

L.N.V.2.(28)

Geneva, February 21st, 1938.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

INTERNATIONAL REPRESSION OF TERRORISM

DRAFT CONVENTION FOR THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF TERRORISM

DRAFT CONVENTION FOR THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

OBSERVATIONS BY GOVERNMENTS

Series III

NOTE BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL.

In execution of the Council's decision of January 23rd, 1936, the Secretary-General invited the Governments to forward to him by July 15th, 1936, any observations they might desire to submit to the Assembly on the texts of the above-mentioned draft Conventions drawn up by the Committee for the International Repression of Terrorism at its second session, held from January 7th to 15th, 1936 (see document A.7.1936.V).

The first two series of replies were printed and published in documents A.24.1936.V and A.24(a).1936.V, but the under-mentioned replies were received after the close of the Assembly's ordinary session in 1936 and were distributed to the Governments in mimeographed form as documents C.552.M.356.1936.V and C.194.M.139.1937.V.

In order that all the observations received from Governments on the drafts drawn up by the Committee at its second session may be easily available for reference in printed form, the present document, forming Series III, is now issued.

	Page		Page
China . . . . .	1	Czechoslovakia . . . . .	2

C.552.M.356.1936.V.

China.

[Translation.]

November 27th, 1936.

My Government is in agreement with the principles of the draft Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court ; on the other hand, it regrets that the draft Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism does not embody the suggestions submitted by the Chinese Government in reply to your Circular Letter 219.1934.V, of December 27th, 1934.

In my letter of April 26th, 1935,<sup>1</sup> I conveyed to you two suggestions which my Government would have wished the Committee of Experts to adopt—namely :

- (1) That, in countries where extra-territoriality is in force, foreigners entitled to the regime of consular courts should forfeit the benefit of this regime and become amenable to local jurisdiction whenever they are accused of any of the acts constituting terrorist action for political ends ;

<sup>1</sup> Document C.184.M.102.1935.V.



(2) That, in the case of countries in whose territory are situated "concessions, settlements or leased territories", every facility should be afforded to the authorities of such countries with a view to the repression, in the above-mentioned territories, which are removed from their administration, of crimes committed for purposes of political terrorism.

As I informed you in that letter, my Government attaches particular importance to the embodiment in the Convention of these two provisions, which would greatly facilitate the prosecution of accused persons who are in China.

I should be glad if you would be good enough to communicate my present letter to the Committee of Experts, whose members, knowing how greatly the prevention and punishment of crime is complicated by the existence of the system of extra-territoriality and of "concessions, settlements and leased territories", will certainly be able to appreciate the utility of my Government's suggestions. My Government will, moreover, explain its views in detail when the draft Convention in question is discussed.

C.194.M.139.1937.V.

Czechoslovakia.

March 13th, 1937.

[*Translation.*]

I. CONCERNING THE DRAFT CONVENTION FOR THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF TERRORISM.

The Czechoslovak Government has been following with close attention and cordial sympathy the various efforts made to ensure collaboration between States in suppressing criminal violence as a weapon in political strife. It accordingly welcomes the proposal of the French Government and of the experts on international criminal law to frame a draft international convention for the prevention and punishment of the acts of violence, committed for political ends, commonly known as terrorism. The conclusion of a series of conventions to which a large number of States are parties demonstrates the possibility of standardising the offences and the corresponding penalties provided for in the laws of the various countries, and the further possibility, by bringing national laws into unison on this point, of obtaining an effective means of coping with the use of criminal violence for political ends. The Czechoslovak Government has in mind the results obtained by means of the Convention of April 20th, 1929, for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency, and, more recently, by the Convention of June 26th, 1936, for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs. In principle, therefore, the Czechoslovak Government's attitude towards the draft Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism is a positive one, but it fully realises that the solution of the problem is fraught with serious difficulties which make it necessary to proceed with the greatest circumspection. While the criminal acts of individuals or groups or associations of individuals must, indeed, be punished, the Convention must not be allowed to apply to acts falling within the scope of public international law—*e.g.*, the law of war. Nor must the repression of terrorism be allowed to become a pretext for unduly restricting or even entirely abolishing the free expression of opinion. These various points must be borne in mind when scrutinising the draft of January 1936 submitted by the Committee of Experts.

