

INTERNATIONAL UNION  
FOR THE PROTECTION OF NATURE



PROCEEDINGS  
AND  
REPORTS  
OF THE  
SECOND SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

held in Brussels, 18-23 October 1950

in the  
Institut de Sociologie Solvay de l'Université Libre de Bruxelles.

PUBLISHED BY THE  
INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NATURE

42. rue Montoyer, Brussels.

1 9 5 1

INTERNATIONAL UNION  
FOR THE PROTECTION OF NATURE



PROCEEDINGS  
AND  
REPORTS  
OF THE  
SECOND SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

held in Brussels, 18-23 October 1950

in the

Institut de Sociologie Solvay de l'Université Libre de Bruxelles.

PUBLISHED BY THE  
INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NATURE

42, rue Montoyer, Brussels.

1951

---

*The publication of this booklet  
was made possible through the generosity of the Comité Spécial du Katanga  
and the Fondation pour favoriser l'Étude scientifique  
des Parcs Nationaux du Congo Beige (Brussels).*

---

## FOREWORD

BY Dr. CH. J. BERNARD,

President of the International Union for the Protection of Nature.

*The International Union was but two years old when its General Assembly was in session for the second time. This was doubtless a very tender age, but nevertheless young as it was the Union succeeded during that short space of time in gaining the favourable regard of all those who are aware of the meritorious work it had undertaken.*

*Those who attended the Union's birth at Fontainebleau will recall with feelings of pleasure the various meetings where all the many complex problems that arose were solved somehow or other thanks to the good feeling which prevailed throughout the discussions. After several days of unremitting effort the Union came into being, and was able — indeed, had — to operate without delay. The report contained in this book provides evidence of the tasks which already have been accomplished, tasks for which the foundations had first to be laid and which were undertaken notwithstanding the many difficulties in the way.*

*We have had the good fortune to be allowed to collaborate with the international organization that is interested in every branch of education, science and culture — Unesco — which played so vital a part in the establishment of the Union and has ever since continued to extend to it the valuable support of its aegis. Unesco did in fact make substantial grants to the Union to enable it to carry out certain specific tasks, and above all shared with it the organization of the Technical Conference for the Protection of Nature which was held at Lake Success in August 1949. At this joint conference a large number of reports on many divers subjects, relating in some way or other to the protection of nature, were submitted, and it was due to the financial assistance of Unesco that it was made possible to publish those reports in an imposing volume, which is invaluable to all those interested in the important problems raised at the numerous sessions at Lake Success. The report prepared by the Secretariat outlines the results accruing from the collaboration with Unesco, and we are happy to have this further opportunity of expressing our sincere gratitude to that organization.*

*So far I have dwelt upon the difficulties with which we have been faced, and unfortunately much of the time at the Second Session had perforce to be devoted to a consideration of those difficulties. Unesco, as I have said, helped with specific tasks which fell within the purview of its programme, but it goes without saying that it could not provide for the administrative or other ordinary expenses; those must be financed entirely by the Union itself. Although the establishment of the Union was unanimously approved by the governments and the numerous societies represented at Fontainebleau, this unanimity of feeling was not supported by the corresponding number of adhesions. Many societies have, indeed, joined the Union, but very few governments, which should be our principal supporters, have as yet done so; the governments of only four countries — Switzerland, Luxemburg, Belgium and the Netherlands — have applied for membership. We need the goodwill of everybody; more effective aid is essential if we do not want the situation, already disturbing, to become desperate and the Union to expire from lack of sufficient funds.*

*Those considerations took up much of the time of the Assembly, which might have more usefully been devoted to more interesting discussions. Indeed, many of those present expressed regret that it was not possible to consider questions of a more technical character. But it proved impossible to do otherwise at a meeting which by force of circumstances was compelled to consider mainly questions of an administrative character. We had to discuss with our friends the lessons we had begun to learn as well as the endless administrative details which must be settled at the start. It was, however, decided that on future occasions the programme of the General Assembly should, in addition to the inevitable business meetings, include conferences at which problems of general interest could be discussed. Among them one which urgently demands our attention is education, that is the need for instilling the concept of nature protection in both children and adults. This should be done throughout the world, even in countries where the idea has at least been partially accepted.*

*Let us hope that this book, which retraces the road traversed during the short period of two years, will attract the attention of all who should participate in the movement and above all will incite governments to join an organization which it is to their advantage to support!*

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS. LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS.

G = Government delegate.  
D = Delegate of organization.  
OG = Observer of government.  
OD = Observer of organization.

G = Délégué gouvernemental.  
D = Délégué d'une organisation.  
OG = Observateur gouvernemental.  
OD = Observateur d'une organisation.

### **Australia — Australie.**

- |   |    |   |
|---|----|---|
| A. B. HACKWELL<br>Australian Scientific Liaison Of-<br>fice,<br>Africa House,<br>Kingsway, London W. C. 2<br>(Great-Britain). | OD | Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial<br>Research Organization of Australia. |
| J. H. WESTERMANN<br>Netherlands.  | D  | Wild Life Preservation Society of Aus-<br>tralia.                             |

### **Austria — Autriche.**

- |  |         |  |
|--|---------|--|
| O. GRIMUS DE GRIMBURG<br>Bundesministerium für Land- und<br>Forstwirtschaft,<br>8, Florianigasse, Vienna VIII. | OG      | Gouvernement.  |
| F. MAYR MELNHOF<br>Frohnleiten,<br>Styrie.   | OG      | Gouvernement.  |
| G. PICHLER<br>Amt der Landesregierung,<br>Salzbourg.   | OG<br>D | Amt der Landesregierung Salzburg.<br>Naturschutz Referat du Gouvernement<br>de la Province de Salzbourg. |

### **Belgium — Belgique.**

- |  |              |  |
|--|--------------|--|
| P. STANER<br>Directeur d'administration,<br>Ministere des Colonies,<br>7, place Royale, Bruxelles.                           | G            | Gouvernement.  |
| O. C. TULIPPE<br>54, quai Orban, Liège.  | G<br>D<br>OD | Gouvernement.<br>Université de Liège.<br>Commission de la Protection de la<br>Nature de l'APIAW. |
| V. VAN STRAELEN<br>Directeur de l'Institut Royal des<br>Sciences Naturelles de Belgi-<br>que,<br>31, rue Vautier, Bruxelles. | G<br>D       | Gouvernement.<br>Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles<br>de Belgique.                          |
| J. GILLARDIN<br>Conseiller forestier,<br>Ministere des Colonies,<br>7, place Royale, Bruxelles.                              | G            | Gouvernement (suppléant de M. P. Sta-<br>ner).   |
| CH. J. BEAUJEAN<br>98, rue de la Fontaine, Anvers.   | D            | Vereniging voor Natuur- en Steden-<br>schoon.  |
| R. BOULLENNE<br>Institut de Botanique,<br>Université de Liège,<br>3, rue Fusch, Liège.                                       | D<br>OD      | Université de Liège.<br>Académie Royale des Sciences.  |

H. CARTON DE WIART Président de la Ligue des Amis de la Forêt de Soignes, 137, chaussée de Charleroi, Bru- xelles.	D	Ligue des Amis de la Forêt de Soignes.
H. DELAUNOIS 40, Delinstraat, Anvers.	D	Vereniging voor Natuur- en Steden- schoon.
P. DEUSE 79, rue Albert Mockel, Liège.	OD	Station Scientifique des Hautes Fagnes.
P. DUVIGNEAUD 100, rue des Atrébates, Bruxelles.	D	Société Royale de Botanique de Belgique.
S. FRECHKOP 25, rue d'Arlon, Bruxelles.	D	Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique.
L. GAVAGE Président de l'Association pour la Défense de l'Ourthe et de ses Affluents, 36, rue des Eburons, Liège.	D	Association pour la Défense de l'Ourthe et de ses Affluents.
A. HENDRICKX 6, chaussée de Malines, Anvers.	D	Vereniging voor Natuur- en Steden- schoon.
A. JACOB Touring Club de Belgique, 44, rue de la Loi, Bruxelles.	OD	Touring Club de Belgique.
L. LEBACQ Chef de la Section économique du Musée du Congo Belge, Tervueren.	OD	Musée du Congo Belge.
G. MANIL 42, boulevard de la Meuse, Jam- bes-Namur.	D	Ardenne et Gaume.
R. MAYNÉ Prorecteur de l'Institut Agro- nomique de Gembloux, 28, avenue de la Tenderie, Boits- fort.	D OD	Ardenne et Gaume. Les Amis de la Fagne.
R. OOR 122, rue Général Gratry, Bru- xelles.	D	Ligue des Amis de la Forêt de Soignes.
M. POLL Chef de la Section des Verté- brés du Musée du Congo Belge, Tervueren.	OD	Musée du Congo Belge.
W. ROBYNS Directeur du Jardin botanique, Rue Royale, Bruxelles.	OD	Commission Royale des Monuments et des Sites.
F. STOCK 219, rue de la Victoire, Bru- xelles.	D	Ardenne et Gaume.
J.-J. A. SYMOENS 69, rue Saint-Quentin, Bru- xelles.	D	Société des Naturalistes Belges.
P. TOURNAY 165, rue Antoine Bréart, Bru- xelles.	D	Ligue des Amis de la Forêt de Soignes.
F. D'URSEL Secrétaire général d'Ardenne et Gaume, 41, rue Marie de Bourgogne, Bruxelles.	D	Ardenne et Gaume.

- W.-K. VAN DEN BERGH                    D      Société Royale de Zoologie d'Anvers.  
 Directeur de la Société Royale  
 de Zoologie d'Anvers,  
 26, place Reine Astrid, Anvers.
- R. VERHEYEN                                D      Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles  
 Conservateur Adjoint à l'Insti-  
 tut Royal des Sciences Na-  
 turelles de Belgique,  
 31, rue Vautier, Bruxelles.
- H. VERWILGHEN                            OD     Commission Royale des Monuments et  
 Vice-Président de la Commis-  
 sion Royale des Monuments  
 et des Sites,  
 161, rue de la Loi, Bruxelles.
- Bolivia — Bolivie.**
- A. GEHAIN                                    OG     Gouvernement.  
 Consul général de Bolivie à  
 Bruxelles,  
 47, avenue Vanderaye, Bru-  
 xelles (Belgique).
- Canada — Canada.**
- A. SMITH                                      OG     Gouvernement.  
 First Secretary of the Embas-  
 sy of Canada.,  
 46, rue Montoyer, Bruxelles  
 (Belgique).
- Chile — Chili.**
- C. M. PIZZARO                                OD     Museo Nacional de Historia Natural.  
 Chef de la Section botanique  
 du Museo Nacional de His-  
 toria Natural,  
 787, Casilla, Santiago.
- Colombia — Colombie.**
- N. D. NOGUERA                                OG     Gouvernement.  
 Légation de Colombie,  
 22a, square de Meeus, Bru-  
 xelles (Belgique).
- Denmark — Danemark.**
- F. LAURITZEN                                OG     Gouvernement.  
 Naturfredningsraadet,                    D      Naturfredningsraadet.  
 Torvegade 21, Copenhagen K.
- R. SPARCK                                    OG     Gouvernement.  
 Zoologisk Museum,                        D      Naturfredningsraadet.  
 Krystalgade, Copenhagen.
- Dominican Republic — République Dominicaine.**
- M. CANELA LAZARO                        OG     Gouvernement.  
 Tecnico de la Secretaria de Es-  
 tado de Agricultura, Pecua-  
 ria y Colonizacion,  
 Ciudad Trujillo, Santo Domin-  
 go.

**Finland — Finlande.**

- O. K. MURTO  
First Secretary of the Finnish  
Legation,  
6, rue du Buisson, Bruxelles  
(Belgique). OG Gouvernement.
- N. DAHLBECK D Finnish League for the Protection of  
Sweden. Nature.

**France — France.**

- G.-H. LESTEL OG Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale; Di-  
Inspecteur général des monu- rection de l'Architecture.  
ments historiques, Chargé des OD Conseil National de la Protection de la  
sites, Nature en France.  
Ministère de l'Éducation Natio-  
nale,  
3, rue de Valois, Paris 1.
- CL. BRESSOU D Fédération Française des Sociétés de  
Directeur de l'École Nationa- Sciences Naturelles.  
le Vétérinaire d'Alfort, D Académie d'Agriculture de France.  
Alfort (Seine). OD École Nationale Vétérinaire d'Alfort.  
OD Société Nationale d'Acclimatation de  
France.
- M. CAULLERY D Académie des Sciences.  
Membre de l'Académie des  
Sciences,  
6, rue Mizon, Paris 15.
- P. DOIGNON D Association des Naturalistes de la Val-  
Secrétaire général de l'Asso- lée du Loing.  
ciation des Naturalistes de  
la Vallée du Loing,  
21, rue le Primatice, Fontaine-  
bleau.
- ROGER HEIM D Académie des Sciences.  
Membre de l'Académie des D Institut Français d'Afrique Noire.  
Sciences, D Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle.  
Muséum National d'Histoire D Société Botanique de France.  
Naturelle, D Société de Biogéographie.  
12, rue de Buffon, Paris 5. OD Conseil Supérieur pour la Protection de  
la Nature dans les Territoires d'Outre-  
Mer.  
OD Société Mycologique de France.
- D. SCHACHTER OD Centre National de la Recherche Scien-  
Laboratoire pour l'Étude Bio- tifique, Laboratoire pour l'Étude Bio-  
logique de la Camargue et logique de la Camargue et des Étangs  
des Étangs Méditerranéens, Méditerranéens.  
Chemin de la Batterie des  
Lions, Marseille.

**French Union — Union Française :****Morocco — Maroc.**

- GRIMALDI D'ESDRA OG Gouvernement Chérifien.  
Directeur des Eaux et Forêts OD Société des Sciences Naturelles du  
du Maroc, Maroc.  
Institut Scientifique Chérifien,  
Rabat.

**Germany — Allemagne.**

- W. BURHENNE OD Schutzgemeinschaft Deutsches Wild e. V.  
25, Viktoriastrasse, München 23.

**Grece — Grèce.**

J. SANTORINÉOS D Club Alpin Hellénique.  
16, rue Galvani, Athènes 8. OD Fondation Nationale « Ethnikon Idhryma ».

**Guatemala — Guatemala.**

A. MORALES DARDON OG Gouvernement.  
Ministro de Guatemala en Belgica,  
25, rue des Francs, Bruxelles  
(Belgique).

**India — Inde.**

V. S. CHARRY OG Gouvernement.  
Second Secretary, Embassy of  
India,  
Avenue Franklin Roosevelt,  
Bruxelles (Belgique).

**Indonesia — Indonésie.**

K. W. DAMMERMAN OG Gouvernement.  
Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke OD Indonesian Society for the Protection of  
Historie, Nature.  
Leiden (Netherlands).  
M. SOEBIARTO OG Gouvernement.  
23, Prins Mauritzplein, The  
Hague (Netherlands).

**Iran — Iran.**

F. FARROKH OG Gouvernement.  
Attaché à la Légation de l'Iran,  
148, avenue Louise, Bruxelles  
(Belgique).

**Italy — Italie.**

F. G. CABALZAR OG Gouvernement.  
38, rue de Livourne, Bruxelles  
(Belgique).  
P. BAVA D Movimento Italiano Protezione della  
2, Jacops Durandi, Turin. D Natura.  
C. REISOLI D Touring Club Italiano.  
Touring Club Italiano,  
10, Corso Italia, Milan.  
R. VIDESOTT D Ente Parco Nazionale del Gran Para-  
diso.  
Parco Nazionale del Gran Para-  
diso,  
19, Corso Svizzera, Turin.

**Luxemburg — Luxembourg.**

M. STEINMETZ G Gouvernement.  
Secrétaire de la Légation du  
Grand - Duché de Luxem-  
bourg,  
75, avenue de Cortenberg, Bru-  
xelles (Belgique).

**Monaco — Monaco.**

M. LOZÉ OG Gouvernement.  
Ministre de la Principauté de OD Institut Océanographique de la Princi-  
Monaco en Belgique, pauté de Monaco.  
2, rue du Conseiller Colignon,  
Paris XVI<sup>e</sup> (France).

**Netherlands — Pays-Bas.**

M. C. BLOEMERS Chef du Bureau de la Protec- tion de la Nature, Ministerie van Onderwijs, Kun- sten en Wetenschappen, 's Gravenhage.	G	Gouvernement.
J. H. WESTERMANN 49, Albert Perkstraat, Hilver-	OG	Gouvernement Provisoire du SURINAM.
F. J. APPELMAN « Diergaarde Blijdorp », 49, Van Aerssenlaan, Rotter- dam.	D	Netherlands Committee for International Nature Protection.
G. A. BROUWER 32, Genestetlaan, Bilthoven.	D	Contact Commissie voor Natuur- en Landschapsbescherming.
	D	Nederlandse Vereniging tot Bescherming van Vogels.
	D	Vereniging tot Behoud van Natuurmo- numenten in Nederland.
H. H. BUISMAN 7, Willemskade, Leeuwarden.	D	Contact Commissie voor Natuur- en Landschapsbescherming.
R.-J. DE WIT 66, Kijkduinstraat, Amsterdam W.	D	Contact Commissie voor Natuur- en Landschapsbescherming.
H. P. GORTER 92-96, Rokin, Amsterdam C.	D	Contact Commissie voor Natuur- en Landschapsbescherming.
	D	Vereniging tot Behoud van Natuurmo- numenten in Nederland.
J. GOUDSWAARD 3326, Heemraadssingel, Rot- terdam C 2.	D	Nederlandse Jeugdbond voor Natuur- studie.
H. M. JOLLES 54 III, Wiesperstraat, Amster- dam C.	OD	Nederlandse Jeugdbond voor Natuur- studie.
S. H. F. SMEETS 47, Wilhelminasingel, Weert.	D	Contact Commissie voor Natuur- en Landschapsbescherming.
A. G. TENNER 13, Thérèse Schwartzstraat, Amsterdam.	D	Nederlandse Jeugdbond voor Natuur- studie.
M. VAN DER GOES VAN NATERS Secretary of Netherlands Pro- visional Nature Conservancy, 49, Konijnenlaan, Wassenaar.	D	Contact Commissie voor Natuur- en Landschapsbescherming.
	OD	Netherlands Provisional Nature Con- servancy.
M. VAN DER MOLEN Marde bij Amsterdam.	D	Netherlands Committee for International Nature Protection.
PH. D. VAN PALLANDT VAN EERDE Eerde, Ommen.	D	Vereniging tot Behoud van Natuurmo- numenten in Nederland.
P. G. VAN TIENHOVEN Président de la « Vereniging tot Behoud van Natuurmo- numenten », 540, Herengracht, Amsterdam C.	D	Contact Commissie voor Natuur- en Landschapsbescherming.
	D	Nederlandse Vereniging tot Bescherming van Vogels.
	D	Netherlands Committee for International Nature Protection.
	D	Vereniging tot Behoud van Natuurmo- numenten in Nederland.
	OD	Netherlands Provisional Nature Con- servancy.

