

intention of disturbing relations between Italy and Ethiopia", and that the Italian Government refers to "these frontier incidents as confirming its duty to take the most vigorous defensive measures to safeguard its legitimate interests."

Protesting against "these allegations and this attitude," the Ethiopian Government proposed that the Council should appoint immediately neutral observers to proceed to Ethiopia and inspect the frontier districts marching with Italian Somaliland and the other colonies. These observers, who would investigate the situation actually existing in the frontier districts, would make an enquiry into all alleged or real incidents and would report to the Council direct.

22. On July 9th, the Council was informed by the Ethiopian Government's agent that the work of the Conciliation Commission had been interrupted. The Italian Government's agent had objected to the agent of the Ethiopian Government giving explanations regarding the territorial situation at Walwal, on the ground that the terms of arbitration drawn up in agreement between the two Governments related to the *de facto* circumstances of the Walwal incident and of the other incidents which had occurred up to May 25th, to the exclusion of frontier incidents in whole or in part. The two Italian arbitrators had accepted the objection put forward by their Government's agent. The two arbitrators appointed by the Ethiopian Government had considered that it was impossible to forbid the agent of the Ethiopian Government to state the reasons which led him to consider that the Commission, being free to judge of all the circumstances of the incident, might include among those circumstances the "ownership" of Walwal. The Italian arbitrators had proposed a suspension of the proceedings until July 20th, in order to give the two Governments an opportunity of settling the point under dispute meanwhile. On their side, the arbitrators appointed by the Ethiopian Government had declared that the time had come for the four arbitrators to select a fifth arbitrator.

23. As already stated above, the Council had decided to meet if, failing an agreement between the four arbitrators for the settlement of the dispute, an understanding should not have been reached by July 25th, between these arbitrators, as to the selection of the fifth arbitrator (unless the four arbitrators agreed to the extension of this period). This situation having arisen, the Council was convened in special session on July 31st.

*Special Session of the Council: First Resolution of August 3rd.*

24. At this session, the Council first of all endeavoured to arrange for a resumption of the work of the Commission of Arbitration and Conciliation. Having studied the notes exchanged between the parties and their declarations made before the Council on May 25th, it considered that the two parties had not agreed that the Commission should examine frontier questions or give a legal interpretation of the agreements and treaties concerning the frontier, and that this matter therefore did not come within