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NON-POLITICAL COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES
AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The vital issue before the world, and the United States as a part thereof, is clear and unmistakable—shall we have organized peace, or "international anarchy"? Resurgent nationalism again threatens world peace as it did during the two decades preceding the great war. The peace movement, which seemed so spontaneous and so universal in the years immediately following the war, has been clouded and confused by economic and political questions arising from the great depression and the demands of the new totalitarian states. The surge of nationalistic thought and action can be held in check only by a clearer understanding of and a more general resort to international cooperation, without involvement in other people's wars.¹

Two solutions of the international situation present themselves. On the one hand is the system of force as a final tribunal, with its intermediate steps of insecurity, armament, alliances, and a dependence on threats of war—a system which has taken an unthinkable toll throughout the centuries. On the other hand is the method of international cooperation, offering not merely peace but also

prosperity, each nation receiving its own rights because of its membership in a community of nations.

Before permitting ourselves as a nation to drift into a system dependent on force, it would be well to learn more about the possibilities and advantages of international cooperation. Among these are:

a) Recurring conferences to discuss and dispose of technical or economic matters which, if neglected, may acquire a political complexion, and such questions of national honor as it is the province of diplomacy to avoid.

b) The integration of national societies in various countries, working for the same ends so that a definite and progressive program may be followed.

c) Services such as the Universal Postal Union which are not feasible or possible for any one nation, but which are for the mutual benefit of all.

d) Regulatory action in those fields which cross national boundaries.

Militarism or isolation may imply disaster, but cooperation is the technic of peace.  

If, therefore, American foreign policy is to be set upon sound lines, it must once more take hold of the central problem which both the war and the depression have thrown across its path, which is the adjustment of the United States to a dynamic world. Shall this be sought by policies of isolation buttressed and confined by an isolationist neutrality;

---

2 Shotwell, op. cit., p. 100.
or shall we, for our welfare and security, seek it by a carefully defined, well-planned policy of cooperation with the community of peace-loving nations?  

This question has not been answered. We have not had to make a decision, but there seems little doubt that the cooperative method has not been properly understood even by those states which accepted the Covenant of the League of Nations.

The League has failed often, but such failures cannot stop the movement to organize peace, any more than the failure of the Articles of Confederation marked the end of the effort to build the American States into a Union.

It is a difficult task to build a working community of nations. It cannot be accomplished in a single generation, but once started it is not likely to be abandoned.  

One of the outstanding aspects of international relations is that of an expanding international government. Just as within the jurisdiction of each government certain aims and duties which are purely social have been taken over by the central authority, so it has evolved in international spheres. Such movements as government supervision of the railroads in individual countries and the allocation of metric bands for international radio broadcasting have influenced the average citizen a great deal, and his inter-

3Shotwell, op. cit., pp. 53-54.
4Ibid., p. vii.
6Ibid., p. viii.
ssts have become universal.

An adequate understanding of international political life must be built up as a foundation for cooperation between peoples.\textsuperscript{7} Most citizens secure their information and viewpoints of foreign affairs through newspapers or news services. The latter very naturally feature the crises and disasters, so that the reader seldom knows much about the normal, peaceful conduct of affairs, and is inclined to be suspicious of foreign nations.\textsuperscript{8}

Each national government has had to assume responsibility for such vital matters as health, sanitation, transportation and the like. Some countries have done much more of this sort of thing than have others. In each country the legislatures pass on fundamental policies, but delegate the power to carry out these policies to small, permanent bodies which work out the details and administer the functioning of the statutes.

Exactly the same development can be seen in international society. Modern transportation and communications, and the tremendous upheaval of the industrial revolution, with its economic specialization and multiplied social contacts, have necessitated efficient control of the factors making for social welfare, not only within the state but among nations. So international administra-

\textsuperscript{7} Mower, op. cit., p. xii, p. 11.

\textsuperscript{8} Shotwell, op. cit., p. 79.
tion has developed. These international bodies do not have the powers of the domestic ones, but they fill a great and continually increasing need.

This movement toward international administration is of great significance. It means that a new order is in the making, and that private interests, such as the Chamber of Commerce, have overrun national boundaries. Such associations exist for practical advantage, generally speaking, although some of them are altruistic. Sometimes the support of national governments is given these bodies, as in the case of the sugar manufacturers. At the same time other international administrative bodies have appeared, this time to deal with work of a public character. How much these public bodies have been influenced by the example of the private associations one cannot tell, but the habit of cooperation started by the private associations, the value of their work, and the need for official aid in dealing with more important interests, have brought about international administrative unions under governmental control.

During the war years, especially from 1916 on, plans for some sort of international league were discussed and formulated. A world-wide conviction that the nations should make an effort to achieve permanent peace found an eloquent voice in President Wilson, and resulted in the formation of

---

10 Ibid., p. 237.
the League of Nations. Five strands are intertwined in the Covenant of this League. They are:

a) An improved and enlarged Concert of the Powers, using the method of regular Conference.

b) A reformed and universalized Monroe Doctrine, using the method of all-round mutual guarantees of territorial integrity and independence.

c) An improved Hague Conference system of Mediation, Conciliation and Inquiry, using the political organ of the Conference for that purpose.

d) An improvement and co-ordination of the Universal Postal Union and other similar arrangements for the carrying on of world services and the administration of world public utilities.

e) An agency for the mobilization of the Hare and Cry against war as a matter of universal concern and a crime against the world community, the political Conference being employed for that purpose.\(^{11}\)

The main organs of the League of Nations are: the Assembly, the Council, the Secretariat, the Permanent Court of International Justice, and the International Labor Organization. In addition there are a number of subsidiary organs created by Assembly resolution and now firmly established as a permanent part of the machinery of the League. Such, for example, are the Communications and Transit

Organization; the Health Organization; the Economic and Financial Organization; the Permanent Mandates Commission; the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium; committees on traffic in and protection and welfare of women, children and young people grouped together under the "Social and Humanitarian" activities of the League. In addition, there are a number of temporary ad hoc committees established to study and report upon certain subjects, as for example the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference and the Slavery Committee. All these organs form an integral part of a single coherent system of institutions. Their activities are co-ordinated and — with the exception of the Labor Organization — controlled and directed by the Assembly.

The political aspects of the work of the League are outside the scope of this survey. The United States Senate failed to accept the Treaty of Versailles which set up the League of Nations, and the government of the United States has consistently refused to join the League. Thus, while we have taken part in the work of the minor League bodies, we have had little to do with the Assembly or the Council. On several occasions the United States has accepted the invitation of the Assembly or Council to take part in its deliberations when problems of particular interest to this country are under consideration, as for instance, during the Manchurian crisis in 1931 our Secretary of State consulted with the Council of the League of Nations regarding a program of joint action, and United States representatives sat
with the Council. This type of action illustrates our political cooperation with the League.

By a process of compromise, a system of non-political cooperation has been evolved. As used in this paper, the term "non-political cooperation" designates those activities begun by groups of individuals or private associations, and which, because they fill a need, grow until they are international in scope. When government interest in the movement is aroused, government participation usually follows.

Activities of this type, generally speaking, fall under the second and third functions of the League:

to discover, through conferences and discussions, the matters on which common policies or standards are obtainable, whether for the world as a whole, or between a larger or smaller number of League members.12

And, as was suggested in 1918:

that of helping its member states to discover 'sensible' ways of dealing with their own affairs.13

The part taken by Americans, and to a smaller extent by the American government, in what the League has done through these two functions is dealt with in the major portion of this paper.

12Zimmern, _op. cit._, pp. 298-299.

13Ibid.
I. Non-Recognition of the League

The first two years of the relationship between the League and the United States were years in which the Harding-Hughes administration ignored the existence of the League of Nations. The American government refused point-blank to cooperate directly with the League in any of its undertakings. What little cooperation the government did permit had to be by indirection and subterfuge. In fact, the American government acted in such a discourteous manner toward the League that it bordered on open hostility.¹

In 1921 four letters were addressed by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to the Secretary of State of the United States. These letters were invitations to the four American members of the Permanent Court of Arbitration to submit nominations for the judges of the Permanent Court of International Justice. The letters had been sent through the channels of the Department of State as a matter of courtesy, but they were not forwarded to the members until a week before the election of judges was to take place.² The United States allowed other communications from the League to remain unanswered during 1921 and 1922. "The United States is not a member of the League," said Mr. Hughes, "and I have no authority to act as if it were."