**New Zealand — Nouvelle-Zélande.**

- C. S. M. HOPKIRK           OG    Gouvernement.  
 Veterinary Advisory Officer,  
 Office of High Commissioner  
 for New Zealand,  
 London (England).  
 G. F. HERBERT SMITH       D    Forest and Bird Protection Society of  
 United Kingdom.           New Zealand.

**Norway — Norvège.**

- N. F. LÜHR                   OG    Gouvernement.  
 Secrétaire adjoint de la Léga-   D    Landsforbundet for Naturfredning i Norge.  
 tion de Norvège,  
 81, avenue Brugmann, Bruxel-  
 les (Belgique).

**Panama — Panama.**

- L. J. BOSMAN                OG    Gouvernement.  
 Consul de Panama à Bruxelles,  
 2, avenue de Tervueren, Bru-  
 xelles (Belgique).

**Sweden — Suede.**

- N. DAHLBECK                D    Svenska Naturskyddsföreningen.  
 Svenska Naturskyddsföreningen,   OD   Kungl. Svenska Vetenskapsakademiens  
 9, Riddargatan, Stockholm.       Naturskyddskommitté.

**Switzerland — Suisse.**

- A. NADIG                    G    Gouvernement.  
 Président de la Commission  
 Fédérale pour la Protection  
 de la Nature et du Paysage,  
 46, Loestrasse, Coire.  
 CH. J. BERNARD            D    Association de Propagande pour la Pro-  
 Président de la Ligue Suisse    tection des Oiseaux.  
 pour la Protection de la Na-    D    Ligue Suisse pour la Protection de la  
 ture,                            Nature.  
 51, route de Frontenex, Genève.   D    Société Romande pour l'Étude et la Pro-  
                                   tection des Oiseaux.  
                                   OD   « Ala », Société pour l'Étude des Oiseaux  
                                   et leur Protection.  
                                   OD   Schweiz. Vogelwarte Sempach.  
                                   OD   Société Helvétique des Sciences Natu-  
                                   relles.  
                                   OD   Uferschutzverband.  
                                   OD   Verband zum Schutze des Landschafts-  
                                   bildes am Zurichsee.  
 J. BÜTTIKOFER             D    Ligue Suisse pour la Protection de la  
 Secrétaire général de la Ligue    Nature.  
 Suisse pour la Protection de  
 la Nature,  
 37, Aeschenvorstadt, Bâle.  
 M. PETITMERMET           OD   Commission Fédérale du Parc National  
 33, Jubiläumstrasse, Berne.       Suisse.  
 M. ZIMMERLI               OD   Commission Fédérale du Parc National  
 Secrétaire de la Commission    Suisse.  
 Fédérale du Parc National  
 Suisse,  
 15, Hallwylstrasse, Berne.



- |  |                  |   |
|--|------------------|---|
| H. W. GLASSEN<br>Michigan Department of Conservation,<br>13, Lansing, Michigan.  | OD               | Michigan Department of Conservation.  |
| W. H. PHELPS<br>Venezuela.   | D                | American Geographical Society.  |
| L. A. WALFORD<br>Chief of Branch of Fishery<br>Biology, Fish and Wildlife<br>Service, Department of the<br>Interior,<br>Washington 25, D. C. | D<br>OD          | National Research Council.<br>U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service.  |
| R. W. WESTWOOD<br>President of the American Nature<br>Association,<br>1214, Sixteenth Street N. W.,<br>Washington 6, D. C.                   | D<br>D<br>D<br>D | American Nature Association.<br>Izaak Walton League of America.<br>National Parks Association.<br>The Wilderness Society. |

**Venezuela — Venezuela.**

- |   |               |   |
|---|---------------|---|
| W. H. PHELPS<br>Sociedad Venezolana de Ciencias Naturales,<br>Avenida Carabobo (Apartado<br>1521), Caracas. | OG<br>D<br>OD | Gouvernement.<br>Sociedad Venezolana de Ciencias Naturales.<br>Museo de Ciencias Naturales. |
|---|---------------|---|

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.  
ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES.**

**International Office for the Protection of Nature — Office International pour la Protection de la Nature.**

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| R. HOIER<br>Office International pour la Protection de la Nature,<br>31, rue Vautier, Bruxelles (Belgique). | D |  |
| V. VAN STRAELEN<br>Président du Comité Exécutif de l'OIPN,<br>Belgique.                                     | D |  |
| P. G. VAN TIENHOVEN<br>Président honoraire de l'OIPN,<br>Pays-Bas.  | D |  |
| J. M. VRYDAGH<br>Avenue des Lièvres, Wesembeek-Stockel (Belgique).  | D |  |

**International Committee for Bird Preservation — Comité International pour la Protection des Oiseaux.**

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Miss P. BARCLAY-SMITH<br>Secretary of I.C.B.P.,<br>United Kingdom.                | D |  |
| B. BENZON<br>Danish Section of I.C.B.P.,<br>27, Halmtorvet, Copenhagen (Denmark). | D |  |

**Standing Committee on Pacific Conservation.**

- |                                  |   |  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| H. J. COOLIDGE<br>United States. | D |  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|

**International Union of Directors of Zoological Gardens — Union Internationale de Directeurs de Jardins Zoologiques.**

- |                                |   |  |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| K. CALDWELL<br>United Kingdom. | D |  |
|--------------------------------|---|--|

**International Commission (or Agricultural Industries — Commission Internationale des Industries Agricoles.**

H. ICKX OD  
Secrétaire de la Commission Internationale des Industries Agricoles,  
38, boulevard du Régent, Bruxelles (Belgique).

H. T. SACHS OD  
Secrétaire général de la Commission Internationale des Industries Agricoles,  
38, boulevard du Régent, Bruxelles (Belgique).

**Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations — Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'Alimentation et l'Agriculture.**

R. FONTAINE OD  
Officier forestier du Bureau Forestier Européen,  
Palais des Nations, Genève (Suisse).

International Council of Museums — Conseil International des Musées.

V. VAN STRAELEN OD  
Belgique.

**International Council of Scientific Unions  
scientifiques.**

V. VAN STRAELEN OD  
Belgique.

**Pacific Science Association.**

H. J. COOLIDGE OD  
United States.  
ROGER HEIM OD  
France.

International Union of Biological Sciences — Union Internationale des Sciences  
Biologiques.

V. VAN STRAELEN OD  
Belgique.

**UNESCO.**

A. GILLE OD  
Unesco House,  
19, avenue Kléber, Paris 16 (France).  
Miss E. SAM OD  
Département des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles, Unesco House,  
19, avenue Kléber, Paris 16 (France).

## **SECOND SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.**

### **FIRST STATUTORY SITTING (3rd MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY).**

**Brussels, Wednesday, 18 October, 1950, at 9.15 a.m.**

The president, Mr. Ch. J. Bernard was in the chair and gave the welcoming address.

#### **Approval of the proceedings of the former meeting.**

The proceedings of the 2nd meeting of the Assembly held at Fontainebleau on October 7th, 1948 were confirmed.

#### **Resolution No. 23 : Rules of Procedure.**

In accordance with Article IV, D, 8 of the Constitution, the Assembly accepted the Rules of Procedure as they stand in the appendix to this document <sup>(1)</sup>.

#### **Credentials Committee.**

The Assembly appointed to this Committee Messrs. N. Dahlbeck (Sweden), R. Videsott (Italy), and J. H. Westermann (Netherlands). Under the chairmanship of the last, the Committee verified the credentials of the delegates and announced that at the time of voting there would be twenty-five votes : eight for governments, fourteen for public services and societies and three for international institutions <sup>(2)</sup>.

#### **Resolution No. 24: Bureau of the Assembly.**

By virtue of the rules of procedure accepted under Resolution No. 23 mentioned above, Messrs. Ch. J. Bernard and Jean-Paul Harroy were, throughout the Session, to fill the offices of President

<sup>(1)</sup> See p. 53.

<sup>(2)</sup> The addition of new members and the late arrival of some credentials brought the final count up to the following figures : Governments : 8; Public Services and Societies : 16; International Institutions : 4.

and Secretary-General of the Assembly respectively. Four Vice-Presidents were elected: Messrs. H. J. Coolidge (United States), Roger Heim (France), G. F. Herbert Smith (United Kingdom), and V. Van Straelen (Belgium).

**Resolution No. 25: Agenda of the Session.**

The agenda of the Second Session was adopted as it stood in the preparatory documents of the meeting.

**Resolution No. 26: Calendar of the Session.**

The calendar of the Second Session was adopted as it stood in the appendix to the agenda for the present meeting.

**Resolution No. 27 : Chairmen of the technical sessions.**

The following were elected chairmen of the four technical meetings on the calendar (Survival Service — Education — Nomenclature — Book of Documentation) : Messrs. H. J. Coolidge (United States), Roger Heim (France), J. Ramsbottom (United Kingdom), V. Van Straelen (Belgium).

**Resolution No. 28: Nominations Committee.**

In preparation for the election, at the close of the Session, of a President, one or two Vice-Presidents, three or four members of the Board, and of the Secretary-General, the following Nominations Committee was formed to submit suggestions to the Assembly. Messrs. R. Bouillenne (Belgium), Cl. Bressou (France), K. Caldwell (United Kingdom), N. Dahlbeck (Sweden).

**Resolution No. 29: Finance Committee.**

A Finance Committee, charged with finding ways of increasing the resources of the institution, was elected as follows :

Messrs. C. Crane (United States), A. B. Duncan (United Kingdom), G. H. Lestel (France), W. H. Phelps Jr. (Venezuela).

The Assembly then proceeded to the study of the Secretary-General's report, which was presented by the President of the Executive Board in accordance with Article VI, 6 of the Constitution. The comments the Board had made about the report were also mentioned by the President.

Arising from the report the following points were dealt with :

1. There was a discussion about the advantages and inconveniences of National Committees of the kind that exists in the United Kingdom under the name of the British Co-ordinating Committee for Nature Conservation.

2. Several votes of thanks were passed by the Assembly. The principal one was for Unesco, which continued to give the Union its generous support; thanks were also expressed to the « Institut pour la Recherche scientifique en Afrique centrale » and to the personnel of the Union secretariat.

3. There was a discussion about the action already taken by the Union in approaching governments to support national activity which aimed at furthering certain conservation measures.

This led Mr. van der Goes van Naters (Netherlands) to make the following statement :

« Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Without doubt the most spectacular action in the young life of our Union has been its collaboration with Unesco in the Technical Conference at Lake Success, the results of which, magnificent reports and monographs, will enrich the arsenal of nature protection for years to come. I should like here to congratulate the Secretariat on this splendid start.

But the Union's aims are more of a cultural than of a technical order, and among the ways of serving these aims I should like to draw your attention to the following points in particular :

- 1) international co-operation;
- 2) preparation of international draft agreements, in accordance with the present Constitution; also carrying out the programme drawn up at Fontainebleau in 1948;
- 3) examination of the value of the application of the different laws now in force;
- 4) choice of model legislation.

Now, apart from the task of stimulating technical research, there is a very special task which was not discussed at Lake Success and which should be discussed now : namely the office of arbitrator in all international matters dealing with nature protection which can be filled solely by the Union. To my great satisfaction, the report which has just been distributed gives proof of the Secretary-General's interest in this problem, but a system must be established and must be based on the four following points :

A. — Among the reports of the technical Conference, there are three concerned with frontier and international parks and in addition a resume written by the Secretary-General.

The defence of the most untouched and the most valuable of these areas runs up against international obstacles. Here are some examples :

At the Belgian-Dutch frontier there are four natural monuments :  
The first is the famous Mont Saint-Pierre, the Dutch section

of which was sacrificed to material interests last year. It is now too late to establish an international monument here. The second is the Heath of Calmpthout, well known to our President; it would be possible to set aside all this frontier area as a reserve. The third is the area of Zwynn, the former mouth of the Scheldt, which is rich in semi-salt water flora of rare beauty. In spite of the mistakes made on both sides of the frontier, it might be possible, even at the last moment, to save this landscape. The last monument, the least known, is an area of marshes and peat-bogs, on both sides of the border between Tilbourg and Arendonk, called De Moeren (The Marshes). I visited it a fortnight ago and was delighted with it. But its protection involves all sorts of difficulties, above all that of satisfying both the farmers and the friends of nature. There is no doubt that in the case of these three natural parks which still exist on our frontiers Benelux-Monuments should be established. What arbitrator, above the parties involved, can help us to establish them if not our Union ?

B. — In Italy, a park of great beauty is seriously threatened by industry and hydro-electric intallations, although it is a national park created by law and said to be inviolable. I am speaking of the Gran Paradiso, in the Valdotaine region, which I visited this summer and the summer before.

The defenders of the Gran Paradiso, a park of international importance, have appealed to the Council of Europe at Strasbourg. As a member of the Assembly of the Council, I will do my best to see that this appeal is favourably received. But who, if not the Union, is in the best position to defend an object of such supra-national importance before supra-national authorities ?

C. — The Netherlands Government has given the Government of the Indonesian Republic complete sovereignty over Indonesia, a country where there are treasures of such beauty that no imagination can picture them. Among some of the benefits of Dutch rule was an exemplary nature protection service, the administration of which was centered in the botanical garden of Buitenzorg. This organization was split up by the war; the reserves of rare animals, as well as the last rhinoceros of Java and Sumatra, are seriously threatened. The Technical Conference at Lake Success resolved, on two occasions, that exceptional vigilance should be exercised on behalf of the threatened fauna of Indonesia.

The Dutch Council for the Protection of Nature has collected all the data necessary for an efficient reorganization of the Service. But... the Dutch Government is rightly opposed to the intervention of an official organization in the affairs of another sovereign state.

There is only one authority which can intervene : namely, our Union, and, Mr. President, I am happy to learn by the report which has just been distributed, that the Secretary-General has already approached the Indonesian Government.

D. — In Western Europe, this over-populated section of the world, the duty of rearming has become a sad necessity. Everywhere shooting ranges, grounds for manoeuvres, aerodromes, and military airports are being demanded. In every instance, the so-called « wild areas » are chosen, that is areas which are undamaged from a botanical point of view. This dangerous situation could certainly be improved if a better international understanding were reached on this matter. A compromise could be agreed upon : the land which is least valuable from the point of view of European nature should be chosen for these exercises.

What international and impartial organization if not the Union, can take action or be in the best position to suggest solutions, not to individual Governments, but to the Committee of the Atlantic Pact?

I may say in conclusion that the real purpose of the Union is :

- I. — To do all that can be done by an organization, a group or a nation.
- II. — To find norms and rules which are internationally valid for the defence of nature and the natural landscape, and then to draw up conventions necessary for their realization.
- III. — To inspire, assist and approach governments, for the heavy responsibility of safeguarding natural resources lies with them.
- IV. — To defend before the supra-national authorities of the Council of Europe, the Atlantic Pact, the United Nations Organizations and their specialized agencies the really supra-national interests of the protection of nature.
- V. — To build up a system of protection according to natural circumstances, but which, like nature itself, will go beyond frontiers.

There, Ladies and Gentlemen, are some of the principles of a programme for the International Union; there is the atmosphere in which it can live and thrive. There is the ecology of our Union. »

This address of Mr. van der Goes van Naters greatly impressed the Assembly, and the meeting was adjourned at 1 p.m.

**SECOND STATUTORY SITTING  
(4th MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY).**

**Brussels, Wednesday, 18 October, 1950, at 3 p.m.**

The meeting was opened at 3 p.m. by the President, Mr. Ch. J. Bernard, in the chair.

The consideration of the Secretary-General's report was continued.

The following were the principal comments made :

1. In the interval before it was found possible to resume the publication of the magazine, *Pro Natura*, it was considered desirable to adopt the suggestion of Mr. R. Videsott (Italy) to start a « Bank of Articles » and to ask members to publish one or more of these articles in the columns of their own publications.

2. Various ways of resuming the publication of *Pro Natura* were studied.

3. Miss E. Sam gave an account of what Unesco had been able to do with regard to the outcome of the suggestions contained in resolutions 2, 4, 5, and 6 of the Lake Success Conference.

4. Mr. R. Heim (France) proposed that the Assembly should pass a motion emphasizing the serious situation of natural communities in Africa. Mr. P. Staner, delegate of the Belgian Government, supported by two of his compatriots, remarked that it would be advisable to tone down such a recommendation in view of the great diversity of conditions existing in Africa.

It was decided not to discuss this technical question.

5. A few details were again altered in the text of the report published in the annex <sup>(1)</sup>.

**Resolution No. 30.**

On the recommendation of the Executive Board the following thirty-five new members were admitted to the Union by the Assembly :

*Australia :*

Naturalists' Society of New South Wales.  
Tree Wardens' League of New South Wales.

(1) See p. 57.

*Belgium :*

Société de Botanique et de Zoologie Congolaises.  
Société Royale de Botanique de Belgique.  
Société Royale de Zoologie d'Anvers.  
Vereniging voor Natuur en Stedenschoon, V.Z.W.

*France :*

Fédération Française des Sociétés de Sciences Naturelles.  
Société des Sciences Naturelles du Maroc.

*India :*

Bombay Natural History Society.

*Italy :*

Laboratorio de Zoologia applicata a la Caccia.  
Touring Club Italiano.

*Mexico :*

Asociacion Mexicana de Proteccion a la Naturaleza.

*Netherlands :*

Nederlandse Commissie voor Internationale Natuurbescherming.

*New Zealand :*

Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand.

*Union of South Africa :*

National Parks Board of Trustees.  
Wildlife Protection Society.

*United Kingdom :*

British Association for the Advancement of Science.  
British Ecological Society.  
British Mycological Society.  
Cornwall Bird Watching and Preservation Society.  
Devon Bird Watching and Preservation Society.  
Geological Society of London.  
Linnean Society of London.  
London Natural History Society.  
Nature Conservancy.  
Norfolk Naturalists Trust.  
Northumberland, Durham and Newcastle-upon-Tyne Natural History Society.  
Royal Zoological Society of Scotland.  
West Wales Field Society.  
Yorkshire Naturalists' Trust.