Passing on to the various provisions of the draft, the Czechoslovak Government desires to submit the following observations :

*Ad Article 1.*

The Committee of Experts discussed what was meant by the word "terrorism", and whether it was necessary to specify that what was intended was political terrorism. The prevailing opinion in the Committee was that the term "terrorism" was universally understood and that no further definition was required. It was also held that "terrorism" should be deemed to include only the offences mentioned in Articles 2 and 3 of the draft, and subject to the conditions therein named. If this view is correct, Article 1 should, in the Czechoslovak Government's opinion, be deleted, assuming that the Convention itself will be described as a Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, or that there will be a preamble to that effect.

If Article 1 is maintained, the term "terrorism" should be replaced by the words "the punishable acts mentioned in Articles 2 and 3". It is important, in a Convention providing for co-operation between States in matters of criminal law, to avoid, as far as possible, ambiguous terms which might involve divergent interpretations of the rights and obligations ensuing from the Convention. The Committee of Experts found that, although it had regarded the meaning of terrorism as generally understood, a definition of its exact significance and scope would present certain difficulties. The solution proposed by the Czechoslovak Government—*viz.*, to refer to the various acts explicitly mentioned in the Convention—would obviate these difficulties.

*Ad Article 2.*

1. As has been pointed out above, it cannot be the purpose of the proposed Convention to make acts which are governed by public international law into offences punishable under criminal law. Thus, by definition, the Convention cannot apply to acts performed by those

amenable to public international law. Such being the case, the nature of the punishable acts coming within the scope of the Convention should be established by elimination ; more particularly, acts of violence subject, for example, to the law of war would be excluded, and the new conventional rules would only apply to punishable acts committed by individuals or groups or associations of individuals, in so far as the latter could not, under international law, be regarded as belligerents. At the same time, it is important to remember that the purpose in view is the framing of international regulations, and that consequently the offences in question must be in the nature of international or, it may be, world offences, the suppression or prevention of which has an interest of a legal character for the international community of States. If the international character of the punishable acts is to be specially stressed in this way, it will obviously be necessary to make it clear that the conventional rights and obligations do not embrace any acts which are restricted to the territory of a single State and the effects of which are not felt in the territory of another State. So long as the term "terrorism" is retained in the title of the Convention, in its preamble, or in the various provisions, the Czechoslovak Government considers it desirable to insert the qualification "international", or to incorporate in the Convention an interpretative rule to the above effect.

2. The text framed by the Committee of Experts does not make it clear whether the Convention is based upon a subjective or objective conception of the acts concerned—that is to say, whether the decisive factor is to be the offender's *intention* of bringing about the overthrow of a Government or an interruption in the working of public services or a disturbance in international relations, by the use of violence or by the creation of a state of terror, or whether it is to be the fact that the act is in itself capable of producing such effects that shall be decisive.

The Czechoslovak Government is inclined to think that, in framing the proposed conventional regulations, the question should be approached from *both these points of view*, and that the subjective and the objective criteria should be adopted in conjunction. At the same time, the decision as to whether the conditions for the application of the Convention under the terms of Article 3, paragraph 2, of the present draft are all fulfilled must obviously rest, in any case, with whatever State might be called upon to take action under the terms of the Convention.

As regards the several provisions of Article 2, the Czechoslovak Government feels some doubt as to how any essential distinction can be made between the various means employed to commit an act of terrorism. The terms "violence" and "creation of a state of terror" used in the Convention are not at all clear, since "violence" may also, it would seem, mean "threat". Nor is it certain whether the expression "violence" is intended to mean only acts directed against the person who is the immediate object of the attack, or whether that term should also include acts aimed indirectly at another person. The expression "state of terror" seems, on the contrary, to imply that more than one person is involved.

In directing attention to the possibility that the terms employed may be variously interpreted, the Czechoslovak Government recommends that they be more accurately defined.

Accepting the method of drafting which follows from the Czechoslovak Government's observations concerning Article 1, it would moreover be possible to avoid all the difficulties just noted, if Article 2, paragraph 1, were worded as follows :

"Each High Contracting Party should make the following acts criminal offences, whether they affect his own interests or those of another High Contracting Party, in all cases where they are directed to the overthrow of a Government or an interruption in the working of public services or a disturbance in international relations—viz. :"

In this way, it would be possible to dispense with the words "by the use of violence or by the creation of a state of terror", which would become superfluous by reason of the limitative enumeration of the acts concerned ; and would moreover obviate the difficulties that might very easily arise as to the significance of these terms in conjunction with the acts enumerated in Article 2, paragraph 1, Nos. (1) to (5).

