



D 219 b/2

COMITÉ INTERNATIONAL
DE LA
CROIX-ROUGE

I N F O R M A T I O N N O T E

- 2 -

Reply of ~~the~~ International Committee
of the Red Cross to requests for
information on the Geneva Convention
and cognate questions.

November 1952

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Pages</u>
Introduction	1
<u>Use of the distinctive emblem</u>	
- Use of the protecting sign by central and local heads of National Red Cross Societies and their fellow-workers	2
- Use of the sign to mark civilian hospitals in peacetime.	5
<u>Preparation of forms for which the Conventions provide</u>	
- Establishment of capture cards and correspondence forms	8
<u>Security zones</u>	
- Creation of security zones in cities - Protection of cultural assets - Age fixed for access to security zones	11
<u>Wartime activities of National Societies</u>	
- Activities of National Societies in the Second World War	14

* * * * *

I N T R O D U C T I O N

The present Information Note No. 2 is a sequel to that which was sent to all National Red Cross Societies in May 1952.

As stated by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) in its introduction to the May Note, the purpose of this periodical publication is to let National Societies know of such replies by the ICRC to applications for information on the Geneva Conventions or cognate questions as it thinks may be of interest to Red Cross Societies, and of service to them in connection with their own particular problems (1).

The International Committee hopes that this new issue, in which it has been thought well to include certain replies containing information of a purely practical character, will meet with the same favourable reception as the May issue. Suggestions or observations by National Societies on the present Note will again be most welcome, and will be highly appreciated.

The Committee has further to repeat that the views expressed in these Information Notes are of a provisional nature in so far as they relate to questions which will be dealt with in the Commentaries on the Geneva Conventions of 1949, which the Committee has in preparation, the first volume of which the National Societies have already received. Nor should the views expressed be regarded as authentic interpretations of the provisions of the Conventions, the interpretation of which is a matter resting exclusively with the States parties to these instruments.

(1) The replies are arranged under general and well established headings. Explanatory notes are inserted at the beginning in brackets, where necessary, and are accompanied by references to the Articles of the Conventions concerned.

USE OF THE DISTINCTIVE EMBLEM

(The conditions for the use of the Red Cross sign continue to be one of the principal preoccupations of National Red Cross Societies and Volunteer Relief Societies. A number of publications (1) and the "Commentaire de la lère Convention de Genève pour l'amélioration du sort des blessés et des malades dans les forces armées en campagne"(2), pages 330-378, have already devoted considerable attention to this important matter.

The following two replies by the ICRC to questions on the subject are nevertheless appended by way of practical illustration. The first of the two questions related to the wearing of the protective sign in time of war by central and local heads of National Red Cross Societies and their fellow-workers.)

USE OF THE PROTECTING SIGN BY CENTRAL AND LOCAL HEADS OF NATIONAL RED CROSS SOCIETIES AND THEIR FELLOW-WORKERS

(First Convention, Article 44)

The first paragraph of Article 44 of the First Geneva Convention of 1949 says in its last sentence that National Red Cross Societies and other recognised Societies designated in

-
- (1) Analysis of the Conventions of 1949 for the use of National Red Cross Societies, Vol. I, pages 76 ff. See also The Sign of the Red Cross and the Repression of Abuses of the Red Cross Emblem by J.-S. Pictet, 1952, and Model Law for the Protection of the Red Cross Emblem and Title, 1951.
 - (2) An English version with the title Commentary, I Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field, is in course of preparation for the press.

Article 26 have the right to use the protecting sign "only within the framework of the present paragraph".

This means that the Societies in question may not make use of the protecting sign except for such staff and material as are attached in wartime to the Army Medical Service. The duties of the staff so attached must be the same as those of the Medical Service staff, which is subject to military law and regulations.

They form indeed for all practical purposes a part of the Army Medical Service.

Accordingly the heads or other members of National Red Cross Societies are not entitled to the protecting sign, (1) i.e. to the armlet, except in so far as they are themselves protected by the Geneva Convention. For that, their duties must be exclusively those which are laid down in Article 24 - namely "the search for, or the collection, transport or treatment of the wounded or sick" in armed forces, "the prevention of disease" in the army, or work "in the administration of medical units and establishments" of the army or in the chaplains' service. On this point see the Commentaire sur la lère Convention de Genève pour l'amélioration du sort des blessés et malades dans les forces armées en campagne (2), page 368. Otherwise the heads or other members of Red Cross Societies may not wear any but a purely indicative sign (which must not be on the armlet).