*United States :*

American Museum of Natural History.  
American Shore and Beach Preservation Association.  
American Society of Mammalogists.  
The Nature Conservancy.

*International Organizations :*

International Committee for Bird Preservation.

The President cordially welcomed these new members to the Union.

The meeting adjourned at 5.30 p.m.

**THIRD STATUTORY SITTING  
(5th MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY).**

**Brussels, Thursday, 19 October, 1950, at 10 a.m.**

The meeting was opened by the President, Mr. Ch. J. Bernard, in the chair. Messages were read from Mr. W. Goetel (Poland), member of the Executive Board, from the Finnish League for the Protection of Nature, and from the Associazione Nazionale per i Paessagi ed i Monumenti Pittoreschi d'Italia.

**PRESENTATION  
OF THE REPORTS OF MEMBERS SENT IN IN ACCORDANCE  
WITH ARTICLE VIII OF THE CONSTITUTION.**

The Secretary-General presented to the Assembly eight mimeographed reports submitted by member societies of the Union on the progress they had made in the field of nature protection since 1948.

These reports came from :

Tree Wardens League of New South Wales (Australia).

Institut des Parcs Nationaux du Congo Beige (Belgium).

Finnish League for the Protection of Nature (Finland).

Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (New Zealand).

Inspection Federate des Forêts, Chasse et Pêche (Switzerland).

Association de Propagande pour la Protection des Oiseaux (Switzerland).

Société Romande pour l'Étude et la Protection des Oiseaux (Switzerland).

Fauna Preservation Society (United Kingdom).

One report came too late to be mimeographed and distributed, from the Société des Amis de la Forêt de Fontainebleau (France).

In addition, three organizations sent a copy of their Annual Report for the past year to the Union instead of writing a special report for the Assembly. These were the :

American Society of Mammalogists.

British Co-ordinating Committee for Nature Conservation.

Yorkshire Naturalists' Trust.

The Assembly took note of these various communications.

Finally, two persons left papers with the Bureau of the Assembly which they wished to make available to interested members. They were :

Mr. Auguste Chevalier (France) who presented the Union with the following papers :

1. « La Progression de l'aridité, du dessèchement et de l'ensablement et la decadence des sols en Afrique Occidentale Française. »

2. « Mesures urgentes à prendre pour entraver le dessèchement, l'ensablement et la decadence des sols et de la vegetation en Afrique Occidentale et spécialement au Soudan Français. »

3. « Programme de reboisement, de lutte contre la sécheresse et d'aménagement agraire en Afrique Occidentale Française. »

4. « Regeneration des sols et de la vegetation en Afrique Occidentale Française. »

5. « La Protection de la Nature et les Parcs-Réserves de l'Afrique Occidentale Française. »

Mr. T. G. Nel (Transvaal) who offered his paper on « Malaria, Bilharzia and Control and its Effect on Aquatic Life ».

#### **Resolution No. 31 : New members of the Union.**

The Assembly, declared unanimously that there was no objection to German or Japanese administrations, public services, organizations, institutions, and associations being proposed for membership of the Union.

#### **Resolution No. 32:**

##### **Relations with the International Office for the Protection of Nature.**

The Executive Board proposed that the Union should not set up a library or documentation section of its own, but that this work of the IUPN could be left to the IOPN, which has pledged its close co-operation. The Assembly unanimously approved.

#### **Resolution No. 33 :**

##### **Contracts concluded in accordance with Article X of the Constitution.**

The Assembly unanimously approved the four contracts which the Executive Board, authorized under Article X of the Constitution, made with Unesco on 4 November 1948, 28 December 1948, 20 December 1949, and 27 March 1950.

The meeting adjourned at 11.30 a.m.

## **FIRST TECHNICAL MEETING.**

**Brussels, Thursday, 19 October 1950, at 11.30 a.m.**

### **THE SURVIVAL SERVICE**

The chair was taken by Mr. H. J. Coolidge, Vice-President of the Union. He opened the discussion by reviewing the activities of the Survival Service since it came into being as the result of a resolution passed at Lake Success. At the outset it was subsidized by Unesco.

Mr. J.-M. Vrydagh, to whom the Union had entrusted the task of initiating the Service, reported to the Assembly as follows :

Five months ago the Secretary-General of the IUPN did me the great honour of proposing that I should undertake the work of the Survival Service. I should like to express my gratitude to him as well as to the Board of the Union. At the same time I wish to thank Mr. V. Van Straelen, Director of the Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles, who has put office accommodations at my disposal and authorized me to make use of the staff of his important library.

My work has been facilitated by the ready help of Colonel R. Hoier of the International Office for the Protection of Nature who, since the Survival Service became active, has put all of his documentation at my disposal. I wish to extend my sincere thanks to him also. More recently, my colleague, Mr. Van Hagendorn has helped me with the translation of articles in foreign languages; I am very grateful to him for this assistance.

In order to clarify this report, I will quote Resolution No 15 of the Technical Conference on Nature Protection held at Lake Success in August 1949 : that the IUPN should establish a « survival service » for the assembling, evaluation, and dissemination of information on, and the study of, all species of fauna and flora that appear to be threatened with extinction, in order to assist governments and appropriate agencies in assuring their survival.

The very wording of this resolution constitutes a programme which can be summed up in four points : 1° collecting; 2° verifying; 3° disseminating; 4° assisting.

It is this programme which we shall analyse and which we shall submit to the General Assembly for discussion.

The first task before us therefore is to collect all the most recent information available on threatened species. The Lake Success Conference, in Resolution No 16, drew up a list of animal species of international interest which included thirteen birds and fourteen

mammals. This list was obviously very limited. It is sufficient to refer to the introduction of the book by Harper on mammals of the old world to see that the author estimated them to number about 600 species.

Let me point out that Harper's book as well as the book by Allen, devoted to mammals of the new world, serve as a basis in the work of collecting information. These works have been edited with the greatest care and give a very complete bibliography which stops in 1942 for Harper and 1939 for Allen. Therefore the first efforts of the Survival Service will be devoted to listing all the documentation which has appeared since these dates. At the International Office for the Protection of Nature Colonel Hoier has made a card-index of all the information which has come to him on the subject of threatened species.

At present the means at the disposal of the Survival Service are limited. The question arises whether to take note of all information about all animals to be protected or to limit ourselves for the present to the species listed in Resolution No 16. It seems more logical to us to note all information as we come upon it in the course of our reading. Indeed, it might become very difficult to find this data again at a later date when the Survival Service, with greater means at its disposal, dealt with all threatened species.

In accordance with the spirit of the discussions at the Technical Conference at Lake Success, we have done our utmost to obtain all possible ecological data on threatened species. With this intention, we have begun by consulting the principal bibliographical source, the « Zoological Record », from the 1938 issues to the latest volume.

Let us note an important result of this first work : the knowledge that threatened species have never been the subject of ecological study. The reason for this seems to be that the researcher tends to devote his energy to working with material which is abundant and easily obtainable. He neglects therefore rare species and those which are localized in inaccessible places. The only information to be found comes in general from enthusiastic observers. It is also important to note that ecology is a young science. It was still unknown at the time when the species which are now threatened were safe from destruction. At that time one did not take the trouble to equip oneself with cumbersome scientific apparatus, in order to determine the variations of the environmental factors in relation to the life of the animals.

After the International Congress held at Upsala in June of this year, we learned that an American specialist, Mr. Greenway, is in the course of preparing a work on all the vanishing birds throughout the world. We wrote to him immediately to find out his intentions. While waiting for his reply, we have temporarily devoted our efforts to mammals. We have just received a reply from Mr. Greenway. It contains complete documentation on all the birds listed in Resolution No 15. Moreover, the author confirms his intention of publishing a work on all threatened birds.

Another important point which the Survival Service brings to the attention of the Assembly is that found in Resolution No 17 of Lake Success. This resolution refers to the protection of plant communities. The means at our disposal do not allow us to do much in this field at present.

The second point on our programme is entitled : verifying. We shall agree to enter here all the information that comes to our attention after the dispatch of a questionnaire. The purpose of the latter is to collect information among people living in areas where the animals are threatened. The Survival Service is drawing up a list of all people capable of supplying this data. In order to facilitate the task we have worked out a questionnaire, a first outline of which lies on the tables. It is entitled : Inquiry on vanishing animal species. It has been sent to several specialists to consult them on the text and we have used some of their suggestions.

Several people have asked us to add more names to the list of thirteen birds and fourteen mammals in Resolution No 15. It was not our job to discuss these proposals, but we would be glad to know the Assembly's opinion on them.

The questionnaire in its approved form will be sent to all the persons already pointed out to us as well as to anyone suggested to us by the Assembly. The information collected by the Survival Service will thus constitute a check and a verification of the data already assembled in books and in magazine articles. It is only when we have collected sufficient information about a species that we will be able to carry out points 3 and 4 of our programme, that is to say : dissemination and assistance.

The Survival Service proposes working through committees of specialists on the Lake Success list of animals. Only after receiving the recommendations of these committees will the I.U.P.N. disseminate information.

We shall now examine this third point of our programme.

Should the Survival Service try to disseminate all the data collected on the subject of the fourteen mammals and the thirteen birds mentioned in Resolution No 16? Eventually this information can be published as a supplement to the work of Allen and Harper on mammals. The data on birds will depend on the reports made by Mr. Greenway.

We have arrived at the fourth point of the programme: in what way can the IUPN assist governments and competent organizations in their efforts to ensure the conservation of threatened species. Our intervention is only justified when it concerns animals whose status is well known. This is the first condition to be filled, to know the threatened species and to have gathered sufficient information through the questionnaire and through bibliographical research. It is not until the Union has all this information at its disposal that intervention will seem opportune.

With this we shall close the report on the first activities of the Survival Service. We hope that the members of the Assembly

will be willing to help us with their suggestions and criticism which, we do not doubt, will be both fruitful and numerous.

The report was approved.

The Italian delegates, Messrs. R. Videsott and P. Bava, urged that the list of threatened mammals drawn up at Lake Success be increased by several individuals and that, in the first place, the Brown Bear of the Alps (*Arctos arctos L.*) should be added to the list. The President proposed — and the Assembly agreed — that the principle of lengthening the Lake Success list should not be examined at a plenary meeting but should be relegated to a limited committee, to be established later.

Mr. P. Duvigneaud (Belgium) stated the necessity of carrying out as soon as possible not only Resolution No 16 of Lake Success which concerns animal species but also Resolution No 17 which recommends measures to be taken in the study and protection of plant communities which are either rare or in danger of disappearing. He added that a French equivalent should be found for the expression « Survival Service » which, in his opinion, has a pronounced tendency to be permanently adopted by the French speaking members of the Union.

Several present pointed out that if the Union dealt with vanishing plant species or communities it would be well to do so in strict accordance with F.A.O., which has already carried out extensive research in this field. Mr. J. Ramsbottom (United Kingdom) then emphasized the essential aspect of the problem which is even more apparent in the plant world than in the animal world: protection of species signifies first of all protection of habitats. A rule forbidding the hunting, capture, extermination or collecting of specimens of the species has no chance, even if it is scrupulously observed, of saving the species from extinction if the environment essential to its existence is destroyed around it.

Various other speakers rose: Mr. W. H. Phelps (Venezuela) to have the meaning of Resolution No 17 of Lake Success clarified, Mr. K. Caldwell (United Kingdom) to point out the possibilities and the duties of the Union in the matter of vanishing species and to propose also the extension of the list of mammals drawn up at Lake Success and Mr. R. Videsott to insist again that attempts be made to save the Brown Bear.

Detailed information was then given on the present condition of several vanishing species. Mr. L. A. Walford (U.S.A.) gave an account of the Monk Seal of the Caribbean, then Mr. F. C. Fraser (United Kingdom) gave an account of what is being done through international co-operation to protect the Whale.

Mr. N. Dahlbeck (Sweden) suggested, in connexion with this last matter, that the I.U.P.N. should make contact with the authorities of the International Whaling Board, then, returning to the general problem, suggested that the species threatened with extinction be divided into two categories: one in which the entire species which is very localized is in danger of disappearance, and the other —

as for example the Brown Bear in Italy — a vanishing sub-species, relic of a species which formerly had a very wide distribution and whose related sub-species are in a more favourable condition. In this connexion, the Addo-bush Elephant which is not specifically different from the *Loxodonta africana africana* of Central Africa, presents a much less disturbing instance — although the menace which threatens it is as great — than the one-horned Rhinoceros of Java. If the latter were completely wiped out, the *Rhinoceros sondaicus* would disappear from the surface of the globe — perhaps with the exception of a few specimens in captivity — while the disappearance of the Addo-bush Elephant, distressing as it would be, would still leave numerous bush elephants on the black continent.

Some discussion followed on the part which the International Committee for Bird Preservation should play in the study of the ornithological species enumerated in Resolution No 16 of Lake Success, and it was decided to refer the matter to a committee meeting.

After the delegates present had agreed to supply the Secretariat with all the information in their possession about the species listed at Lake Success and about the persons and organizations throughout the world able to throw new light on these species, a Commission was formed by Mr. H. J. Coolidge, to help him in examining the activities programme of the Survival Service and in deciding on the final text of the questionnaire which would be circulated by the Service <sup>(1)</sup>. Miss P. Barclay-Smith (United Kingdom) stated that in her opinion it would be advisable to send the questionnaire to many more organizations than to individuals.

The Commission, appointed by Mr. Coolidge to assist him in his work, was composed of the following :

Miss P. Barclay-Smith (United Kingdom);  
Messrs. V. Cahalane (U.S.A.), President;  
K. Caldwell (United Kingdom);  
H. J. Coolidge (U.S.A.);  
N. Dahlbeck (Sweden);  
S. Frechkop (Belgique);  
R. Heim (France);  
W. H. Phelps (Venezuela);  
J. Ramsbottom (United Kingdom);  
R. Verheyen (Belgique);  
J.-M. Vrydagh (Belgique).

The meeting was adjourned at 1 p.m.

(1) See the text of this questionnaire p. 29.

## INQUIRY ON VANISHING MAMMALS.

### Draft questionnaire.

#### *Vanishing Species :*

Scientific name.

English, French (German, and Spanish) names.

Vernacular name.

#### A. — *History :*

What was the extent of the original range of the species ?

To what areas is the range restricted at the present time ?

Can you give an estimate of the number of individuals in existence before the species was threatened ?

#### B. — *Ecology :*

##### a) History :

What was the nature of the environment or habitat, when the species was common ?

Has the climate changed since that time ? If so, how ?

Has the habitat changed ? If so, is this because of :

climatic influences ?

human action? (such as clearing the land);

other reasons ?

At what period did the species begin to be threatened or become extinct ?

##### b) Present day :

What are the causes of the decrease or extermination of the species ?

Disease, predators, game control, economic uses, price of trophies, changes in habitat, changes in climate, introduction of new species, etc.

To what extent is the animal or parts thereof exported, for what purposes and to what countries ?

Is the area of the present habitat decreasing ?

Is the plant community of the environment in the process of change ?

Is there a possibility of saving the present area of the habitat in its entirety or in part ? If in part indicate what area.

What is the food of the species in its natural surroundings ?

Does the environment contain sufficient food ?

Is the species threatened by a new arrival : an animal introduced by Man, or a native species which has become too numerous ?

What is the relationship between the vanishing species and the other animals living in the same environment ?

What is the rate of reproduction ? Length of gestation ? and number of young per brood ?

What is the sex ratio ?

Are there periods in its life when the species is particularly vulnerable to predators ? During the period of dropping of its young, suckling, etc.

What is the behaviour of the animal during the day and at night ?

Can you give an estimate of the number of individuals that still survive ?

What protective legislation exists at the moment ?

#### C. — *Measures to be taken:*

What measures would you recommend to save or to preserve the species ?

Is there a possibility of preserving the species in semi-liberty or in captivity? (for example, in an enclosed area or in zoological gardens ?)

#### D. — *Other Considerations:*

In the case of the species under consideration, what particularly convincing arguments do you suggest which bring about rapid protective measures in its favour ?

economic;  
scientific (nature balances);  
aesthetic;  
educational;  
others ?

Do you know of any organizations or persons particularly interested in the problem of preserving the species in question and capable of helping us ?

## **SECOND TECHNICAL MEETING.**

**Brussels, Thursday, 19 October, 1950, at 3 p.m.**

### **EDUCATION IN THE PROTECTION OF NATURE.**

The meeting was opened by Mr. Ch. J. Bernard (Switzerland) President of the Union, who then released the chair to the chairman of the meeting, Professor Roger Heim (France). The latter requested Mr. A. Gille (Unesco) to act as Secretary.

Mr. Heim briefly recalled the necessity of educating the public in the need for nature conservation : legal action alone is inadequate;

the co-operation of the public is essential and therefore it must be educated in this field. This question of education continues to be the Union's foremost problem. During the Lake Success Conference four resolutions were passed on this subject. Certain results have already followed.

*Resolution No 2 :* Unesco has organized a conference to facilitate the free exchange of educational material; the proposals put forward by this conference will be submitted to the governments for ratification in November 1950; as soon as ten of them have given their signature to this document it will become effective.

*Resolution No 4 :* A meeting will be held in Paris on November 15th, 1950, in the course of which the question of youth clubs will be discussed.

*Resolution No 5:* Unesco has granted a scholarship for the study of Nature Protection to a certified student from Tanganyika who will spend six months in the United States studying the techniques of soil conservation.

*Resolution No 6:* In connexion with the introduction of conservation into educational programmes, the Chairman was happy to point out that in his country two courses on the Protection of Nature had been instituted, one at the « Ecole Supérieure d'Application d'Agronomie Tropicale » and the other at the « Ecole Nationale Vétérinaire d'Alfort ».

The publication of a booklet to be used by Italian school teachers will be part of the Union's programme for 1950; for 1951, similar pamphlets for the schools as well as the organization of a card-index of educational films; and for 1952, the publication of another series of booklets and the establishment of youth clubs.