¹Clarence A. Berdahl, Policy of the United States with Respect to the League of Nations, p. III.
²Due to the carelessness of minor officials in the Department. Later, steps were taken to see that all such letters were acknowledged. See James W. Garner, American Foreign Policies, pp. 198-199.
It has been stated that the League Secretariat forced the hand of the Department of State by sending communications by registered mail.\(^3\) In September, 1921, Mr. Hughes finally replied to fifteen of these accumulated communications at one time, merely acknowledging their receipt.\(^4\) Later, other League communications were acknowledged with promptness and courtesy. A scheme was devised whereby the communications from the League to the United States and those from the United States to the League were sent through the Swiss minister of foreign affairs at Berne and the American minister stationed there.\(^5\)

The Harding-Hughes administration refused to ratify the St. Germain Convention on Traffic in Arms, the negotiation of which was largely due to the initiative taken by the American delegates who signed it in 1919. Mr. Hughes stated that "the treaty was too closely bound up with the League."\(^6\)

The United States was also unwilling to assume any responsibility with respect to the mandates question.

The administration went so far as to compel Mr. W. Cameron


\(^4\)\textit{Ibid.}, October 19, 1924, Sec. 9, p. 5, c. 1.

\(^5\)\textit{Ibid.}

\(^6\)Letter of Secretary Hughes to the Secretary-General, Sept. 12, 1923, in \textit{Official Journal}, vol. IV, p.1471.
Forbes, who distinguished himself as Governor-General of the Philippines under President Taft, to decline an appointment to the Mandates Commission tendered him by the Council. "I was well disposed toward the suggestion," wrote Mr. Forbes to the Secretary-General, and added, "I regret to inform you that ..., my government has notified me that it would be inadvisable for me to assume any responsibility in connection with the commission on mandates. I am extremely sorry that I am compelled to decline the appointment." 7

The United States was the only nation which was unwilling that the Dutch government be permitted to shift its responsibilities of administration under the Opium Convention of 1912 to the League of Nations. The Netherlands government was anxious to have the League Secretariat assume these duties, since the work was being duplicated by the League. However, the American government said "in view of the fact that America was not yet a member of the League, it would look for the present to the Netherlands government to carry out the executive functions imposed by the Convention of 1912." 8

Similarly, The United States objected to the incorporation of the International Office of Public Hygiene at Paris (of which it was a member) with the health organization of the League, as was desired by all the other nations concerned. The Secretary-General reported that

---

7Letter of W.C. Forbes to the Secretary-General, March 31, 1921. League of Nations, Documents, C.5.M.5.1921.VI.

the United States "was not willing that any international organizations upon which it was represented, should in any way be attached to the League."9

The World Court of International Justice, set up by the Treaty of Versailles in 1920, had been approved during the United States presidential campaign of that year, and both President Harding and Secretary Hughes advocated it warmly. In spite of this approval, the anti-League bias was allowed to cloud the American attitude to such an extent that the American members of the Permanent Court of Arbitration were unable to participate in the first nomination of judges for the World Court.10

The policies and actions of this period of non-recognition were such that few people could possibly be proud of them. Such indirection and discourtesy on the part of our government when dealing with international affairs has been extremely rare in our diplomatic history. The American government, as a rule, has been among the first to recognize the rise of new international influences. Indifference to the merits of the League in the first two years of its existence must be ascribed largely to political partisanship.11

---

9 *League of Nations, Documents, Report of Secretary-General to Second Assembly, 1921*, p. 60.

10 *New York Times*, October 19, 1924, Sec. 9, p. 5, c. 3.

11 Ibid.
II. Unofficial Recognition of the League by the United States

Hostility to the League of Nations did not mean that the United States was no longer to take part in world affairs. Nor could the United States long ignore an organization of more than fifty nations meeting to discuss, plan, and carry on the world's affairs. Some method of correspondence and cooperation had to be worked out, if only to further the interests of the United States when those subjects of major concern to the American people were under consideration by the League.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the intran-sigency of the Harding-Hughes administration when first in office gradually gave way to a policy of tolerance of the League and its aims. The government seemed to feel that "the League has its value for those countries caring to join ... But it is no place for America."¹ Senator Fess, the Republican National Chairman, probably expressed the official viewpoint when he said "because the United States did not enter the League of Nations, it does not mean that this country is going to withhold its support of the good that the League will accomplish.... It does not mean that....we will have nothing to do with what is going on for the benefit of the world."²

¹Chicago Tribune, September 22, 1924.
²Illinois State Historical Society, Transactions, 1923, p. 56.
The meager cooperation begun by the American Government at this time was presumably to be confined to non-political matters. The League was referred to as the "proper agent to deal with humanitarian questions."³ Representatives of the United States were permitted to serve on committees, commissions, and conferences of the League of Nations dealing with matters of humanitarian interest. Accordingly, Miss Grace Abbott, Chief of the Children's Bureau in the Department of Labor, was appointed on October 15, 1922, to sit with the League's Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Women and Children; Dr. Marion Dorset, of the Bureau of Animal Industry in the Department of Agriculture, was appointed at about the same time to serve on the Anthrax Committee of the International Labor Office, and Dr. Rupert Blue, Assistant Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, was appointed in November, 1922, to attend the meetings of the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium.

If one bears in mind the dependence of modern legislative and scientific methods upon complete and accurate statistical material, it is easier to apprehend the value of this non-political cooperation between the League and the United States. These non-political activities of the League are not new aspects of international life, and they are admirable illustrations of the wide scope of useful

cooperation between modern nations. 4

In all the cooperation of these years, the Administration still maintained that the actions taken were entirely unofficial. The representatives of the United States were said to act in an entirely consultative capacity or as observers, and their presence at Geneva was not supposed to imply official recognition of the League. This attitude on the part of the United States caused considerable uncertainty and confusion as to the status of these representatives, not only in League circles but even among the representatives themselves. Miss Abbott acted as though she were a full member of the committee with which she served. 5 This matter of "unofficial representatives acting in an unofficial capacity," as Mr. Hughes described the American representatives to the League, was explained by Minister Joseph C. Crew, who attended the sessions of the League's Temporary Mixed Commission on Disarmament, in the following words: "I have been instructed to attend the meetings of this Commission, in accordance with the invitation extended to my government in December last, for the purpose of being fully advised as to the proposals that may be made, and particularly to receive information respecting any draft convention which may be considered. 6

4Mower, op. cit., pp.241, 482.
6Ibid., A.16,1924.IX.
Regardless of the uncertainty as to the status and nomenclature of the representatives of the United States working with the League, the record shows that these delegates were chosen by the government generally from among its officials, that they participated in the proceedings of the appropriate League activities, presented the views of the American government, and attempted to win the other nations to these views, but that they usually did not vote or assume any responsibility for the decisions taken. The implication would seem to be that the Harding-Hughes administration slowly developed a new attitude toward the League. There was a gradual recognition of the League, of its right and capacity with respect to certain matters, and of the necessity of entering into some sort of relationship with it.
III. Recognition of the League by the United States

The policy of unofficial cooperation with the League of Nations was more or less abandoned when Calvin Coolidge succeeded Mr. Harding as President of the United States. Communications were no longer routed through the Swiss Foreign Office at Berne or the Dutch Foreign Office at The Hague but were almost always sent directly to the Secretary-General of the League at Geneva. Official representatives were sent now and then to sit with League organizations of one kind or another, and these representatives took part as fully as did those of any other nation.

American participation in League affairs increased so much during the early months of the Coolidge administration that President Coolidge made reference to it in his speech accepting the Republican nomination in 1924. "We have refused to ratify the Covenant of the League of Nations," he said, "but we have cooperated with it to suppress the narcotic trade and promote public health. We have every desire to help; but the time, the place, and the method must be left to our own determination."¹

Secretary Hughes also changed his opinions of the League. Speaking at the New York State Republican Convention in April, 1924, he said, "There is no more difficulty in dealing with the organization of the League in

¹Republican National Convention, Proceedings, 1924, p.230
this way for the purpose of protecting our interests than there would be in dealing with the British Empire."² During the 1924 campaign Mr. Hughes urged publicly the desirability of continued cooperation with other nations through the League.

Progress in cooperation with the League was so pronounced that by 1928 the Republicans were mentioning the League by name and boasting of the amount of cooperation the Administration had allowed. The party went on record as promising to continue such cooperation in the future. Mr. Hoover, the Republican candidate for president, said: "We are glad to cooperate with the League in its endeavors to further scientific, economic, and social welfare and to secure limitation of armaments."³ Secretary of State Kellogg set forth a summary of this cooperation and ended his statement with these words:

The correspondence with the League is carried on by the American Legation at Berns. Information on the activities of the League in which this Government is not directly represented is obtained through the Consulate at Geneva. The willingness of the United States to cooperate freely, fully, and helpfully with the League in matters of genuine international concern and our Government's determination to adhere to the policy of non-participation in the League itself is now well understood at Geneva.⁴

Mr. Ogden Mills, later Secretary of the Treasury, in a

²Quoted in League of Nations Associations Pamphlet, "Memorial to the Secretary of State, May 2, 1925," p. 5.