Similarly, red crosses may not be painted on the roofs of buildings belonging to National Societies, unless the buildings

(1) The distinction to be made under Article 44 between the protecting sign and the indicative sign has to be borne in mind. The former is the outward and visible sign of the protection accorded by the Convention to persons or things. The indicative sign on the other hand serves solely to indicate the connection of a person or thing with the Red Cross without at the same time placing them, or implying that they are placed, under the protection of the Convention.

(2) See footnote on page 18 above.

are protected by the Convention - that is to say, unless they are medical establishments or dépôts of medical material for the use of the wounded or sick in armed forces.

The above rules held good also under the Geneva Convention of 1929.

To the above account there should be added certain considerations arising out of the new Geneva Convention of 1949 relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War.

Article 18 of this last Convention says that a civilian hospital - which may be a hospital belonging to a National Red Cross Society - may show the protecting sign "if so authorised by the State".

Further, under Article 20 of the same Convention, the heads or other members of a Red Cross Society will be protected, and entitled to wear the armlet, in occupied territory and in zones of military operations, if they are "regularly and solely engaged in the operation and administration of civilian hospitals" authorised by the State.

Such is the law. The solution of the problem in practice will have to take into account the conditions in regard to the composition of the different National Red Cross Societies. Most of the latter employ some of their staff to assist the Medical Services, and others for other duties not covered by protection. They should therefore as far as possible divide their heads in time of war between the two sectors of work. Only those who work in the first of these sectors will have the benefit of the special protection instituted by the Geneva Convention. A National Society for instance will appoint one of its heads as Chief Medical Officer. This man in the event of mobilisation will become the head of those of the staff who are attached to the service of the wounded and sick in the armed forces. He will take his place in the hierarchy of the Medical Service, and will accordingly be entitled to use the protecting sign.

USE OF THE SIGN TO MARK CIVILIAN HOSPITALS IN PEACETIME. (Fourth Convention, Article 18)

(Article 18, paragraph 3, of the Fourth Geneva Convention gives States the power of marking civilian hospitals on their territory with the distinctive emblem, but does not say explicitly whether this faculty is valid in peacetime or only in wartime. The point was raised with the International Committee by a Red Cross Society.)

The object of Article 18 is to mark civilian hospitals in such a way that the enemy can see them, in order to give them the protection of the red cross sign (1). This must imply the emblem which confers the right to immunity under the Convention, and not merely a sign indicating membership of the Red Cross. But it is only in wartime that the protecting sign can service its purpose and assume its true significance.

The grammatical interpretation of the wording of Article 18, paragraph 2, also shows that there can be no question in the Article of any time other than wartime, since it speaks of "States which are Parties to a conflict", which automatically implies belligerence. The Convention consistently uses the two terms "State" and "State which is party to a conflict" to denote respectively States at peace and States at war. It may further be concluded, in view of the logical connection between paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article 18, that paragraph 3 tacitly presupposes a state of war, even though it does not contain the words "which is Party to a conflict" after the word "State". The repetition

(1) The question dealt with in this reply is quite distinct from the question raised by the conditions entitling a civilian medical establishment to the use of the emblem. The conditions in question are specified in Information Note No. 1 page 8 ("Use of the emblem for civilian hospitals and their equipment") under II.

of the words was not necessary, as the word "State" here serves to make clear that the attribution of the protecting sign is made on its responsibility.

This interpretation is confirmed by consideration of the general arrangement of Part II of this Convention, of which Article 18 forms part. Part II contains a number of provisions of a practical character for the purpose of rendering more effective the protection of civilians in time of war. Where it was thought desirable to make provision for action to be taken in peacetime, the Convention is explicit to that effect - for example, in Article 14, which deals with "hospital and safety zones and localities".

The conclusion is therefore justified that Article 18 is intended to apply to wartime and not to any other time. Obviously that conclusion does not prejudice the wearing in peacetime of the indicative sign by hospital establishments belonging to a national Society of the Red Cross or administered by it. The use of the indicative sign in these cases is not governed by Article 18 of the Fourth Convention, but by Article 44 of the First Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field.