.Subject of the discussion : practical methods for achieving results as rapidly as possible — in connexion with this, an Education Commission. The first question under discussion was the Italian project : to provide the teachers of certain classes, not yet designated, with a booklet enabling them to give one or two basic lessons on the Protection of Nature; accompanying this publication for teachers would be illustrations for pupils. This project was submitted to, and accepted by, Unesco, which had made a \$ 1,500 grant to this end. Three countries had been proposed : Mexico, Brazil and Italy. From these three Italy was chosen on condition that the agreement of the Government and the Minister of Education were obtained to ensure the successful carrying out of the plan. Following an exchange of letters with the Italian Minister of Education, five persons were chosen to make up the committee charged with drawing up the pamphlets and with determining the number to be printed and their distribution. On September 27th the Minister's letter of acceptance arrived with the request that two more people chosen from teachers in the primary and secondary level be added to the commission.

Mr. R. Videsott (Italy), speaking for his country, thanked the Union for the favour that it had done to Italy by choosing it for this experiment. He asked if it would be possible to restrict the project to Northern Italy and in this region to the elementary schools made up of rural population, which is in the closest contact with nature.

Mr. Heim expressed the opinion that there had been too much delay and that results must be shown by next month if the money allotted by Unesco was not to be forfeited.

Mr. Videsott admitted that since the committee had not been formed nothing had yet been done.

Mr. P. D. van Pallandt van Eerde (Netherlands) asked if it would be possible to send a copy of the plan submitted to the Italian Government to all interested countries and international organizations, because many had already begun working on this subject.

Mr. Heim requested the immediate establishment of a committee, which would include Mr. Videsott, to draw up a plan which would be referred to the Italian Government. Mr. Videsott accepted this proposal.

The Chairman suggested that the committee be made up of the three Italian delegates, together with Mr. J.-P. Harroy (IUPN) and two other delegates. Mr. Videsott expressed the view that one of the latter be a specialist in bird protection.

Mr. J. Büttikofer (Switzerland), asked by Mr. Heim, agreed to this proposal and Messrs. R. W. Westwood (U.S.A.) and J. Goudsward (Netherlands) were then elected.

Mr. H. J. Coolidge (U.S.A.) presented three new propositions :

The establishment of a conservation project in India at the elementary level. This would be carried out in a limited area densely populated and located near a nature reserve;

In the Fiji Islands educational material on nature protection was recommended for the elementary level;

Establishment in Africa, perhaps in the Belgian Congo, of a similar conservation project was suggested.

Mr. Harroy agreed to write to India about this matter; and with the help of Unesco and Mr. Gille's assistance, to choose the material to be sent to Tonga.

Mr. Coolidge announced that he had obtained private funds to be used in Tonga.

Mr. Heim's proposal that these three projects be put on the agenda of the next meeting was unanimously accepted.

Mr. G. F. Herbert Smith (United Kingdom) raised the question of what the results of giving public access to National Parks might be. To minimize the risk of damage in these areas, arrangements were being made to issue in Great Britain a publication specifying the code of behaviour in the countryside.

Mr. M. C. Bloemers (Netherlands) said that means for raising funds for an educational campaign devoted to conservation had been

found in the Netherlands by adding a surtax to the charge for admission to National Parks, which is set aside for conservation education.

Mr. Goudswaard outlined the work accomplished during the Lake Success meetings and stated that the principles found there should serve as a starting point. He presented a note to this effect to the Secretariat.

The Chairman requested that practical methods be found for achieving results as quickly as possible, and that suggestions for developing the activities of the Union be submitted to him.

Mr. Coolidge proposed that the aid of Mr. Gabrielson (U.S.A.) who was Chairman of the Lake Success Conference be obtained.

Mr. Heim asked the Assembly if they thought an Education Commission was the only solution possible for arriving at results in this field. So far the Commission had remained in a state of dormancy.

Mr. Harroy intervened to remark that a glance at the composition of the Commission, whose members are scattered in the four corners of the world, was sufficient evidence that this group would never meet. The principle that the Secretary should be of the same nationality as the President was agreed on. If the Assembly should decide to try this experiment again with Mr. Gabrielson and Miss H. Hatcher (U.S.A.), five or ten projects ought to be launched.

As another solution to the problem, the Chairman suggested organizing small national committees which would collect the existing documents in each country and serve as a clearing house.

Miss Eleen Sam (Unesco) emphasized the fact that it was of little importance to Unesco whether or not the Union acted through a commission and that at all events Unesco would not pay the administrative expenses involved. It is the work accomplished and the results obtained which counted.

Mr. J. Ramsbottom (United Kingdom) believed that the existence of an International Committee alone might seem a little dictatorial; consequently he recommended the establishment of National Committees, that is, committees established in different countries, as well as an International Committee.

Mr. P. Duvigneaud (Belgium) pointed out the example of his country where a law existed introducing a course in Nature Protection into the curricula of agricultural studies. This course had for some reason been dropped. He asked if it would be possible for Unesco to supply countries with documents and to carry out this role of clearing house.

Mr. Gille replied that this was not Unesco's role, but rather that of the Union which was created for this purpose. Unesco was limited to the organization of conferences for obtaining the free exchange of documents. Once this aim had been accomplished it was for the Union to serve as a clearing house.

Mr. P. Duvigneaud thought that the elite must be instructed in this field first and therefore action must be taken in the universities.

Mr. Coolidge was in favour of these two ideas : the creation of national committees, and the introduction of conservation courses in University programmes. The Chairman pointed out that in many

countries there were no treatises on Nature Protection nor a sufficient number of specialists in the field, even in the Universities. Mr. Goudswaard requested that Mr. Gabrielson be chosen Chairman of the Commission and that the Lake Success documents be used.

Mr. Bloemers proposed the establishment of regional committees, representing groups of countries, which after collecting ideas and acquiring experience would be able to recommend methods to be followed.

Mr. Heim brought up the question of which one of the three suggestions should be chosen ? That of regional committees raised the same difficulties as the creation of a single international committee.

Mr. W. H. Phelps (Venezuela) was in favour of a single committee.

Mr. P. Bava (Italy) was of the opinion that the masses must also be educated.

Mr. H. W. Glassen (United States) said that in Michigan carefully thought out courses were given. He would undertake to have them sent to foreign universities which might ask for them.

Mr. Heim concluded that there were two problems : first, to organize education in the heart of the Union, second, to choose ideas and projects which were in accord with the aims of Unesco so that the latter would finance them. Therefore, *who* to sound, *where* to establish the Commission, and *how* ? The principle of a world-wide commission was unanimously agreed to. The chairmanship was offered to Mr. Gabrielson, also by a unanimous vote, and Washington chosen as the seat for the Commission. Mr. Bloemers withdrew his suggestion of regional committees and the proposal of local committees was adopted.

It was suggested by Mr. Harroy that the Union Secretariat should establish documentation, based on the ideas brought up today, which would be submitted to all the members for comment. He then suggested that the Office in Washington be called : Educational Section of the Union. Mr. Coolidge expressed the fear that this would lead to confusion with the already existing Bureau.

Mr. Bernard was not of that opinion and did not think that the Bureau need fear any possibility of overlapping.

Mr. Büttikofer proposed that Mr. Gabrielson be given full powers to organize his own secretariat for this work. He was supported by Mr. Coolidge.

The term « Commission », which was suggested by Mr. Heim, was unanimously adopted.

The meeting was adjourned at 5.40 p.m.

A. GILLE.

### THIRD TECHNICAL MEETING.

Brussels, Friday, 20 October, 1950, at 10 a.m.

#### NOMENCLATURE.

Mr. J. Ramsbottom (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Nomenclature Commission, presided over the meeting and began by giving a brief historical account of the question. He outlined the work done at Brunnen and the three proposals published before the Fontainebleau Conference in the two numbers of *Pro Natura* by Messrs. Bourdelle, Däniker, and Ramsbottom, Herbert Smith, Diver and Whitehorn. He then gave his opinion on how the problem might be attacked. The Secretariat of the Union had suggested the adoption of some plan for nomenclature, the plan drawn up by Mr. Bourdelle for instance. The owners of reserved areas in each country could then decide in which of the categories, as defined by Mr. Bourdelle, their areas should be classified.

Mr. Ramsbottom was not in agreement with this procedure. He would prefer that the Union should limit itself to defining categories without attaching names to them; it should then carry out a thorough investigation, in order to gather more exact information than was available at present on the status of each of the reserved territories. He added that the United Kingdom in recent legislation had provided a plan for conservation as well as legal definitions for various types of protected areas.

Mr. P. Duvigneaud (Belgium) pointed out that in his country approximately fifty naturalists had drawn up a national nomenclature without waiting for an international agreement to be reached. The nomenclature adopted was similar to that of Mr. Bourdelle, though a little simpler. It had revealed that in Belgium there was no possibility of establishing more than one National Park worthy of the name. The remaining protected areas would be classified as nature reserves or special reserves. The conclusions reached by the commission were at the disposal of the Union if it wished for further details.

Mr. R. Videsott (Italy) hoped that when decisions were taken it would be borne in mind that theory and practice did not always coincide in the matter of nature reserves. Mr. G. H. Lestel (France) stressed the urgency of the Union's adopting a scheme. One by one countries were putting their definitions into law. The London Convention of 1933 had already given precise definitions for international nature reserves and national parks which had been legally accepted at the international level. The United Kingdom had just enacted laws and drawn up definitions on the subject. France was in process

of doing so. The Union must not lose time or their action would come too late, since the countries which had the greatest interest in this question were already taking up irrevocable positions.

Mr. R. W. Westwood (U.S.A.) emphasized the difficulties involved in establishing a codification which would apply to all countries. Then Mr. M. C. Bloemers (Netherlands) stated the two possibilities of dealing with the problem : either choosing a system a priori and making an inquiry based on the system; or beginning with an investigation and formulating a system from the results so obtained. Various arguments were presented by different members of the Assembly on these two points of view.

Under the chairmanship of Mr. J. Ramsbottom and with Mr. M. C. Bloemers' assistance, the members of the Nomenclature Commission present at the meeting undertook to submit before the close of the session a draft questionnaire which would correspond as closely as possible to the views expressed during the discussion.

At 11 a.m. the meeting passed to a new subject for discussion under the chairmanship of Mr. V. Van Straelen (Belgium).

### **INQUIRY ON THE POSITION OF NATURE PROTECTION THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.**

Before the session the delegates had each received a folder of proofs of the reports received by the Secretariat in response to the questionnaire sent to all countries in the world with a view to forming as complete a documentation as possible on the position of the various natural kingdoms in each country and on the measures taken to ensure their conservation and rational utilization.

The draft of the questionnaire was examined and approved, after which the list of countries from which reports had already been received was submitted to the meeting. Publication could not be postponed for long and it would be unfortunate if some countries were represented by a blank page, particularly if these lands were important in the field of Nature Protection.

Some remarks were made about the value of the various reports and the Secretary was questioned on the way in which people or organizations in each country were chosen to give a report. The Executive Board dealt with the problem in the following manner : (1) in the case of countries which had one or more nationals on the Board, the questionnaire was sent to that person or one of these persons with the request for collaboration with the appropriate people in drawing up the report; (2) in the case of countries : (a) where only one organization was a member of the Union, that organization was approached, (b) where several organizations were members, one of them was chosen by the Secretariat to receive the questionnaire, (c) where there was no Union member, either a member of the Board living in a neighbouring country was approached or else the most suitable person or organization in the country was chosen by the Secretariat.

In a forceful speech, the Chairman stressed the value of the work that had been undertaken. It was becoming more and more important to perfect scientific methods for a stricter conservation or a more rational utilization of natural communities which constitute man's normal environment. It was essential to take account of what had been done if we wanted to know both the points of departure and the results of eventual action. Mr. V. Van Straelen stated that, with a few exceptions, the situation was becoming constantly worse. Governments of countries which had recently become autonomous were especially faced with formidable tasks : the reorganization of the economy of their territories involuntarily and unconsciously drew very heavily on the natural fauna and flora of the country and on the fertility of the soil. Numerous natural animal and vegetable communities were thus threatened with extinction. It would be well to try and find out, with as many details as possible, the actual attitudes which the responsible authorities in each country had adopted in the face of this danger.

Mr. L. A. Walford (U.S.A.) interposed to ask how the Assembly could reconcile the existence of the Union with the idea, which he found hard to refute, that Man is a normal constituent of Nature. Several persons answered this question, by paraphrasing the Fontainebleau preamble. When one of the components of nature's equilibrium became preponderant to the point of threatening the continued existence of this equilibrium, spontaneous reactions took place which controlled its extension. Through his intelligence, Man, who, according to the expression used by Mr. R. Bouillenne (Belgium), was gradually becoming a « disease of the earth », was capable of hindering these natural reactions. And his expansion on the globe, which was as much a question of numbers as of the increasing power of exploitive techniques, was making itself felt more and more. The only limitation possible now, while waiting for catastrophes to follow, must come from his own will, guided by his intelligence. From this arose the need for Humanity to adopt wittingly an attitude of immediate self-sacrifice, an attitude which was a priori unnatural. It was the Union's task to stimulate this will for present parsimony with a view to safeguarding the future.

Mr. H. J. Coolidge (U.S.A.), in his turn, emphasized the importance of the volume of documentation now under preparation. He repeated the appeal that every one should make a real effort to see that the still lacking reports were handed in. This appeal was as much in the interest of each country as of the Union which represented the general interest.

Mr. F. J. Appelman (Netherlands), speaking for Mr. W. Burhenne (Germany), explained how he thought a report on Germany might be obtained. Mr. Cl. Bressou (France) was disturbed by the excessive optimism disclosed by the authors of certain texts already drawn up, who mistook plans and desires for reality. Mr. P. Duvigneaud, in agreement with a request formulated by Mr. W. Robyns (Belgium), thought that the plan of the report prepared by this country should

be altered and made more complete. Mr. Coolidge proposed that certain uniformities in presentation be adopted and expressed the wish that each report be followed with the date of its drafting.

Before the meeting was adjourned, on a motion by the President, the Assembly approved the way in which the Secretariat had gone about preparing this volume of documentation and authorized its completion according to the principles so far followed in its preparation.

The meeting was adjourned at 12.45 p.m.

## **FOURTH TECHNICAL MEETING.**

**Brussels, Friday, 20 October, 1950, at 3 p.m.**

### **VARIOUS QUESTIONS.**

The President, Mr. Ch. J. Bernard, was in the chair.

A discussion took place first on the subject of the technical meetings which complemented the statutory meetings of the General Assembly. Several delegates expressed regret that these meetings had permitted very few purely technical discussions. It would have been appreciated, in view of the great variety in the backgrounds of the people who came, through different channels, to participate in the defence of Nature, if committees of specialists had been able to devote their time to the thorough examination of a particular problem.

The President, with a view to preparing for the 1952 Session, made several suggestions : open meetings, the presentation of one or more reports, on subjects chosen by the Executive Board, followed by a general discussion. A final decision on this was left to the close of the session.

\*  
\*\*

The resolutions of the Lake Success Conference were then reviewed seriatim and information was furnished on the way in which most of them had already been carried out.

*Resolution n° 1* : The Economic and Social Council of the United Nations was considering the creation of an International Institute for Human Sciences, where studies in human ecology, advocated in this resolution, would be conducted.

*Resolution n° 2* : Unesco had prepared the text of an international agreement to facilitate the circulation of educational material between countries, a text which complied with this resolution and which would come into force, now that it had been passed by the General Assembly at Florence, as soon as ten governments had ratified it.

*Resolution n° 3* : Resolution of a very general character.

*Resolution n° 4* : The IUPN would participate at the Meeting of the Representatives of International Youth Organizations to be held in Paris from November 14-17 and would be able on that occasion to work out certain concrete projects in order to encourage the establishment of Youth Clubs devoted to the conservation and study of Nature in several countries.

*Resolution n° 5* : Unesco, in accordance with this resolution, had already given a scholarship to an African from Tanganyika Territory which would allow him to go to the United States and to profit from that country's experience in the field of the science and technique of conservation.

*Resolution n° 6* : Several countries had examined the possibilities of complying with this resolution. Messrs. P. Bava (Italy) and R. Videsott (Italy) repeated what Italy was already doing in this field. Mr. Cl. Bressou (France) spoke about the Veterinary School in Alfort. The Assembly had already touched on this point at a meeting held the previous day. There was material in this field which might be considered by the Education Commission.

*Resolution n° 7* : The envisaged investigation in the zone of the Groundnut Scheme seemed at present to have little chance of being carried out as the IUPN had wished owing to a lack of necessary funds. An approach would be made to FAO.

*Resolutions n° 8, 9, 10*: Mr. Ch. J. Bernard, in his various capacities, had had an opportunity to work on the question of pesticides. Approaches, desired by the participants of the Lake Success Conference, had been made to the United Nations specialized agencies (FAO, WHO, and Unesco) capable of effective intervention. The International Commission for Agricultural Industries, the Pesticide Section of which was presided over by Mr. Bernard, was also very active in this field, and those who controlled the use of powerful, modern insecticides were giving more and more attention to the question.

*Resolution n° 11* : Mr. Cl. Bressou noted the recent information which he had obtained about the dangerous and unforeseen consequences of using antrycide to protect herds of African bovidae against cattle trypanosomiasis. Anthrycide-resistant parasites had now appeared, thus increasing the incidence of the disease in certain regions where it had been hoped the use of this new product would have reduced it.

*Resolution n° 12*: The IUPN had not yet started assembling special documentation on the problem of the introduction of exotic species in its relation to the equilibrium of plant communities, phytopathology, fish farming, and exploitation of wild game. The International Office for the Protection of Nature would soon be charged with an investigation on these problems.

*Resolution n° 13 :* The Union Secretariat, still with too small a staff to deal with the tasks which fall on it at the present stage of development of the organization's activity, had not yet been able to promote the establishment of local or regional scientific committees of ecologists or naturalists as noted in this resolution.

*Resolution n° 14:* The Indonesian authorities had given the Union formal assurance that the resolution passed in favour of vanishing animal species (rhinoceros, varan, etc.) in this territory had been seriously considered and, in their opinion, there was no reason to be alarmed about their present condition.

*Resolutions n° 15, 16 and 17 :* These three resolutions were all covered by the creation of the Survival Service.

*Resolution n° 18 :* The Indian Government, approached by the Union, had furnished reassuring information about the future of the groups of One-Horned Rhinoceros of Assam.

*Resolution n° 19:* The British Government had informed the IUPN of its intention to call a meeting of the signatories of the London Convention as soon as circumstances were favourable. At present, however, the authorities in Great Britain thought such a conference premature. On the other hand, an approach would soon be made to the Organization of American States with a view to a meeting to discuss the application of the Convention of the Western Hemisphere of 1940.

