The Secretary-General has the honour to circulate to the Delegates at the Assembly the English edition of the documents relating to the organisation of a system of European Federal Union.
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COMMUNICATION DISTRIBUTED TO THE PRESS

(September 9th, 1929.)

At a meeting to which he had invited the Ministers for Foreign Affairs or first delegates of the twenty-seven European nations represented at the Assembly of the League of Nations, M. Briand amplified the ideas he had outlined at the Assembly regarding the organisation of Europe. After an exchange of views, the delegates present unanimously stated that they regarded with favour the step taken by the French Prime Minister to establish a bond of union among the European nations. They all undertook to bring the question to the notice of their Governments, and to give it their consideration. They requested the French Prime Minister to draw up a Memorandum for the European Governments represented on the League of Nations, and to institute a general consultation on the question. On the basis of the replies, the French Prime Minister was asked to prepare a report summarising the views expressed. This report will be discussed at another meeting to be held at Geneva during the Eleventh Assembly of the League of Nations.
II

MEMORANDUM ON THE ORGANISATION OF A SYSTEM OF EUROPEAN FEDERAL UNION
MEMORANDUM ON THE ORGANISATION OF A SYSTEM OF EUROPEAN FEDERAL UNION.

[Translation.]

At a preliminary meeting held in Geneva on September 9th, 1929, at the request of the French representative, the authorised representatives of the twenty-seven European States which are Members of the League of Nations were invited to consider the advantages of an agreement between the interested Governments having as its object the creation, among the nations of Europe, of some kind of federal bond establishing between them a system of constant solidarity, and allowing them, whenever necessary, to get into touch immediately to study, discuss and settle problems likely to be of common interest.

Having unanimously recognised the need for some effort in this direction, the representatives who were consulted all undertook to recommend to their respective Governments the consideration of the question which had been directly submitted to them by the French representative, who had also taken the opportunity, on September 5th, of raising the matter before the Tenth Assembly of the League of Nations.

In order to demonstrate more clearly their unanimity, which in itself embodied the principle of a moral union in Europe, they considered that they should draw up without delay the procedure which seemed to them the most likely to facilitate the proposed investigation. They entrusted to the French representative the task of indicating, in a Memorandum addressed to the interested Governments, the main points to which they should give their attention; to collate and record their views; to set forth the conclusions of this widespread enquiry, and to embody them in a report for submission to a European conference, which might be held at Geneva on the occasion of the next Assembly of the League of Nations.

In fulfilling the task which was entrusted to them, the Government of the French Republic desire to emphasise the general anxiety and the essential reservations which have never ceased to dominate the thoughts of all the representatives united at Geneva on September 9th last.

The proposal examined by twenty-seven European Governments found its justification in the very definite feeling of collective responsibility in face of the danger which threatens the peace of Europe, from the political as well as from the economic and social points of view, as a result of the essential lack of unity in the organisation of Europe. The need for establishing a permanent regime of solidarity based on international agreements for the rational organisation of Europe arises from the very conditions of security and well-being of the nations whose geographical position already imposes on them in this part of the world a real solidarity.

No one to-day doubts that the lack of cohesion in the grouping of the material and moral forces of Europe does in fact constitute the most serious obstacle to the development and efficiency of all political or judicial institutions on which the foundations of any universal organisation of peace tend to be based. This dispersion of energy does not limit less seriously, in Europe, the possibilities of enlarging the economic market, the attempts at intensifying and ameliorating industrial production, and thereby every guarantee against labour crises, which are sources of both political and social instability. Moreover, the danger of such division is still further increased by the extent of the new frontiers (more than 20,000 kilometres of Customs barriers) which the peace treaties have had to create, in order to satisfy national aspirations in Europe.

The very activities of the League of Nations, whose responsibilities are rendered all the more heavy by the fact that it is a universal organisation, might meet with serious obstruction in Europe if these territorial divisions were not counteracted at the earliest moment by a bond of solidarity enabling the nations of Europe to realise at last the geographical unity of Europe, and to bring about, within the framework of the League, one of the regional understandings which the pact has formally recommended.

