our hopes for a legal organisation of nations and the improvement of moral disarmament of the peoples.

It is because our comrades have understood the prime importance of effective intellectual co-operation and of teaching directed in every nation towards the aim of peace, that I venture in their name to support the proposals submitted to you—proposals which are nevertheless very modest.

Finally, I request the Assembly to take the necessary step by unanimously adopting the resolutions and recommendation submitted by Professor Murray on behalf of the Second Committee. This will be a way of recognising the lofty part which intellectual work has to play side by side with other forms of activity, and of encouraging the education of young people in a spirit of wide understanding.

Before concluding, I would ask the representatives of all the nations, not only those nations which took part in the war but also those who were spared the horrors of the war, to associate more closely than hitherto ex-combatants, disabled soldiers, survivors of those who have fallen, and even those who only served in the work of peace which is being carried on in their respective countries.
The League will gain tremendously in power if the work of educating public opinion is carried on not only in a few countries but simultaneously in all countries. By the effective urging of this alliance of the intellectual classes and the masses, this union of the generation which has been sacrificed and the generation which is to come. If we are to overcome the obstacles which meet us at every turn on the path of peace, we shall have full need of the united hopes and efforts of those who think, of those who act and of those who suffer. (Applause.)

The President: Translation: Mr. Charlton delegate of Australia, will address the Assembly.

(Mr. Charlton mounted the platform amidst the applause of the Assembly.)

M. Charlton (Australia): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen—In voicing my opposition to the recommendation before the Assembly, I want to say at once that I regard the offer of the French Government as a generous one. As a public man, may I also say that the promoters of this idea are acute, keen men who look well after the national position and realise that their scheme is, from the national point of view, of vital, paramount importance for the future? To that extent I give them credit.

At the same time, examining this question internationally, as this Assembly should, I venture to say that, if such a proposal is carried in to effect, it will not work out in the manner anticipated by this Assembly. Instead of being international, it will, in a very few years, be clearly proved to bear a national aspect only.

The League of Nations was established for the purpose of dealing with international matters on an international basis. For that purpose, Switzerland was chosen as the home of the League. This being so, if it is desired to preserve this international aspect, it is necessary, in my view, to keep all the institutions which come under the League of Nations within the boundaries of the League, so that there may be no room for differences of opinion in the future, from the international point of view.

What is an international institution? In my view, an institution set up for the purpose of co-operating and collaborating with all international institutions of a similar kind. If that view is accepted, each particular institution established within a particular country must be designated as an institution and not an international institution.

If the League is to decide that it must accept all offers, however generous, which may be made for different objects from time to time, what will become of the League a few years hence? Probably, next year some other country will make an offer in regard to a particular object which should be international. If that country is good enough to make an offer accompanied by a certain sum of money, are we to establish another institution in that country and call it international? If so, where will it lead us? Will it lead us to a successful termination in regard to the question of internationalism?

I venture to say that, as a result, many other nations will decide that they cannot co-operate with an institution which, after all, is supposed to be the tree of knowledge, and which is established in one particular country. Full information having been obtained regarding certain aspects of specific subjects and historical matters, that information is disseminated to all parts of the world. How long do you think such an organisation will continue to be an international institution? Do you think it will receive that co-operation from other countries which is so essential to make it an international institution? I venture to say that you cannot expect this.

If an institution is established on the territory of the League, every nation in the world will be in sympathy with the object, will co-operate, and will supply such information as they have. By disposing of their own national institutions, knowing that it will be dealt with in a proper manner. To my mind, there is no escape from this position. Much as I applaud the action of the representatives of France in doing very much to advance to this particular matter, I say that the plan will not, perhaps, work out in practice as satisfactorily as you anticipate; for that reason, I am opposed to it.

If we have to adopt some such plan as the one before us—and I believe the idea is good—it should be carried out here under the eyes of the League and governed entirely by the League. You will tell me that the Institution, as at present suggested, will be under the jurisdiction of the League. It will to a certain extent; but it must be remembered that, as time goes on, the necessary credits will have to be voted by the French Parliament, as they would by any other Parliament, and the organisation may thus become a mere means of fermentation for renewed votes in the future. From that point of view, it is not directly under the supervision of the League.

Even if the institution were to develop and continue—though I contend that this is not possible if it is located in one particular country—I take exception to the manner in which the business is done, and wish to lodge a most emphatic protest. If the constitution of the League of Nations permits it to do so, I am prepared to admit, as every reasonable man must admit, that the Council must have great powers to administer the affairs of the League of Nations between the meetings of the Assembly, especially as regards matters of urgency. If the Assembly, however, is the superior body, I consider that when dealing with proposals such as the one now before this Assembly, which is not urgent, the Council is not justified in saying that it will accept it in principle and in asking this Assembly to draw up conditions regarding these three specific points. I consider that the duty of the Council was to submit this proposal to the Assembly, asking the Assembly whether it accepts it or not. The Assembly is paramount to the Council, and if the position is to be reversed the League of Nations will not, I am sure, continue for very long. It is against all forms of democracy.

In the recommendation regarding this matter, which is now before the Assembly, it says: "The Assembly notes that the Council has accepted, in principle, this generous gift, for which it desires to express its deepest gratitude"—practically leaving it to the Council to decide this most important and practical problem. Before the Assembly can be the highest authority of the League of Nations—merely deciding the conditions for the establishment of this institution in Paris.
I think that such a procedure is wrong. The Assembly should itself decide whether it will accept this proposal or not, and should draw up the conditions. The Council should be put in the second place, but here I notice that it occupies the first position. If it had been an urgent matter, it would have had to come before the Assembly for endorsement, but here the position is different.

In examining this matter, I have found that many members of the Assembly hold views similar to my own, but say: "The Council has accepted this, and the Council having accepted it, there is nothing for us to do but to draw up conditions which will ensure that the League acts both internationally." I insist that we cannot draw up conditions which will keep an institution international. The practical working of the Institution will decide that, when it is established, and also the people of other countries in which national institutions are established.

If we are prepared to put one particular country in the position of being the seat of culture, or to increase the prestige of one particular country by making it the seat from which all culture is disseminated, I say good-bye to the question of an international institution.