Ad Article 2, Paragraph 1.

The Czechoslovak Government thinks that it will be necessary to specify whether the obligations of the contracting parties refer *ex conventione* to all the persons named therein, and whether the contracting States would be bound to extend such protection to nationals of their own to whom they had hitherto accorded no exceptional protection. Another question which arises in connection with Article 4, is whether the Convention involves an obligation to provide special protection for the persons named, or whether the degree of protection to be provided by any given State should be the same as that accorded to its own nationals of similar rank, irrespective of the degree of protection accorded to the said persons by the laws of their own countries. The Government also thinks that it should be decided, in connection with Article 4, whether the contracting parties shall be free to make the protection of the persons concerned conditional, in each case, on reciprocity and, possibly, equality.

Ad Article 2, Paragraph 3.

The Czechoslovak Government considers that the amendments proposed by the Polish Government in its observations of September 3rd, 1936 (document A.24(a).1936.V), are better suited to the purpose of the Convention, and accordingly recommends their adoption.

*Ad Article 2, Paragraph 4.*

If the provisions of this paragraph are to apply to preparatory acts in any form, "purchase" and "brokerage", which are not at present covered by the Convention, should be added to the list of punishable acts.

*Ad Article 2, Paragraph 5, and Article 3.*

The draft Convention employs the terms "giving assistance" (Article 2, paragraph 5), "wilful complicity" and "any help" (Article 3, paragraph 1, point (2)), in which it is difficult to distinguish any essential difference. From the fact that the expression "giving assistance" is used in Article 2, it can only be inferred that assistance given to the person guilty of an offence or his accomplice is itself to constitute a separate offence the commission of which may take the form of "wilful complicity" or "any help". It is not at all clear from the text what essential difference there is between these various expressions. If the term "any help" means assistance given to the offender after he has committed the punishable act, this is not sufficiently clear from the Convention.

The Czechoslovak Government accordingly recommends further consideration of the question whether acts which are essentially the same should be designated by different terms. It recommends also that the various forms of activity in respect of which proceedings are to be taken should be designated by terms which cannot be construed to mean that there is no essential difference between them.

The Czechoslovak Government would prefer, on the contrary, to employ, as far as possible, the same terminology as in the other international Conventions relating to criminal law, more particularly the most recent in date, that of June 26th, 1936, on the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs. The Government refers more particularly to the terminology employed in Article 2, letters (b), (c) and (d), of that Convention.

As regards paragraph 2 of Article 3, it would be more in keeping with the purpose of the Convention to adopt a formula whereby acts committed in different States can be punished separately. Since a definite distinction must be made between the obligation to prosecute in respect of these various acts, and the subsequent possibility of a joint trial—which would be determined by considerations of convenience of procedure and expediency—the Czechoslovak Government recommends that the wording of paragraph 2 of Article 3 be brought into line with that of Article 4 of the above-mentioned Convention of June 26th, 1936.

*Ad Article 4.*

The expression "but this provision is without prejudice to the characterisation of offences and other special provisions" does not exclude the possibility that the contracting States may, among the persons mentioned in Article 2, make a distinction as regards persons who are nationals of foreign States, provided this does not affect the obligation imposed on the contracting States to punish, at all events in a general fashion, the acts mentioned in the Convention. The expression "certain persons mentioned at point (1) of Article 2" would seem to give the contracting State the right to select the group of persons to be protected.

In directing attention to these possible interpretations and to its observations concerning Article 2 of the draft, the Czechoslovak Government recommends that the meaning and scope of the expressions "the characterisation of offences and other special provisions" and "certain persons" should be more closely defined.

*Ad Article 5.*

Paragraph 1 should be brought into line as far as possible with the text of the Convention relating to dangerous drugs.

Paragraph 2 might give rise to various objections if it is to be interpreted as an undertaking to give effect to foreign criminal sentences, even to the extent of taking them as a basis for imposing additional penalties or for ordering and carrying into effect provisional measures.