That is to say, that the search for a formula of European co-operation in conjunction with the League of Nations, far from weakening the authority of that body, should not, and could not, tend but to increase it, for it is in close keeping with the ideals of the League.

It is in no way proposed to form a European group outside the League of Nations, but, on the contrary, to bring European interests into harmony under the control of, and in conformity with, the spirit of the League of Nations, by creating within its universal organisation an organisation which, for being limited, would be all the more effective. The creation of a system of federal organisation in Europe would always be placed to the credit of the League of Nations as a factor of progress, of which even nations outside Europe could reap the benefit.

Such a conception can leave no room for ambiguity, any more than that which, in an area even more limited, gave birth to the collective negotiation of the Locarno agreements, which inaugurated the real policy of European co-operation.

There are, in fact, certain questions of special interest to Europe for which, in the interests of peace itself, the European States may feel the need of a special, more immediate and more direct action, and with which they are, moreover, specially competent to deal, because of their racial affinities and their common ideals of civilisation. The League of Nations itself, in the general
exercise of its activities, has more than once had to take into account this geographical unity which Europe represents, and for which common solutions may be found which could not be imposed upon the whole world. To prepare and facilitate the co-ordination of those activities of the League, which are essentially European, would be one of the tasks of the proposed association.

Far from constituting a fresh tribunal for the settlement of disputes, the European association, which could not be called upon in such matters to use its good offices except in a purely consultative capacity, would not be competent to deal fully with particular problems for the settlement of which a special procedure of the League of Nations or some other expressly defined procedure has been laid down by the Covenant or by treaties. But even in matters involving a task essentially reserved for the League of Nations, the federal bond between the European States would still play a very useful part in preparing an atmosphere favourable to a peaceful settlement by the League, or in facilitating, in practice, the execution of its decisions.

Accordingly, the French representative was careful, from the beginning, to avoid all ambiguity when, taking the initiative at the first European reunion, he expressed the opinion that it should include only the representatives of the States which are Members of the League of Nations, and should meet at Geneva on the occasion of the Tenth Assembly—that is to say, in the atmosphere and within the framework of the League of Nations.

The proposed European organisation could not be opposed to any ethnographical combination outside the League, either in Europe itself or in other continents, any more than it could be to the League itself.

The work of European co-ordination meets requirements so immediate and so vital that it seeks to be an end in itself, by doing positive work which there can be no question of directing or of allowing to be directed against anyone. On the contrary, this work will be carried on in complete and friendly trust, and even often in collaboration, with all other States or groups of States which are so sincerely interested in the organisation of universal peace as to recognise the advantage of a greater homogeneity in Europe, and which, in addition, understand sufficiently clearly the modern laws of international economy, to seek, in the better organisation of a Europe which has been simplified and thereby freed from the constant menace of conflicts, the conditions of security indispensable to the development of their own economic intercourse.

The policy of European union, towards which must tend the present search for the first link of solidarity between the Governments of Europe, implies, in effect, a conception absolutely contrary to that which formerly led to the creation in Europe of Customs unions, tending to abolish internal Customs barriers in order to erect on the boundary of the whole community a stiffer barrier—that is to say, in order to create, in practice, a weapon against the States situated outside these unions.

Such a conception would be incompatible with the principles of the League of Nations, closely bound as it is to the ideal of universality which remains its aim and end, even while it seeks or favours partial results.

Lastly, it is necessary to make the proposed study very clearly subject to the general principle that in no case and in no degree may the formation of the Federal Union desired by the European Governments affect in any way any of the sovereign rights of the States which are members of such an association.