We want to see this organisation flourish, and if the idea is good, it ought to be established on a proper basis. The Institution should be established here, and the system of the League should be such that we continue, we should, from the economic point of view, have all our institutions in one centre. This would result in many economies in administration.

It will, of course, be said that these arguments do not apply in this case, because France is supplying the money. But what exactly is our position now, notwithstanding the fact that France is supplying this sum of £125,500, because that is all it is—a million francs sounds magnificent, but when worked out it only amounts to £125,500! Is it to be said that this League of Nations cannot finance an organisation that will cost £125,500? It must be borne in mind by those who say that it is necessary to accept this offer and that it will be a saving to the League, that the League of Nations has already passed it: usual budget; it has voted 150,000 Swiss francs for intellectual co-operation, a sum equal to £6,000. The other day two additional credits were voted, amounting to about £60, in connection with this Institution. So we are going to spend £660 in addition to what the French Government has offered.

It will be better in principle, better for the future welfare and success of this Institution, even if the money voted must be increased, to establish it here at Geneva rather than on territory outside that of the League.

In saying this, I do not wish to show any ill-feeling towards France. The offer is a most generous one. I do not blame France. If I were a Frenchman, I should perhaps take up the same attitude and fight for such an institution to be established in my own country. I say, however, that this is not a proper thing to do from the point of view of the League of Nations itself, and I therefore contend that we are doing wrong in agreeing to this proposal.

It is proposed that we should establish a Committee of Control. This does not make the organisation any more international. It will be regulated from the centre in which it is established and will depend upon the information distributed to the world from it and upon co-operation with similar institutions. The Institution is not likely to be successful under such conditions. It will have to deal, as we all know, with very important matters, matters that are of vital concern, as the last speaker said, to the great masses of the people throughout the world. Take, for instance, one question, that of patents. Every body knows that the inventor, right through history, has been placed on the second place, but here I notice that it occupies the first position. He has been the first in championing the people. It is not because no international arrangement existed whereby he could be protected. He has been at the mercy of individuals, syndicates or companies in the different countries, who have exploited him by leaving him in poverty while they reaped great advantages financially at the expense of the masses of the people. If this question of patents is to be dealt with universally so that something will be given to the inventor and so that, at the same time, the masses of the people will be protected from exploitation, I say that there must be a common centre.

Can it be expected that all countries will agree to co-operate with one given centre, with one nation, for this particular purpose? They would co-operate if the Institution were situated at Geneva, in neutral territory belonging to the League of Nations. They would not then hesitate to co-operate if something could be devised which would protect the inventor and the people throughout the world.

This is only one illustration. There are dozens of others. The only way in which this work can be accomplished is by keeping it within the territory of the League of Nations. I am not satisfied that the Council has the right to say that it has agreed in principle to a certain thing and to ask the delegates here, who represent every country throughout the world and who have obligations and responsibilities to discharge, also to agree to it—because the Council has so decided—subject to certain conditions which may be introduced for the purpose of working the Institution. Accordingly, I say that we cannot put in writing anything which will cover up the fact that, if this plan is to succeed—and I am afraid that it cannot possibly succeed—the world would be putting Paris and France on a pedestal by themselves. Paris would be the seat of knowledge distributing culture to all other parts of the world. This is a position which other nations will not be able to accept, much as they admire France, and nobody here admires France more than I do.

I am only adopting this attitude and speaking as I do in order to realise that the League of Nations we have to deal with things as we see them; we have to be frank. We are not here to try to work together without expressing different opinions in regard to any plan, if we happen to hold those different opinions. We are not here to sing our point of view, this institution, which should be known to the world as the greatest international institution ever created and which has for its object the establishment of peace and disarmament, will be looked upon by people outside as nothing more or less than a mutual admiration society.

It is just as well to be frank. If delegates believe conscientiously that a scheme is wrong, they should vote accordingly. If they believe it is a good principle to have intellectual co-operation in regard to these scientific and research matters, then it should be established within our own territory. The nations only supported this scheme because they believed it was international; it should be carried on at the headquarters of the League, on neutral territory, as it were. It would ill become the nations, if they think this work should be done, to refuse to find the necessary money to enable it to be done within the territory of the League.

This is the last thing that I charge the delegates about disruption, and I ask this Assembly not to adopt the proposal. I have not a vote myself, but I know how I should vote if I had one. Without the slightest hesitation I ask the delegates to deal
conscientiously with this matter on its merits. If they believe it is not in the best interests of the League that this organisation should be established outside its territory, it is their duty to vote against the proposal.

The President:

Translation: M. Pitanic, delegate of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, and Professor at Ljubljana University, will address the Assembly. (Applause.)

Dr. Pitanic (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen—The most important and most interesting event that has happened during this session of the Assembly of the League, in connection with the work of intellectual co-operation, is, without doubt, the generous offer and gift of the French Government. We associate ourselves, with the greatest joy and heartiness, with the thanks expressed to the French Government from so many sides.

France has always been anxious to spread culture and civilization beyond her own boundaries, and it is especially our country which has partaken of French generosity in the sphere of intellectual development. Therefore, it is our simple duty, while congratulating and thanking the French nation for the magnificent gift it has given to all the nations, to remember what she has done so many times for the nation which I now have the honour to represent.

The gift having been accepted by the Council, it is now the task of the Assembly to answer the questions asked by the Council. It is evident that, apart from the proper working and the administration of the new Institute, it is mainly the safeguarding of its international character which has preoccupied the Council as well as the Second Committee.

It seems to us that the solution, which has been found in the Committee after a long discussion, is a very good one. Yet, we venture to add that, as in the province of national laws and constitutions, so also with regard to the international document concerning the administration of the Institute, it is not only the document which is of importance, but equally, and even more, the spirit in which it is carried out. The carrying out of the scheme in a real international way depends, however, not only upon the administration, but upon us, upon all of us, great and small nations alike. The larger the number of nations which use this Institute, the more will it become international—just as the League itself will become more fully international—and the more the nations will knock at the door. Briefly, the securing and maintaining of the internationality of the new Institute depends chiefly upon the co-operation offered by the different nations. In this respect, we shall try to collaborate as much as possible.

In order to contribute to the practical carrying out of the idea of intellectual co-operation, we took the liberty of proposing in the Second Committee an additional clause to the seventh resolution contained in the very interesting report of that distinguished man of learning, Professor Gilbert Murray, dealing with the question of facilitating journeys of professors and students for scientific purposes.

