

ANNEX 1584 a.

FREE CITY OF DANZIG.

OBSERVATIONS OF THE SENATE OF THE FREE CITY ON THE ANNUAL REPORT  
OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AT DANZIG FOR THE  
YEAR 1935.

C.62.1936.VII.

LETTER, DATED JANUARY 21ST, 1936, FROM THE HIGH COMMISSIONER TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL,  
TRANSMITTING THE OBSERVATIONS OF THE SENATE, DATED JANUARY 21ST, 1936.

Geneva, January 21st, 1936.

I have the honour to refer to my letter of January 8th forwarding my annual report.<sup>1</sup>

I have to-day received the enclosed communication from the President of the Senate regarding the report and, in the circumstances, I should be glad if you will circulate it for the information of the members of the Council as soon as possible.

(Signed) Sean LESTER.

[Translation from the German.]

To the High Commissioner of  
the League of Nations.

Geneva, January 21st, 1936.

I have the honour to communicate to you the following observations on the report for 1935 transmitted to me with your letter of January 11th last, and would request you to forward these observations to the Council of the League of Nations.

In your introductory remarks, you express the view that the year 1935 saw an intense development of the policy of creating a National-Socialist community *de facto*. That is not the case at all. In this connection, I would refer you to my letter of January 11th, 1936.<sup>2</sup> You also state the view that the Government of the Free City of Danzig has applied an anti-constitutional policy in a steadily increasing degree. Such a very serious charge should, in my opinion, have been accompanied by some proof, which is entirely lacking in your report. I maintain that a policy which is in harmony with the independent jurisprudence of the highest constitutional tribunal cannot be contrary to the constitution guaranteed by the League of Nations.

Elections.

The laws, the constitutionality of which was called in question by the Council of the League of Nations, in no way influenced the result of the election to the Popular Assembly of April 7th, 1935. This was expressly recognised in the election judgment pronounced by the Supreme Court of the Free City of Danzig on November 14th, 1935, to Section III A of which I would refer you. The fact that the decrees complained of were in force at the time of the election to the Popular Assembly cannot justify any objection to the validity of the election.

Liberty of the Press.

Article 79 of the Danzig Constitution does not guarantee the free expression of opinion by word or writing absolutely but *only within the limits of the law*. This also applies to the Press. Such legal limits were laid down by the Legislative Ordinance of June 30th, 1933 (*Gesetzblatt*, page 287), issued in virtue of the constitutionally enacted Enabling Act of June 26th, 1933. The

<sup>1</sup> See page 202.

<sup>2</sup> See page 199.

police action taken against the journals in question was therefore legitimate and necessary, since the unscrupulous agitation carried on by the newspapers against which action was taken, not only endangered public order and security but even in some cases the safety of the State. In this connection, I may refer you to my letter of November 26th, 1935, regarding the petition of the *Danziger Volksstimme*. I also venture to attach copies of the Senate's decisions of January 13th and 14th, 1936, confirming the suspensions of the *Danziger Nationale Zeitung* and the *Danziger Volkszeitung* pronounced by the Chief of Police (see Appendix).

#### *The Parliament.*

Although the Senate is held responsible for the alleged unconstitutionality of the Popular Assembly's procedure, it is surely well known that every Parliament is itself responsible for the form and contents of its Rules of Procedure, and that a Parliament of any democratic State determines its own procedure (see Article II of the Danzig Constitution).

#### *Workers' Organisations.*

Proceedings are now pending before the Administrative Chamber of the Danzig Landgericht regarding the legality of dissolving the Allgemeine Arbeiterverband of the Free City of Danzig. The hearing has been fixed for January 30th, 1936. There is therefore no reason to apprehend that the procedure will be delayed.

As the matter is still *sub judice*, the Senate is unable to discuss it at present. It is for this reason that the petition of the three Opposition parties communicated to the President of the Senate by a letter dated December 30th, 1935, has not yet been answered.