While it is clear that the marking of civilian hospitals is intended to apply to wartime, it would seem nevertheless that this rule may be subject in application to exceptions, where indicated by practical considerations and the necessity of ensuring fully effective marking. There is no reason for example why a State, which is compelled to take all possible contingencies into consideration, should not be able to mark its civilian hospitals in peacetime, in order in the event of attack not to be worse served for humanitarian purposes than for military purposes. The purpose of the Convention would clearly be frustrated, if one of its provisions was such as to lead to developments of this kind.

As regards the choice of the most favourable moment for marking the emblem, it is desirable in view of the numerous imponderable elements in the case to leave the Governments concerned extensive powers of appreciation. A State would appear to us to be justified for example in using the sign on its hospitals in peacetime, where the circumstances are such that war may be regarded as imminent, and where it proposes accordingly to have resort to other preparatory action with a view to conflict (preparations for mobilisation, partial mobilisation, general mobilisation etc.).

But it would appear to be indicated that in such cases only fixed signs should be marked, requiring the activities of workmen and periods of delay (e.g. signs painted on the roofs of buildings). Removable signs on the other hand, such as flags, can easily wait to be put out until the beginning of a state of war.

The useless multiplication of red cross signs in peacetime on buildings not belonging to a Red Cross Society may lead to confusion in public opinion. It will not only affect Red Cross Societies, whose establishments will be liable to confusion with the buildings so marked (1), but will also diminish the prestige and symbolical force of the emblem.

(1) To avoid confusion, a National Society will be well advised to show its name distinctly with the emblem, which it places as an indicative sign on its establishments and property.

PREPARATION OF FORMS FOR WHICH THE CONVENTION PROVIDES

ESTABLISHMENT OF CAPTURE CARDS AND CORRESPONDENCE FORMS (Third Convention, Articles 70 and 71, and Annex IV. Fourth Convention, Articles 106 and 107, and Annex III).

(The Geneva Conventions contain a certain number of provisions for the preparation of certain forms - such as identity cards, capture cards, correspondence cards and letters, death certificates, repatriation certificates, to mention only the most important.

With a view to the implementation of these provisions, the ICRC was approached by one Government, which submitted specimen capture cards and correspondence forms with its request. The particulars contained in the reply of the ICRC are of twofold interest. On the one hand they represent an attempt to solve the problem of the languages in which the cards should be drawn up; and on the other hand they suggest certain simplifications in the correspondence forms.)

Experience shows that Government Departments at the beginning of a conflict have so many, and such urgent, duties that they have hardly any time to deal with such matters as the preparation of the forms for which the Geneva Conventions provide. The International Committee of the Red Cross cannot therefore sufficiently congratulate those Governments which have the sagacity to take action in these matters beforehand.

The preparation in peacetime of these forms raises however a problem. The language of those who will have to use the forms is as yet unknown; and yet it is recommended in the specimens annexed to the Convention to draw them up, in accordance with the approved practice of the ICRC, "in particular in the native language" of those concerned. This recommendation is based on the general principle followed again and again in the

Conventions, the object of which is to ensure that requests or orders addressed to prisoners or internees should be in a language which they understand, so as to prevent any confusion or mistrust on their part.

To solve the problem, it might be proposed to draw up forms in a number of languages selected from those most commonly in use in the world. But there would be practical difficulties to this solution in the shape of lack of space; and even a form in four languages would not cover all cases.

Accordingly the adoption of the principal language of the Detaining Power appears preferable, on the understanding that it is not regarded as a comprehensive or definitive, but merely as a provisional, solution. It would help to deal with sudden influxes of prisoners or internees; and in such urgent cases an appeal might be made to those of the prisoners or internees, who know one of the languages employed, as well as to any interpreters who may be available, to assist those concerned in filling in the forms. Explanatory notices in the language of those concerned might also be put up in the camps.

This however can only be an emergency measure, since the rule is that the forms are to be drawn up in a language which the prisoners of war or internees understand. To comply with this rule, it would seem desirable to draw up the text of the forms at once in the different languages which may be required. In each of these languages - they should have the national language as well - a specimen should be prepared, e.g. on a printer's block, especially in the case of those languages which do not employ the same characters as the national language. At the same time a sufficient stock of paper should be put aside in reserve.

These arrangements should make it easy in case of need to print and distribute the necessary forms very rapidly.

In the wording of the forms there are one or two suggestions which may perhaps be made in connection with the correspondence cards and letters. In the first place the

different items of the forms should be numbered like the items of the capture cards. Certain differences will also be noted in the lay-out of the items "To" and "From" in the specimens for prisoners of war and those for civilian internees. We do not think there was any intention to differentiate in this case. The difference is due merely to lack of coordination, such as occurs at big conferences where material is dealt with by more than one Committee. In these cases it seems preferable and more practical to adopt a uniform lay-out for the different items in all the correspondence forms.