The addition reads that the States may be invited to found scholarships in order to make such scientific journeys and studies possible. The proposal was readily accepted by Professor Gilbert Murray and the Committee. Moreover, the new Institute can in this respect be of great value as an intermediary.

It has often been said that intellectual co-operation is a province in which the aims of the League of Nations can be attained in the most peaceful and loyally constructive way. May I add now, when so much is being talked about the problem of security, that there is only one absolute security for the peace of the world? This security rests in the mind and the good-will of mankind. No treaty, no covenant, no diplomatic instrument, and no limitation of armaments—though I do not underrate these means—but only education, interchange of ideas, a knowledge of one another, an understanding of and respect for one another—briefly, intellectual and moral co-operation—can provide the best security for the world. However, even then only be fully attained when love, brotherhood and self-denial are not only written in treaties and covenants, when these virtues are not only on our tongues, but when they dwell in our hearts and form an essential and inseparable part of our minds. To form such a mind is the noblest and loftiest task of intellectual co-operation. (Applause.)

The President:

Translation: M. de Halsecki, delegate of Poland and Professor at Warsaw University, will address the Assembly.

(M. de Halsecki mounted the platform amidst the applause of the Assembly.)

M. de Halsecki (Poland):

Translation: Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen—I, in the Second Committee I had the honour to set forth the reasons for which Poland welcomed the steady progress made by the League of Nations in the field of intellectual co-operation.

I do not propose to go over the same ground here.

As regards the particularly important question of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation which it is proposed to found, the clear and lucid explanations contained in Professor Murray’s admirable report made, I thought, any misunderstanding impossible. We have, however, just listened to an eloquent appeal to all delegates to reconsider this important question, and I feel it my duty to respond to this request.

I have two reasons for doing so. First, countries, which have found their own, have revived to a new life and have resumed the normal course of their intellectual activity, founded great hopes upon the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation. The latter has done its utmost to respond to their desires, and we were all deeply moved by the words spoken on this subject by the delegate of the British Empire in the Second Committee. Owing, however, to the limitation of its means and the lack of the implements of labour, many of the Committee’s ambitions still remain impracticable, and consequently we feel great joy at the magnificent prospect opened before us, thanks to the proposal of the French Government.

This proposal—and I now come to my second reason—has aroused similar hopes in other and no less an important circle. It is no mere coincidence that, at this moment, an international congress of students is meeting in one of Poland’s old university towns. These students, I am certain, are looking to us at this hour and with great confidence. This confidence is not only the special resolutions which encourage the activities of students’ associations, but also the all-important resolution referring to the Institute of International Co-operation, which will at length enable the Committee to afford these young people, upon whom depends the future of the
League not merely platonistic encouragement but a full measure of support.

Allow me to tell you why, in my humble opinion, the proposal made by the French Government does nevertheless appear to give rise to certain difficulties. The reason is very simple; it is because the work in Paris is not a question of fact, the first occasion on which, instead of coming before you to complain of the financial burdens imposed upon its Members by the League, a Government has made a spontaneous and complete offer of practical co-operation which exceeds the obligations contracted by it.

It is said that the new Institute will be established elsewhere than at the seat of the League and that it will not be immediately incorporated in the administrative machinery of the League.

In this connection I would draw the Assembly's attention to an article in the Covenant which has not yet received the consideration it deserves. I refer to Article 24, which explicitly stipulates that there may be in different parts of the world international institutions which, though not incorporated in the machinery of the League, will be affiliated to the League by a special agreement, which must be defined in each particular case.

If the great French government case is not wholly analogous and that, contrary to the existing provisions for the various international bureaux, the expenses of the new Institute will, at the outset, be borne exclusively by France. To my mind, however, this difference can only be regarded as disadvantageous to the latter Government, which, moreover—as the French delegates have frequently stated—would be happy if other Governments would share in the work.

It is true that Article 24 speaks of the "direction" of the League. As the Assembly is aware, according to the interpretation which has been given to that article, this means merely a somewhat vague moral patronage, whereas in the particular case which we are considering the entire administration of the Institute, including its financial control and the appointment of its staff, will be entrusted to an organisation set up by the Council of the League—I refer to the International Committee on the utilisation of its knowledge and experience. I have no doubt that this will be done to the Committee appointed by the League to which I have just referred.

The President: (Applause.)

I think I need say no more on the legal and constitutional aspects of the matter. What is more important is to decide whether, in the case in question, the seat selected for the Institute is suitable for the work of the League. I have therefore asked the Institute, which the Committee appointed by the League to which I have just referred adequately to provide all the necessary guarantees to assure the international character of the new Institute. I will not, of course, enumerate the many international scientific institutions which, both before and since the foundation of the League, have selected Paris for their seat and are fully satisfied with their choice. One need only mention the Office international d'Hygiène publique, with which the League is already in close cooperation, and the Bureau international des poids et mesures, which is of vital importance in the development of scientific research.

As a Polish intellectual worker, I must in all loyalty discharge what is a simple but necessary duty in bearing witness here to the fact that, after our unsuccessful attempts at insurrection in the nineteenth century, when Polish thought was unable to develop freely in any quarter of the world, it was France which, on two notable occasions to Paris, where it found an opportunity of free development untainted by alien influences. As was said by one of our poets, yearning for his distant motherland, the works in which our national genius found full, original and independent expression were conceived on the pavements of Paris. Here you have assurances which are not based upon or influenced by political feeling or political circumstances, but definite facts in intellectual history. I will give a more recent instance. As you are all aware, an illustrious daughter of Poland, Madame Curie-Skłodowska, has gone to the University, while remaining a professor at my own University of Warsaw. Madame Curie has never forgotten the country of her birth. The members of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation have come to the conclusion that, if Madame Curie may now be said to have two countries, she has but gained thereby a wider and deeper understanding of international life.

I now come to my second and last question: Is the Committee which I have just mentioned imbued with a spirit which affords every guarantee that it will faithfully maintain the international character of the new Institute?

