



Title	Summary of contents
Citation	北大法学論集, 59(6), 672[i]-671[ii]
Issue Date	2009-03-31
Doc URL	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/2115/38381">http://hdl.handle.net/2115/38381</a>
Type	bulletin (other)
File Information	59-6_p672-671.pdf



[Instructions for use](#)

## THE HOKKAIDO LAW REVIEW

Vol. 59 No. 6 (2009)  
SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

---

### The Origin of International Trusteeship (1): From Empires to International Organizations

Motomichi IGARASHI\*

The purpose of this article is to examine the origin of “international trusteeship,” which is defined as territorial administration by international organizations on behalf of a territory and its people. This includes the Mandates System of the League of Nations, the Trusteeship System of the United Nations, and peace-building operations (state-building operations) by the United Nations and other international organizations. By tracing the origin of international trusteeship, this article tries to reveal the nature of these peace-building operations. This article locates the origin of “international trusteeship” to a number of international trusteeship plans that were proposed around the time of WW I. **Chapter 1** summarizes the controversy over “international trusteeship,” and suggests my own approach to “international trusteeship.” **Chapter 2** examines the international trusteeship plans for the African colonies, especially J. A. Hobson’s plan, and concludes that these plans were innovative in that they assumed an international organization (the League of Nations) as the executor of territorial administration, while at the same time being racialistic and paternalistic. **Chapter 3** analyses Jan Smuts’ international trusteeship plan for the Austro-Hungarian, Ottoman and also parts of the Russian Empire, and concludes that

---

\*Ph. D. Student, Hokkaido University  
JSPS Research Fellowship

we should conceive Smuts' international trusteeship plan for rearing newly-independent nation-states in the former Empires, while at the same time, maintaining a stable and peaceful order by intervening in the relations of the newly independent countries through an international organization (the League of Nations). **Chapter 4** explores to what extent international trusteeship plans were institutionalized at the Paris Peace Conference. **The last chapter** concludes that international trusteeship plans were created as the antitheses of empire (not only the colonial empires, but also the Austro-Hungarian, Ottoman and Russian Empire), and therefore we should distinguish "international trusteeship" from colonial and imperial administration. Also, it can be pointed out that empire contributed toward legitimating the international trusteeship plans, because the international trusteeship plans were assumed as a *panacea* for flaws of empire; accordingly, international organizations carrying out "international trusteeship" inevitably faced difficulties legitimating themselves after empire disappeared.