It is on the plane of absolute sovereignty and of entire political independence that the understanding between European nations must be brought about. It would, besides, be impossible to imagine the existence of any idea of political domination in an organisation deliberately placed under the control of the League of Nations, whose two fundamental principles are precisely the sovereignty of States and their equality of rights. And, as regards rights of sovereignty, will not the very genius of each nation be able to assert itself more consciously in its individual cooperation in the collective work, under a system of federal union fully compatible with respect for traditions and for the characteristics peculiar to each people?

It is in the light of these observations and inspired by the general anxiety mentioned at the beginning of this Memorandum that the Government of the Republic, in conformity with the procedure laid down at the first European reunion of September 9th, 1929, have the honour to submit to-day for consideration by the Governments concerned a statement of the different points on which they are invited to give their opinion.

I.

Need for a General Agreement, however Summary it may be, to Affirm the Principle of the Moral Union of Europe and to Place Formally on Record the Existence of the Solidarity Established between the States of Europe.

In a formula as liberal as possible, but indicating clearly the essential object of this association in the service of the collective effort towards the pacific organisation of Europe, the signatory Governments would undertake to get into touch regularly at meetings held regularly or on special occasions to examine in common all questions likely to be of interest primarily to the common-wealth of European peoples.

Observations.

I. The signatory Governments appearing thus pledged to the general orientation of a certain common policy, the principle of European union would henceforth be beyond discussion and
removed far above the routine of everyday procedure; the consideration of ways and means would be delegated to the European conference or to the permanent organisation which would be called upon to constitute the living link of solidarity between European nations and thus to incarnate the moral responsibility of the European Union.

2. This initial and symbolic pact, under the auspices of which would take place, in practice, the definition, the organisation, and the development of the constituent factors of the European association, should be drawn up summarily enough to contain only a definition of the essential rôle of this association. (It would be left to the future, should that be favourable to the development of the European Union, to facilitate the eventual development of this pact, which would be confined to general principles, until a more comprehensive charter can be conceived.)

3. When the European Pact is drawn up, the essential reservations indicated in the present Memorandum must, nevertheless, be taken into consideration. It would be necessary, in fact, to define the character of Europe, regarded as a regional understanding in keeping with the provisions of Article 21 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and exercising its activity within the framework of the League. (It should be specified particularly that the European association cannot take the place of the League in matters entrusted to the latter by the Covenant or by treaties, and that, even in its own province of the organisation of Europe, it should still co-ordinate its particular activity with the general activities of the League of Nations.)

4. To demonstrate more clearly the subordination of the European association to the League of Nations, the European Pact should be confined at first to the European States which are Members of the League.

II.

NEED FOR MACHINERY WHICH WILL SECURE FOR THE EUROPEAN UNION THE ORGANS ESSENTIAL FOR THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF ITS TASK.

A. Need for a representative and responsible body in the shape of a regular institution known as the "European Conference" composed of the representatives of all the European Governments Members of the League of Nations. This body would remain the primary directing body of the European Union in conjunction with the League of Nations.

The powers of this conference, the organisation of its chairmanship and its sessions, regular or special, should be settled at the next reunion of the European States, at which will have to be considered the conclusions reached in the report of enquiry and at which must be definitely drawn up the scheme of European organisation, subject to the necessary governmental approval or parliamentary ratification.

Remark.

In order to avoid the predominance of any one of the European States over the others, the post of Chairman of the European Conference should be filled annually and in rotation.

B. Need for an executive body in the form of a permanent political committee composed only of a certain number of members of the European Conference, which would act both as the committee of research and as the executive body of the European Union.

The composition and the powers of the European Committee, the method of election of its members, the organisation of its chairmanship and its sessions, regular or special, should be settled at the next meeting of the European States. Since the work of this committee, like that of the conference, must be carried on within the framework of the League of Nations, its meetings should take place at Geneva itself, where its ordinary sessions might be made to coincide with those of the Council of the League of Nations.

Remarks.

1. In order to keep the European Committee free from any predominating influence, the post of Chairman should be filled in rotation.