Those of you who have had time to peruse the many documents emanating from the Committee have, I am sure, found in them abundant proof that this is so. Not to detain you too long, I will give you only a single instance—the welcome offered by the Chairman of the Committee, the great German scientist, to the French delegation. As far as I know, to the great German scientist upon his joining the Committee. M. Béranger's words made a deep impression, even in the summary form in which they were given in the Minutes, and they will never be forgotten by anyone who had the privilege to hear them. At first he applauded the German scientist for converting the masses in ever-increasing numbers to a belief in his lofty speculations and for awakening in them a zeal for pure and disinterested research. Later, he hoped to see yet another conversion, the conversion of intellectual workers, in ever-growing numbers, to the great scientist's conception of the international relations which both before and during the war was identical with that of the League.

With these noble words echoing in my ears, I have the honour, on behalf of the intellectual workers of Poland, to pay a tribute to the French Government for its lofty manifestation, in our days of trial, in the struggle of its knowledge and worth. May I, through you, address to them this message: we shall be happy to see yet another conversion, the conversion of intellectual workers, in ever-growing numbers, to the great scientist's conception of the international relations which both before and during the war was identical with that of the League.

With these noble words echoing in my ears, I have the honour, on behalf of the intellectual workers of Poland, to pay a tribute to the French Government for its lofty manifestation, in our days of trial, in the struggle of its knowledge and worth. May I, through you, address to them this message: we shall be happy to see yet another conversion, the conversion of intellectual workers, in ever-growing numbers, to the great scientist's conception of the international relations which both before and during the war was identical with that of the League.

The President: (Applause.)

Translation: Sir Muhammad Rafique, delegate of India, will address the Assembly.

Sir Muhammad Rafique (India): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen—When the distinguished scholar whose report we are now considering presented it to the Second Committee, it was especially welcomed as sounding a note of useful criticism. I have no note of criticism to offer now, but only a few suggestions, which I trust will receive the attention of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.

We have no definite proposal before us, and we cannot be blind to the fact that it has aroused differences of opinion in the Assembly. On the question at issue, I offer no opinion: on the principle which lies behind it, may I say this? The work must go on. If, therefore, it is decided, in order to maintain the essentially international
character of our intellectual co-operation, that it should continue to be centred at Geneva, then it is our plain duty to see that it is sufficiently provided with funds. None of us can regard lightly the words of the Rapporteur that this work is in danger of falling for lack of funds. If, therefore, we are unable to accept the financial help offered to us, we must provide the necessary funds from our own resources.

I speak strongly, because in my country learning has always been revered for its own sake. The Rishis, the wise men, were the most honourable figures in our heroic age. The tie which binds the pupil to his guru, or teacher, is one of the strongest we know and is severed only by death. Learning is the one force which knows no nationality, no territorial boundaries; it is international in the fullest sense of the term. A better understanding of each other's intellectual thought, co-operation in stimulating each other's intellectual thought, is therefore the life blood of the League of Nations; unless we maintain this movement in full vigour we cannot advance surely towards our goal, the brotherhood of man.

On behalf of India, then, I beg to express my cordial agreement with the principles underlying the desirability of intellectual co-operation. It is obvious that there will be differences of opinion regarding certain details, but what really matters is the appreciation of the main proposal of promoting contact between the different peoples of all countries and of educating the younger generation in the ideals of world peace and solidarity. I venture to think that without some such scheme the work of the League itself would have remained incomplete.

When one visualises the future, one can well imagine the large and important part which the young people, trained in the early impressionable period of their lives to respect and admire what is best in every culture and civilisation, are bound to play in the recognition of international co-operation as the only right and satisfactory method of conducting world affairs. Much of our present trouble would never have come into existence if we, while young, had been thoroughly schooled in the principles of tolerance and universal brotherhood produced by common understanding and sympathy.

As an Indian, I feel happy and proud to think that the culture of my country, unfortunately not so well understood in the West as it ought to be, is slowly but surely making its way through the future under the influence of the great community consent, it did in the past, contribute its own share to the attainment of the ideals on which the League is established. I have not the slightest doubt that by the efforts of the Committee the culture of India will be more widely appreciated and spread than it is to-day.

I am one of those who maintain that the peace and progress of humanity depend on the mutual understanding and co-operation of the East and the West. In the distant past the East kept burning the torch which imparted light of learning to the far-off corners of the world. Had I the time, I would enumerate the services of the East in the various domains of human thought and activity. I am happy to say, and I may say with confidence, that India's capacities and resources are not exhausted; she is still a living intellectual force, ready and eager to place her services at the disposal of the world, if only she is given a chance of doing so.

The East, and especially my country, I may be permitted to remark, has many valuable thoughts to offer for the enrichment of the world's literature, science and philosophy, if only her sciences and institutions are properly understood and studied. Take the example of Hindu culture, the proud inheritance of the vast majority of my countrymen, and you will find that, before the dawn of history in the West, it taught the lessons of universal brotherhood and universal peace for the acceptance of which this illustrious gathering is working to-day. The achievements of our countrymen in the past are beyond dispute; their achievements to-day are worthy of serious notice.

The work of this Committee will gain in strength and value if it is kept in vivid contact with our numerous universities—not only with the older seats of learning, modelled on Western institutions, but with the great Hindu and Moslem universities brought into being by the combined efforts of the Government, of the Princes, and of the people of India, and where a great renaissance of Indian culture is bursting into vigorous life.

In India we have our learned societies, some of them over a century old, and cultural organisations depending on the devotion and self-sacrifice of learned men, some known to fame and others content to labour in obscurity; through the hope, I have every hope, will be able to render valuable assistance to the work we are considering at this moment. Knowing the young men of my country as I do, I make bold to prophesy that, given adequate facilities and encouragement, they will rise to their own culture and civilisation, prove excellent pioneers and propagandists of the principles which we all desire universally to see recognised and acted upon in the world.

With you, permit me, sir, I wish to express my gratification at the response made by many countries to the appeal for books and publications on behalf of the library of the University of Tokio. This is as it should be. Our aim will only be attained when institutions in all the civilised countries, Members of the League, are treated alike in this as well as in all other matters.

I am here to acknowledge the debt we owe to the European savants who opened the storehouse of Eastern learning to the West and at the same time stimulated our own interest in our rich culture. I am here to proclaim the contribution which India is able and ready to make to the world's store of knowledge from her own treasures, which are increasing every day through the work of her devoted sons. I am here to declare the message which India has to give to the West, drawn from her deep and diffused spirituality, from her respect for ascetic ideals, from her rare capacity for sacrificry and from her vast intellectual considerations. Finally, I am here to proclaim my confidence that the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation is the instrument for this fusion of Eastern and Western culture, to the infinite advantage of both.