*Resolution n° 20 :* Mr. Cl. Bressou revealed to the Assembly the astonishment provoked in the Société Nationale d'Acclimatation de France by the terms of this resolution, which seemed to make it clear that the preservation of natural species was not sufficiently assured in the Camargue Reserve. The President, Mr. Ch. J. Bernard explained that that resolution resulted from a unanimous desire to come to the aid of the Société d'Acclimatation which was faced with many problems in the execution of this difficult task. The Assembly was then informed by Mr. Bressou that a new statute has been established for the reserve, dividing it into three zones, one open to visitors, another accessible only to accredited workers, and the third strictly closed even to scientific research workers. This last, very severe clause, had aroused much interest. It was rare that the desire for complete conservation was carried to the point of forbidding the access of ecologists and naturalists to protected biotopes which they wished to study. Mr. Bressou ended his interesting expose by assuring the Assembly that the Board of the Société d'Acclimatation had examined the possibilities of associating with organizations of other countries in the control of the Camargue Reserve, as was suggested in Resolution 20. It had decided to agree to the suggestion made to it, and the Directors of the Society were ready to receive the visit of Union representatives who would discuss with them the statute to establish this collaboration. Mr. Bressou's announcement was received with

warm applause. It was decided that on November 15th Messrs. Ch. J. Bernard and J.-P. Harroy, President and Secretary-General of the Union respectively, would meet the Directors of the Société d'Acclimatation in Paris.

*Resolution n° 21* : This resolution had not yet been put into effect.

\*  
\*\*

Mr. W. K. Van den Bergh (Belgium) made a statement on the often deplorable conditions in which wild animals are transported to circuses and zoological gardens. The merchants who sold these animals, moved by the desire to obtain the maximum profit and to limit the costs of packing cases as much as possible, often forced the animals to travel long distances in bad weather in cases or cages which were unreasonably small. Besides its cruelty, this means of procedure was also self-condemned because of the losses it caused. In this connection, Mr. Van den Bergh revealed the failure of recent attempts made by the Congo authorities to transport African wild animals among which were okapis and gorillas. In his position as Secretary-General of the Institut pour la Recherche Scientifique en Afrique Centrale, Mr. J.-P. Harroy stated the intentions of this organization which, in agreement with the Congo Government, was about to undertake the breeding and study, in conditions of semi-captivity, of the principal large animals which were protected in the Congo in the heart of their natural habitat. This enterprise, which would be directed by zoologists, would lead to a much wider knowledge of the physiology and pathology of these animals and afterwards would increase the chances of transporting them safely and keeping them in captivity. It would permit a considerable reduction in the present number of animals which must be captured in order to bring one gorilla or okapi to a zoological garden alive. It would be combined with a method, which was becoming more and more systematized, of using planes to permit rapid and direct transportation of delicate animals from their habitat to distant countries where they would end their days. And in this connexion it was decided to refer to the Executive Board Mr. W. Van den Bergh's suggestion of establishing an international convention which would limit the number of zoological gardens to which, depending on their importance and scientific methods, rare and strictly protected animals could still be delivered. With the same object, the Union would make contact with the International Committee for Bird Preservation which had already had a good deal of experience in handling the problem of transporting birds.

The meeting was adjourned at 5 p.m.

**FOURTH STATUTORY SITTING**  
**(6th MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY).**

**Brussels, Saturday, 21 October, 1950, at 10 a.m.**

The meeting was opened by the President, Mr. Ch. J. Bernard, in the chair. First a telegram was read announcing that the delegate from Yugoslavia was unable to reach Brussels in time for the meeting because of difficulty in obtaining a visa. Then a few songbirds bought for local commercial purposes were laid on the table before the Assembly by way of protest against the hunting practices, which are both the cause and result of this trade. Miss Phyllis Barclay-Smith pointed out the attitude which the Union should take in this matter.

**Approval of the Proceedings.**

The Proceedings of the 3rd, 4th, and 5th meetings of the Assembly (18th and 19th of October 1950) were approved.

**Resolution No. 34 : Accounts of the Union,**

The Assembly unanimously approved the Union accounts as presented by the treasurer in his report for the period, 31 October 1948-30 September 1950 <sup>(1)</sup>, and which had been audited by Mr. Lombart, chartered accountant. Thus the accounts of the treasurer up until 30 September 1950 were approved.

**Resolution No. 35 : Budget for 1951.**

The Assembly received the report of the Finance Committee read by Mr. G. H. Lestel (France), member of the Committee as named in Resolution No. 29 (1st sitting, 3rd meeting, 18 October, 1950). After comments made by Messrs. H. J. Coolidge (U.S.A.), W. K. Van den Bergh (Belgium), P. Tournay (Belgium), R. Westwood (U.S.A.), A. B. Duncan (U.K.), B. Benzou (I.C.B.P.), P. Duvi-gneaud (Belgium), J. Ramsbottom (U.K.), and M. C. Bloemers (Netherlands) as well as Miss E. Sam (Unesco), the budget for 1951 given in the appendix to these proceedings was approved.

**Resolution No. 36: President of the Union.**

Mr. Ch. J. Bernard, out-going President, was re-elected with acclamation as President of the Union.

<sup>(1)</sup> See pp. 76, 77 and 78.

### **Resolution No. 37:**

Vice-President of the Union — Replacement of Mr. H. G. Maurice.

The President of the Nominations Committee, Mr. R. Bouillenne (Belgium) explained to the Assembly the reason why it would be unfortunate for the Union if a new Vice-President was appointed to replace Mr. H. G. Maurice, who had died, just when a new officer was elected to replace Mr. Roger Heim, out-going Vice-President, as a result of the lots drawn at Fontainebleau. To ensure greater continuity in the work of the Union at its beginning, the Assembly unanimously requested Mr. Roger Heim to agree to finish Mr. Maurice's term by continuing to be Vice-President of the Union for another two years. Mr. Heim after some hesitation agreed to do so.

### **Resolution No. 38: New members of the Executive Board.**

Mr. H. G. Maurice had died and three members of the Executive Board : Messrs. B. Benzon, J. K. van der Haagen, and J. Yepes were due to retire from office.

The President briefly spoke of Mr. Maurice's good work and warmly thanked Messrs. Benzon, van der Haagen, and Yepes for the valuable help they had given to the Union. Mr. Benzon, who was present, received a particularly hearty ovation, to which he briefly replied.

At the suggestion of the Nominations Committee, it was decided that the members of the Executive Board should number thirteen or fourteen. The following were elected :

Mr. G. F. Herbert Smith (U.K.),  
Miss Ph. Barclay-Smith (U.K. and ICBP),  
Mr. W. H. Phelps (Venezuela),  
Mr. M. C. Bloemers (Netherlands),  
Mr. R. A. Falla (New Zealand),

in place of :

Mr. H. G. Maurice (U.K.),  
Mr. B. Benzon (Denmark and ICBP),  
Mr. J. Yepes (Argentina),  
Mr. J. K. van der Haagen (Netherlands).

### **Resolution No. 39 : Election of the Vice-President.**

The Assembly unanimously elected Mr. G. F. Herbert Smith Vice-President of the Union.

### **Resolution No. 40 : Appointment of the Secretary-General.**

The Assembly also unanimously elected Mr. J.-P. Harroy Secretary-General of the Union.

The meeting adjourned at 1 p.m.

\*  
\* \*

As a result of the above departures and appointments, the Board of the Union for 1950-1952 would be composed of the following :

*President :*

CHARLES J. BERNARD,  
Route de Frontenex, 51,  
Geneve (Suisse).

*Vice-Presidents :*

HAROLD J. COOLIDGE Jr.,  
National Research Council,  
Washington 25, D.C. (U.S.A.).

ROGER HEIM,  
Directeur du Muséum National  
d'Histoire Naturelle,  
12, rue de Buffon,  
Paris V<sup>e</sup> (France).

GEORGE FREDERICK HERBERT SMITH,  
Honorary Secretary,  
Society for the Promotion of Nature Reserves,  
British Museum (Natural History),  
Cromwell Road,  
London, S.W.7 (U.K.).

*Members :*

Miss IDA PHYLLIS BARCLAY-SMITH,  
Secretary,  
International Committee  
for Bird Preservation,  
British Museum (Natural History),  
Cromwell Road,  
London, S.W.7 (U.K.).

MARIUS CORNELIUS BLOEMERS,  
Chef du Bureau de la Protection  
de la Nature,  
Ministerie van Onderwijs, Kunsten  
en Wetenschappen,  
's-Gravenhage (Pays-Bas).

NILS DAHLBECK,  
Svenska Naturskyddsföreningen,  
Riddargatan, 9,  
Stockholm (Suède).

R. A. FALLA,  
Royal Society of New Zealand,  
Victoria University College Buildings,  
Wellington C 3 (New Zealand).

WALERY GOETEL,  
Recteur de l'Ecole Supérieure des Mines,  
Al. Mickiewicza, 30,  
Cracovie (Pologne).

HENRI HUMBERT,  
Professeur au Muséum National  
d'Histoire Naturelle,  
57, rue Cuvier,  
Paris V<sup>e</sup> (France).

WILLIAM H. PHELPS Jr.,  
Sociedad Venezolana  
de Ciencias Naturales,  
Avenida Carabotao (Apartado 1521),  
Caracas (Venezuela).

VICTOR VAN STRAELEN,  
Président de l'Institut  
des Parcs Nationaux du Congo Belge,  
21, rue Montoyer,  
Bruxelles (Belgique).

JEHAN VELLARD,  
Director del Museo de Historia Natural  
Javier Prado,  
Avenida Arenales Cuadra, 12,  
Lima (Pérou).

RENZO VIDESOTT,  
Parco Nazionale del Gran Paradiso,  
Corso Svizzera, 19,  
Torino (Italia).

WILLIAM VOGT,  
c/o American Embassy,  
Oslo (Norway).

*Secretary-General :*

JEAN-PAUL HARROY,  
Secrétaire Général de l'Institut pour la Recherche Scientifique  
en Afrique Centrale,  
42, rue Montoyer,  
Bruxelles (Belgique).

**FIFTH STATUTORY SITTING**  
**(7th MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY).**

**Brussels, Monday, 23 October, 1950, at 10 a.m.**

The meeting was opened by the President, Mr. Ch. J. Bernard, in the chair.

**Approval of the proceedings of the former meeting.**

The proceedings of the 6th meeting of the Assembly (21st of October 1950) were approved.

**Resolution No. 41 : Honorary members.**

Messrs. A. Chevalier (France) and J. Huxley (United Kingdom) were elected honorary members of the Union in accordance with Article II, 4, of the Constitution.

**Resolution No. 42 : New members of the Union.**

On the recommendation of the Executive Board, two new members were admitted to the Union by the Assembly in accordance with Article II, 3, of the Constitution. They were :

The Club Alpin Hellénique (Greece);

The Naturschutz Referat of the Government of the Province of Salzburg (Austria).

The President briefly welcomed these new members of the Union. He also welcomed their representatives to the Assembly, Messrs. J. Santorineos and G. Pichler, both of whom in reply assured the Assembly of the full collaboration of the organizations and countries which they represented.

**Resolution No. 43: Consequent on the preceding decision.**

The Assembly gave the Executive Board authority to grant, after further investigations have been made, Union membership to the Verein Naturschutzpark, Stuttgart, in accordance with the above-mentioned Article II, 3.

**Resolution No. 44: Insignia for the Union.**

The Executive Board submitted to the Assembly, without recommendation, the sketch of a proposed insignia for the Union which appeared on several documents published on the occasion of the

General Assembly. It was however decided not to adopt this particular design, but to look for other designs either by means of an open competition or in other ways, and, if the finances of the Union permitted, to offer a prize for the most acceptable design.

**Resolution No. 45 :**

**Relations with the International Committee for Bird Preservation,**

The Assembly was informed of a letter from this Committee, proposing the text of an agreement to be concluded between the two organizations. The text had been examined by the Executive Board (Decision 116, 11th meeting, October 17th, 1950 and Proceedings of the 12th and 13th meetings, October 21st and 23rd, 1950) who considered that some modification was necessary. After Miss P. Barclay-Smith and Mr. B. Benzon said that they could not commit the Committee, the Assembly decided to submit to ICBP a revised agreement, the final terms of which would be approved by the Executive Board. This agreement would be based on the following draft:

« The International Union for the Protection of Nature shall co-operate with the International Committee for Bird Preservation in matters concerning bird preservation, and shall as far as possible call upon it for assistance in dealing with all matters in the field of international bird preservation in which it is widely recognized as the principale international agency.

» The Union shall, so far as is in its power to do so, procure financial assistance for the Committee to enable it to carry out its work for the preservation of birds.

» The Union invites the Committee to accept membership in the Union without payment of dues. »

Mr. P. G. Van Tienhoven, Honorary Member, was satisfied that the aforesaid text would reserve the Union's freedom to act in circumstances affecting nature generally, even though birds might be involved.

**Resolution No. 46: Union Programme for the period 1950-1952.**

On the proposal of the Executive Board, it was decided that the efforts of the Union during the next two years should be concentrated mainly on the following items :

a) Education. It is in this field that the Union will make its gfeatests efforts. Realization of a number of projects to be decided on, almost always in association with the specialized departments of Unesco : booklets for use in Italian schools, card-indexes of films, special action in Tonga, Venezuela, France and the Belgian Congo.

b) Development of the activity of the Survival Service.

c) In connexion with the preceding point, taking full advantage of the library and card-indexes of the International Office for the Protection of Nature.

d) Making full use of the volume, now under preparation, on Nature Protection throughout the world with a view to justifying the existence of the Union.

e) After preliminary inquiries, steps to reach a practical scheme of nomenclature.

f) Preparation and organization of a series of technical meetings, the word symposium being avoided, which shall coincide with the Third General Assembly of the Union in 1952, so that the delegates to these sitting shall have fuller opportunity of exchanging their views on technical matters than was possible at the session in Brussels.

g) The organization, towards the middle of 1951, of a meeting which will not be a statutory session of the Union. By carefully choosing the subjects for discussion, this meeting will permit : 1) a fruitful exchange of views on problems under the jurisdiction of the Union, 2) personal contacts between the friends of the organization who will be able to attend this meeting. The opportunity to meet somewhere in Europe in 1951 will be even more valuable should the decision be taken to hold the statutory General Assembly of 1952 outside of Europe. On the proposal of Mr. M. C. Bloemers (Netherlands), the Executive Board will examine the advisability of placing on the draft agenda of this meeting the discussion of the problems of landscape planning.

These seven points are additional to the normal activities of the organization which are : approach to governments, role of international arbiter, etc. Their choice gave rise to a certain exchange of views, developments or resolutions which it is advisable to present in outline in these proceedings :

#### **A. — PRELIMINARY REMARK.**

Before speaking of a programme, the very survival of the organization and of its working bodies, that is to say, in the first place, of a secretariat, should be ensured. The accounts presented to the Assembly, and approved by Resolution No. 34 (6th meeting, October 21st, 1950), already show a serious deficit. Moreover, the budget adopted for 1951 (Resolution No. 35, same meeting) is not balanced and shows a deficit of \$ 7,000 to be covered by special receipts. It is evident that if they do not want the Union to die of financial inanition all members must make serious and strong efforts both to bring in new members, particularly governments, and to find benefactors willing to make gifts and subventions to the Union which the Secretary-General has the power to accept in accordance with Article IX, 5, of the Constitution.

## B. — EDUCATION.

In the technical meeting of Thursday afternoon, October 19th, 1950, the Assembly discussed at length the constitution of the Education Commission. It was decided to ask Mr. I. N. Gabrielson, President of the Wildlife Management Institute in Washington, to head this commission which is such an important part of the Union. The problem of editing the booklets to be used in Italian schools was also considered, first in a plenary meeting and then by a sub-committee composed of Messrs. J. Büttikofer (Switzerland), P. Bava (Italy), J. Goudswaard (Netherlands), R. Videsott (Italy), R. W. Westwood (United States) and J.-P. Harroy (Secretary-General of the Union). At the request of Mr. Ph. D. van Pallandt van Eerde (Netherlands), it was decided that when the enterprise was well under way a report on its progress and activity shall be sent to all members of the Union.

### **Resolution No. 47 : Publicity Committee.**

On the proposal of Mr. P. Tournay (Belgium), it was decided to appoint a publicity committee charged not only with publicizing the Union but above all for being on the alert to detect any serious danger which it was the Union's duty to combat.

Messrs. Bava and Videsott gave in more precise detail their conception of a wide programme of education to be carried out as much among adults as among children who are still in the hands of teachers.

## C. — SURVIVAL SERVICE.

The text of the report drawn up by the Survival Service Commission, established on Thursday morning, October 19th, 1950, was read to the Assembly. After a few minor amendments it was adopted and led to the following resolutions and observations :

### **Resolution No. 48: List of threatened animals.**

The list of threatened species will be temporarily restricted to the animals proposed in Resolution No. 16 of Lake Success. The same resolution, limited to birds, was adopted in June 1950 at Upsala by the International Committee for Bird Preservation.

The Survival Service will be glad to receive suggestions concerning species which it would be advisable to add to the list.

### **Resolution No. 49 : Consequent on the preceding decision.**

Before new names are put forward they will be examined by one of the committees of specialists appointed by the Executive Board. On the suggestion of Messrs. P. , Duvigneaud (Belgium) and H. J. Coolidge (Vice-President), it was decided that the Executive

Board shall create, as the need for them is felt, three committees of this type dealing respectively with the following three groups :

- a) mammals,
- b) other classes and sub-classes of the animal kingdom other than birds and mammals,
- c) plants and *vegetations*.

Problems relating to birds which appear in this connexion will be submitted to the International Committee for Bird Preservation.

**Resolution No. 50:**

The Assembly supported the petition made by the Italian delegates to their Government demanding immediate and effective action for the protection of brown bears which are threatened with extinction in Italy. The setting aside of the forest of Val de Gênes (Trentino) would be indispensable to the conservation of the natural habitat of the last representatives of the species in Italy.

**Resolution No. 51:**

The Assembly accepted the suggestion of the Advisory Commission to intervene, in principle, only in cases where local protection committees, incapable of effective action themselves, appeal to the Union for help.

The Advisory Commission also formulated the following remarks and resolutions :

The Commission took due note of several changes to be made in the questionnaire of the Survival Service. It recommended the IUPN to act with maximum discretion in cases where careless publicity might further endanger vanishing species.