2. As the Committee can consist only of a limited number of representatives of European States Members of the League of Nations, it would retain the power to invite at any time the representatives of other European Governments, whether Members or not of the League of Nations, who might be particularly interested in the consideration of a question. Furthermore, the Committee would be formally given the right to invite, whenever considered necessary or desirable, a representative of a non-European Power, whether Member or not of the League of Nations, to be present or even to participate in an advisory or deliberative capacity in discussions on a subject in which that Power is interested.

3. One of the first tasks of the Committee might be:

On the one hand, the general examination of every method of realising and applying the proposed scheme in accordance with the essential data obtained after consultation with the various Governments, and the investigation, for this purpose, of the ways and means of facilitating the technical definition of the constituent elements of the future Federal Union in Europe;
And on the other hand, the preparation of a general inventory of the programme of European co-operation comprising:

(a) The study of political, economic, social and other questions of special interest to the European commonwealth and not yet dealt with by the League of Nations;

(b) The special measures to be taken in order to accelerate the execution by the European Governments of the general decisions of the League of Nations.

4. After the adoption of the general programme of European co-operation, the Committee might entrust the study of certain subjects to special technical committees, making sure that there exist conditions such as will enable the work of the experts always to be kept under the control and direct inspiration of the political element emanating directly from the Governments which remain jointly responsible for the prosecution of their international undertaking and which alone can ensure success on the political plane where it finds its supreme justification. (For this purpose, the chairmanship of the technical committees, in each special case, might be entrusted to a European statesman chosen either from within or from without the European political committee.)

C. Need for a secretarial staff, however small it may be at the outset, in order to ensure the administrative execution of the instructions of the President of the European Conference or of the European Committee, communications between Governments parties to the European Pact, the summoning of the conference or committee, the preparation of their discussions, the registration and notification of their resolutions, etc.

Observations.

1. In the beginning, the secretarial duties might be entrusted to the Government responsible, for the year, for the chairmanship of the European Committee.

2. When the necessity for a permanent secretariat shall have been recognised, the seat of this secretariat should be the same as that of the meetings of the conference and of the committee—that is to say, Geneva.

3. In the organisation of the secretariat, account should always be taken of the possibility of making use, at least in part and temporarily, of special sections of the Secretariat of the League of Nations.

III.

Need for laying down in advance the essential principles which shall determine the general conceptions of the European Committee and guide it in the enquiries which it makes for the purpose of preparing the programme of the European Organisation.

(This third point might be reserved for consideration at the next European meeting.)

A. The general subordination of the economic problem to the political problem. — All possibility of progress on the road to economic union being strictly governed by the question of security, and this question itself being intimately bound up with that of the progress possible on the road to political union, it is essential to bring on to the political plane at the outset the constructive effort tending to give Europe its organic structure. It is on this same plane that the broad lines of the economic policy of Europe as well as the tariff policy of each individual European State should be elaborated.

The inverse order would not only be fruitless, but would appear to the weakest nations, left without guarantees or compensation, as liable to expose them to the risks of a political domination resulting from an industrial domination of the most powerfully organised States.

It is thus logical and natural that the economic sacrifices to be made to the commonwealth should find their justification only in the development of a political situation permitting confidence between peoples and the true pacification of minds. Even after the realisation of such a state of affairs guaranteed by the establishment of a close and permanent pacific union between the peoples of Europe, there would still be need for the introduction, on the political plane, of a higher sense of international requirements which would oblige members of the European commonwealth, for the common good, to elaborate in all sincerity and to pursue effectively a truly liberal tariff policy.

B. The principle that European political co-operation should be directed towards the following essential object: a federation based on the idea of union and not of unity—that is to say, a federation elastic enough to respect the independence and national sovereignty of each State while guaranteeing to all the benefits of collective solidarity in the settlement of the political questions affecting the destiny of the European commonwealth or that of one of its members.