Not through Eastern windows only,
When daylight comes, comes in the light;
In front the sun climbs slow, slow;
But westward look, the land is bright.

(Appause.)

The President:

Translation: M. de Bronckère, Vice-Chairman of the Second Committee, will address the Assembly. (Applause.)

M. de Bronckère (Belgium), Vice-Chairman of the Second Committee:

Translation: Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen—When I entered my name yesterday on the list of speakers for this discussion, I could not but feel, on seeing the names of our eminent Rapporteur and of so many distinguished speakers, that I could turn nothing new to the discussion, and
now, when the President calls upon me to speak, this conviction is borne in upon me still more strongly.

Nevertheless, I trust that the very candour of my confession on mounting this platform will bring me your forgiveness—as is the case to-day—when we are solemnly inaugurating the birth of a new institution, those responsible receive from this platform the congratulations of the delegates of the States most nearly concerned.

There are perhaps a number of objections to this practice, but there is also a great deal to be said in its favour, and it would in my view be a matter of profound regret if the practice were given up at the very moment when we are dealing with intellectual co-operation, which those outside our gates have sometimes accused us of neglecting. In order to make clear the nature of my speech, which is a kind of inaugural discourse, I should like to commence, as is the custom, with a truism.

We are witnessing to-day the modest beginning of what is a great thing. I cannot claim that intellectual co-operation is a new thing; I am glad to say that it has long been known in the world. If we wished to set a precise date to so great an event as the birth of intellectual co-operation, we might say that it first gained notice in France, 130 years ago to-day, at the moment when the illustrious Permanent Secretary of the Académie des Sciences, the philosopher Condorcet, true to himself and to his ideals, consented to martyrdom. He deferred for a few days the moment of his surrender to the executioner in order to gain time to write what he intended to be his own testament and the philosophic testament of his age—his Nouvelle Atlantide, the most wonderful and complete scheme of intellectual co-operation which had ever been conceived up to that time.

It was the year 1793—I trust you will pardon me for dwelling upon this point—which marked the end of the old regime and the beginning of the new, not for France alone but for the world. It was the beginning of a new year in which took place innumerable political changes. This was the year of the birth of that conception which, in face of innumerable difficulties, will make its triumphant progress throughout the world, that conception which may be summarised in two words—democratic government and the brotherhood of nations. These are the ideas on which the League of Nations is based. It is not without interest to recall that the world gave birth in the same hour and in the same circumstances of painful travail to these two ideas, so close akin—intellectual co-operation and the League of Nations.

Just now I heard one of our colleagues—and I trust you will allow me to make this passing observation—accuse France in somewhat bitter terms of a kind of usurpation. But we should, I think, remember that France is to a certain extent entitled on historical grounds to house, not the League of Nations' Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, but the League of Nations' first International Intellectual Co-operation, a juridical claim to which I refer is clear and we may recall it now.

The idea of intellectual co-operation is not new. Indeed, even if I had not already spoken of the great example of France in 1793, I might remind you of the more recent example of Belgium, the intellectual claim to which I refer is clear and we may recall it now.

It has become a truism to say that my country, which stands at the crossing-place of so many highways, is exposed to war, because men more often meet together to fight than to come to an understanding or to organise. But through the very fact that our country stands at the meeting-place of many roads, it has often formed a channel for the export of ideas. Since then we have long learned to regard Brussels as one of the chief centres of co-operation, and a large number of international associations have been founded in our country.

Those who have steadfastly toiled and laboured, often with modest means, and sometimes in the face of indifference and even of hostility, have at length created in Belgium centres of intellectual co-operation to which at this very moment the League of Nations is rendering a solemn and, I will add, an unwonted tribute by endorsing the resolution now before you and so placing them, as it were, on the agenda of the League.

The idea of intellectual co-operation is not new, and, as I reminded you just now, if we were witness to the modest beginning of a great movement, the League of Nations is not dealing to-day for the first time with intellectual co-operation.

Two years have elapsed since the League created the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation; but I venture to say that it would perhaps be better not to dwell too much on the origin of the League's work on intellectual co-operation, and that our reputation will stand higher if history throws a discreet veil over these beginnings.

We have been privileged—though perhaps we have hardly deserved it—to secure the collaboration of some of the foremost personalities of our time—Einstein, Bergson, Mme Curie, Lorentz and many others, apart from those present in this Assembly. Yet after two years of unremitting labour they have had to admit that, although they have explored every possibility and tried every means of accomplishing some real achievement, they have everywhere encountered the same difficulties—and that the League will not give them the requisite funds.

Gentlemen, we have not been generous to intellectual co-operation! I have heard it said in certain quarters that we can do no more, and that the world is not rich enough to afford an elaborate programme of intellectual co-operation. I thereupon worked out how much the League of Nations' subsidy to intellectual co-operation costs the world. I based my calculation on the ratio of intellectual currency, that of America. Taking the smallest unit of that currency, the cent, I reached the following conclusion: In the most heavily taxed countries intellectual co-operation costs one cent per head a little less than once every century; in the most lightly taxed nation it only costs one cent per head just over once every hundred centuries. (Laughter.)

The world may not be very rich, but I think this can hardly be called an exorbitant charge for its intellectual development.

In this Assembly I have rarely heard proposals to increase the subsidies which we grant, and it was with the greatest satisfaction that, a few moments before mounting this platform, I first heard a generous offer put forward.

I heard an Australian delegate say: We only give £6,000 between us; let us make an effort and give £12,000. Unfortunately, it appears that the Australian Government are not prepared to make the condition attached to it; the proposal, when stripped of the verbal reservations which surround it, is that the League might give an additional £6,000 to intellectual co-operation on condition that it renounced the £6,000 offered by the French Government. The transaction can hardly be termed a profitable one.
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A great deal has been said about this sum of £12,000, and I am glad to see the generous offer, which deserves to be greeted with gratitude and applause, expressed in terms of English currency. This offer may have a most favourable effect on our future efforts, although, as the Australian delegate, the amount of our sum actually is very small, and £12,000 is nothing compared with the sum necessary to provide the whole world with a proper organisation for intellectual co-operation. It is only a beginning, but it is a beginning which should encourage other countries, and as Australia, having expressed this sum in terms of her own currency, sees for herself that it is a small one, she will find it all the easier to display the liberality which we expect from every nation and will outbid France in a generous rivalry which will be to the benefit of intellectual co-operation.