At the same time, I should like to point out that the Allgemeine Arbeiterverband is not in the nature of a trade union; it is a political association whose purpose is, by fostering the class struggle, to combat the Government's policy of organising the national community. It pursues this end by illegal means (see Judgment of the Danzig Administrative Court, dated February 20th, 1934). Associations may be dissolved under the Constitution and under the Law of Association if their aims are contrary to the criminal laws. The sending of Danzig unemployed to Germany, a measure which was wrecked by the Allgemeiner Arbeiterverband, is a matter of vital importance to the Danzig working classes and to the public welfare.

Your Excellency's remarks in this connection require moreover to be corrected on certain material points:

(1) It is not the case that the Allgemeiner Arbeiterverband was allowed to resume its activities for only a short period. A period of fifteen and a half months elapsed between the raising of the previous prohibition (August 20th, 1934) and the pronouncement of the new prohibition (December 7th, 1935).

(2) The confiscation by the police of the weekly journal *Die Arbeit* was in both cases confirmed by the Amtsgericht. These measures were rescinded by the Landgericht on the purely formal ground that, when the confiscation was made, the passages complained of were not exactly specified with a statement of the laws infringed.

(3) The Allgemeiner Arbeiterverband is not the only non-National-Socialist trade union. There are at Danzig, in addition to the Danziger Arbeitsfront, which is not of a purely National-Socialist character, two Polish trade unions, a Jewish employers' union, and a union of railway and harbour employees.

#### *M. Albert Forster and M. Forster and State Officials.*

The remarks made under these two headings disregard the fact that Albert Forster's position at Danzig is only that of Gauleiter—i.e., of Leader of the National-Socialist Party—so that his actions can be judged only from the party standpoint. Naturally in this capacity, he exercises an influence over the Government *party* as cannot fail to be the case in any democratic State. He takes no direct part in Government affairs, however. This also disproves your inference from the Supreme Court's Judgment of November 14th, 1935, that Mr. Forster exercises an influence over the higher officials. I have already stated my views on this subject in my reply of January 11th, 1936, to the election petition.

#### *Police and Political Partisanship.*

No really serious political outrages have occurred in Danzig either during the past year or in the whole two and a half years of National-Socialist rule, as is shown indeed by the fact that during the whole of this time not a single death has occurred through the political campaign. In so far as disturbances have occurred, the police, who proceed against all breakers of the law irrespective of persons or parties, have easily gained control. In this connection, I would refer to my remarks under IV in my letter of January 9th, 1936, replying to the Social-Democratic Party's petition of May 3rd, 1935.

*The League's Guarantee.*

On this important question, I consider that I have expressed myself sufficiently fully in my reply of January 11th, 1936, to the election petition. In my opinion, the legal situation is quite clear and unmistakable. The guarantee can never lead to a limitation of the rights arising out of the sovereignty of the Free City of Danzig, as is clearly stated in the well-known Ishii report of November 17th, 1920.<sup>1</sup>

*Outstanding Questions.*

In this connection, I should like to point out that in the interim, the Social-Democrat petition of May 1935 has been answered by my remarks of January 9th, 1936. The reply was kept back until that date, for material reasons, with your own approval.

In conclusion, I should like to add the following observations:

The Danzig Opposition parties, which are continually sending petitions direct to the High Commissioner and to the League of Nations regarding alleged breaches of the Constitution, seem to have overlooked the fact that a remedy lies open to them under Article 19, paragraph 2, of the Constitution. This provision obliges the Popular Assembly to set up a Committee of Enquiry if only one-fifth of its members request it, and if the legality or propriety of any governmental or administrative measure is called in question.

The Opposition parties have hitherto made no use of this right. We believe it to be a rule of the Council of the League of Nations, however, to deal with Danzig's internal affairs only when all other judicial and legal remedies have been exhausted. Had the Opposition parties made use of this remedy which was ready to their hand, most of these questions would perhaps already have been settled within the Free City without the League of Nations being obliged to trouble itself with such matters.