*Ad Article 7.*

The Czechoslovak Government recommends that the text of this article be brought into line with that of Article 7 of the Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs.

*Ad Article 8.*

The Czechoslovak Government takes a similar view as regards the text of Article 8.

In the matter of detail, it recommends the deletion in letter (a) of the words "has been demanded and".

The draft text would be amended to read as follows :

"(a) Extradition cannot take place for a reason independent of the act itself."

This amendment is more in keeping with the spirit of the Convention, which is designed to preclude the possibility of evading the obligations laid down in the Convention, which possibility would at present exist if extradition were not demanded.

The Czechoslovak Government also proposes the deletion of letter (c), since this provision would result in immunity from prosecution for the nationals of certain States and, thus, in an unequal apportionment of the rights and obligations ensuing from the Convention. A similar provision was discussed in June 1936 at the Diplomatic Conference on Dangerous Drugs, and was deleted from the text of the Convention.

Ad Article 9.

The Czechoslovak Government recommends that the text of this article should be arranged as far as possible in the same way as that of the corresponding Article 9 of the Convention relating to dangerous drugs. At the same time, the reservations laid down in Article 9, No. 4, of that Convention would hardly be acceptable.

Ad Article 10.

This article raises doubts as regards Article 3 of the Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court. In the Committee of Experts, there has already been some discussion as to whether, by sending a case for trial to the International Criminal Court, a State would be released from its conventional obligations *vis-à-vis* a State which was not a party to the proposed Convention concerning that Court. The Czechoslovak Government rather inclines to the view that such a possibility should only exist as between States bound by the Convention concerning the International Criminal Court, and that it cannot apply to States which are not parties to that instrument.

Ad Article 12.

The Czechoslovak Government endorses the amendments proposed by the Polish Government in its observations of September 3rd, 1936 (document A.24(a).1936.V).

Ad Articles 14, 15 and 16.

The Czechoslovak Government thinks that these provisions should be brought into line with the similar provisions of the above-mentioned Convention relating to dangerous drugs (Articles 11, 12 and 13).

As regards paragraph 4 of Article 16, the Czechoslovak Government notes that this provision is not in accordance with the practice followed in regard to the languages to be used in the letters of request mentioned in similar international Conventions. These go on the principle that the State applied to is not itself obliged to procure a translation. The Czechoslovak Government recommends that, on this point, the text of the Convention should be modelled on that of Article 13 of the Convention concerning traffic in dangerous drugs.

The Czechoslovak Government recommends further that consideration be given to the question of the languages to be used in the relations between the central services mentioned in Article 15. Here, too, it would be possible to adopt the rules recommended for application to letters of request (Article 16), as the contracting States might perhaps agree on one or more languages in which the central services should, for instance, draw up reports supplied at the same time to similar services in a number of States.

Ad Article 17.

The Czechoslovak Government thinks that the provisions of this article should be brought into line with the similar Article 14 of the Convention relating to dangerous drugs.

Ad Article 18.

Similarly, this article should be brought into line with Article 15 of the Convention relating to dangerous drugs.

Ad Article 23.

To this article might be added a clause placing the contracting parties under an obligation to communicate to one another, through the League of Nations Secretariat, any *legal* measures that they may take to enforce the Convention.

Ad Articles 19-28.

During the discussions on the Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs, it was recommended that a model set of formal articles should be prepared for use in all multilateral agreements concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations. The Czechoslovak Government shares this view and recommends further that the formal articles of the proposed new Convention should be brought into line as far as possible with the text of the corresponding articles of the last Convention of this kind—that is to say, the above-mentioned international Convention of June 26th, 1936, for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs.

II. CONCERNING THE DRAFT CONVENTION FOR THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT.

The Czechoslovak Government is in sympathy with the idea of concluding an international Convention for the Creation of an International Criminal Court, to have the character of a permanent tribunal competent to try the specific criminal cases referred to it. The idea is not a new one and, as examples of similar courts, mention may be made of the Rhine and Elbe International Commissions, which have heard appeals against the judgments, in penal matters, of the ordinary navigation tribunals.

Since, however, many States have adopted a negative attitude towards this draft Convention, it seems unlikely that any agreement will be reached in the near future, and the Czechoslovak Government is opposed to any discussion of this draft which would delay the successful conclusion of the first Convention.