I told you that I would not detain you for long, and I will keep my promise. One word more and I have done.

I would like to reply to two objections which have been raised to the recommendation of the Second Committee. It has been contended that, if we accept France’s offer and fix the seat of the first Institute of Intellectual Co-operation at Paris, we shall encourage other countries, and as Australia, placing her in a privileged position. But why should the existence of this first International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation prevent the creation of other similar institutes? Do you seriously believe that an enterprise which was planned on so vast a scale when originally conceived by Condorcet at the end of the eighteenth century can be achieved by a single institute working in a single direction? Further, can we accept the contention that the best way to foster the Australian delegate that all work connected with intellectual co-operation must necessarily be concentrated in one and the same place? A few moments’ reflection must make it clear that the centralisation of the whole work of intellectual co-operation in a single place is a material and moral impossibility.

I am reminded of a project which bears some resemblance to the Australian delegate’s somewhat too specific attention. In the interests of symmetry and simplicity a new plan was proposed for Paris—or so Edmond About asserts in his novel “L’homme à l’oreille cassée”. According to this plan the Imperial Palace would be in the centre, around which all the houses of the great and the humble of France would be built, and so on in concentric circles around the Imperial palace the houses of the different classes of society. The plan was simplicity itself, but it was too simple to be practicable. I very much fear that the scheme of co-operation which has just been outlined is also too simple to be feasible.

May I be allowed to submit one or two objections? Intellectual co-operation, I take it, means co-operation in thought. In the interests of a specific branch of learning, all the artists, all research workers, all historians, and so on, for the purpose of co-ordinating their work to attain a specific end. Suppose for the sake of argument that oceanographical researches of great interest are being pursued in different parts of the world. It is essential that they should be carried out on a combined plan. Would anyone dream of placing the seat of an international institute of oceanography at Genoa? But if someone were to say that its proper place would be on the sea-coast if you wanted to found an international institute for scholarly research work, for which a quantity of rare books must be consulted, you will have to place it in one of the three big cities which have the most important libraries—Paris, London or Washington. My point is sufficiently clear and I need say no more.

Human thought is not an artificial thing which can be pruned, as trees are pruned by gardeners, into all sorts of fantastic shapes. It develops spontaneously according to the laws of life, and there is a geography of science, a geography of thought, and a geography of cultural relations which makes such-and-such a place suitable for one purpose and not for another.

I will quote another example to make my point clearer. We have had our dreams of intellectual co-operation on a small scale in my city, Brussels. The occasion was the construction of our university.

We had been offered a magnificent piece of ground on which all our institutes were to be built, but when we came to study the problem, we were forced to recognise that what was suitable for a Botanical Institute was not suitable for a Faculty of Law, while a place that was suitable for the Faculty of Law was not suitable for the School of Medicine, and so on. We were therefore obliged to build our institutes in different parts of the town. It is clear, therefore, that there are even more cogent reasons why intellectual co-operation should be established in different parts of the world, one can hardly expect each country to make the same mistakes we made.

I repeat, the French institute will be the first, but you may be sure that others will follow. There is work for all, and no willing offers should be rejected. (Applause.)

We are told that France has acted generously, but that she will thereby gain an unfair advantage because other countries will not imitate her generous action.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, that will depend on the rest of us. I am not worried, and I think France’s generous example will be followed. It is for this reason that I see in this proposal the beginning of a big thing. I think that, henceforward, every country will be forced to follow in France’s footsteps. They will have to do so by that irresistible force which we call the logic of circumstances.

Yes, the creation of the first institute at Paris will give France a great scientific advantage and a great moral advantage. The more intellectual co-operation, and the more the intellect does play a certain part in the world, this great scientific and moral advantage will eventually become a political advantage.

This is where the other countries will become involved. The French will certainly be able to let France keep this political advantage. They will realise that intellectual co-operation is something concrete, something real, that it constitutes an element of power, and they will be forced to try and gain this element for themselves. They will be forced into competition and will finally understand, what they perhaps failed to understand at first, the utility of intellectual co-operation. The battle will then be won for science and learning and the consequences will be far-reaching for our work and for mankind. In this connection I would like to recall the eloquent words of one of the previous speakers—namely, that it is by ensuring intellectual co-operation that we can really ensure peace.

The work of the First and Third Committees is undoubtedly of the most urgent importance. We shall hail the successful conclusion of that work with the greatest satisfaction and shall congratulate our colleagues on their achievement. As soon as the League of Nations, which spells co-operation among the peoples, was conceived, it became clear that political co-operation was a primary condition for the fusion of good intentions.
which were often in conflict. The next stage was to ensure economic co-operation and to discipline and co-ordinate the great material forces which have so often clashed and have caused so many wars. The third step is to remember that man is a rational being, whose efforts may be directed towards evil as well as towards good, that the intellect is a supreme force and that the only method of establishing peace on a firm basis is to dispel hatred and disarm the mind. This aim will not be attained until thinkers all over the world have learnt to work together and to acquire that feeling of brotherhood which is born of common endeavour.

I repeat, intellectual co-operation is not a conception of minor importance. It is the very basis of our work, and not until we have won intellect to our side will the peace of the world be established on a secure foundation. (Loud applause.)

The President:

Translation: There are still the names of Sir James Allen and M. de Jouvenel on my list of speakers. Although it is now somewhat late, I am sure that, in view of the importance of the discussion, all our colleagues will remain until the vote is taken.

Sir James Allen, delegate of New Zealand, will address the Assembly.

(On mounting the platform, Sir James Allen was greeted with the applause of the Assembly.)

Sir James Allen (New Zealand): Mr. President and delegates—I desire to endorse the remarks that were made by my colleague from Australia with regard to the action of the Council in accepting the gift of France, when it had an opportunity of referring the question to the Assembly. It is very essential, in my judgment, that the privileges of the Assembly should be safeguarded as far as possible. There was no necessity for hurry, on this occasion, in accepting the gift. It may be said that the Council has not committed the Assembly; but it is very difficult indeed for the Assembly to reverse a decision of the Council, and I think that it would be a breach of faith, or almost a breach of faith, towards France were the Assembly to do so after the Council has given its judgment.