(Signed) GREISER.

*Appendix.*

DECISION OF THE SENATE, DATED JANUARY 13TH, 1936.

The appeal of Rudolf Gamm, publisher of the *Danziger Nationale Zeitung* against the Order of the Danzig Chief of Police of November 25th, 1935, is dismissed as unfounded.

*Reasons.*

By an order of November 25th, 1935, the Danzig Chief of Police prohibited the publication and circulation of the *Danziger Nationale Zeitung* for a period of five months. In an application of November 29th, 1935, received by the Senate on December 3rd, 1935, the publisher of the newspaper appealed against this ban. The appeal procedure admissible under Article II, § 6, of the Legal Ordinance of June 30th, 1933, though entered within the proper time-limit, could not be successful, as the Order objected to by the appellant cannot be impugned either in point of law or in point of fact.

The freedom of opinion accorded under Article 79 of the Danzig Constitution exists only "within the limits of the law". These legal limits are constituted by Article II of the Legal Ordinance of June 30th, 1933 (*Legal Gazette*, page 287), which was enacted on the basis of § 1, No. 9, of the constitutionally enacted Law for the Relief of People and State, of June 24th, 1933 (*Legal Gazette*, page 273). Under Article II, § 3, No. 2, periodical publications may be prohibited if their contents endanger public security or order. further grounds for prohibition are, *inter alia*, the breach of certain penal provisions, including § 106 (a) and 131 of the State Code of Law (Article II, § 5, No. 1) and the malicious bringing into contempt of prominent foreign statesmen (Article II, § 5, No. 6).

The *Danziger Nationale Zeitung*, a weekly publication which first appeared on November 1st, 1935, certainly began by proclaiming that its policy would be to confine itself to objective, constructive criticism and to refrain from all destructive comment. The numbers hitherto published, only one of which, No. 2, did not call for police intervention, reveal exactly the contrary. They testify to a policy of incitement of popular feeling such as has never been surpassed in Danzig by any organ of the Press.

The first number issued was confiscated on account of an article entitled "Schwarz-Weiss-Rot lebt" which contained serious slanders on the Chancellor of the German Reich, who was accused in indirect, certainly but, to any intelligent reader, clearly intelligible, terms of dishonourable conduct. The publisher now attempts to represent the utterances then made as purely historical and not aimed at the Chancellor of the Reich, but it is sufficient to refer to the wording of the

<sup>1</sup> See Minutes of the second meeting of the eleventh session of the Council.

article and to the decision of November 18th, 1935, taken by the Senate in the Court of Appeal. In this decision, it was also pointed out that the first issue, in addition to insulting the Chancellor of the Reich, also contains spiteful attacks on Reichsminister Dr. Goebbels ("Furtwängler kommt nach Danzig") and an unobjective criticism of Reichsminister Dr. Schacht ("Wirtschaft, Handlung, Hausbesitz") all of which utterances are calculated to jeopardise the vitally important relations between the Free State and the German Reich.

Issue No. 3 was confiscated because, in an article entitled "Was wird aus unserer Danziger Jugend?" the Danzig education authorities were accused of "maintaining themselves by terror alone". This confiscation, which was based on § 23 of the Reich Press Law in connection with § 1, Article II of the Legal Ordinance of June 30th, 1933, was confirmed by the Amtsgericht on November 16th, 1935. The Court's decision establishes the fact that the contents of the article are not only as the police authorities had assumed, a breach of § 131 of the State Code of Law (bringing State organs into contempt by assertions which cannot be proved true) but also of § 106 (a) of the State Code of Law inasmuch as a member of the Senate—namely Senator Boeck—was insulted and libelled by a charge of "deliberate misguidance in spite of knowing better".