³Republican National Convention, Proceedings, 1928, pp. 100, 120, 294.

⁴Republican National Committee, Campaign Textbook, 1928.
review of the Republican foreign policy, protested the charges of failure to cooperate with the League and emphasized the record of participation in its activities. 5

In the spring of 1930, ex-Secretary of State Kellogg was able to give figures which showed that the United States had by that time participated in over forty League conferences and commissions. In more than half the cases, this participation was entirely official. 6 Each year American participation in the work of the League "tended both to go deeper into those activities into which it had already entered and to widen to cognate activities." 7 A compilation of American representation at Geneva drawn up at the close of 1930, listed more than two hundred Americans who had represented the United States in various phases of League activity, including twenty-eight from the Department of State, sixty-eight from five other Executive Departments, eleven from the Tariff Commission and other independent establishments, and five from Congress itself. 8

There was very little opposition in the United States to the growing cooperation between the American Government and the League. The New York Times seemed to sum up the situation by stating in an editorial:

5 "Our Foreign Policy: A Republican View," in Foreign Affairs, July, 1928, pp. 4-5.


The noteworthy thing is that these successive proposals to work hand in hand with the League of Nations no longer excite resentment or feigned horror. To express suspicion or dread of the League has gone out of fashion... It is now impossible to make cold chills run down the backs of Americans at the mere mention of the League of Nations. If we ought to shudder at anything today, it is at the stupidity of statesman or politicians who do not perceive that the League is a going concern, getting stronger every year, establishing itself in the confidence of all countries and still offering to perplexed peoples and Governments the best means of settling international disputes and avoiding war.  

Official cooperation with the League, begun under President Coolidge, gradually supplanted the older method of unofficial participation. To a certain extent the two systems of official and unofficial cooperation existed side by side for more than ten years. The change in the method and character of the American relationship to the League has made it unnecessary that an attempt be made to conceal the interest of the United States in League activities. The desire of the American Government for a more intimate and harmonious association with the work of the League resulted in the enlarging and reorganization of the American Consulate in Geneva in 1928. The staff of the Consulate was increased to five; four of them were assigned to "the observing and reporting of the general activities of the League," while the fifth was to carry on the regular consular duties.  

Two years later the Geneva Consulate was moved to new

---


and larger quarters nearer the Secretariat of the League. This move was believed to indicate "the establishment of close co-ordination between the United States government and the League of Nations."\textsuperscript{11} Later in 1930 the State Department announced the appointment of Mr. Prentiss Gilbert as Consul at Geneva, and spoke of the appointment "as the consummation of a policy determined upon some time ago by Secretary Stimson for representation at the seat of the League of Nations by an experienced diplomat whose previous work had fully equipped him as a competent observer of the League."\textsuperscript{12} At the same time the staff of the Geneva Consulate was further enlarged to seven, of whom five, including Mr. Gilbert, were to devote their time to the League.

Secretary Stimson announced, when these things were done, that it "should not be interpreted as a step toward bringing about any closer connection between the United States and the League, or as an important change in the policy which this government has maintained in its relationship with the League."\textsuperscript{13} Regardless of this statement the action taken was widely accepted as tantamount to the erection of a legation accredited to the League of Nations, similar to those maintained by a number of the members of the League. It must certainly be interpreted to "signify a

\textsuperscript{11}\textit{New York Times}, January 5, 1930.

\textsuperscript{12}\textit{Ibid.}, August 24, 1930.

\textsuperscript{13}\textit{Ibid.}.\vspace{1cm}
recognition and proclamation of the increased importance and volume of League activities in which the United States participates."

Due to the development of an official theory that American cooperation with minor League organs is admissible and to be desired, but that the United States should not entangle itself with the principal organs of the League, representatives of the United States have seldom appeared at meetings of the Assembly or Council of the League. Only in situations where special American interests are involved in the deliberations of the Assembly or the Council, as for example, the Liberian investigation or the Manchurian crisis, have representatives of the United States appeared at the League meetings, and generally they served only in an advisory or non-voting capacity. A method of relationship between the United States and the political organs of the League has been found through the use of communication, informal consultation, formal conference, and even an actual seat with the Council of the League of Nations on occasions when the interests are sufficiently important.

The increasing volume of international intercourse has made the League of Nations an indispensable agency for the life of the modern world.\(^{15}\) It is, in fact, an instrument


\(^{15}\) Zimmern, op. cit., p. 7.
of cooperation, available for the use of states animated by the cooperative spirit. It is not perfect in any respect, but it is the most inspiring attempt yet made by man to achieve peace and orderliness in the world community. Not the least of its major problems is the solution of its difficulties with the United States. Until the League and the United States find a way enabling them to work in unison the peace of the world will continue to be insecure.\textsuperscript{16}

If one bears in mind the development of the cooperation between the United States and the League, it is impossible to believe that the convergence of fifteen years can stop short of complete membership in the League. Regardless of the immediate success or failure of the League of Nations in a given situation, the technique of consultation and conference, of which only a beginning has been made at Geneva, may prove to be one of the most important contributions of the post-war generation toward the efforts for the prevention of international disputes. Former Secretary of State Stimson, writing of his visit to Geneva during the Disarmament Conference and the Assembly debates on the Sino-Japanese dispute of 1932, said:

\begin{quote}
These conferences were very valuable. They confirmed my long-held conviction that in the realm of international relations, more than in any other realm of human activities, personal conference is indispensable to mutual understanding. It immensely reinforces that which can be achieved through the ordinary channels of cables, dispatches and ambassadors.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{16} Shotwell, op. cit., p. 326.
To talk face to face with the chiefs of other governments greatly facilitates a mutual grasp of the respective difficulties and points of view of each government. Such regular and direct contact between the officers of governments is the greatest innovation which has been established by the organization of the League of Nations, and is in my opinion one of the most signal contributions to the conduct of international relations. 17

This declaration on the part of Mr. Stimson brings to mind once again the words of Mr. Elihu Root in connection with the Conference at The Hague in 1907:

The greatest benefit of the Peace Conference of 1907 will be, as was that of the Peace Conference of 1899, in the fact of the conference itself; in its powerful influence moulding the characters of men; in the spectacle of all the great powers of the earth meeting in the name of peace, and exalting, as worthy of honor and desire, national self-control and considerate judgment and willingness to do justice.

Dr. Shotwell provided a fitting close to a survey of the League system with the following declaration:

The League of Nations... is the symbol and the agent of international morality... The League cannot realize these ideals while the nations themselves deny them in their own structure and internal life; social justice is the basis of permanent peace. But, in the words of one of its creators, General Smuts, 'humanity has struck its tents' and is on the march. 18

18 Shotwell, op. cit., p. 353.
IV. Cooperation of the United States with the League

Participation on the part of the United States in the work of the League of Nations has increased steadily in the seventeen and one-half years since its inception.

The first two years form a period in which the United States Government declined to recognize the existence of the League, due largely to the bitter animosity aroused by a small group of Republicans, who successfully fought Woodrow Wilson and his plan for an organized community of nations. Following the war, the United States was swept by a wave of reactionary feeling, which led not only to anti-sedition measures, and to a definite breakdown in liberal thought, but also to a fixed determination that this country was not again to concern herself with the affairs of Europe. Capitalizing on this wave of disillusionment, the Republican party was able to sweep into power in the elections of 1920.

This attitude was not only detrimental to our interests, but contrary to the American tradition of humanitarian activity. Even prior to 1914, the United States had been a party to various international services and conventions, such as public health work, and the supervision of traffic in narcotic drugs. Most of these international organizations in existence in 1920 were placed under the supervision of the League of Nations, which at that time represented forty-two nations.

It is not surprising, therefore, that by 1923 a method of partial cooperation with the League had been evolved, as
has been shown in Chapter II. This method has been described as 'unofficial recognition'. Every participation of Americans in the activities at Geneva has led to further participation, in the sense that the study of one subject has inevitably resulted in the discovery of related lines of research by revealing new influences and new approaches which must be taken into account. This unceasing flow of world thought and endeavor, through the League, is what makes the functioning of that body always dynamic, never static.