In the case of the "To" items, the arrangement of the form for civilian internees is more usual (the "street" coming before the "place"), and should be adopted in the other forms.

In the case of the "From" items, we think the lay-out of the letter for prisoners of war should be the same as that of the letter for civilian internees. (The item "Prisoner (internee) No.", which may at first sight appear superfluous, may be of some use, even for civilian internees).

The above proposals with a view to uniformity of forms appear (apart from the obvious advantages they have for the purposes of printing) to be especially commendable in respect of the numbering which we advocate. A particular number will correspond to a particular item, which will be the same on all the correspondence forms; and much risk of confusion will thus be avoided.

SECURITY ZONES

CREATION OF SECURITY ZONES IN CITIES - PROTECTION OF CULTURAL ASSETS - AGE FIXED FOR ACCESS TO ZONES OF SECURITY. (Fourth Convention, Article 14)

(The questions put to the ICRC in connection with the new Geneva Convention on the Protection of Civilians include a large number which relate to the problem of security zones. Most of them ask for information, which the ICRC has already been able to furnish to the National Societies by its special brochure of 1951 and by its Circular 398 of March 1952.

It appears nevertheless worth while to include here the particulars furnished by the ICRC to one of its correspondents, a jurist, in reply to criticisms on the regulations of the Fourth Geneva Convention with regard to security zones. His criticisms related mainly to the three following points, with which the reply of the ICRC deals in succession. Our correspondent contends (1) that the Convention is in effect confined to the case of security zones outside cities, which presupposes the evacuation of thickly populated areas: he further objects (2) that the protection of the security zones does not cover cultural assets (works of art, monuments etc) : and lastly he considers (3) that the age-limits fixed for access to the zones appear in some respects arbitrary.)

The criticism to the effect that the Convention is only concerned with the establishment of security zones outside cities does not appear to be well founded. It is not based on any provision of the Convention or of the Draft Agreement annexed to it. There is nothing in the wording of these texts in support of our correspondent's contention; and the provision in the Convention itself leaves the door open to any possible arrangements.

We are not therefore justified in inferring that the Convention contemplates only security zones outside urban centres. It is quite within the spirit and the letter of the Convention to form a security zone out of a residential town.

In practice however urban centres generally contain a more or less large number of "military objectives", which the belligerents claim the right to select as objects of attack (military establishments, war industries, administrative centres etc). Consequently, pending regulation of the law of war in the air, it is essential to establish medical and security zones in places where no belligerent can reasonably claim that they contain military objectives. The creation of security zones outside cities is therefore indicated generally speaking on practical grounds, though not for any legal reason arising out of the Convention. The evacuation of certain elements of the population to zones at a distance is liable no doubt to meet with vigorous resistance on psychological grounds, which humanly speaking are altogether comprehensible. But let there be no mistake as to the numbers of those, who in future wars will put their trust in these zones. The fear of the havoc caused by bombing is unfortunately only too well justified. (1)

On the other hand it is true that the Convention does not contain provisions for the protection of assets of historical or cultural value. That is not, it will be readily understood, from any lack of interest in such a highly important matter. It

(1) It may be noted in this connection that Article 15 of the Fourth Convention makes provision for the creation "in the regions where fighting is taking place" of "neutralised zones intended to shelter ... the wounded and sick ... and civilians who take no part in hostilities". Neutral zones of this kind must be clearly distinguished from the hospital and safety zones of Article 14; but they serve the same object. Three such zones have been established up to now - namely, Madrid in the Spanish Civil War, Shanghai in the Sino-Japanese War, and Jerusalem in the conflict between the Arab States and Israel.

is due simply to the fact that the Geneva Conventions from their origin have been concerned primarily with the protection of the human being qua human being, and that material objects do not come into consideration in this Convention in so far as they are contributory to its primary object.

At the same time it is to be hoped that the efforts of UNESCO in this connection will be crowned with success, and will evolve a happy supplement to the Geneva Conventions in the form of a suitable Convention. No one will have failed to remark the numerous analogies between the UNESCO draft convention and the Geneva Conventions, certain passages in the former being reproduced textually from the latter.