In spite of disciplinary action having already twice been taken, the *Danziger Nationale Zeitung* subsequently ventured in its issue No. 4 to commit further serious offences. With the obvious intention of discrediting the President of the Senate, it reverted in an article entitled "Mehrfache Verhandlungen des Präsidenten Greiser mit Weise?" to the *false* statements forming the subject of criminal proceedings taken against a certain Jaeschke; the fact that it did not commit itself as the sentence was still pending in no way affects the attempt to compromise the President of the Senate in the eyes of the public. The article "Wieder beschlagnahmt!" as the Chief of Police rightly indicates in the prohibition order, depicts the confiscation of the third issue as an instance of the *high-handed action* of the authorities. There is absolutely no other way of construing an utterance, which starts with the "jocular" assertion that "the *Danziger Nationale Zeitung* would be confiscated even if it printed the Lord's Prayer" and goes on to say that issue No. 2 "was graciously allowed to pass". Here again there is an obvious intention to bring into contempt organs of the State—viz., the police authorities who carried out the confiscation and the courts which confirmed it. The assertion that these authorities had acted in an arbitrary manner cannot only not be proved—which in itself would be sufficient to justify the application of the penal provision in § 131—but, since the reasons underlying the Court's decision were already known to the newspaper, is even made against its *better knowledge*. The historical reminiscences in which the newspaper indulges in this as in so many other cases, do not affect in the slightest the real facts of the case.

The passages referred to by the Chief of Police in his Prohibition Order are by no means the only utterances which are open to objection. The same issue No. 4 of the *Danziger Nationale Zeitung* contains quite a number of other articles which reveal the same carping and provocative spirit. For instance, the observations of an ostensibly humorous nature introduced under the heading "Wir antworten" would seem to reach the extreme limit of destructive and malicious criticism.

In view of all the foregoing, the prohibition Order issued by the Chief of Police is fully justified. It is based not only on Article II, § 5, No. 1, of the Legal Ordinance (Breaches of the Penal Provisions of §§ 106a and 131) and on § 5, No. 6 (endangering relations with Germany by insulting German statesmen), but also, and more particularly on § 5, No. 2, since the behaviour of the newspaper has been a serious menace to public safety and order. The unrestrained and mischievous charges levelled by a newspaper describing itself as "national" against leading personalities in the German homeland, against the constitutional Government of the Free City and against organs of the Danzig State have provoked acute irritation and unrest, not only in National-Socialist circles, but also among the respectable inhabitants of Danzig, and have thus conjured up the danger of disturbances of public order. The very serious offences committed in issues No. 1 and No. 3 would, of themselves, have afforded ample grounds for a ban. Since confiscation twice repeated brought no change in the policy of the newspaper, no further consideration could be shown. The ban was unavoidable if the State was not to suffer serious injury. The five months' term of prohibition is commensurate with the circumstances of the case.

For the Senate of the Free City of Danzig.

(Signed) GREISER.      (Signed) Dr. WIERCINSKI-KEISER.

#### DECISION OF THE SENATE, JANUARY 14TH, 1936.

The appeal by the publisher of the *Danziger Volkszeitung*, Karl Formell, of December 19th, 1935, against the order by the Danzig Chief of Police of December 13th, 1935 is dismissed as unfounded.

#### Grounds.

By an Order dated December 13th, 1935, the Danzig Chief of Police, in virtue of Article II, § 5, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Legislative Ordinance of June 30th, 1933 (*Legal Gazette*, page 287) prohibited the *Danziger Volkszeitung* for a period of four months. The publisher of the newspaper

appealed to the Senate, under Article II, § 6, against the police measure by a petition dated December 19th, 1935, and received on December 20th, 1935—that is to say, within the proper time-limit. He requested the cancellation of the prohibition on grounds of form and substance. Both grounds of appeal fail.

I. It is not correct that the order contested did not state the reason for the prohibition with sufficient precision and is for that reason invalid.