I also want to endorse the remarks of my colleague from Australia with respect to the international character of these organisations. I do not think that their internationalism can be sustained for any length of time unless they are absolutely under the control of the League and are located at the headquarters of the League at Geneva. When this organisation for intellectual co-operation was started two years ago, I felt it my duty to vote against the appropriation proposed. I have watched the work of that organisation for the last two years. Although I have nothing whatever to say with respect to intellectual co-operation itself, except that I value it as every one of us does, the question arose two years ago, and arises again to-day, as to whether this organisation for intellectual co-operation was an organisation which we were justified in setting up under the Covenant of the League. My conclusion at the time was that the Covenant of the League did not cover organisations of this kind and I have consistently voted against the appropriation.

After watching the work of intellectual co-operation during the last two years, I have come to the conclusion that had I the opportunity of exercising my vote again I should do exactly what I did two years ago. I should vote against it. I venture to ask the members of the Assembly whether really I can say that during these two years the work of the organisation for intellectual co-operation has done much to create the atmosphere which it was hoped that it would create. Is it not safe to say that during the last three or four weeks in which this organisation has probably been the sphere of good-will has been created which intellectual co-operation alone would not have been able to create in half a century?

I want to help my Australian colleague. I do not know whether he is going so far as to vote against the report of the Second Committee. It is rather a serious thing to do that. Should he do so, I will vote with him. I want my fellow-members to understand that in doing so I believe I am serving the best interests and the past purposes of the League. If we are to encourage the creation of these organisations—and I think that it is very doubtful whether they come within the terms of the Covenant—I cannot see where the end will be. Intellectual co-operation is not the only kind of co-operation which may be created among the nations belonging to the League and those which do not belong to the League. Already, two speakers, who have dealt with the question in the Second Committee, have referred to the possibility of the extension of these organisations. This necessarily means an extension of the budgetary provisions which the League will have to make.

I want to assist my colleague from Australia and, if he does call for a vote, I shall vote with him.

The President:

Translation: M. Henry de Jouvenel, delegate of France, will address the Assembly.

M. Henry de Jouvenel (France):

Translation: Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen—I respect your time as much as I do the national genius of the different peoples. I will therefore confine myself to thanking briefly the Rapporteur, Professor Gilbert Murray, who is so welcome a figure at this Assembly, and the speakers who followed him, especially M. de Brocckère, M. Pitamie and M. de Halseki, who have so clearly interpreted the views of France. These views, as M. de Brocckère very rightly pointed out, are in keeping with the traditions of my country.

Unlike my colleague, the delegate for New Zealand, France has always felt, as M. Pitamie has just said, that there can be no League of Nations in the fullest sense, that there can be no material disarmament and security so long as there is no moral security, that is to say, until it has been borne in upon every single individual that all nations are interdependent.

This is the function of intellectual co-operation, and I must ask the delegate for Australia to forgive me if at a time when everything should be international the money alone should be French. It is not the fault of France if intellectual co-operation has not hitherto met with financial co-operation.

Two years ago, when my colleague M. Reynald, the delegate of France, asked this Assembly for a slight increase in the credits voted for the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, what was the reply of the delegate for Australia? He said: "We were told by a number of distinguished men that we should not vote any funds at all for this purpose", and that "the co-operation would quite well be found by private individuals." The only private individual who has come forward up to the present is France. France has responded to Australia's invitation, and does not regret doing so, for she has at any rate met with a cordial reception from the other States. (Loud applause.)
The President:

Translation: As no one else wishes to speak, the discussion is closed.
The vote will now be taken.
The Rapporteur proposes that the different points of the resolution should be adopted as a whole.
Before we take a vote, Sir Littleton Groom, delegate of Australia, will address the Assembly.

Sir Littleton Groom (Australia): I should just like to make one or two remarks upon this very important matter.
My colleague has made his protest, but I am quite sure that he never intended to say one word which would injure the feelings of our French friends.
He wanted only to emphasize the question of principle—nothing more than that—and the definite principle in view was this, that, when a League of Nations has been established, with its agencies somewhat in the nature of secretariats, the latter should be concentrated at the seat of Government, as far as possible. This was the only principle involved, and my colleague expressed, as I also have expressed, his appreciation of France's generosity in coming forward to try and fill a gap in this matter of intellectual co-operation and development throughout the world.
I speak as a university man from Australia. I am Australian born and I have been educated at an Australian university. I believe that the universities of the world can do much, by spreading a proper spirit throughout the world, to encourage the peace of the nations and the spreading of the finest ideas possible among the peoples.
Those who listened this morning to the magnificent speech made by the Indian delegate, Sir Muhammad Rafiqulla, must echo his sentiments that each nation should be asked to contribute the best of its art, its literature, its science, and its philosophy. Art and science, literature and philosophy, have no boundaries. They are the common possessions of the nations of the world.
My colleague, Mr. Charlton, will echo that sentiment too, but his protest in the Second Committee was to the effect that we should be careful at this time, when we are establishing the League of Nations, that we do not base our work, at the outset, on wrong principles. I am sure that his protest was right. We in Australia are establishing a Federal nation all over the continent and we are trying to create a national sentiment, just as you are trying to create an international sentiment. In my capacity as chief delegate for Australia I would not exercise my vote in order to prevent this proposal being carried out. My only desire is to let you know that, so far as that aspect is concerned, the principle has our sympathy.
We seek the good-will of you all, and we believe that you, with your large hearts, will accept in a spirit becoming to the older nations the criticism which comes from the younger. We are here to advance intellectual co-operation. At the same time, with all diffidence, we feel that we ought to let you know—if we think the path indicated is not the path along which we should travel—where exactly, in our opinion, it goes astray. In that way we think that we also may contribute by some element of wisdom to the well-being of the League of Nations.
(Applause.)