American collaboration in the activities of the League has, so far, been largely non-political - that is, it has been mainly concerned with studies and discussions of those subjects which have to do with the public welfare, and with normal, peaceful affairs of the everyday social and business world. President Roosevelt, speaking at Chautauqua, New York, on August 14, 1936, said:

We shun political commitments which might entangle us in foreign wars; we avoid connection with the political activities of the League of Nations; but I am glad to say that we have cooperated whole-heartedly in the social and humanitarian work at Geneva. Thus we are a part of the world effort to control traffic in narcotics, to improve international health, to eliminate double taxation, and to better working conditions and laboring hours throughout the world.¹

That this statement was, if anything, too modest is evident from the following account of American cooperation with the League of Nations in non-political matters. This participation falls into the following major divisions: (a) codi-

fication of international law; (b) communications and transit; (c) economic and financial organization; (d) health organization; (e) intellectual cooperation; (f) narcotic drugs, and (g) social and humanitarian activities.
Codification of International Law

Of all the projects which the League has undertaken, none has met with more sincere approval in the United States than that for the progressive codification of international law. Although surrounded by a maze of technical difficulties, it is a subject which received considerable attention at the two Hague Conferences before the war, and also was considered by the legal authorities assembled in 1920 to draft the statute for the Permanent Court of International Justice. At the first Assembly of the League, a resolution was introduced which was intended to start immediate action for the codification of international law. This resolution was not adopted, however, and it was not until 1924 that the League again undertook to place this subject upon its agenda.

Meanwhile, interest in the United States was further awakened by Secretary of State Hughes, by Senate resolutions, and by President Coolidge. Secretary Hughes' speech of April 23, 1925, is especially significant. In this he said:

---


3 League of Nations, First Assembly, Minutes, pp. 744-747.

4 Congressional Record, Vol. 65, Part 3, p. 3084; Part 9, pp. 9728-9733; 9157-9158.

We fully recognize that important as is development of what we call American international law, and this should be promoted without delay, helpful as our Pan-American conferences may be, we cannot be content until appropriate plans are made to restate, amend, and enlarge the universal law, and this, as I have said, should be accomplished through conferences, embracing all civilized nations treating international law as obligatory and meeting each other on an equal footing. It should be apparent that the controversy over the Covenant of the League of Nations involved no hostility to international conferences, or to their organization with machinery for their continuity, with suitable inquiries and reports pending meetings... 6

In 1924 the League Assembly authorized the Council to make a study of those subjects which could be submitted to the states for codification. As a result, seven subjects were selected for discussion by a codification conference. These seven were then included in a questionnaire submitted by the Secretary-General of the League to the several governments, for their observations and suggestions. The United States replied that she would be willing to discuss: (a) nationality; (b) territorial waters; (c) diplomatic privileges and immunities; and (d) responsibility of states to foreigners in case of injury to their person or property. For various reasons, the United States did not think the following subjects suitable for codification at that time: (a) exploitation of the products of the sea; (b) procedure for conferences and the drafting of treaties; and (c) domicile.

Thirty governments replied to the questionnaire, whereupon plans were made for a codification conference to meet

6 New York Times, April 24, 1925.
at The Hague in 1930. The original number of subjects had been reduced from seven to three - nationality, territorial waters, and the responsibility of states - in the hope that the consideration of three important subjects would lead to definite results. 7

At this conference, a month of discussion resulted in the adoption of three measures concerned with the first topic on the agenda - that of "nationality". These were: (a) an act establishing the principle that each state shall be free to decide who are its nationals; limiting the issuance of expatriation permits; and making a woman's nationality dependent largely upon that of her husband; (b) military obligations concerned with double nationality; (c) deprivation of states rights. 8 Of these agreements, the United States delegates were able to accept only section (b), dealing with military obligations in cases of double nationality. The opposition of our delegates to sections (a) and (c) was summarized by the Department of State on two grounds: first, the United States recognizes the fundamental right of expatriation, which the convention does not; second, the United States recognizes almost no differences in the rights of men and women as regards nationality.

Our government felt that the convention did so little to help the condition of women that it did not justify it-


8American Journal of International Law, July and October, 1930.
self. The Secretary of State was fully aware of the views of the various women's organizations, and although he could not comply with all their requests, he stated: "If I may judge by a letter from their spokesman at the Conference, the course taken by our delegates has been enthusiastically approved by them."

The Department of State, in signing the section dealing with military obligations in cases of double nationality, explained:

This agreement will benefit many Americans who have a dual nationality, particularly those who were born in the United States of alien parents. Many such persons, when visiting the homeland of their parents, have been arrested and drafted into the army of a particular country.

It would appear, as a result of this meeting, that the United States is more liberal in its views on nationality and related subjects than are other parts of the world, especially Europe. International contacts are so conglom- erate that further effort will inevitably be made to reconc- ile the various legal aspects of this broad topic. The difficulty of integrating such divergent legal systems as the Roman, the Anglo-Saxon, and the Oriental, each of which is deeply rooted in the culture of a people, is too great to be overcome within a generation.

The minor success of the first conference on codifi- cation of international law should not lead to a belief that the subject is closed. It seems reasonable to believe that it is only a question of time, opportunity, and application
before the task of making national laws on certain fundamental topics uniform with those of other countries. The conference of 1930 may be said to have acted as a searchlight revealing the magnitude of the problem and the effort required to make an agreement possible.

The Secretary of State of the United States, replying to an inquiry from the Secretary-General of the League as to the opinion of the United States on the value of codification conferences, indicated our government believes that codification of international law is essential. He suggested, however, that future conferences should be limited to one, or possibly two, questions, and that the questions chosen for consideration at the next few conferences should be those on which there would be a minimum of controversy. This attitude indicates how thoroughly the United States is in sympathy with this movement to codify the world's laws as a step toward the maintenance of international justice.

---

Communications and Transit

This organization is the most autonomous among the League's technical bodies, operating under a highly developed constitution. According to Article 23 of the Covenant, "the members of the League are to make provision to secure and maintain freedom of communications and transit, and equitable treatment for the commerce of all members." The Council in 1920 undertook to make definite plans for translating this article into practice, and for this purpose called a conference to meet at Barcelona in 1921. The United States was invited to attend, but refused the invitation. 10 No Americans were associated with the work of this organization until 1923, when the American Consul at Geneva attended the meetings of the second conference and reported on them. Since that time, however, the United States has sent official representatives to each succeeding conference.

The objectives of the organization are: (a) development of standardized practices in the field of communications by means of international conventions embodying general rules; and (b) the promotion of technical and administrative coordination and cooperation by simplifying formalities and unifying regulations. The field is so wide that the organization confines its activities to

10 League of Nations, Secretariat, Ten Years of World Cooperation, chap. VI.
those subjects of international concern which require governmental cooperation and action.\textsuperscript{11}

The work has fallen into the following divisions:
(a) air transport coordination; (b) buoyage and lighting of coasts; (c) pollution of the sea by oil; (d) unification of transport statistics; (e) tonnage measurement of vessels; (f) calendar reform; (g) news services; (h) passports and visas; (i) road traffic; (j) international railways; (k) international ports; (l) transmission of electric power; and (m) navigation on the Danube and Rhine.

In the field of air transport coordination the United States has been a pioneer. Since Colonel Lindbergh's historic flight of a decade ago, there has been every reason for this country to pursue a policy of cooperation in civil aviation. Since the winter of 1936-37 the problem has become more acute, with the inauguration of trans-Pacific flights, Bermuda trips of the late spring of 1937, and the survey for trans-Atlantic air services by both British and American companies in July, 1937. These services are all fostered by Pan-American Airways, with British Imperial Airways cooperating in planning the trans-Atlantic schedule.

The improvement in airplane construction, and the successful establishment of an international commercial air transport service between North and South America by Pan-American Airways, gave impetus to the development of civil

aviation the world over. It was to be expected, therefore, that this new international interest would come to the attention of the League. By 1930 it was felt necessary that the problem be studied "for the stimulation of new activities, from the viewpoint of economic extension, legal development, and the avoidance of military danger." An invitation to attend an aeronautical meeting under League auspices was accepted by the United States. Colonel Lindbergh approved of this attempt at international coordination, and in a cable to the meeting said:

Aviation does not concern one nation alone. Its ultimate value lies in bringing the various countries of the earth into closer contact. It is not possible to develop air transport and communication in its broadest aspect without the cooperation of the entire world.12

To date, little has been accomplished in this increasingly important field, due largely to the preparedness programs and the intensely nationalistic feelings prevailing among the nations.

The evolution of a universal system of buoyage and lighting of coasts is another topic concerning the public welfare in which the United States has been greatly interested since before 1899, when the subject was discussed among several nations meeting in Washington. It was brought up again in St. Petersburg in 1912, but the World War interrupted this, as it did nearly everything else, and nothing much was accomplished.

In 1924 the League endeavored to formulate a uniform system of buoyage and lighting which could be used by all countries. The United States and Great Britain refused to participate at first. Both these countries have such extensive coast lines that they were reluctant to consider any significant changes in their established practice, as it would entail vast expense.