The Chief of Police does not merely refer to the article in No. 149, of December 12th, 1935, which was the immediate cause of the prohibition ("Der Deutsche Mensch"—"The German Man"), but in addition reproduces *verbatim* the passages of articles to which exception was principally taken. The remarks in Nos. 141, 145 and 148, mentioned as a further reason for the measure, are referred to by their titles ("Danzig's Educational Objective: Misuse for Party Purposes" "Mr. Senator Boeck, why go on? Better go back", "Senator Boeck defends himself"). In the case of Nos. 137-140, it is true that the titles of the articles objected to were not mentioned. There can, however, be no doubt as to which remarks are referred to; they are those which, as mentioned in the prohibition order, contain attacks on schools and the school administration. The appeal shows that the publishers of the *Danziger Volkszeitung* were quite clear on this point. The cause for complaint was accordingly to be found in No. 137 in the articles entitled "Against Party Politics in the Schools" and "Threatened Depreciation of the Danzig School System" in No. 138, "Mr. Senator for Public Worship, when will you take Action?", in No. 139, in a further article under the same title, and, in No. 140, in an article on "School and the National-Socialist Party"

The legal provisions on which the prohibition is based are also correctly quoted, since reference is made to Article II, § 5, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Legislative Ordinance of June 30th, 1933. These provisions read as follows:

Periodicals may be prohibited:

- (1) If their contents give grounds for the punishment of one of the acts mentioned in §§ 81-86, 93a-93c, 106a, 110, 110a, 129a, 130, 131 of the Criminal Code;
- (2) If their contents endanger public security or order.

The text of the order shows that the Chief of Police considers that, of the penal provisions mentioned in § 5, paragraph 1, §§ 106a and 131 (abuse of a member of the Government or contempt of State organisations) are contravened. The fact that § 5, paragraph 2, is also given as a further reason for the prohibition implies that the contents of the articles objected to are regarded as endangering public order. No further explanations were required.

The prohibition order would consequently not be lacking in the necessary accuracy even if the Legislative Ordinance of June 30th, 1933, on which it is based, provided for any formal requirements in this respect, such as are to be found in § 28 of the Reich Press Law. Such provisions are in fact not contained in the Legislative Ordinance. It is, therefore, sufficient to state the fact as such on which the prohibition is based, together with the legal provision under which the order is issued.

II. From a material point of view, the investigation has also proved the justice of the prohibition order.

I. In the first place, agreement must be expressed with the Chief of Police that the articles objected to represent contraventions of §§ 106a and 131 of the Criminal Code.

(a) According to § 106a of the Criminal Code, any person is punished who publicly abuses or libels the Government or a member of the Government.

The continuous serious attacks on the school administration are ultimately directed, as the *Danziger Volkszeitung* is well aware, against the Senator for Education and Public Worship responsible for the Danzig educational system, who is moreover personally addressed in a large number of articles. It is not proposed to discuss whether the constantly repeated charges of "breaches of the Constitution" and "misuse of the school for purposes of party politics" represent abuse (*Beschimpfung*) or a libel (*Verleumdung*) in the sense of § 106a. In any case, the Senate agrees with the Chief of Police that it constitutes abuse when, in the article in No. 148 entitled "Senator Boeck defends himself: A Wrong Word in the Wrong Place" the Senator for Education is said "to have made in public malicious, distorted and biased attacks on fellow-countrymen holding different views". It is indeed true that the District Court did not consider that these remarks constituted abuse, and therefore by a decision of December 12th, 1935, cancelled the confiscation of No. 148. The appellant however, makes no mention of the fact that the confiscation was re-enforced by decision of the Criminal Chamber of the Provincial Court of December 14th, 1935. The Criminal Chamber, however, bases its decision on the fact that the article constituted "abuse" (*Beleidigung*) in stating in its decision, however, that it cannot with certainty regard the passage objected to as constituting "abuse" it is approaching very closely to the view of the Senate.