It was suggested that the Union should encourage different countries to draw up lists of plants of scientific, aesthetic, genetic or economic interest, which were in danger of extinction. In accordance with the statement of the FAO observer, it was made clear that in the preparation of lists of threatened plants of economic interest the Union should act in strict agreement with FAO, a specialized United Nations agency which had already been active in this important field.

The Advisory Commission also proposed that the IUPN should suggest in such countries where it might deem advisable the adoption of certain methods of publicity, for example, the publication of posters showing the species of local flora which were threatened with extinction and which needed effective protection.

Finally :

**Resolution No. 52: Delegation of Authority to the Board.**

At the suggestion of the Commission, the Assembly granted the Executive Board authority to take immediate action in all urgent cases as, for example, the *Rhinoceros sondaicus*.

**Resolution No. 53: Survival Service.**

In accordance with Mr. P. Duvigneaud's request, the Assembly considered the problem of finding a suitable French phrase for the term « Survival Service », which has as yet been used in the French text. It was decided to make inquiries in France in order to find a suitable translation of this expression in French.

**D. — NOMENCLATURE.**

Since Mr. J. Ramsbottom, the President of the Commission, was compelled to leave Brussels on Saturday, Mr. M. C. Bloemers, the secretary, made the report on the activities of the Commission. The proposed questionnaire is ready, and the Secretariat of the Union will see that it is distributed shortly.

**E. — NON-STATUTORY MEETING IN 1951.**

**Resolution No. 54: Delegation of Authority to the Board.**

Authority was granted to the Executive Board to look into the possibilities of calling in 1951 a meeting, open to delegates and observers from all the members of the Union, at which would be discussed certain problems relating to the aims of the Union. The agenda and organization, as well as the location and duration of the meeting, were left to the discretion of the Board.

**F. — 1952 ASSEMBLY.**

**Resolution No. 55 : General programme for the third General Assembly.**

The Executive Board was charged with taking all necessary steps, in ample time, to organize various technical meetings which would coincide with the statutory administrative sessions of the 1952 Assembly. A carefully worked out programme would be prepared for these technical meetings, which would make possible a fruitful exchange of ideas between the specialists present at the Assembly.

**Resolution No. 56: Seat of the next Assembly of the Union.**

The Assembly thanked the Government of Venezuela for its invitation to hold the third session of the Assembly in Caracas in September 1952 and unanimously decided to accept it.

**Resolution No. 57: Government members of the Union.**

It was decided to indicate clearly, in order to remove certain anxiety which had been apparent in several countries, that, when a Government becomes a member of the Union, in accordance with

Article II of the Constitution, it was in no way bound by a decision of the Assembly even if its delegates were present on the occasion and voted for it.

**Resolution No. 58: Motion put forward by the French Delegation.**

The following motion was adopted :

The General Assembly of the International Union for the Protection of Nature, being aware of the grave dangers which threaten, at the present time, the natural life and the very fertility of tropical Africa by the steady extension of industrial monoculture and by the constant multiplication of the causes of destruction and degradation, proposes that local committees, with the object of defending natural resources, be established in the principal areas in Africa, and expresses the hope that the competent authorities in these territories will give due consideration to the recommendations thus made to them and follow them in their decrees and their acts, and in drawing up international agreements on Nature Protection.

The adjective « tropical » was inserted in the above text in consequence of the remark made by Mr. P. Staner (Belgium) concerning this motion during the 4th meeting of the Assembly (October 18th, 1950). The importance of this remark was indicated in paragraph 4 of the proceedings of the fourth meeting.

**Resolution No. 59 : Proposal by Mr. O. Grimus von Grimburg.**

Mr. O. Grimus von Grimburg (Austria) had put forward in writing certain proposals which merited the attention of the Assembly. Due to lack of sufficient time for discussing them, the Assembly transmitted them to the Executive Board for consideration.

**Resolution No. 60 : Proposals by Mr. R. Videsott.**

In addition to his request for the protection of the brown bear, which was dealt with in Resolution No. 50, Mr. R. Videsott asked the Assembly to adopt a definite stand on certain questions which interested Italy. In accordance with this request, the following resolution was drafted :

The Assembly hopes that it will be possible for the Italian authorities to ensure that the Parc National du Gran Paradiso will be left intact in keeping with the reputation it has earned for Italy in countries which, like Italy, are concerned with the protection of the last remnants of nature on their soil. This resolution mainly refers to projects for the construction of dams for hydroelectric power, the installation of railway lines in the reserve, and the use of the National Parks for military manoeuvres.

In connection with the above-mentioned suggestions of Mr. Grimus von Grimburg and Mr. Videsott, Mr. P. Duvigneaud drew the

Assembly's attention to the existence of an international association for the protection of nature and of alpine flora directed by Mr. W. Schöenichen. It was important that the Union should establish contact with this organization before traversing a path which might prove dangerous and which had already been well explored by others.

\*  
\*\*

Various persons, including Mr. L. Gavage and Mr. P. Tournay (Belgium), delivered addresses of thanks to the foreign delegates many of whom had travelled long distances in order to take part in the session, and to the Officers of the Union who, in spite of many difficulties, had taken such pains to make the meetings a success.

Mr. P.G. van Tienhoven, Honorary Member, remarked upon the work already accomplished and expressed his wishes for the future of the Union which he regarded as the « Red Cross of Nature ».

The President, Mr. Ch. J. Bernard, made a final speech of thanks and the second session of the General Assembly closed at 1.30 p.m.

ANNEXES  
TO THE  
PROCEEDINGS AND REPORTS  
OF THE ASSEMBLY

**ANNEX I.**

**RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NATURE.**

(Annexed to the proceedings of the 3rd meeting of the Assembly.)

**I. — DELEGATIONS AND CREDENTIALS.**

*Article 1.*

In accordance with Article IV of the Constitution, the General Assembly shall be composed of delegates from members of the Union.

The Executive Board may invite governments and non-member organizations to be represented at the General Assembly by observers without the right to vote.

*Article 2.*

A member shall not be represented at the General Assembly by more than two delegates, but, on the other hand, it may send as many observers without the right to vote as it wishes.

*Article 3.*

A Credentials Committee shall be elected at the beginning of the session. It shall consist of not more than six members elected by the Assembly on a proposal by the President. The Committee shall elect its Chairman and its officers and shall report without delay.

## II. — BUREAU OF THE ASSEMBLY.

### *Article 4.*

The President of the Assembly who, in accordance with Article V, A, 1, of the Constitution, is Chairman of the Executive Board of the Union until the following Assembly, shall be elected by the Assembly at the end of each session.

### *Article 5.*

At the beginning of each session, the General Assembly shall elect at least two Vice-Presidents.

In accordance with Article 4, the out-going President shall preside at the Assembly. The Secretary-General also shall remain in office.

### *Article 6,*

The Secretary-General shall be elected by the Assembly at the end of each session.

### *Article 7.*

The President shall declare the opening and closing of each meeting of the Assembly. He shall direct the discussions, ensure observance of these rules, accord the right to speak, put questions to the vote, and announce decisions. He shall rule on points of order and shall have control of the proceedings at every meeting.

### *Article 8.*

The Secretary-General may at any time make to the Assembly either oral or written statements concerning any question which is being considered by the Assembly.

### *Article 9.*

It shall be the duty of the Secretariat acting under the authority of the Secretary-General, to receive, translate, and distribute documents, reports and resolutions of the Assembly, its Commissions and Committees, to translate speeches made at the meetings; to draft and circulate the summary records and minutes of the meetings; to preserve the documents in the archives of the Assembly, and undertake any other work which the Assembly may require.

### III. — RECORDS OF THE MEETINGS.

#### *Article 10.*

Verbatim records shall be drawn up of all meetings of the Assembly, whenever the Secretariat of the Assembly deems them necessary. A summary record shall be made of the proceedings of the Assembly.

#### *Article 11.*

The summary record shall sum up the deliberations; shall reproduce the text of the propositions submitted to the Assembly and of the decisions taken; and shall record the result of the ballots.

#### *Article 12.*

Speakers who wish their statements to be included in the summary record shall give their full or abridged text to the Secretariat.

#### *Article 13.*

The summary records shall be submitted for correction to the delegates.

#### *Article 14.*

The final summary records shall bear the signatures of the President and of the Secretary-General and shall be transmitted to all the delegates to the Assembly.

#### *Article 15.*

The summary records and the verbatim records of the meetings shall be issued in the two official languages of the Assembly. They shall be circulated by the Secretary-General to the delegates of the Conference within a month after the close of the session.

### IV. — LANGUAGES.

#### *Article 16.*

In accordance with Article XVI of the Constitution, the official languages of the Assembly shall be English and French.

#### *Article 17.*

At the meetings of the Assembly, speeches shall be interpreted from English into French and from French into English. At these meetings delegates may also speak in any other language, provided

that they arrange for the interpretation of the speech into either English or French, as they may choose, the Secretariat arranging for the interpretation into the other language.

## **V. — VOTE.**

### *Article 18.*

In accordance with Article IV, C of the Constitution each member government shall have two votes; national organizations of each country as a whole shall have one vote; and each international organization shall have one vote. Decisions shall be made by a simple majority of the votes cast. Voting by proxy is not permitted.

### *Article 19.*

Voting shall normally be by a show of hands.

### *Article 20.*

When the result of a vote by show of hands is in doubt, the President may take a second vote by roll-call.

### *Article 21.*

A vote by roll-call shall be taken if it is requested by not less than five delegates or is decreed by the President.

### *Article 22.*

When a vote is taken by roll-call, the vote of each delegate participating shall be inserted in the summary record and in the minutes of the meeting.

### *Article 23.*

A secret ballot shall be taken if requested by five delegates.

## ANNEX II.

### REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NATURE FOR THE PERIOD OCTOBER 1948 TO SEPTEMBER 1950 <sup>(1)</sup>.

#### I. — ORGANIZATION.

- a) **M e m b e r s** : According to Article II of the Constitution, the Union is composed of :
- 1° Governments;
  - 2° Public services;
  - 3° International organizations, institutions, and associations;
  - 4° Non-governmental national organizations, institutions, and associations.

Up to date four governments have announced their adherence to the Constitution. They are, in chronological order, the governments of:

Switzerland, Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, the Netherlands and Belgium.

In addition, seventeen public administrations and services, three international organizations, and fifty-two national organizations represented at Fontainebleau adhered to the Union during the first twelve months after its establishment. These make up the seventy-two founding members of the Union.

The Executive Board has admitted temporarily until ratification by the Assembly fifteen institutions, organizations, or public services as members of the Union while eighteen have solicited membership subject to the decision of the Assembly. If the Assembly accepts all the applications which have been submitted, the organization will have a total of one hundred and nine members, governments included, at the time of the Second Session of the General Assembly. While this is an encouraging beginning, the number of members is, nevertheless, too small to permit the Union fully to achieve its aims.

<sup>(1)</sup> As, in accordance with Article VI, Clause 6, of the Constitution, submitted by the Secretary-General to the Executive Board and amended by it, and presented to the General Assembly and further amended by it.

It is chiefly governments whose adherence would provide the Union with the funds so necessary for its operation, and it is to be hoped that most of the new members to join in the coming year will be governments.

With regard to non-governmental organizations, a problem has arisen because in certain countries it has been desired to group together all members of the Union of a similar character in order to form a kind of National Commission affiliated to the Union. This system might present advantages and disadvantages, but if it hindered direct contact between the Bureau of IUPN and the individual members, it would be unconstitutional and therefore unacceptable.

A problem of this kind exists in the case of Great Britain, and during October 1949 it was considered advisable for the Secretary-General of the institution to visit London in order to clarify the relations between the Union and the British Co-ordinating Committee, formed along the lines mentioned above.

#### b) Executive Board :

The Board suffered a grievous loss by the death of Mr. H. G. Maurice, British Vice-President of the Union, who died in London on May 12th, 1950.

The Constitution provides that the Executive Board shall meet at least once a year in ordinary session. During the first two years of the Union's existence, the Executive Board met four times, and the Bureau met a fifth time by direction of the Board. The dates are the following :

Fontainebleau, 5th and 6th October, 1948 (2 meetings).  
Brussels, 18th and 19th March, 1949 (4 meetings).  
Lake Success, 27th and 29th August, 1949 (3 meetings).  
Paris (bureau meeting), 21st and 22nd March, 1950 (3 meetings).  
Brussels, 17th October, 1950 (2 meetings).

In the course of these fourteen meetings of the Board and the Bureau, more than one hundred decisions were taken in accordance with Article V of the Constitution.

#### c) Commissions :

At Fontainebleau a certain number of technical commissions were established, perhaps rather hurriedly. The Executive Board during its second session held in March 1949, decided to discontinue all but three of them, which are made up as follows :

*Education Commission.*

President : W. Vogt.

Secretary : to be appointed by the President.

Members : J. G. Baer.  
G. Brewer.  
F. Darling.  
J.-J. Deheyn.  
J. Goudswaard.  
M. Mikulski.  
T. G. Nel.  
J. Yepes.

*Nomenclature Commission :*

President : J. Ramsbottom.  
Secretary : to be appointed by the President.  
Members : J. G. Baer.  
W. Brzezinski.  
R. Bouillenne.  
Cl. Bressou.  
M. C. Bloemers.  
A. U. Däniker.  
K. Dammerman.  
G. Dennler de la Tour.  
F. R. Fosberg.  
Ph. Guinier.  
H. Gams.  
W. Goetel.  
G. F. Herbert Smith.  
J. Vellard.  
R. Videsott.

*Publication Commission.*

President : Ch. J. Bernard, President of the Union.  
Secretary : J.-P. Harroy, Secretary-General of the Union.  
Members : J. G. Baer.  
R. Heim.  
A. C. Townsend.  
W. Vogt.

*d) Secretariat :*

In accordance with Article VI of the Constitution, the members of the Secretariat have been chosen on as wide a geographical basis as possible.

Only a few weeks after the organization was founded, the responsible post of Chief of the Secretariat was given to M<sup>me</sup> Marguerite Caram, Swiss by nationality and Lebanese by birth, who continues to hold this office today. It is fitting in this report to the Assembly to pay warm tribute to her devotion to duty and intelligent spirit of initiative.

With her have collaborated various assistants, three of whom are still at work. Miss S. Coolidge, American, has rendered valuable service since she joined the Secretariat in March 1949, but unfortunately she is compelled to leave Europe shortly; Miss N. Thacher, also American, who will replace her, is therefore working with her.

Two assistants of French origin have served the Union with zeal. They are M<sup>me</sup> G. De Cock, who worked until May 1949, and M<sup>lle</sup> C. Dejaiffe, who joined the staff on May 24th, 1949, and still devotes her excellent services to the Secretariat.

Mr. P. Aptekers, librarian-typist, was engaged in February 1949 by the Union and put at the disposal of the International Office for the Protection of Nature. Mr. G. de Vleeschauer, accountant of the « Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique » and of the « Fondation Universitaire de Bruxelles », engaged part-time, keeps the accounts of the Union with a punctuality that is evident in the report of 5 October 1950 of the « Commissaire aux Comptes », M. J. Lombart, chartered accountant (« Chambre Beige des Comptables »).

The mail of the Union is dealt with through the part-time services of M. G. Stockmans of the personnel of the « Institut pour la Recherche Scientifique en Afrique Centrale ».

## II — FINANCE.

Attached in appendix :

1° Balance Sheet and Income and Expenditure Account of the Union as at 31 December 1949;

2° Balance Sheet and Income and Expenditure Account of the Union as at 30 September 1950;

3° Copy of the report of the chartered accountant who audited the accounts.

Of these figures it should be borne in mind :

a) That the membership fees to 31 December 1949 amounted altogether to 159,054.02 Belgian francs.

b) That the total for the financial years 1948-1950 amounted to 341,456.86 Belgian francs.

c) That the subsidies, due in large part to the generosity of Unesco, have covered the costs of carrying out the terms of the contracts under which the sums were granted; that to meet these contracts an enormous amount of correspondence, translation, secretarial work and correction of printers proofs was involved. It is not surprising therefore that the staff have devoted most of their time to particular tasks, such as the preparation and bringing together the results of the Conference at Lake Success.

d) That the general office expenses have been reduced to a minimum through a policy of strict economy and also because of the hospitality the Union has enjoyed in the « Institut pour la Recherche Scientifique en Afrique Centrale ».

e) That the travelling expenses, so often high for international organizations, have not fallen on the funds of the Union more than could be helped, only 32,063 Belgian francs having thus been spent in twenty-four months. This has been made possible by the independently-financed journeys of the President (who travelled to Brussels and Paris on several occasions for the benefit of the organization), of the Secretary-General (who on behalf of the Union has in the last two years visited the United States, South Africa — Conference of Johannesburg —, Central Africa, Paris — seven trips —, and also London, Amsterdam, Basle, Copenhagen, and Stockholm), and of the members of the Executive Board.

The following are the figures of the subsidies received from Unesco by contracts made since the founding of the Union :

Contract of November 4th, 1948. . . . .	\$	8,000
Preparation of the Lake Success Conference.		
Contract of December 28th, 1948. . . . .	\$	1,200
Research in the IOPN for the preparation of the Lake Success Conference.		
Contract of December 20th, 1949. . . . .	B. fr.	222,750
Publication of the Proceedings and Papers of the Lake Success Conference.		
Contract of March 21st, 1950. . . . .	\$	8,500
of which :		
\$ 4,500 was for the book containing documentation on the status of nature protection;		
\$ 1,500 was for publishing a pamphlet to be used in the Italian schools;		
\$ 2,500 was for the Survival Service.		

Through the efforts of several devoted friends of the Union, certain American and British institutions announced at the beginning of 1950 their intention of giving supplementary contributions to help the Union to overcome the difficulties of the initial period. The following are the amounts of these generous gifts which are additional to the regular membership fees :

American Committee for International Wild Life Protection. . . . .	\$.	700
Conservation Foundation . . . . .		200
New York Zoological Society. . . . .		450
Wildlife Management Institute. . . . .		500
		\$ 1,850

British Museum (Natural History). . . . .	£	32
British Association for the Advancement of Science . . .		12
Fauna Preservation Society. . . . .		7
Society for the Promotion of Nature Reserves . . . . .		32
Zoological Society of London . . . . .		82
		<hr/>
	£	165

(N.B. — Certain of the British grants have not yet been received).

It may be hoped that in the future, especially at the beginning of 1951, some of these donations may be repeated. But it would, however, be inadvisable to count on such donations to ensure the balance of the ordinary budget of the Union. Arrangements ought to be possible to guarantee by means of regular fees an adequate operational budget for the organization.