(Such an idea might imply, as a corollary, the general development in Europe of the system of arbitration and security and the progressive extension to the whole European commonwealth of the policy of international guarantees inaugurated at Locarno, culminating in the fusion of special agreements or series of special agreements into a more comprehensive system.)
C. The principle that the economic organisation of Europe should be directed towards the following essential object: a rapprochement of the European economic systems effected under the political control of the Governments acting in concert.

For this purpose, the Governments might themselves settle, definitely, in a document confined to general principles which would constitute a simple pact of economic solidarity, the objective which they intend to define as the ideal of their economic policy (the establishment of a common market which shall raise to the maximum the standard of human well-being in all the territories of the European commonwealth). In the favourable atmosphere of such a general orientation could be begun the immediate practical construction of a rational organisation of production and of European exchanges, by means of the progressive liberation and the methodical simplification of the circulation of goods, capital and individuals, due account being taken of the requirements of each State as regards national defence.

Once the principle of this tariff policy has been accepted, and accepted definitely, as part and parcel of the general policy of the Governments, the study of the ways and means of its practical application might be left entirely to a committee of technical experts, under the conditions mentioned under Heading II, B, Observation 4.

IV.

Advisability of Reserving, Either for the Next European Conference or for the Future European Committee, the Study of All Questions of Practical Application.

Among which are the following:

A. Definition of the field of European co-operation, particularly in the following spheres:

1. General economics. — Effective realisation in Europe of the programme laid down by the last Economic Conference of the League of Nations; control of the policy of the industrial unions and "cartels" between different countries; examination of and preparation for all future possible measures for the progressive reduction of tariffs, etc.

2. Economic equipment. — Realisation of a system of co-ordination between large public undertakings executed by European States (motor highways, canals, etc.).

3. Communications and transit. — By land, water and air: regulation and improvement of inter-European traffic; co-ordination of the work of the European River Commissions; agreements between railways; European system of posts, telegraphs and telephones; regulations regarding broadcasting, etc.

4. Finance. — Encouragement of credits intended for the development of those areas of Europe which are least developed from the economic standpoint: European markets; monetary questions, etc.

5. Labour. — Solution of certain labour questions peculiar to Europe, such as labour on river boats and in glassworks; of questions having a Continental or regional character, such as the control of the social consequences of inter-European emigration (application in one country of the laws of another on workmen's compensation, social insurance, workers' pensions, etc.).

6. Health. — General application of certain methods of hygiene tested by the Health Organisation of the League of Nations (especially regeneration of agricultural regions; application of health insurance; national schools of hygiene; European epidemiology; exchange of information and of officials between national health services; scientific and administrative co-operation in the fight against great social scourges, against occupational diseases and infantile mortality, etc.).

7. Intellectual co-operation. — Co-operation between universities and academies; literary and artistic relations; concentration of scientific research; improvement of the regime of the Press as regards relations between agencies and transport of newspapers, etc.

8. Inter-Parliamentary relations. — Utilisation of the organisation and activities of the "Inter-Parliamentary Union" for increasing contacts and exchanges of views between parliamentary circles in the various countries of Europe (in order to prepare the ground politically for the realisation of the objects of the European Union, which would require parliamentary approval, and, in general, to improve the international atmosphere in Europe by mutual comprehension of the interests and feelings of the nations).


B. Definition of the method of European co-operation in the questions which would occupy the attention of the European Conference or the European Committee.
It might be advisable, according to circumstances:

Either to create organisations for co-ordination and study, where they do not already exist (for instance, for European equipment or for the various European River Commissions).

Or to second the efforts of the League of Nations in those questions which have already been the subject of careful study on its part notably, in preparing, by exchanges of views and friendly negotiations, the entry into force, in relations between the States of Europe, of conventions drawn up, or recommendations formulated by, the League;

Or, lastly, to convene European or general conferences of the League of Nations regarding questions capable of settlement by that body, but which have not yet been dealt with by it. (Non-European States should be invited to be represented by observers at every European conference, and any convention drawn up by a conference summoned at the request of the European States, in so far as it might not be strictly continental in its object, would remain open for the accession thereto of non-European States.)