The defamatory article entitled ("Der Deutsche Mensch"—"The German Man") in No. 149 contains gross abuse of the Senator for Public Worship, and bitterly attacks the educational principles of the Danzig schools. The remark that the creators of the "German man" in arriving at this ideal had cut out the "natural use of the brain" must be taken to refer to the leaders of the Danzig school system, and in particular to the Senator for Public Worship, who is referred to a few lines lower down as the defender of this "German man". It is unnecessary to discuss the attempt made in the

appeal to avoid this inference by quibbles over words. The order of the various sentences and words is wholly irrelevant. The only decisive factor is the impression which must be made on an unprejudiced and reasonable reader by the general sense of the article. When the same article states that the teachers "spoke and acted under pressure and coercion otherwise than they felt and thought" this cannot be regarded as anything but a charge against the responsible Senator which is so extravagant as to amount to abuse.

(b) The legal arguments of the appellant with regard to Article 131 of the Criminal Code are based on a form of this article which is no longer in force, with the result that the conclusions drawn by the appellant are wholly erroneous. He overlooks the fact that Article 131 was very largely amended by the Law of June 30th, 1931 (*Legal Gazette*, 605 ff.) in which the Centre, which then formed part of the Government, had a considerable share of responsibility. In the new form of the article, which is retained in force under the Legislative Ordinance of June 30th, 1933, the text runs:

"Any person who makes or circulates publicly an assertion of fact with the intention of bringing State institutions, laws, ordinances or regulations of the authorities into contempt shall be liable to imprisonment not exceeding two years or fines, if such assertion cannot be proved to be true."

Article 131 does not therefore presuppose the assertions or circulation of "imagined or misrepresented" facts. It is sufficient that the assertions should not be able to be "proved to be true". It is not necessary that the offender—there is no divergence of opinion on this point—should even be aware of the fact that his assertion cannot be proved to be true, still less of its untruth. He may be liable to the penalties even when he believes in the truth of his assertion. The appellant's view that conclusions and judgments should not be regarded as assertions of fact, even where they include assertions of concrete facts, is not only not accepted by the authorities, it is explicitly rejected (see Dalcke, footnote 4 to the similar provision in Article 186 of the Criminal Code). The appellant is also in error when he asserts that the point at issue is whether the party circulating the assertion puts it forward as his own or merely circulates it as a rumour with expressions of reserve or doubt or disbelief. So long as he has the intention in his assertions of bringing State institutions into contempt, the form in which the assertions are put forward is immaterial, provided they cannot be proved to be true.

The intention of the *Danziger Volkszeitung* to bring the educational administration of Danzig into public contempt by the continual attacks which it made on the latter is abundantly clear from the invidious form in which its charges were brought forward. The articles to which exception was taken contain a large number of assertions directed to that end which cannot be proved to be true. It is sufficient to refer to a few of these assertions.

In the article above mentioned with the title "The German Man" it is asserted that young people are incited by the schools against authority and leadership. It is further asserted that the education given in the schools usually brings the school pupils into conflict with the general outlook they have been brought up in at home.

In No. 145 ("Senator Boeck, Why go on? Better go back"), the educational administration is accused of being anti-Catholic. The question put to Senator Boeck in the final sentence of the article ("Very well then, so you have nothing against us Catholics—Yes?") does nothing to counteract the tendency of the article; on the contrary it confirms it.

In No. 137 ("Party Politics in the Schools: The Schools and the National-Socialist Youth Organisation"), a report is circulated to the effect that Senator Boeck had asserted that children who were prejudiced against the State ought not to have a share in school meals. In this case, there is not only an offence against Article 131, but also a grave libel on the Senator, who never said anything of the kind (Article 106 a).

In No. 138, some rumour is made the occasion of a reference to a "threatened depreciation of the Danzig school system"

In No. 141 an article is headed "Danzig's Educational Objective, Misuse for Party Purposes"—a generalisation which would be improper even if abuses had occurred in particular instances.