Some decision must be taken as regards Article 3 of the Convention concerning the International Criminal Court, from the point of view of the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism. That article entitles the parties to send certain accused persons before the Court for trial and judgment. The Czechoslovak Government has already expressed doubt—in connection with Article 10 of the Convention for Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism—as to whether a signatory State can release itself in this way from its obligations *vis-à-vis* other States which have not accepted the second Convention. As in the case of Article 10 of the first-named Convention, it thinks that this possibility should be open only, and on reciprocal terms, to States which are parties to both the Conventions.

\* \* \*

Annex.

EXTRACTS FROM THE CONVENTION OF 1936 FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN DANGEROUS DRUGS.

.....

Article 2.

.....

- (b) Intentional participation in the offences specified in this article ;
- (c) Conspiracy to commit any of the above-mentioned offences ;
- (d) Attempts and, subject to the conditions prescribed by national law, preparatory acts.

.....

Article 4.

Each of the acts specified in Article 2 shall, if committed in different countries, be considered as a distinct offence.

.....

Article 6.

In countries where the principle of the international recognition of previous convictions is recognised, foreign convictions for the offences referred to in Article 2 shall, subject to the conditions prescribed by the domestic law, be recognised for the purpose of establishing habitual criminality.

Article 7.

1. In countries where the principle of the extradition of nationals is not recognised, nationals who have returned to the territory of their own country, after the commission abroad of any of the offences referred to in Article 2, shall be prosecuted and punished in the same manner as if the offence had been committed in the said territory, even in a case where the offender has acquired his nationality after the commission of the offence.

2. This provision does not apply if, in a similar case, the extradition of a foreigner cannot be granted.

Article 8.

Foreigners who are in the territory of a High Contracting Party and who have committed abroad any of the offences set out in Article 2 shall be prosecuted and punished as though the offence had been committed in that territory if the following conditions are realised—namely, that :

- (a) Extradition has been requested and could not be granted for a reason independent of the offence itself ;
- (b) The law of the country of refuge considers prosecution for offences committed abroad by foreigners admissible as a general rule.

*Article 9.*

1. The offences set out in Article 2 shall be deemed to be included as extradition crimes in any extradition treaty which has been or may hereafter be concluded between any of the High Contracting Parties.

2. The High Contracting Parties who do not make extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty or on reciprocity shall, as between themselves, recognise the offences referred to above as extradition crimes.

3. Extradition shall be granted in conformity with the law of the country to which application is made.

4. The High Contracting Party to whom application for extradition is made shall, in all cases, have the right to refuse to effect the arrest or to grant the extradition of a fugitive offender if his competent authorities consider that the offence of which the fugitive offender is accused or convicted is not sufficiently serious.

*Article 11.*

1. Each of the High Contracting Parties shall set up, within the framework of its domestic law, a central office for the supervision and co-ordination of all operations necessary to prevent the offences specified in Article 2, and for ensuring that steps are taken to prosecute persons guilty of such offences.

2. This central office :

(a) Shall be in close contact with other official institutions or bodies dealing with narcotic drugs ;

(b) Shall centralise all information of a nature to facilitate the investigation and prevention of the offences specified in Article 2 ;

(c) Shall be in close contact with and may correspond direct with the central offices of other countries.

3. Where the Government of a High Contracting Party is federal in character, or where the executive authority of its Government is distributed between central and local Governments, the supervision and co-ordination specified in paragraph 1 and the execution of the functions specified in (a) and (b) of paragraph 2 shall be carried out in conformity with the constitutional or administrative system thereof.

4. Where the present Convention has been applied to any territory by virtue of Article 18, the requirements of the present article may be carried out by means of a central office set up in or for that territory acting in conjunction, if necessary, with the central office in the metropolitan territory concerned.

5. The powers and the functions of the central office may be delegated to the special administration referred to in Article 15 of the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs of 1931.

*Article 12.*

1. The central office shall co-operate with the central offices of foreign countries to the greatest extent possible in order to facilitate the prevention and punishment of the offences specified in Article 2.