The criticisms with regard to the age-limits fixed in Articles 14 and 24 of the Convention do not seem very important. It is matter of experience that there is an arbitrary element about any form of schedule. The reason why particular typical ages were specified was that the majority of the States represented at the Conference regarded those ages as appropriate, reasonable and in general accordance with the physical and moral development of childhood.

Moreover the existence of certain age-limits, like the differentiation between categories of persons, may be advantageous in so far as it enables a State, which establishes a security zone in conformity with the specified limits and categories, to demand recognition of such a zone under the Convention.

It is however obvious that material considerations may force a State to adopt other age-limits, or a part only of the specified categories of persons, for the zone it establishes. In such a case the details in Article 14 could hardly be invoked for the purpose of denying the character of the zone as a zone covered by the Convention. The principal thing is that States should act on the invitation addressed to them in the Article: even a partial response will always be preferable to inaction in this connection.

WARTIME ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL SOCIETIES

ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL SOCIETIES IN THE SECOND WORLD WAR.

(In connection with the reorganisation of its services and its preparation for wartime work a Red Cross Society asked the International Committee what the principal activities of National Societies had been in the last World War.

As the activities of members of the Red Cross in time of war are largely based on the Geneva Conventions, it has been thought fitting to reproduce in this Note the reply given to the above question. The essential purpose of the reply is to give a rapid conspectus in the form of a simplified list of the different things actually done by the National Societies in the last World War. It is therefore a purely descriptive account. Obviously every National Society did not do everything specified in the list.

The information contained in the reply has been taken mainly from the Reports on their activities, which were presented to the XVII International Red Cross Conference in 1948 by 34 National Societies in all parts of the world. These Reports constitute a splendid testimony to the efforts of the Red Cross in time of war. Reference has also been made to the remarkable and voluminous Report published by the War Organisation of the British Red Cross on its own work from 1939.

Should any Red Cross Society therefore wish for details on any particular activity, the ICRC would be delighted to let it have additional particulars especially in the form of references to the Reports presented by the Red Cross Societies concerned.

The new Geneva Conventions of 1949 have had the effect of extending the field of activity of the National Societies. It is

desirable therefore to supplement the table which follows by the indications already given by the Committee or the League to National Societies in the form of numerous publications (1) dealing with the new activities of the latter under the 1949 Conventions.)

The activities of the National Red Cross Societies may be classified under three headings :

- I. Activities on behalf of the members of the national armed forces.
- II. Activities on behalf of civilian nationals.
- III. Activities on behalf of foreigners.

I.- Activities on behalf of the members of the national armed forces.

A. On behalf of wounded and sick (in cooperation with the Army Medical Services). (2)

(a) Specialised personnel.

- Recruiting and training of nurses and assistant nurses.
- Training of (women) resident dieticians for military hospitals.

(1) See especially the Analysis of the Conventions of 1949 for the use of National Red Cross Societies, published by the ICRC, and the circulars and questionnaires sent to them by the latter on particular points (training of nurses, security zones, protection of the emblem, identification of children etc).

Of the publications of the League of Red Cross Societies see especially "Guide for National Red Cross Societies on their Role as Auxiliaries of the Army Medical and Civil Defence Services".

(2) Though in practice these activities will mainly be on behalf of the members of the national army, the enemy military have the benefit of them. The Geneva Conventions and the principles of the Red Cross enjoin identical treatment for all wounded and sick, whether enemies or nationals.

(b) Medical establishments and units.

- Installation and equipment of military hospitals, mobile medical units and auxiliary hospitals.
- Equipment of the same with X ray apparatus.
- Organisation of medical trains and hospital ships.

(c) Social assistance.

- Training of social workers to care personally for the wounded and sick, and in particular to attend to the matter of their relations with their families.
- Supervision and care of wounded and sick, and especially disablement cases, on their coming out of hospital.
- Material relief to hospital patients - such as sweets, cigarettes, games, books etc.

(d) Service of disablement cases.

- Readaptation of disabled persons for ordinary life.

(e) Blood transfusion.

- Establishment of blood transfusion services.

B. On behalf of prisoners of war.

(a) Information Services.

- Organisation of a National Information Bureau as provided in Article 77 of the 1929 Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War (=Article 122 of the Third Convention of 1949 (1))

(1) As the official Bureau will in general be concerned with nationals who are prisoners of war in foreign countries, its activities might be classified under activities on behalf of nationals of armed forces. Very few National Societies have had occasion to undertake duties of this kind : of those who did, the Belgian, Finnish, Italian and Norwegian Red Cross may be cited.