The United States Commissioner of Lighthouses became interested in the work of the League in 1927. The result of this interest was that our government invited a group of Europeans to inspect the American lighthouse system, and later participated in two meetings on the subject.\textsuperscript{13}

Although no definite agreements were reached at the meetings participated in by the United States, this country continued to be interested in this problem. We suggested schemes which could be regarded as fine possibilities, inasmuch as nearly all the countries of the western hemisphere and certain ones bordering the western Pacific were using them.\textsuperscript{14}

This particular problem has been reported on as late as May, 1936. The United States is not vitally interested in the European angle of this question, inasmuch as whatever system of buoyage we use is likely to be followed by most countries in the Americas. The systems of the other

\textsuperscript{13}League of Nations, Documents, C.59.M.34.1929.VIII.(1929.VIII.1); and C.163.M.58.1931.VIII.(1931.VIII.1).

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., C.128.M.67.1936.VIII.
countries of the world vary so greatly, though, that the United States felt willing to sacrifice some part of her present system in order to achieve universal homogeneity in such an important field.\textsuperscript{15}

In 1927 the United States started action on a new problem which was rapidly assuming international proportions — pollution of the sea by oil.\textsuperscript{16} The conservation of natural resources has been a major tenet of the United States Government since the time of President Theodore Roosevelt, and fish and bird life are essential resources. The government was also made aware of the vast amount of damage being done to fishing industries and canneries by the pollution of the sea.

Our extensive sea coasts and many harbors and cities located on the coasts have been experiencing continually increasing trouble due to the burning of oil by ships while plying the coasts and in the harbors. This has become a serious menace to bird and fish life, and the fishing interests have incurred material losses.

The elimination of such a dangerous nuisance necessar-
ily implies international rather than national action. The United States, therefore, referred the matter to the League, as the logical body to bring about cooperation among its members in regard to this question.

\textsuperscript{15}League of Nations, Monthly Summary, May, 1936, p. 145.

\textsuperscript{16}United States, Department of State, Press Release, Nos. 112-120.
Setting the wheels of the League into motion is always a lengthy process, so it was not until 1934 that any definite action was undertaken. At that time, as a result of continued pressure through those years by the United States, the League took measures to ascertain the opinions of its members. The net result was that international steps to prevent the discharge of oil near coasts were recommended.

This was no definite accomplishment, so in 1935 the League sent to the various countries a tentative proposal for common action in the suppression of this nuisance. Many of the countries to which this was sent replied that they were definitely in favor of some attempt being made to eliminate this menace, and urged the League to investigate possible methods of which the countries might avail themselves.17

This investigation is still under way, but owing to the difficulties of the problem, some time will elapse before sufficient data are offered to warrant an international conference. Until that time the United States will undoubtedly be exerting pressure on the League for an early settlement.

The three problems just discussed were the ones of most immediate concern to the United States of all those studied under the supervision of the Communications and Transit Organization of the League.

17League of Nations, Documents, G.449.M.235.1936.VIII.
In regard to the remainder, our government was interested to the extent of providing statistical data whenever requested, sending delegates to conferences called to consider any of those subjects, and was willing to cooperate with the League by sending full information as to public opinion in the United States on the question of calendar reform, and by transmitting the regulations adopted by the highway officials of this country on all questions relating to automobile traffic.

Most of the work of this organization is concerned with European problems. Only occasionally does some matter arise which is universal in scope, and then the United States must be alert to see that no international move is made without her viewpoint being considered.

\[18\text{See page 34 for this listing.}\]
Economic and Financial Organization

The United States, to all intents and purposes, came out of the World War as the preponderant economic and financial authority of the world. The nations who had carried on the war for more than four years were exhausted in every respect, and, in the case of the Central Powers, were facing bankruptcy. It was a new sensation for Americans that European countries were in debt to the United States for some $15,000,000,000, because during the entire course of our history, prior to 1917, American expansion and development depended upon foreign funds for capital, so that being in debt to Europe seemed natural to us.

The United States, therefore, found that it was impossible to retire into its traditional shell of isolation from the domestic affairs of Europe, as she was inclined to do after the close of the war and the rejection of the Treaty of Versailles by the American Senate. The history of Europe since 1920 is mainly a review of the attempts made to bring some sort of economic reorganization out of the chaos caused by the war and the treaties of peace. Again and again the United States has been called upon for help and advice. The plans adopted for the payment of the penalties levelled against Germany were devised by Americans, Charles G. Dawes and Owen D. Young. The failure of these plans, the second failure being due to the depression beginning in 1929, led to the intervention of
President Hoover with his suggestion of a "moratorium" on reparations and war debts.19

International economics and finance are not subjects which the layman is prepared to tackle, or to understand, if indeed an understanding is possible. Such subjects as customs formalities; laws relating to bills of exchange and checks; execution of arbitral awards in the business world; import and export prohibitions and restrictions; marks of origin; commercial propaganda; a world survey of raw materials; an inquiry into the nature of economic cycles; double taxation and tax evasion; counterfeit currency; the world's gold supply; and clearing agreements, require expert study and combined governmental authority before any agreement on them is possible.20

The world-wide depression of the six years following 1928 has served to bring home to citizens and governments alike the fact that the ties binding one country to another are innumerable, and that economic distress in one portion of the earth's surface always reacts on the other parts.

The fact that the effects of the war on certain countries, especially Italy and Germany, culminated in a determination on their parts to become self-sufficient,

20League of Nations, Secretariat, Ten Years of World Cooperation, ch. V.
is an unfortunate factor which has served to complicate the international situation. This theory implies that each state will endeavor to develop means, synthetic if necessary, to produce every article that it can possibly need. Such a process must disrupt international commerce and have far-reaching effects on the industrial situations in other countries. This theory probably seems absurd to the average American, but it appeals greatly to the citizens and governments of those countries which are dependent upon other nations for a great amount of supplies and raw materials, and who fear strangulation in case of another war.

It was, therefore, a tremendously complicated situation which confronted the economic and financial organization of the League in 1920. From that year on the League worked constantly to bring some sort of order out of the pre-war set-up. Two methods have been used with considerable success, that of allowing a group of experts to study a particular subject and recommend ways and means of dealing with it, and that of using a general international conference as a forum, in the hope that an airing of the difficulties, fears, desires and aims of each country would somehow lead to a program of cooperation.21

An example of the first method is the treatment of the abolition of import and export prohibitions and restrictions. Mr. Hugh R. Wilson, United States Minister to Switzerland, headed a group of American experts, who

21League of Nations, Secretariat, op. cit.
met with other delegations in Geneva in 1927, to deal with the problem. These delegations were interested in "eliminating as far as possible the systems of prohibitions and restrictions of ordinary articles of commerce." Customs barriers and tariffs were not discussed at all, and the talks were confined to the actual restrictions which kept commodities from being exported or imported.

Certain principles were acceptable to all the delegations. These were: (a) all export and import prohibitions should be abolished, except those universally recognized as justifiable, such as prohibitions on the movement of disease-bearing plants and animals, noxious drugs, obscene publications, and historical works; (b) no new prohibitions should be levied except by subsequent treaty; and (c) the principle of arbitration should be introduced into commercial relationships.23

The United States exerted her influence for the adoption of a program curtailing the list of commodities which might be subject to prohibition. The only product upon which the United States had an absolute export restriction at the time was helium gas, and this restriction was modified in 1937 following the Hindenburg disaster. The United States, therefore, had everything to gain by an agreement abolishing the use of export and import prohibition and

23Ibid.
restriction as far as possible in international trade. It was an easy matter, therefore, to win the consent of the United States Senate to ratification of the measure drawn up by the delegations on the subject. Senator Borah, in supporting the movement for ratification, enumerated a long list of American products which would find new markets due to the agreement. 24 Unfortunately, the other nations did not view the convention in such a favorable light and it was not ratified by enough states to bring it into force. Finally, in 1933 the United States government notified the League that it would be necessary for our country to withdraw from the agreement. 25 The second method, that of an international conference, has been used three times since the close of the war; the Brussels Conference of 1920, the economic conference in 1927, and the monetary and economic conference in 1933. The gathering in 1933 is typical of this phase of League activity and may be given in some detail.

Preparation for the conference began over a year before the meeting was scheduled to take place. 26 The United States made provision for taking part in the preparatory work, and assigned Ambassador Frederick H. Sackett and Norman H. Davis to cooperate with the delegates from other countries in

24 Congressional Record, September 19, 1929.

25 United States, Department of State, Press Release, July 8, 1933.

planning the program for the conference. In accepting the League's invitation to take part, the United States made it clear that war debts and specific tariff rates were not to be discussed, and that a discussion of the silver question was desired by the American government.

The preparatory work participated in by Sackett and Davis went forward from May, 1932, until the middle of June, 1933, when the conference finally met. Numerous American experts were called upon by Ambassador Sackett for information and advice in regard to points on the proposed agenda.