2. The office shall, so far as it thinks expedient, communicate to the central office of any country which may be concerned :

(a) Particulars which would make it possible to carry out any investigations or operations relating to any transactions in progress or proposed ;

(b) Any particulars which it has been able to secure regarding the identity and the description of traffickers with a view to supervising their movements ;

(c) Discoveries of secret factories of narcotic drugs.

*Article 13.*

1. The transmission of letters of request relating to the offences referred to in Article 2 shall be effected :

(a) Preferably by direct communication between the competent authorities of each country or through the central offices, or

(b) By direct correspondence between the Ministers of Justice of the two countries or by direct communication from another competent authority of the country making the request to the Minister of Justice of the country to which the request is made, or

(c) Through the diplomatic or consular representative of the country making the request in the country to which the request is made. For this purpose, the letters of request shall be sent by such representative to the authority designated by the country to which the request is made.

2. Each High Contracting Party may, by communication to the other High Contracting Parties, express its desire that letters of request to be executed within its territory should be sent to it through the diplomatic channel.

3. In case (c) of paragraph 1, a copy of the letter of request shall at the same time be sent by the diplomatic or consular representative of the country making the request to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the country to which application is made.

4. Unless otherwise agreed, the letter of request shall be drawn up in the language of the authority to which request is made or in a language agreed upon by the two countries concerned.

5. Each High Contracting Party shall notify to each of the other High Contracting Parties the method, or methods, of transmission mentioned above which it will recognise for the letters of request of the latter High Contracting Party.

6. Until such notification is made by a High Contracting Party, its existing procedure in regard to letters of request shall remain in force.

7. The execution of letters of request shall not be subject to payment of taxes or expenses other than the expenses of experts.

8. Nothing in the present article shall be construed as an undertaking on the part of the High Contracting Parties to adopt in criminal matters any form or methods of proof contrary to their laws or to execute letters of request otherwise than within the limits of their laws.

*Article 14.*

The participation of a High Contracting Party in the present Convention shall not be interpreted as affecting that Party's attitude on the general question of criminal jurisdiction as a question of international law.

*Article 15.*

The present Convention does not affect the principle that the offences referred to in Articles 2 and 5 shall in each country be defined, prosecuted and punished in conformity with the general rules of its domestic law.

*Article 19.*

The present Convention, of which the French and English texts shall both be equally authoritative, shall bear this day's date, and shall, until December 31st, 1936, be open for signature on behalf of any Member of the League of Nations, or of any non-member State which received an invitation to the Conference which drew up the present Convention, or to which the Council of the League of Nations shall have communicated a copy of the Convention for this purpose.

*Article 20.*

The present Convention shall be ratified. The instruments of ratification shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall notify their receipt to all Members of the League and to the non-member States referred to in the preceding article.

*Article 21.*

1. As from January 1st, 1937, the present Convention shall be open to accession on behalf of any Member of the League of Nations or any non-member State mentioned in Article 19.

2. The instruments of accession shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall notify their receipt to all the Members of the League and to the non-member States mentioned in that article.

*Article 22.*

The present Convention shall come into force ninety days after the Secretary-General of the League of Nations has received the ratifications or accessions of ten Members of the League of Nations or non-member States. It shall be registered on that date by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

*Article 23.*

Ratifications or accessions received after the deposit of the tenth ratification or accession shall take effect as from the expiration of a period of ninety days from the date of their receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

*Article 24.*

1. After the expiration of five years from the date of the coming into force of the present Convention, it may be denounced by an instrument in writing, deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. The denunciation shall take effect one year after the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations and shall operate only as regards the Member of the League or non-member State on whose behalf it has been deposited.



2. The Secretary-General shall notify all the Members of the League and the non-member States mentioned in Article 19 of any denunciations received.

3. If, as a result of simultaneous or successive denunciations, the number of Members of the League and non-member States bound by the present Convention is reduced to less than ten, the Convention shall cease to be in force as from the date on which the last of such denunciations shall take effect in accordance with the provisions of this article.

*Article 25.*

A request for the revision of the present Convention may at any time be made by any Member of the League of Nations or non-member State bound by this Convention by means of a notice addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. Such notice shall be communicated by the Secretary-General to the other Members of the League of Nations or non-member States bound by this Convention, and, if endorsed by not less than one-third of them, the High Contracting Parties agree to meet for the purpose of revising the Convention.