- Organisation of an unofficial Bureau of Enquiries and Information on nationals who are prisoners of war in foreign countries, where the official Bureau is set up and run by a Government Department.
- Publications for the information of relatives of prisoners of war (particulars of the condition of the prisoners, the internment camps, the arrangements for correspondence, the consignment of relief parcels etc).
- Establishment of a Service of simplified Red Cross messages for correspondence with nationals held as prisoners of war in very distant countries.

(b) Relief.

- Preparation and despatch of relief parcels to prisoners of war, supervision and transmission of consignments by families, make-up of parcels for families, consignment of collective parcels (foodstuffs, clothing, medicines, cigarettes etc).

(c) Social assistance.

- "Prisoners of war Knitting Service".
- "Prisoners of war Sponsor (marraine) Service".
- Medico-social assistance to prisoners of war repatriated at the close of hostilities.

(d) Liberation and repatriation.

- Action on behalf of prisoners of war fulfilling the conditions for liberation before the close of hostilities.
- Organisation of medical trains and ambulances for the repatriation or exchange of wounded or sick prisoners of war.

e) Transfers of funds.

- Transfers of funds of prisoners of war to their families.

C. On behalf of armed forces in general. (1)

(a) Social assistance.

- Establishment of social assistance centres with the quarters of armed forces.
- Supply of canteen equipment.
- Organisation of laundry facilities for soldiers and preparation of body linen for the same.

(b) Organisation of leisure.

- Establishment of educational and recreational programmes for the troops, installation of premises for rest, relaxation and distraction.

(c) Medical Service. (Prevention of disease)

- Preparation of serum tests for the armed forces.
- Contribution to the struggle against epidemics liable to occur in armed forces.

(1) Activities under (a) and (b) are generally classified as "Welfare". Those who benefit by them are not strictly speaking war victims. See in this connection Commentaire I La Convention de Genève pour l'amélioration du sort des blessés et des malades dans les forces armées en campagne. (Page 372, and footnote on page 3).

II. Activities on behalf of civilian nationals.

(a) Information Services.

- Organisation of a Bureau of Enquiries and Information for civilians, especially those who are dispersed as a result of operations of war.
- Transmissions of "civilian communications" to or from foreign countries through the International Committee of the Red Cross.

(b) First Aid.

- Training of relief teams for the aid of civilian victims of bombing.
- Training of ambulance and relief workers.
- Training of relief teams for the convoy of distressed or constitutionally feeble persons (children, old people, pregnant women).

(c) Material relief.

- Consignments of relief to political detainees or civilian internees in enemy countries.
- Receipt and distribution of relief from foreign countries to civilians.

(d) Assistance to the civilian population and to children.

- Establishment of sanatoria and dispensaries for assistance to children.
- Provision of identity disks for young children.
- Aid to populations displaced as a result of war.
- Enumeration for the Ministry of Public Health of civilians wounded or sick as a result of war.
- Food supply of the civilian population.

III. Activities on behalf of foreigners.

(a) Information Services.

- Establishment of a Bureau of Research for dispersed families and persons.
- Organisation of an Official Information Bureau on Prisoners of War as provided in Article 77 of the 1929 Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War (=Article 122 of the Third Convention of 1949).

(b) Relief.

- Material relief for prisoners of war of foreign nationality interned in foreign countries.
- Relief for foreign prisoners of war interned in national territory (1).

(c) Exchange and repatriation.

- Organisation of exchanges and repatriation of prisoners of war and civilians.

(d) Refugees and civilian populations.

- Reception of refugees and internees.
- Aid to civilian populations sorely tried by war.
- Medical aid to victims of a civil war in a neighbouring country.
- Organisation of welcome by families of the National Society's country of foreign children, who are

(1) The work of National Societies on behalf of prisoners of war interned in their territory was not extensive in the Second World War. Attention was however drawn to its humanitarian significance at the Preliminary Conference of Red Cross Societies at Geneva in 1946, and the XVII International Red Cross Conference at Stockholm in 1948 passed a resolution (Resolution No.XXVI) recommending this form of activity to National Societies.

war victims. Establishment of the Services necessary for looking after the children.

- Organisation of curative treatment for foreign children or adults attacked by tuberculosis.
- Hospital treatment for mutilated or disabled cases.