When the conference convened in June, 1933, a program consisting of three subjects was ready for discussion. These topics were: currency stabilization, freer world trade, and higher price levels - objectives which the United States has consistently pursued in recent years, and which she has urged upon other nations time and again.27 The American delegation to the conference was headed by Secretary of State Cordell Hull, and included members of Congress and a group of experts. Although the conference was regarded at that time as a failure, due largely to the refusal of many nations, including the United States, to give up policies of excessive economic nationalism, it has resulted in several subsequent agreements.

27United States, Department of State, Press Release, June 17, 1933.
One measure attempted by the conference was the stabilization of the price of silver. The United States was actively concerned in pushing some such agreement because (1) we produce so much silver; (2) silver has always been a more or less active influence in American politics; (3) the Roosevelt administration was induced to buy so much silver at a price higher than the world price that the Treasury was receiving more than it could take care of; and (4) the national silver policy of the United States was having a very detrimental effect in the Orient where silver is the chief form of currency.

The new agreement, which stabilized the price of silver at 64.64 cents per ounce, was ratified by the United States in December, 1933. However, not enough nations signed the agreement to bring it into force, and the price of silver continued to fluctuate. At one time in 1935 the world price rose to 81 cents an ounce, and caused Mexico and China to send strong protests to the United States government.

A second result of the monetary and economic conference was the conclusion of an agreement on the part of the twenty countries mainly concerned with the supply and price of wheat. The parties to the agreement tried to balance the supply and demand of wheat, to get rid of the surpluses which had piled up in some countries, notably the United States, and to engineer a rise in the price of wheat so
that the farmer would be able to profit thereby. The agreement assigned quotas to the exporting countries, and established an international advisory body to supervise the working of the agreement. As a result, the United States was able to plan production of wheat, and this in conjunction with other factors such as the drouths of 1934 and 1936, curtailed production under the AAA, and increased purchasing power, caused the price of wheat per bushel in this country to rise from 30cents in the early part of 1933 to the present price of around $1.10.

A third movement which may be credited to the conference of 1933 is the adoption by the Roosevelt administration of a policy of lowering trade barriers through bi-lateral agreements. Secretary of State Hull is a firm believer in freer trade between nations, and the United States government has steadily followed what has been named "the good neighbor" policy. The Secretary-General of the League, in commenting on the work of the previous year at the close of 1936, said, "Very few of the commercial treaties that have been signed since September, 1935, can be said to be based on liberal principles, with the exception of those concluded by the United States in conformity with the new commercial policy inaugurated by them in 1934."

---


Therefore, it would appear that the United States has so completely adopted and pursued the League policy as its own that our government, in this respect, is actually leading the states which are members of the League in the way the organization is urging them to go.
The Health Organization of the League

The health of a people is of vital importance. The pages of history are dotted with the record of man's struggle to survive in the face of devastating epidemics such as smallpox and plague, accepted stoically in the past as punishment for sin or as "acts of God." Only since the discovery of the origin and methods of continuance of these dread diseases has man made any real progress in the conquest of them. Unceasing work on the part of a comparatively few men such as Pasteur, Gorgas, etc., has acted as a searchlight, and men engaged in research all over the world have shown humanity a better way of living.

Nations in the past have isolated themselves to prevent the spread of epidemic or plague into their country. Primitive health organizations depended on exile or sequestration to protect the community. A study of the nature of these epidemic diseases, carried forward mainly during the nineteenth century, led to international sanitary conventions as a logical means for combating these universal dangers. They have set a precedent for cooperative work in preventive medicine.

Questions of medicine have never stopped at national lines. The establishment of such organizations as the Red Cross, or the International Health Board of the Rockefeller Foundation, did not wait upon government initiative and financial backing. They appealed to the sympathies
and humanitarian interests of the masses everywhere for their establishment and support. The profession of medicine is universal in its interests and research. This must be so because few types of human ailments are peculiar to any one region; for instance, the influenza epidemic, which swept the United States in 1917 - 1918, did not originate here but appeared simultaneously in many other parts of the world, and required concerted action before it could be checked.

To forestall any possibility of an epidemic arising and gaining menacing proportions, the United States, in cooperation with the League of Nations, has established an epidemic service somewhat similar to the weather observation service. In every plague-breeding center the world over, observation stations have been established. In these stations, records of plague diseases are kept and each week a combined report is broadcast to the world. These reports give warning to health officials everywhere, and also enable port officers to anticipate and make preparation for diseases aboard ships coming from infected regions.30

The experiences in eastern Europe following the World War pointed to the necessity for collecting and distribu-

ing the facts concerning the plague diseases, such as typhus and relapsing fever. To meet this need the service of Epidemiological Intelligence and Public Health Statistics was begun in 1923. The late Edgar Sydenstricker, an officer of the United States Public Health Service, was given a year's leave of absence in 1923 to join the Health Section of the League. The inroads of disease among the refugees made homeless by the war, furnished a proving ground for this new service.

As an essential complement to this fact-finding service, the establishment of international biologic standards was undertaken. During the period from 1920 to 1935 the health organization of the League secured agreement on twenty-five such standards and units, as sera and serological tests, anti-toxins, glandular extracts, etc. At the conference of 1935, Dr. G.W. McCoy, representing the United States government, recommended that these should be compulsory standards, and that "each country should have a national center recognized by the competent authority to take care of the international standards and corresponding national standards." These standards are available, free of charge, at the National Institute for Medical Research in London and at the Danish State Serum Institute at Copenhagen, acting as central laboratories on behalf of the health organization.32

31League of Nations, Secretariat, op. cit., chap. VII.
32League of Nations, Documents, C.464.M.244.1935.III.
The Rockefeller Foundation, which has done so much for American medicine in establishing research centers, hospitals, and scholarships for medical students in this country, has pursued the same course of action in the international sphere. Millions of dollars have been spent by the Foundation in scholarships to enable American doctors to study malaria, leprosy, rabies, syphilis, and other diseases, these studies in some cases necessitating residence by the doctor in a foreign region where the disease is native.

Perhaps one of the best examples of the Foundation's work in this field is in the interchange of health officers and doctors between the United States and foreign countries, through the League of Nations. On various occasions Americans — both officials of the United States Public Health Service and practicing physicians — have been sent abroad in order to observe methods in use there. On three occasions the United States government has welcomed health missions visiting here under the auspices of the League, and has facilitated their study of American institutions and methods.33 The last of these missions, in 1936, was a group of Latin-American health officers who were interested in up-to-date methods in our schools of medicine,

sanitation, and public hygiene. As the Director of the Rockefeller Foundation points out, "the interchanges of the League are something more than junkets of hygienists. They are genuine tours of institutes."

The object of these exchanges is to encourage a higher standard of public health in all countries, and to persuade those nations which have been laggard in this field to make greater efforts in health improvement.

The depression emphasized the need for studying the far-reaching problem of nutrition, the implications of which were so vast that no serious effort had ever been undertaken to deal with it. The problem had become acute in Germany during and following the war, due to the curtailed diet of the Central Powers. Infant mortality jumped to an unprecedented degree, and practically every child was found to have some disease based on malnutrition, such as rickets. The capacity of people for work, both mental and physical, declined amazingly.

The Allied and Associated Powers were not confronted with this problem of food shortage, and it was not until they were overtaken by the depression with its decline in purchasing power that steps were taken to deal with the

35 Rockefeller Foundation, Annual Report, 1925.
problem. The Health organization of the League led the attack. One definite result of the research undertaken has been to uncover the tie-up between nutrition and such subjects as housing, working conditions, rural hygiene, national trade policies, and even financial programs adopted by the several governments.

This revealing process was especially noticeable in the United States, where the study of nutrition is perhaps further advanced than in any other country, due to the work of such experts as Dr. E.V. McCollum of Johns Hopkins, and Dr. Mary Schwartz Rose of Columbia University. As a result of the American Food Administration's experiences in the war-torn regions of Europe, and the tragic conditions which came to light in the enemy countries, an impetus was given the study of nutrition here. This impulse has gone steadily forward, until today we find the government, through the Children's Bureau, outlining the diet of children, the Department of Labor basing its recommendations for labor legislation upon the needs of the average working man's family, and the Mayor of such a great city as New York threatening to import milk and supply it free to needy mothers and children in case the retail price made it impossible for them to purchase the necessary amount.

Americans have participated in the consideration of various less involved questions under League auspices. Some of these were: a study of the use of codeine by drug addicts; the effect on public health of poor housing
conditions; the revision of the international nomenclature of diseases; standardization of medical statistics; methods for ship fumigation; reorganization of the public health service in Greece;\(^{37}\) and the schooling of Chinese port officials in sanitation measures. In all of these activities men and women have devoted themselves to the advancement of the technic of public health in a world wide movement to better the conditions under which people live.