These examples are sufficient to justify prohibition of the paper under § 5, paragraph No. 1 mentioned above.

2. The Chief of Police has every reason to find a further obvious ground for prohibition of the paper in the danger to public security and order involved in the utterances to which exception was taken.

It is obvious that the continuous and systematic agitation of an organ of the Press against the Government and against State institutions is liable to create a danger of disturbance to public security and order. While it excites indignation and discontent among the population, it tends at the same time to undermine the authority of the State. The charges of the *Danziger Volkszeitung* against the educational administration, immoderate in form and inaccurate in substance, have had the effect, even where they do not overstep the limits of Criminal Law, of arousing profound unrest amongst the population. The adherents of the Opposition parties are incited against the National-Socialist Government. The National-Socialist majority of the people of Danzig is once again at a loss to understand why the Press of an Opposition group representing only a small part of the population as a whole should be allowed in its own party interest to ignore the national welfare while it indulges in such unrestrained agitation against the Government and against State institutions as is to be found for example in the article "The German Man".

The National-Socialist majority is also unable to understand why every pretext, however trifling, is allowed to be made the occasion for charges of the most public character against the

Government placed in power by their own votes, charges to the effect that that Government has violated the Constitution, with the result that difficulties are created for the Government's internal and external policy alike which interfere with its constructive work for the benefit of the entire population. The organs of public safety of the State cannot wait until the indignation everywhere aroused by the agitation of the *Danziger Volkszeitung* is brought to boiling-point, and the deliberate intensification of party differences makes disturbances of public order inevitable. The organs of public safety were compelled to intervene, in order to make an end of the menace of such disturbances which already existed. The Chief of Police was accordingly only doing his duty when he issued his prohibition order.

In view of the fact that the *Danziger Volkszeitung* had to be confiscated no less than six times in the two months immediately preceding the prohibition on the ground that it contained matter liable to lead to a disturbance of public order, and in view of the fact that, in spite of these measures, it not only did not modify this attitude, an attitude involving danger to the State, but, on the contrary continually intensified it, so that there was no reason whatever to anticipate loyal conduct on its part in the future, the period of four months at which the prohibition was assessed must be regarded as proper and reasonable.

The appeal of the publisher of the *Danziger Volkszeitung* had therefore to be dismissed as unfounded.

For the Senate of the Free City of Danzig:  
(Signed) HUTH. (Signed) Dr. WIERCINSKI-KEISER.

---

ANNEX 1585.

FREE CITY OF DANZIG.

---

C.41.1936.VII.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE HIGH COMMISSIONER OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND THE SENATE OF THE FREE CITY ON THE SUBJECT OF THE POLICE (" LANDESPOLIZEI ") AND THE CIVIC GUARD (" EINWOHNERWEHR ") OF THE FREE CITY.

LETTER, DATED JANUARY 15TH, 1936, FROM THE HIGH COMMISSIONER TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL.

Danzig, January 15th, 1936.

I have the honour to refer to my letter dated August 29th, 1935, which was circulated to the Council for information as document C.337.1935.VII<sup>1</sup> on September 6th last, concerning the *Landespolizei* and the *Einwohnerwehr* in Danzig.

I have the honour now to enclose herewith two further letters in connection with these forces, which I shall be glad if you will be good enough to communicate to the Members of the Council for their information.

(Signed) Sean LESTER.

Appendix I.

Danzig, October 26th, 1935.

To the President of the Senate  
of the Free City of Danzig.

I have the honour to refer to your letter of August 6th, 1935, in which reference was made to the *Landespolizei*.

I have recently observed a newspaper announcement concerning the disbandment of this force, and I shall be glad if you will be kind enough to supply me with information regarding any action taken by the Government.

(Signed) Sean LESTER.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Journal*, November 1935, page 1342.