### III. — ACHIEVEMENTS.

The record of work done has necessarily been affected by two factors :

- 1° The administrative services had to be formed and contacts made with nature protection circles established throughout the world;
- 2° Funds were limited to start with and in fact still are.

The Union showed, as the result of Unesco's initiative, its ability to function by undertaking the organization of the International Technical Conference on the Protection of Nature at Lake Success in August 1949.

In this connexion it may be mentioned that this work, which involved the preparation of a booklet entitled « Preparatory Documents », the collection of some hundred and fifty reports for the Conference during the first half of 1949, the organization of the Lake Success meetings, and the publication in a relatively short time of the « Proceedings and Papers » of the Conference have taken up most of the time of the Secretariat from the time the Union was founded until the spring of 1950. Since then, the preparations for this Session of the Assembly and the aggregation of the documents, of the first proofs which will be examined in the days to follow, kept the Secretariat working almost to capacity.

The initial period of the Union has been marked therefore more by the incontestable success of the Lake Success Conference than by the work done in connexion with the objects assigned in Article I of the statutes.

These objects may be classed roughly as follows :

**A.**

- a) To participate in safeguarding parts of nature, habitats, or species which are in danger of destruction;
- b) To spread the knowledge that is already available on the art and science of nature protection;
- c) To educate adults and children to realize the danger which lies in the alteration of natural resources and the necessity of common action against such danger;
- d) To instigate international agreements on the protection of nature;
- e) To encourage scientific research on the art and science of nature protection.

**B.**

To disseminate information about the protection of nature which is likely to promote conservation throughout the world when made known either to the public or to persons or bodies concerned with conserving natural associations.

The following is a summary of the steps taken so far by the Union in compliance with the recommendations made by the constituent members.

**A.**

- a) To participate in safeguarding that part of nature, habitats, or species which are in danger of being destroyed.

1. Approach to governments:

Approach to the Indonesian Government (orang-utans, rhinoceros) in accordance with Resolution No 14 passed at Lake Success. An encouraging reply was received from the Minister of Economic Affairs, Djakarta.

Approach to the Indian Government (rhinoceros) in accordance with Resolution No 18 passed at Lake Success. Again an encouraging reply was received from the Minister of Agriculture at New Delhi.

Approach to the Belgian Government (« forêt de Sart-Tilman »). The reply was favourable.

Approach to the Governments of Belgium, France, Great Britain, Netherlands, Switzerland, about destruction of the often few remnants of comparatively untouched nature in these countries as a result of military manoeuvres. Favourable answers were received from each government written to.

Approach to the Military High Commission in occupied Germany (Teutoburgerwald). This question is in suspense.

Approach to the Italian Government (opportunity to develop teaching of the natural sciences in the schools). This question is in suspense.

Approach to the New Zealand Government (Waipoua Kauri Forest Reserve). This question is in suspense.

Approach to the Algerian Authorities (status of the North African Bubal and its protection). A favourable reply was received.

Approach to the Authorities of Morocco (status of the North African Bubal and its protection). Also a favourable reply was received.

Approach to the Authorities of the Trentin and Haut Adige region (protection of the bear). An encouraging reply was received.

Approach to the Italian Government (Quail hunting). This question is in suspense.

Approach to the Valley of Aoste administration (protective measures for this valley). This question is in suspense.

Several steps of the same kind are being studied which involve the governments of the United States (introduction of the axis deer into Hawaii), Belgium (dam of Esneux), Rhodesia (game control), and Switzerland, France, Italy, and Spain (possibility of establishing frontier national parks between these countries).

## 2. Approach to national groups :

Approach to the « Société Nationale d'Acclimatation de France » with the view to studying the possibility of complying with the Lake Success Resolution No 20 dealing with the Camargue Reserve. A promise was given on December 2nd, 1949, and again on July 28th, 1950 that this resolution would be given due consideration; but as yet has not been implemented.

## 3. Approach to individuals :

Congratulations were conveyed to a South African, M. J. K. Lombard of Cradock, whose generous gift has improved the chances for survival of the Mountain Zebra.

4. Action aimed at instigating or encouraging efforts in countries where the problem of nature protection is still to be solved.

Several examples of varying significance are : Greece, Israel, Turkey, Argentina.

5. Steps taken to follow up Lake Success Resolutions No 15, 16, and 17 by initiating action that can be applied to governments, groups, etc. to promote the conservation of species threatened with extinction.

The Survival Service, which has been financially supported by Unesco (\$ 2,500) has been started and is being run by Mr. J.-M. Vrydagh, who will himself report to the Assembly what he has done to launch it, and how he hopes to continue it.

- b) To spread the knowledge that is already available on the art and science of nature protection.

Great efforts were made, principally by Dr. Ch. J. Bernard, President, and Professor R. Heim, Vice-President, to revive the beautiful magazine, *Pro Natura*, of which two issues were published in 1948 by the Provisional Union on the initiative of Mr. J. Büttikofer. Although the Union's financial resources were far too slender to warrant facing the risk of the substantial loss that might result from continuing its publication, inquiries as to the possibility of doing so were made in several quarters. Unesco was asked for assistance in initiating the scheme by providing funds for the purpose, and various firms were approached as to the possibility of publishing it; a Swiss firm did, indeed, agree to underwrite part of the risk involved, but nevertheless in spite of all the efforts made no practicable way of resuming publication of the magazine could be found. This outcome was most unfortunate, because to have its own official publication is at the moment the Union's most urgent need. It would enable readers throughout the world to learn what is happening, and at the same time provide them with information about new conservation methods that had been developed, about successful experiments in certain areas which might with advantage be tried elsewhere, and generally about the progress that had been made in discovering means of avoiding the risk of disastrous results that might possibly accrue from large-scale interference with the balance of nature.

To some extent the publication of the pamphlet, « Preparatory Documents of the International Technical Conference on the Protection of Nature » and of the « Proceedings and Papers » of the Conference may be considered as a contribution to the spread of ideas as mentioned above.

Also the research made by Mr. J.-M. Vrydagh in the abundant data provided by the IOPN library — research instigated by the Union with the financial help of Unesco — must be regarded as contributing to the spread of ideas.

And in view of what so far has been accomplished, although rather sporadically, the Union may justifiably look to the organs of its members (magazines, bulletins, etc., published in a good many countries of the world) for the dissemination of the information in its possession.

- c) To educate adults and children to realize the danger which lies in the alteration of natural resources and the necessity of action against such a danger.

That so little progress has been made to this end was due to one of the handicaps which have hampered the Union from the start, the Education Commission set up at Fontainebleau for various reasons having failed to function. It should, however, not be overlooked that important work in this field was done at meetings at the Lake Success

Conference, which under the able chairmanship of Dr. W. Vogt, President of the Commission, were devoted to the consideration of the problems involved.

The Secretariat, too, achieved some success in this field by securing from Unesco a grant of \$ 1,500 for the purpose of publishing in 1950 30,000 booklets and 130,000 illustrated pamphlets for the use of teachers and children, respectively, in schools in Italy, this country therefore being the first in which an active campaign for making widely known the concept of nature protection was launched. The Italian Government was asked to help in making compulsory at least one lesson a year dealing with the vital necessity of conserving natural resources. The lesson would be given in a prescribed number of intermediate classes. The Government's answer to the suggestion was encouraging. The whole question will be submitted to the Assembly in the course of one of the technical meetings to be held during the session.

Further, the Union communicated to Unesco the recommendations contained in the Lake Success Resolutions No 2 (duty-free exchange of educational materials), No 4 (youth clubs), No 5 (grant of traveling fellowships) and No 6 (introduction of the principles of nature protection into schools and universities).

Several of these questions are now being studied.

With regard to Resolution No 4, the Union decided to participate in the meeting of representatives of International Youth Organizations called by Unesco for November 15th, in Paris. Also a grant of \$ 2,000 was requested for the financial year of 1952 to enable the Union to make an investigation of youth clubs which have proved successful in several countries and to find out how others, less advanced in this field, may profit from their experience.

d) To instigate international agreements on the protection of nature.

The Lake Success Conference took the opportunity to recommend the Union to undertake the drafting of a world convention on the protection of nature. The Commission appointed for the purpose decided that, while this task was important, the time was perhaps not ripe (cf. « Proceedings and Papers », p. 152).

Resolution No 19 was to the effect that the Union should suggest to the competent authorities the desirability of Conferences to consider the effectiveness of the London Convention (1933) and of the Washington Convention (1940), which respectively concerned the protection of species in Africa and the Americas.

The British authorities, on being approached, expressed the opinion that the present time was premature for such Conferences, but they would not fail to resume them directly the moment seemed opportune.

A similar approach to the Pan-American authorities was postponed, and perhaps the Assembly may be able to throw light on the chances of such a Conference being held in present circumstances.

e) to encourage and increase knowledge on the art and science of nature protection.

The establishment of the Survival Service might just as appropriately be discussed here. In addition, two projects have been started by the Union, despite its limited resources, to promote studies which may enrich human knowledge in the vast and important subject of ecology in its relation to the protection of nature.

The first project was conceived when the difficulties of carrying out the Groundnut Scheme in Tanganyika Territory were known. This huge planned enterprise, which involved the clearing of extensive areas, the use of heavy agricultural equipment, the resort to powerful modern insecticides used on a large scale cannot help but affect the natural associations of the areas treated, and these consequences are often unexpected and sometimes harmful. It would seem worthwhile if several ecologists who were not concerned with the financial or material success of the enterprise were to study on the spot the corollary occurrences of the scheme, and the Union might be considered well qualified to instigate or even carry out this investigation. The consent of the British authorities and the Overseas Food Corporation to the visit of the ecologists commissioned by the Union was required, and long discussions were had with them. These discussions, which were supported by Resolution No 7 passed at Lake Success, met with success, and all the necessary authorizations were obtained some months ago. Unfortunately the modest request for credit made to Unesco to cover expenses of a preliminary reconnaissance mission to Kongwa was not considered owing to budgetary limitations, and the project was, therefore, paralyzed. An effort should be made to try and obtain the necessary credit elsewhere.

A second investigation was envisaged along similar lines if the expenses could be met from outside the funds of the Union. This was to obtain greater knowledge of the dangerous phenomenon which every year affects to a greater extent the equilibrium in one of the intertropical continents: bushfires in Africa. An application was made to the administrators of the Marshall Plan in order to obtain eight sets of modern instruments especially adapted for studying the effect of fires on the equilibrium of soils, microfauna and microflora, on the action of solar rays, etc. This project was not abandoned, but it was considered desirable to incorporate it into a broader programme which would involve a far-reaching and concerted effort to control the erosion of African soils. Unfortunately there is no news yet of the fate of this project, but next November, when the Secretary is in Paris for the meeting of International Youth Organizations at Unesco, the matter will be taken up again.

With regard to nomenclature — another field where an effort on the part of the Union might have thrown some light on a subject which needs clarification to avoid confusion — the difficulty of launching the work of the Commission appointed at Fontainebleau is again the reason why so little has been done. The question of nomenclature will be discussed during the forthcoming technical

meetings. In the hope of stimulating some progress, the Secretariat drafted a note as a basis for discussion of the subject.

Finally, Resolutions No 8, 9, and 10 of the Lake Success Conference dealt with the need to obtain more information about the repercussions — harmful or not, apparent or not, desired or not — of the generalized use of powerful modern antiparasites (insecticides, phytohormones, etc.). In accordance with Resolution No. 8, the suggestion was made to form a Permanent Joint Commission for Antiparasitic Products (« Commission Mixte Permanente des Produits Antiparasitaires, » CMPPA). Dr. Ch. J. Bernard, President of the Union, in his capacity as President of the section for Antiparasites of the International Commission for Agricultural Industries played an important part in this matter and is particularly qualified to tell the Assembly about it.

## B.

To disseminate all information about the protection of nature which is likely to promote conservation throughout the world when made known either to the public or to persons or bodies concerned with conserving natural communities.

In this connexion, something may well be said again about the policy adopted by the Union for assembling and correlating documentation as had been provided in one of the paragraphs of the statutes.

From the beginning, the Union has had the International Office for the Protection of Nature a short distance away from it in Brussels and has had access to the valuable library and the classified documentation of this experienced organization. The collection is the outcome of twenty consecutive years of fruitful activity.

Wisely enough the Union decided not to undertake what had already been done by another organization willing to make its library available to the Union. The task of grouping and filing the written documents, legislative texts, scientific studies, and other literature dealing with the protection of nature was deliberately left to the Office. When documents of this sort are sent to the Union, they are passed on to the library of the International Office for the Protection of Nature. In the same way requests for information are referred to the Office.

The Office eventually hopes to have sufficient funds to permit it to disseminate information systematically, but in the meantime it is concerned with putting on index cards data contained in documents dealing particularly with the problems of ecology discussed at Lake Success — introduction of exotic species, destruction of big game herds, etc. This work, with which Mr. P. Aptekers is occupied on behalf of the Union, is under the supervision of Colonel R. Hoier, formerly conservator of the Parc National Albert and associate of the Institut des Parcs Nationaux du Congo Beige.

It may be added that these arrangements received the full approval of the General Council of the Office, which showed its willingness to co-operate closely with the Union by appointing the Union's Secretary-General as Director of the Office on 5 July, 1949.

But as far as making known the principles of nature protection the Union has been almost completely blocked by not having a mouthpiece such as *Pro Natura*.

Through the intermediary of the Office all requests made for information and documentation were answered, but it was unfortunately impossible to do more than give replies to these questions.

It will be agreed that this shortcoming must be remedied. The plan to publish a book containing documentation on every country in the world is one effort to accomplish something in this line, so that Unesco has given its support by granting \$ 4,500. The Assembly will have a chance to become familiar with the details of this project.

#### IV. — FUTURE PROSPECTS.

If the Union had the necessary means to enable it to be more active, it could, in keeping with its objects as specified in Article I of the Constitution :

- a) effectively contribute to safeguarding wildlife in its natural environment throughout the world, by establishing international parks for example;
- b) disseminate information about nature protection by sending scientists of international repute to countries that have requested such help. These missions would be likely :
  1. to find out precisely the situation of the natural equilibrium in the country,
  2. to initiate or support a national movement for the protection of nature.
- c) put into effect an educational programme of real significance in the field of nature protection.
- d) organize study missions to increase what is known about nature protection.
- e) benefit from publications, periodicals, newspapers, etc. and gain the ear of « protectors », who are glad of suggestions and encouragement, and of the general public, which still has everything to learn.

The help asked of Unesco will enable the Union to start this programme in a modest but useful way.

Let us recall these projects :

1950:

Preparation of booklets to be used in the schools of Italy.

Publication of a book containing documentation on the protection of nature.

Initiation of the Survival Service.

1951 :

Booklets for schoolchildren.

Card index of films on the protection of nature.

Survival Service.

1952:

Booklets for schoolchildren.

Youth clubs.

Mission for ecological study in a country that agrees to the proposal.

Survival Service.

But let us repeat that the Union should aim higher. If we want it to be a success, the organization has the right to expect more concrete support from its members. And this Assembly should present the Bureau with its suggestions, its advice, and also its promises. Only with the active participation of the members in the life of the Union, in addition to payment of the fees, will the organization derive the necessary vigour to face the gigantic task which it has undertaken.

Among other ways here are some in which members of the organization can and should give their support to the Union :

- a) take steps to obtain the adherence of their government and the concomitant payment of a substantial fee;
- b) obtain new members for the Union;
- c) participate actively in the work of the technical commissions of the Union. The Commissions at Fontainebleau have done nothing to help the Union. Is the cause of the inertia the fact that funds for recompensing the secretariats of these commissions have not been available ? The question deserves consideration.
- d) make available columns in their publications where important news about the protection of nature can be brought to the notice of the readers;
- e) send notices to the Union which may serve the cause of nature protection if it be possible to have them published either by the general press or by the periodicals of members of the Union.

Along the same lines, much importance can be attached to the fact that other bodies might be persuaded to provide the Union with the means of action, and that some of the specialized agencies of the United Nations such as ECOSOC and FAO, from which the Union hopes to obtain the benefit of consultative status, may follow the example of Unesco's generous support.

But the limited powers of persuasion and intervention of the Secretariat alone is not enough to obtain such aid without the assist-

ance of influential persons working on behalf of members of the organization. It is necessary that definite projects such as that for the Groundnut Scheme and for the study of bush-fires that are likely to be carried out in the *name of the Union* be thought of and worked out in sufficient detail and provided with an adequate budget, in order that the scheme can be supported until it succeeds in gaining the backing of those specialized organizations or bodies likely to be interested. President Truman's Point IV programme undoubtedly provides an unusual opportunity for the Union to render service badly needed by humanity at the same time that it establishes its right to act more forcefully.

But this opportunity cannot really be made use of unless a concerted effort is made by the members of the Union to shoulder the burden of the work which the Secretariat is able to do in the circumstances and to see that this work becomes crystalized.

It is not unreasonable to claim that the United Nations should place the Union on a level with its principal specialized agencies and endow it with numerous collaborators disposing of very substantial credits. Without risk of conflicting with the work of such organizations as FAO—the problems that need to be solved are so numerous that the efforts of all will scarcely be enough to resolve them — an International Union for the Protection of Nature, given the means to act on a scale commensurable with its objectives could play a major part in securing world peace. If the unbridled devastation of natural resources, which is permitted in the 20th century throughout the world were curbed, certainly by consolidating the basis of world economy a greater contribution would be made towards averting the risks of war than that resulting from political meetings and military coalitions.

Jean-Paul HARROY.  
Brussels, October 1950.

## ANNEX III (1).

### LISTE DES MEMBRES FONDATEURS DE L'U.I.P.N. (ayant ratifié leur adhésion avant le 5 octobre 1949).

### LIST OF FOUNDING MEMBERS OF THE I.U.P.N. (having ratified their adherence before 5 October 1949).

#### **Argentine — Argentina.**

Agrupacion Zoologica Americanista de Relaciones y Arbitrajes.  
Universidad de Buenos Aires.

#### **Australie — Australia.**

Wild Life Preservation Society of Australia.

#### **Autriche — Austria.**

Biologische Station Lunz.