Intellectual Cooperation

Intellectual cooperation, as defined by the League of Nations, was undertaken in order to obtain:

international collaboration with a view to promoting the progress of general civilization and human knowledge, and notably the development and diffusion of science, letters, and arts.38

Within the scope of the League the purpose is to create an atmosphere favorable to the pacific solution of international problems.

Popular education has been one of the chief earmarks of American cultural development. Our educational heritage is rooted in English liberal thought of the 17th and 18th centuries. The quickening commercial life in England, resulting from the expansion of Europe, made it possible for men such as Pepys, with his never-ceasing interest in men and affairs, to take part in and contribute to the development of a new culture. The Royal Society, of which he was one of the founders, encouraged an understanding of the culture of other nations, and opened the doors to participation by men of all classes in experimental studies in the natural sciences and in the arts, thereby contributing to the betterment of the common outlook.

The American colonies were, to a large degree, dependent upon England for their cultural background. Benjamin Franklin, himself a member of the Royal Society in England, had

had an insatiable interest in the more practical aspects of life. Whereas Pepys loved books, and collected them for his private library, Franklin set up the first subscription library, composed largely of the latest European works of a scientific and practical character. This idea later developed into a movement for public libraries supported by public funds, a movement which is perhaps the outstanding American contribution to the library movement the world over.

Franklin kept in touch with the old world through his membership in the important scientific societies of Europe, and, through his printing establishment, brought the thought of the old world to the homes of the new. He was also the instigator of the American Philosophical Society which, during the century and a half of its existence, has done much to promote the general culture of the American people as a whole.

International cooperation in fields of learning, therefore, antedates the founding of the American republic. Such associations as the American Association of University Professors, the National Education Association, the American Library Association, and other learned societies in this country have been glad to cooperate with similar organizations in other countries. The founding of the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation at Paris in 1926, under the auspices of the League of Nations, gave added impetus to these activities by providing a central foci for controlling and directing the cooperation between such organizations.
Americans, both as individuals and private organizations, have participated whole-heartedly. An instance of our cooperation is shown in the building of the League Library, the funds for which, amounting to $2,000,000, were donated by John D. Rockefeller, Jr. William Warner Bishop, of the University of Michigan, helped to draw the plans and supervised the building of the Library. 39

Another group of Americans have interested themselves in the League's work in the field of visual education, which is carried on through the International Educational Cinematographic Institute in Rome. Specialists in this field from private and state universities, United States government bureaus, and the business world, have cooperated in raising the standards for production and distribution of educational film. Among those who have attended the meetings of the institute is W.W. Charters, director of the bureau of educational research, Ohio State University, who has done much in this country to further the advance of visual education.

This phase of the program for intellectual cooperation led to an agreement among the nations by which educational films are exempted from customs duties. 40 The institute issues a certificate covering each exempt film, importing countries retaining certain rights to refuse entry. A
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catalog of certified films, with all decisions concerning them is issued periodically by the institute.41

Another proposal which gives promise of increasing importance in American life is the movement for League of Nations teaching, which aims to train young people "to regard international cooperation as the normal method of conducting world affairs."42 It is an age-old axiom that if we "train up a child in the way he should go, when he is old he will not depart from it."

With this thought in mind, a group of progressive educators, headed by Dr. Shotwell, the American member of the League's advisory committee on teaching, urged the revision of history textbooks "to eliminate incitements to hatred of foreigners and to afford a comprehension of what one nation owes to another."43 A reorientation of the teaching of social and political sciences, history, geography, and modern languages was also suggested - all this to the end that a sense of international tolerance and fair play might be developed in the youth of the world. To further nourish such an outlook, the League has arranged student tours to foreign countries, has set up foreign scholarships, and has encouraged correspondence between American students and those in other countries.44

41United States, Department of State, Press Release, April 10, 1934.
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American learned societies have also supported such League activities as: (a) international study conferences on current topics, (b) correlation of university administrative practice, (c) bibliographical work such as the publication of Notable Books and the Index Bibliographicus, (d) establishing a general system of documentation for libraries, and (e) a general survey of the resources of libraries. Considering the type of subject dealt with in this field, it is not surprising that government participation is so limited. In the United States, only the Library of Congress and the Smithsonian Institution have been closely affiliated with the League's work in this field.45

Narcotic Drugs

In the earliest records of man's civilization we find instances of the use of narcotics. Homer's account of the Land of the Lotus-eaters - a land where people, forgetting their kin and their homeland, dreamed away their lives - is an historic example. Harry Franck, too, found that the Indians of the Andes followed an age-old custom of chewing the coca leaf, which enabled them to endure hunger and hardships in a state of numbed serenity.

The menace to civilization and to the human race which is involved in the use of these drugs for purposes other than the treatment of disease is well known to physicians and those who have been brought into contact with drug addicts.

The principal habit-forming drugs which are classed as dangerous are: opium and its derivatives - morphine, heroin, and codeine; the coca leaf and its derivatives - cocaine; and Indian hemp and its derivatives - hashish and marijuana. Indian hemp grows wild throughout the United States; the others are imported. Despite the fact that many of these products are essential prerequisites of modern medicine, control of their importation and sale has long been sought because of the vast illicit traffic in them.

American interest in this problem was first aroused by the studies of such organizations as the American Medical Association, the work of the various societies for social
welfare, and the agencies set up by the government for
bettering the conditions under which people live.

The problem of controlling the use of narcotic drugs
was too immense, however, to be left long in the hands of
any private organization or group of organizations. For
years the Federal government and state boards of health
have cooperated in disseminating information regarding the
effects of these drugs, have attempted to limit their sale,
and have tried to cure drug addicts in state and federal
institutions. It was found that little headway could be
made in the control of the supply without international
cooperation.

A preliminary step toward such control was the draft-
ing of the International Opium Convention, signed at The
Hague in 1912. The war prevented the ratification and
functioning of this convention, and it was not until the
close of the war that the League of Nations was empowered
to take steps to set up some system of international control.

The efforts of the League in this direction led to the
Geneva Convention of 1925, which

binds signatory governments to limit exclusively to
medical and scientific purposes the trade in and use
of the dangerous derivative drugs of opium and the
coca leaf - morphine, heroin, cocaine, and certain
other narcotic drugs.

The convention also set up a system for certifying exports
and imports of drugs, and a permanent central Opium Board,
to which nation-signatories supply quarterly reports show-
ing quantities of drugs exported and imported, and annual reports showing estimates of raw materials needed, statistics of consumption, production, manufacture, stocks, and confiscations.46

The fact that the United States agreed to cooperate with the Opium Board as early as 1925, and to such a great extent, may be easily explained. Our government considered that the board was completely independent of the League, and that it fulfilled a function which the United States regarded as necessary. In a press release it was declared that:

as the largest legitimate consumer of opium and coca leaf, and as the largest market for narcotic drugs in the illicit traffic, the United States is vitally interested in and directly affected by the work of this board.47

The ineffectiveness of attempting to suppress the illicit traffic without controlling the production of manufactured drugs, became evident in the period immediately following the formation of the Opium Board. Drugs were developed which were not subject to the regulations but which were easily convertible into morphine and heroin for the illicit traffic. Therefore, a conference held in 1931 drew up further rules for limiting the manufacture and regulating the distribution of narcotic drugs. Steps were taken to examine, to approve, or to amend with the consent

46 Geneva Special Studies, Vol.VI, No.1, "International Administration of Narcotic Drugs, 1928-1934."
47 United States, Department of State, Press Release, September 19, 1933.
of each government, the annual estimates presented by the states, and to make estimates for territories that failed to do so. These estimates, once adopted, became binding on governments, parties to the agreement of 1931, an important improvement over the 1925 convention.48

The United States was the second country to ratify this agreement, and diplomatic pressure on other countries was used to such a degree that the measure went into effect only two years later.49 A Department of State press release announced that:

The advantage of the convention to the United States lies in the fact that it limits the quantities of dangerous drugs manufactured in other countries, renders much stricter the control abroad of the legitimate trade in these substances, and affords better facilities for combating the illicit traffic from which the United States is today one of the principal sufferers.50

The action taken in 1931 made it possible to tabulate the legitimate drug needs of the world each year, the first issue of this tabulation appearing in October, 1933.51 By 1935, 137 countries and territories were cooperating in the making of estimates for the tabulation


50 United States, Department of State, Press Release, February 25, 1935.
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of drug needs. The Opium Board was not only given
authority to collect and publish such estimates, but it
may also take steps to see that a country does not exceed
its estimate for the year, except in case of an emergency.
In case a country does not live up to its obligations
under the agreement, all the countries who signed the
agreement are notified, and shipments of drugs to the
offending countries are stopped.