The President:

Translation: I asked Sir Littleton Groom to speak after the close of the discussion because I understood that he wished to explain the reason for his vote. I am glad that I took this course, because we find there is now no opposition to the resolutions submitted by the Second Committee. The honourable delegate of New Zealand announced that he would make his adverse vote conditional upon the adverse vote of Australia. As Australia is no longer opposed to the resolutions, the opposition of New Zealand is thereby removed also. This is the result, and recommendation before the Assembly are as follows:

1. The Assembly records with great satisfaction the fact that the system of forming national committees on intellectual co-operation is making steady progress. It requests the Council to make further representations to the Governments of those States which have not yet formed such national committees, inviting them to promote the creation of such committees and, if possible, to give them financial support in their work of mutual assistance in intellectual matters.

2. The Assembly shares the opinion of the Council that it would be highly desirable to convene a conference of experts to consider the various problems raised by the question of scientific property, especially in the report of Senator Baffini and the replies of the various Governments regarding this question. It requests the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation to organize such a meeting in 1925, after consultation with the Economic Committee.

3. The Assembly notes with satisfaction the important results obtained by the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation in regard to the co-ordination of bibliographical work in the domains of physics, and requests the Committee to undertake a similar task with regard to the other sciences, and, in the first place, with regard to the social sciences.

4. The Assembly, noting that the Council has approved in principle the draft agreement with the Institut international de Bibliographie at Brussels approves this agreement.

5. The Assembly adopts the report of the Committee of Experts on the international exchange of publications. It relies on the good offices of the Belgian Government to obtain the partial adherences to the Brussels General Convention of 1886, provided for in the first resolution of the Committee of Experts.

It also requests the Council to invite all States, whether signatories of the Convention or not, to consider the possibility of accepting the new Convention for the Exchange of Scientific and Literary Publications proposed by the Committee.

6. The Assembly instructs the International University Information Office to embody in one draft all the recommendations of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation in university matters.

In view of the proposals made by the Spanish Government at the fourth Assembly and the suggestion made at the Second Committee by the Persian delegate with regard to the equivalence of degrees, the Assembly asks all States to communicate what steps they have taken, or intend to take, in the direction indicated by the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, with a view to attaining, as far as possible, the aims referred to in the said proposals.

7. The Assembly, noting with satisfaction that a considerable number of States have replied favourably to the recommendation adopted last year that students should be provided with special travelling facilities, invites all the States:

(a) To consider favourably applications from students for scholarships for measures to facilitate interchanges of students;

(b) To grant similar travelling facilities to duly qualified teachers and scholars going abroad in the interests of science.
(c) To found scholarships for the purposes indicated in paragraphs (a) and (b).

8. The Assembly, being convinced of the necessity of solidarity among the nations, and having witnessed the results of such solidarity in certain countries in the sphere of economics and finance, could be happy to see this principle applied in the sphere of intellectual life.

It invites the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation to examine and, if necessary, to refer to the Financial Committee the question of an international loan, under the supervision of the League of Nations, intended exclusively for intellectual development in the countries of those Members of the League which may desire it.

9. The Assembly expresses the wish that the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation should make —under the Council’s authority—the same appeal to the universities, academies and other scientific bodies, on behalf of the intellectual workers of Hungary, which it made in November 1922 on behalf of the intellectual workers in Austria. The Council is respectfully asked to act with regard to that matter in the same way as it acted in the case of Austria.

10. The Assembly,

Being convinced of the fundamental importance of familiarising young people throughout the world with the principles and work of the League of Nations, and of training the younger generation to regard international co-operation as the normal method of conducting world affairs:

In view of the resolutions adopted by the fourth Assembly regarding the encouragement of contact between young persons of different nationalities, and concerning the instruction of youth in the ideals of the League of Nations:

Is of opinion that further steps should be taken to promote these objects;

And therefore instructs the Secretariat to investigate the means by which efforts to promote contact and to educate the youth of all countries in the ideals of world peace and solidarity may be further developed and co-ordinated, and to furnish a report to the sixth Assembly.

Recommendation.

In reply to the three questions asked by the Council;

In view of the fact that the above resolutions and, in general, the whole programme of the League of Nations as regards intellectual co-operation will be carried out more easily with the assistance of the International Institute which the French Government has proposed to found and place at the disposal of the League of Nations, the Assembly notes that the Council has accepted, in principle, this generous gift, for which it desires to express its deepest gratitude;

Being desirous of emphasising the international character which this Institute should possess, both as regards the programme of its work and the choice of its staff, in accordance with the intention of the French Government and of the Council:

The Assembly expresses the following recommendation:

A. The powers and duties of the new Institute shall be defined by the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation in accordance with the principles laid down by the Committee itself—after such consultations as may be necessary to avoid overlapping—and with the instructions of the Council and the Assembly. These powers and duties may subsequently be enlarged by the Committee with the consent of the Council and the Assembly.

B. The Council of the League of Nations is invited to conclude with the French Government all agreements necessary to ensure the establishment, continuity and proper working of the Institute.

In accordance with these agreements, the administration of the Institute shall be entrusted to the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, acting as a Governing Body. The latter shall, with the approval of the Council, appoint five persons of different nationalities, who shall form a Committee of Directors. The powers and duties of the Committee of Directors, which shall meet at least once every six months, the term of office of its members and the system of rotation by which its membership shall be renewed, shall be determined by the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.

The budget and accounts of the Institute will be communicated to the Council and the Assembly. The accounts will be audited at least once a year by the Chief Auditor of the League, and his report will be annexed to the budget and the accounts.

C. The Committee on Intellectual Co-operation shall determine in each case, after consulting the parties concerned and in agreement with them, the relations with the International Institute of the institutions mentioned in the resolution of the Council, or any other institutions of an intellectual character.

The Committee on Intellectual Co-operation will be ready to collaborate with these institutions with a view to solving particular problems, without, however, interfering in any way with their autonomy.

The resolutions and recommendation were unanimously adopted.

Mr. Matthew Charlton (Australia): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen—I want it to be distinctly understood that the President’s remarks in regard to there being no opposition are not correct, for they do not apply to me personally. I am just as strong in my opposition to the proposal now as when I spoke, but, unfortunately, I have no vote. If I had a vote, it would be recorded, without doubt, against the resolution.

The President:

Translation: That is understood and will be mentioned in the record of the meeting.

The next meeting of the Assembly will be held on Thursday next, September 25th, at 10 o’clock prompt.

The Assembly rose at 1.25 p.m.