#### **Belgique — Belgium.**

Gouvernement beige.  
Ardenne et Gaume.  
Association pour la Defense de l'Ourthe et de ses Affluents.  
Institut des Parcs Nationaux du Congo Beige.  
Institut pour la Recherche Scientifique en Afrique Centrale.  
Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique.  
Ligue des Amis de la Forêt de Soignes.  
Les Naturalistes Beiges.  
Université de Liège.

#### **Canada.**

Société Canadienne d'Histoire Naturelle.

#### **Danemark — Denmark.**

Danmarks Naturfredningsforening.  
Naturfredningsraadet.

#### **États-Unis — United States.**

American Committee for International Wild Life Protection.  
American Geographical Society.  
American Nature Association.  
American Ornithologists' Union.  
Boone and Crockett Club.  
Conservation Foundation.  
Izaak Walton League.  
National Audubon Society.  
National Parks Association.  
National Research Council.

(1) Annex to the Report of the Secretary-General.

National Wildlife Federation.  
New York Zoological Society.  
Wilderness Society.  
Wildlife Management Institute.

**Finlande — Finland.**

Finnish League for the Protection of Nature.

**France.**

Academic d'Agriculture de France.  
Académie des Sciences.  
Association des Naturalistes de la Vallée du Loing.  
Club Alpin Français.  
Institut Français d'Afrique Noire.  
Ligue pour la Protection des Oiseaux.  
Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle.  
Société des Amis de la Forêt de Fontainebleau.  
Société de Biogéographie.  
Société Botanique de France.  
Société Ornithologique de France.  
Touring Club de France.

**Italie — Italy.**

Associazione Nazionale per i paesaggi ed i Monumenti Pittoreschi d'Italia.  
Ente Parco Nazionale del Gran Paradiso.  
Movimento Italiano Protezione della Natura.

**Luxembourg — Luxemburg.**

Gouvernement du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg.  
Commission des Sites et des Monuments Nationaux.  
Musée d'Histoire Naturelle.

**Norvège — Norway.**

Landsforbundet for Naturfredning i Norge.

**Pays-Bas — Netherlands.**

Gouvernement néerlandais.  
Contact Commissie voor Natuur en Landschapsbescherming.  
Nederlandse Jeugdbond voor Natuurstudie.  
Nederlandse Vereniging tot Bescherming van Vogels.  
Vereniging tot Behoud van Natuurmonumenten in Nederland.

**Pérou — Peru.**

Comite Nacional de Proteccion a la Naturaleza.  
Museo de la Historia Natural « Javier Prado ».

**Pologne — Poland.**

Association Scientifique Forestière de Pologne.  
League for the Protection of Nature in Poland.  
Société Zoologique de Pologne.

**Royaume-Uni — United Kingdom.**

British Museum (Natural History).  
Fauna Preservation Society.  
Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom.

National Trust for England.  
Royal Entomological Society.  
Society for the Promotion of Nature Reserves.  
Zoological Society of London.

**Suede — Sweden.**

Svenska Naturskyddsföreningen.

**Suisse — Switzerland.**

Confédération Helvétique.  
Association de Propagande pour la Protection des Oiseaux.  
Comité Central du Club Alpin Suisse.  
Ligue Suisse pour la Protection de la Nature.  
Société Romande pour l'Étude et la Protection des Oiseaux.

**Venezuela.**

Sociedad Venezolana de Ciencias Naturales.

**Organisations Internationales — International Organizations.**

Office International pour la Protection de la Nature.  
Standing Committee on Pacific Conservation.  
Union Internationale de Directeurs de Jardins Zoologiques.

**LISTE DES MEMBRES DONT L'ADHÉSION A ÉTÉ RATIFIÉE  
PAR LA 2<sup>e</sup> ASSEMBLÉE GÉNÉRALE DE L'INSTITUTION.  
LIST OF MEMBERS WHOSE ADHERENCE WAS RATIFIED  
BY THE 2<sup>nd</sup> GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE ORGANIZATION.**

**Australie — Australia.**

Naturalists' Society of New South Wales.  
Tree Wardens' League of New South Wales.

**Autriche — Austria.**

Naturschutz Referat du Gouvernement de la Province de Salzbourg.

**Belgique — Belgium.**

Société de Botanique et de Zoologie Congolaises.  
Société Royale de Botanique de Belgique.  
Société Royale de Zoologie d'Anvers.  
Vereniging voor Natuur en Stedenschoon, V. Z. W.

**États-Unis — United States.**

American Museum of Natural History.  
American Shore and Beach Preservation Association.  
American Society of Mammalogists.  
The Nature Conservancy.

**France.**

Fédération Française des Sociétés de Sciences Naturelles :  
Association des Amateurs de Cactées.  
Association Française pour l'Avancement des Sciences.  
Association des Naturalistes Parisiens.  
Société d'Acclimatation de France.

Société des Amis du Museum de Paris.  
Société de Biologie.  
Société Entomologique de France.  
Société d'Histoire Naturelle de la Moselle.  
Société d'Histoire Naturelle et du Museum de Rouen.  
Société Linnéenne de Lyon.  
Société Mycologique de France.  
Société des Océanistes.  
Société des Sciences Naturelles d'Autun (Saône-et-Loire).  
Société des Sciences Naturelles de Dijon (Côte-d'Or).

Société des Sciences Naturelles du Maroc.

**Grèce — Greece.**

Club Alpin Hellénique.

**Inde — India.**

Bombay Natural History Society.

**Italie — Italy.**

Laboratorio de Zoologia Applicata a la Caccia.  
Touring Club Italiano.

**Mexique — Mexico.**

Asociacion Mexicana de Proteccion a la Naturaleza.

**Nouvelle-Zélande — New Zealand.**

Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand.

**Pays-Bas — Netherlands.**

Nederlandse Commissie voor Internationale Natuurbescherming.

**Royaume-Uni — United Kingdom.**

British Co-ordinating Committee for Nature Conservation :

British Association for the Advancement of Science.  
British Ecological Society.  
British Mycological Society.  
Cornwall Bird Watching and Preservation Society.  
Devon Bird Watching and Preservation Society.  
Geological Society of London.  
Linnean Society of London.  
London Natural History Society.  
Norfolk Naturalists Trust.  
Northumberland, Durham and Newcastle-upon-Tyne Natural History Society.  
Royal Zoological Society of Scotland.  
West Wales Field Society.  
Yorkshire Naturalists' Trust.

Nature Conservancy.

**Union Sud-Africaine — Union of South Africa.**

National Parks Board of Trustees.  
Wildlife Protection Society.

**Organisations Internationales — International Organizations.**

International Committee for Bird Preservation.

## ANNEX IV.

### FINANCIAL STATEMENT (1).

#### BALANCE SHEET AS AT DECEMBER 31st, 1949.

<b>Assets.</b>	
	Belgian francs
Banque de Bruxelles, our current account . . . . .	10,656.50
Société Générale de Paris, 683 French francs. . . . .	89.80
Cash in hand . . . . .	29,767.40
Sundry debit accounts. . . . .	1,000.—
Debit balance. . . . .	18,486.30
	<hr/>
	60,000.—
<b>Liabilities.</b>	
Sundry credit accounts. . . . .	60,000.—

#### INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT AS AT DECEMBER 31st, 1949.

<b>Expenditure.</b>	
	Belgian francs
Publications and reports. . . . .	83,791.10
Administration expenses :	
Salaries (2). . . . .	434,903.40
Travelling expenses. . . . .	22,720.70
Postage. . . . .	30,385.50
Stationery and Office equipment. . . . .	8,266.45
Translation expenses. . . . .	1,000.—
Telephone calls and telegrams. . . . .	474.20
Sundries. . . . .	3,595.80
	<hr/>
	501,346.05
	<hr/>
	585,137.15

(1) Second annex to the Secretary-General's report. (See also Resolution No. 34, 6th meeting of the Assembly.)

(2) Salaries to eight people, four of whom are immediately connected with the Secretariat of the Union, a typist put at the disposal of the International Office by the Union, an accountant, a messenger (part time), and an ecologist who did research in the International Office for the preparation of the discussions at Lake Success.

### Income.

	Belgian francs
Grants received . . . . .	407,376.83
Membership fees . . . . .	159,054.02
Interest, bank account . . . . .	220.—
Debit balance . . . . .	18,486.30
	<hr/>
	585,137.15

### BALANCE SHEET AS AT SEPTEMBER 30th, 1950.

#### Assets.

	Belgian francs
Banque de Bruxelles, Our current account . . . . .	186,142.95
Société Générale de Paris, Our account: 32,593 French francs . . . . .	4,286.—
Cash in hand . . . . .	38,860.70
	<hr/>
	229,289.65

#### Liabilities.

Sundry credit accounts . . . . .	40,000.—
Credit balance . . . . .	189,289.65
	<hr/>
	229,289.65

### INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT AS AT SEPTEMBER 30th, 1950.

#### Expenditure.

	Belgian francs
Publications and reports . . . . .	233,316.45
Debit balance at December 31st, 1949 . . . . .	18,486.30
Administrative expenses :	
Salaries (1) . . . . .	344,268.50
Travelling expenses . . . . .	9,343.—
Postage . . . . .	25,196.70
Stationery and Office equipment . . . . .	8,376.60
Sundries . . . . .	2,970.80
	<hr/>
	390,155.60
Credit balance . . . . .	189,289.65
	<hr/>
	831,248.—

#### Income.

Grants received . . . . .	648,814.16
Membership fees . . . . .	182,402.84
Interest, bank account . . . . .	31.—
	<hr/>
	831,248.—

(1) Salaries to eight people, four of whom are immediately connected with the Secretariat of the Union, a typist put at the disposal of the International Office by the Union, an accountant, a messenger (part time), and a ecologist to start the Survival Service.

## ANNEX V.

### AUDITING OF THE UNIONS ACCOUNTS (1).

Bruxelles, le 5 octobre 1950.

#### COPIE.

MONSIEUR LE PRÉSIDENT,

En exécution de la mission qui nous a été confiée, nous avons procédé au contrôle de la comptabilité de l'Union Internationale pour la Protection de la Nature depuis l'ouverture de cette comptabilité, soit depuis le 5 décembre 1948, jusqu'au 31 décembre 1949.

Nous avons pu constater que les opérations effectuées, appuyées de pièces justificatives, ont été correctement enregistrées et que les livres comptables sont parfaitement tenus.

Nous avons également vérifié le bilan au 31 décembre 1949, bilan qui se présente comme suit :

ACTIF.		Francs beiges
Banque de Bruxelles. Compte courant . . . . .	10.656,50	
Société Générale de Paris. Compte courant fr. fr. 683 ...	89,80	
Caisse. . . . .	29.767,40	
Comptes débiteurs divers. . . . .	1.000,—	
Solde débiteur du compte de profits et pertes. . . . .	18.486,30	
	<hr/>	60.000,—
PASSIF.		
Comptes créditeurs. . . . .		60.000,—

Le bilan est en complet accord avec la comptabilité et reflète exactement la situation de l'organisme au 31 décembre 1949.

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur le Président, l'expression de nos sentiments les plus distingués.

*Le Commissaire aux Comptes,*  
(s.) J. LOMBART,  
Expert-Comptable (C.B.C.)

P. S. — A la demande de M. Jean-Paul Harroy, Secrétaire Général, nous avons contrôlé, au moyen des extraits et des pièces probantes, les écritures enregistrées en comptabilité du 1<sup>er</sup> janvier au 30 septembre 1950, ainsi que la Balance de Vérification à cette dernière date.

Tout est parfaitement en ordre et les livres continuent à être tenus avec ordre et méthode.

Derechef.  
(s.) LOMBART.

---

(1) Annexe to the Report of the Secretary-General and to the proceedings of the 6th meeting of the Assembly.

## ANNEX VI.

### ESTIMATES FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 1951 <sup>(1)</sup>.

#### *Administrative Budget :*

Salaries. . . . .	\$ 8,000	
Office accommodation (contributed by Belgian organizations) . . . . .	—	
Office expenses, equipment, stamps, telephone, etc. . . . .	1,000	
Travelling expenses. . . . .	500	
	<u>          </u>	9,500

#### *Operative Budget :*

Education in the field of Nature Protection. . . . .	\$ —	
Various projects under consideration, to be partly met by outside financial assistance. . . . .	—	
School-teachers in the Seine-et-Oise, Educational Experiments in Venezuela, the Belgian Congo and Tonga . . . . .	4,500	
Card-index of films on Nature Protection. . . . .	2,000	
Continuation of the Survival Service. . . . .	3,000	
	<u>          </u>	9,500

Total . . . . . \$ 19,000

#### *Estimate of Receipts :*

Membership fees (approximate amount). . . . .	\$ 4,000	
Grant assured by Unesco. . . . .	8,000	
	<u>          </u>	12,000
To be covered by special receipts. . . . .	\$ 7,000	
	<u>          </u>	19,000

(1) Annex to the Proceedings of the 6th meeting of the Assembly.

## SIDELIGHTS OF AN ASSEMBLY.

It is well known to those who attend conferences, congresses or other forms of international gatherings that not the least fruitful results flow from the informal contacts made by delegates in the interval between meetings or at social functions or on excursions. This aspect should be kept well in mind and not underestimated when arrangements are made for such gatherings.

The friendly and smiling assistance of M<sup>mes</sup> J.-P. Harroy, G. De Cocq, and S. Du Champs, who generously helped to give the finishing touches to the organization of the Assembly, was certainly largely responsible for the atmosphere of friendly and pleasant animation which pervaded the meeting. Thanks to them, the ladies who came with the delegates could be shown round some of the Belgian cities and could enjoy looking at the masterpieces of Flemish Art.

The first social function took place on the evening of the first day in the historic Brussels City Hall, where the guests were received by Mr. G. Verheven, the Deputy-Mayor. To his address of welcome, Dr. Ch. J. Bernard, President of the Union, replied with his customary felicity. Two days later the visitors were conveyed to Tervueren to the famous museum of the Belgian Congo and were enabled to see the splendid collections exhibited in it. The visit concluded with the generous hospitality offered by the Director, Mr. F. Olbrechts, and his wife in their adjoining residence, and to them the grateful thanks of the visitors were expressed by our Vice-President, Dr. G. F. Herbert Smith.

The following Thursday, a few excellent films on Nature Protection were shown to the delegates in the hall of the Philips Firm, very kindly put at the disposal of the Union for the occasion. The Embassies of Canada, Poland and the USSR had generously lent films recorded in their countries. A copy of « Yours is the Land », a realization of the Conservation Foundation, had been brought over by Mr. Nils Dahlbeck from Sweden and was equally popular.

The week-end excursion to the Fagnes area in Upper Belgium, a lovely stretch of country, was favoured with beautiful sunny weather. On the outward journey a stop was made at Esneux, where Mr. L. Gavage, President of the Association pour la Defense de l'Ourthe et de ses Affluents, guided us round the site where the first Belgian National Park had been established. The Communal Authorities warmly received the party, and Mr. R. Videsott cordially thanked all those who knew how to acknowledge « Nature's gift of beautiful emotions ».

In Belgium dusk comes early in October and it was dark when we reached Spa on Saturday evening. In consequence and owing to a slight disorganization of the programme we almost missed the welcoming reception at the Town Hall, and we still deplore not hearing about Spa's historic past, as we should have, had Mr. H. J. Coolidge been present to return thanks.

Sunday began with a visit to the Mont Rigi Laboratory, which belongs to Liege University, under the guidance of Professor R. Bouillenne. This was followed by a plunge through the « great sponge », as the boggy area was happily described by a witty correspondent, which led a Flemish newspaper to head its report: « Seventy scientists barefoot in the Fagnes ». The wonderful scenery, not to mention the glass of port at the Signal de Botrange, provided ample compensation for any hardship suffered. An interesting exhibition of fungi had been arranged by the assistants of the Mont Rigi Laboratory and even the uninitiated were delighted by the varied shapes and rich colouring of the specimens. While thinking of pleasant sensations, we are reminded of the rightly-famed creamed potatoes at the Signal Restaurant. Mr. M. C. Bloemers, on behalf of the party, eloquently thanked those who had provided such a range of interesting entertainment.

Most of the afternoon was spent driving through the magnificent countryside of the Ardennes to the Furfooz National Park, where Professor R. Mayné, President of the Association « Ardenne et Gaume » awaited the party. The approach of night forced us to make but a brief visit to the National Park and it was quite dark when the visitors gathered at the Furfooz Cabin for the reception by the Local Authorities, who were thanked by Mr. W. H. Phelps in excellent and picturesque French. A romantic touch was added by the native beer drunk by candlelight, and the moon's rays guided the party's footsteps along the Lesse, and provided a lovely ending to an enjoyable day.

\*

\*\*

On Monday afternoon the delegates that still remained in Brussels were conveyed through the wonders of the Forêt de Soignes under the expert guidance of Mr. Coleaux, Inspecteur Principal des Eaux et Forêts, finishing up with the generous hospitality provided by Mrs. P. Tournay at the Rouge Cloître Abbey.

On the evening of the same day, every one gathered at the Union Coloniale for the banquet which ended the Session. Happily expressed words of farewell were spoken by Professor V. Van Straelen on behalf of the Belgian Government and by Dr. Bernard on behalf of the Union. Feelings of sadness were tempered by listening to the witty speeches made by Mr. Coolidge and Mr. Phelps and by thoughts of the next meeting, in two years time, at Caracas.

MARGUERITE CARAM.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Pages
Foreword . . . . .	3
List of Participants. . . . .	5
First Statutory Sitting (18.X, 9.15 a.m.). . . . .	15
Second Statutory Sitting (18.X, 3 p.m.). . . . .	20
Third Statutory Sitting (19.X, 10 a.m.). . . . .	22
First Technical Meeting : Survival Service. . . . .	24
Second Technical Meeting : Education. . . . .	30
Third Technical Meeting : Nomenclature and Inquiry on the Position of Nature Protection throughout the World.	35
Fourth Technical Meeting : Various Questions. . . . .	38
Fourth Statutory Sitting (21.X, 10 a.m.). . . . .	42
Composition of the Second Executive Board of the IUPN . .	44
Fifth Statutory Sitting (23.X, 10 a.m.). . . . .	45
Annex I : Rules of Procedure of the Assembly. . . . .	53
Annex II : Report on the Work of the IUPN 1948-1950 . .	57
Annex III : List of Founding Members. . . . .	72
Annex IV : Financial Statement . . . . .	76
Annex V : Auditing of the Union's Accounts. . . . .	78
Annex VI : Estimates for the Financial Year 1951 . . . . .	79
Sidelights of an Assembly. . . . .	80



Printed in Belgium.