Further measures for the suppression of illicit
traffic in drugs were considered at Geneva in 1936.
The intention was to find some means for securing more
severe penalties for those who break anti-drug laws, and
to provide for extradition of offenders. The agreement
made at the meeting was signed by twenty-five countries,
but not by the United States. The Department of State
explained the American attitude by stating:

signature to the convention was withheld because
the American government considers that application
of the stipulations of the convention as drafted
would weaken rather than strengthen the interna-
tional measures available today to suppress the
abuse of narcotic drugs, and would not effectively
contribute to the prevention or punishment of the
illicit traffic.
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December 12, 1936.
Social and Humanitarian Activities

Reformers of the past century in many countries have called attention to the need for action on social and humanitarian problems. Work of this nature has been cared for mainly by philanthropic individuals, religious bodies, and benevolent societies. Government endeavor in these fields has lagged far behind the need for action. Public Opinion has been the energizing force which has finally brought government acceptance of responsibility for social welfare.

When the League of Nations was established it was understood that one of its functions would be to coordinate the work of the various national governments in dealing with social and humanitarian problems. This part of the League program has been concerned mainly with such questions as: (a) child welfare, (b) refugees, (c) traffic in women and children, (d) slavery, (e) penal and penitentiary questions, and (f) assistance to indigent foreigners. Traffic in women and children and slavery will be discussed.

Most of these topics are of the kind which do not call for governmental assistance until the ground has been thoroughly gone over by experts, the difficulties isolated and made clear, and possible remedies and courses of action outlined for consideration by the several governments. Many private Americans have given their knowledge and financial support to the bodies which have functioned in these fields under the auspices of the League of Nations, and the sup-
port of American civic organizations also has been very generous.

Traffic in women and children is a subject which has occupied reformers and all who are interested in the betterment of the position of women in society since the rise of modern nations. In older civilizations women were considered to be chattel property, and both a woman and her issue could be disposed of at the pleasure of the head of the household. In some countries of the Near East and practically all of China and India, and even parts of Japan, this holds true today. However, western nations look upon this matter in a different light, and have taken steps to remedy it.

Individual countries went as far as possible in controlling this traffic through laws and regulations, but the traffic did not stop at national boundary lines. Therefore, international control was attempted as early as 1904, when an agreement was signed by which the countries agreed to report any movement of women and children from one country to another. The United States signed this particular agreement, and for some years the traffic was greatly diminished, especially in the Americas and in Europe.55

When Miss Grace Abbott, of the United States Children's Bureau, began her collaboration with the League in 1923, she urged that a survey be made in non-Oriental countries

so that the exact state of the traffic in women and children could be defined. 56 This survey was finally begun in 1925 and enlisted the support of almost every American institution in the social science field. The American Social Hygiene Bureau and the Children's Bureau of the Labor Department were especially active in their support. In 1929 the results of the survey were made public, and were of such a nature that the civilized world was shocked at the enormity of the traffic. The national governments, and in the United States the local governments, were galvanized into action. 57

During the period since 1929 authorities in the cities and states of the United States have increased their efforts to cope with the situation disclosed by the League's survey. The newspapers have been full of accounts of raids, trials, and convictions of those who have amassed fortunes because of the misuse of women and children. One of the most spectacular and far-reaching cases of this nature was the Luciano case in New York City, brought to light by the investigations of Special Prosecutor Thomas F. Dewey. 53

Another League investigation which resulted in a shock to the public conscience of the United States was the inquiry into the charge of slavery in Liberia. Theoretically, Liberia is the only independent country in the whole of the

56 World Peace Foundation, Nine Years of the League of Nations, Boston, 1929.

57 League of Nations, Documents, C.527.52.1927.IV.(1927.IV.2).

continent of Africa. The country was founded in 1820 by American societies interested in finding a home for freed slaves. Throughout the whole of its history it has been under the benevolent protection of the United States. Therefore, when reports began to be circulated that conditions of slavery existed in Liberia, the people of the United States were immediately interested.

American interest in the matter was further stimulated by the discussion of Liberian affairs led by Raymond L. Buell at the Institute of Politics held at Williamstown, Mass., in August, 1928. By the middle of 1929 Liberia had agreed to an investigation to be carried out by the League of Nations and the United States, acting together. Dr. Johnson, president of Fisk University, was appointed American representative.

Approximately four months were spent by the investigating committee in Liberia. The report made on the findings of this committee was published in December, 1930, and made it clear to all that: (a) slavery did exist in Liberia, (b) that the Liberian government discouraged it by freeing any slave who appealed to the courts, (c) that leading citizens used forced labor, and (d) that government officials permitted compulsory recruitment of labor. The report also included recommendations for correction of the situation,

---
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such as a suggestion that the making of roads in the interior be curtailed, and for a complete house-cleaning of government officials.

Naturally, the report of the investigating committee was received with resentment in Liberia. Although the United States sent word that she would be glad to help Liberia make the reforms suggested in the report, Liberia made no definite plans for carrying them out. This attitude of procrastination and delay on the part of Liberia exasperated the American government, and caused Secretary of State Stimson to send a very strongly worded note to the Liberian government in which it was made clear that unless the reforms affecting slavery and forced labor were made, the result would be a rupture between that country and the United States. 62 Liberia continued to refuse to accept the recommendations of the League, and the United States withdrew its minister in 1930.

Liberia made a little progress in ridding herself of slavery during the next four years, and the United States took steps to find out what had been done by sending Assistant Secretary of State Henry McBride to Liberia in July, 1934. 63 His report caused Secretary of State Hull to decide that more could be done if the confidence of Liberia were gained, and that normal relations between the two countries should be renewed. 64 Therefore, on October

63 Ibid., July 24, 1934.
64 Ibid., June 12, 1935.
2, 1935, the new American minister presented his credentials to the President of Liberia, and diplomatic relations were resumed. 65

In the preceding pages some part of the story of past cooperation between the United States and the League of Nations has been given. In the light of this cooperation, and confronted with the great problems of the present and the future in international affairs, it would seem quite natural for one to draw the conclusion that future cooperation between the United States and the League would become increasingly close and would widen in scope. Recent changes in the status of Hugh R. Wilson, our minister at Berne, and Prentiss Gilbert, consul at Geneva, have caused much speculation in League circles, and have led to a hope that closer cooperation with the League is contemplated through the establishment of an American diplomatic office credited directly to the League of Nations. 66


BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. SOURCES

Official Publications.


C. II (Records of the Second Assembly, 1921)
Report of the Secretary-General to the Second Assembly, 1921.
C.5.M.5.1921.VI.
C.225.M.129.1923.IV.
A.16.1924.IX.
C.52.M.52.1927.IV.(1927.IV.2)
C.59.M.34.1929.VIII.(1929.VIII.1)
C.65.M.272.1930.VI.
A.12(a).1931.V.
C.163.M.58.1931.VIII.(1931.VIII.1)
A.55.1933.XI.
C.464.M.193.1933.XI.
C.425.M.213.1935.III.
C.429.M.220.1935.XI.
C.449.M.235.1935.VIII.
C.464.M.244.1935.III.
A.6(a).1936 (Report of Secretary-General to Assembly)


Rockefeller Foundation, Annual Report, New York, 1925.

Newspapers.

Chicago Tribune, September 22, 1924.

II. SECONDARY MATERIAL

General Works.


Brailsford, Henry Noel, Olives of Endless Age; Being a Study of This Distracted World and Its Need of Unity. New York, 1928.


Clerke, John Hessin, America and World Peace. New York, 1925.

Fanshaw, Maurice, Reconstruction: Five Years of Work by the League of Nations. London, 1925.


Garner, James W., American Foreign Policy; an Examination of Certain Traditional and Recent International Policies of the United States. New York, 1926.


League of Nations, Secretariat, Ten Years of World Cooperation. Boston, 1930.


Miller, David H., The Drafting of the Covenant. New York, 1928.


**Special Studies.**


Periodical Publications.


Buell, Raymond L., "The League of Nations; a Summary of its Organization and Accomplishments During Ten Years," (Foreign Policy Association Pamphlets, No. 61, Series, 1929-1930), New York, 1930.


Fosdick, Raymond B., "The State Department and the League of Nations," (Review of Reviews, April, 1924), New York, 1924.


Hubbard, Ursula P., "The Cooperation of the United States With the League of Nations, 1931-1936," (International Conciliation, no.329), New York, 1937. This pamphlet was particularly helpful.


Wilde, John C. de, "Sugar; an International Problem," (Foreign Policy Association Reports, Vol. IX, No.13), New York, 1933.

Young, John P., "The United States' Silver Policy," (Foreign Policy Association Reports, Vol. XII, No.11), New York, 1936.