C. Definition of every method of collaboration between the European Union and countries outside that Union.

The French Government, in soliciting an opinion on the four points indicated above from the twenty-six European Governments by whom they have been entrusted with this enquiry, wish to make the following general observation. They have considered it necessary, for purely practical reasons, to adopt as elementary an interpretation as possible of their mission of enquiry; not that they wish, in their hearts, to limit the possibilities of the future development of a federal organisation of Europe, but because in the present state of the European world and in order to increase the prospects of unanimous acceptance of an initial concrete proposal capable of reconciling all the interests and special conditions involved, it is of essential importance for them to limit themselves to outlining certain very simple ideas. Similarly, it is the best course to proceed from the most simple to the most complex, leaving it to time and life to ensure, by a steady evolution and a kind of continuous creation, the full development of the natural resources which the European Union could be made to contain.

Such was the conception which guided the representative of France when, at the first European reunion convened at Geneva, he confined himself to suggesting the immediate examination of a simple federal bond to be established between European Governments, Members of the League of Nations, to ensure their practical co-operation.

There is, in fact, no question of building up an ideal edifice corresponding in the abstract to all the logical needs of a vast framework of European federal machinery. On the contrary, while avoiding all abstract anticipation, it is a question of pursuing, in a practical way, the effective application of a first method of contact and of constant solidarity between European Governments for the common settlement of all problems affecting the organisation of European peace and the rational organisation of Europe’s vital forces.

The Government of the Republic are very anxious to receive before July 15th the replies of the Governments consulted, with any observations or spontaneous suggestions which they might care to add to their communications. The Government of the Republic express the firm hope that these replies, inspired with an earnest determination to satisfy the expectations of the nations and the aspirations of the European conscience, will furnish the elements of understanding and conciliation which, by means of an embryonic federal organisation, will facilitate the establishment of the permanent framework of this European co-operation, the programme of which might be decided on at the next reunion at Geneva.

The hour has never been more propitious nor the need more urgent for the commencement of constructive effort in Europe. The settlement of the principal problems, both material and moral, resulting from the late war, will soon have freed the new Europe from that which was weighing most heavily both upon her economic life and on her moral consciousness. Europe may now be said to be ready to make a positive effort corresponding to a new order of things. It is the decisive hour when Europe, by taking heed, may fashion her own destiny.

To unite in order to live and prosper; that is the imperious necessity which henceforth confronts the nations of Europe. The nations seem already to have made manifest their sentiments on this subject. It is the duty of the Governments to assume to-day their responsibilities, under penalty of abandoning to the perils of private initiative and unco-ordinated enterprise the grouping of material and moral forces, the collective control of which it behoves them to retain, as much for the benefit of the European commonwealth as for that of humanity itself.
III.

REPLIES TO THE MEMORANDUM ON THE ORGANISATION OF A SYSTEM OF EUROPEAN FEDERAL UNION
REPLY FROM THE SPANISH GOVERNMENT

(June 25th, 1930.)

[Translation.]

On September 9th, 1929, at Geneva, M. Briand representative of France, drew the attention of the delegates of all the European countries Members of the League of Nations to the advantages of an agreement having as its object the creation of some kind of federal bond establishing between them a system of constant solidarity, and allowing them whenever necessary to get into touch immediately to study, discuss and settle problems likely to be of common interest.

The delegates at once undertook to recommend to their respective Governments the consideration of the question.

The task of indicating the main points to which they should give their attention was unanimously entrusted to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the French Republic. On behalf of his Government, the latter submitted for the consideration of the other Governments a Memorandum on the Organisation of a System of European Federal Union, which was presented by the French Ambassador at Madrid on May 17th last.

After examining this Memorandum, His Majesty's Government, in order to enable the necessary action to be taken within the time stipulated, desires to communicate its observations to the Government of the French Republic, which has been asked to collect the replies of all the Governments concerned and to summarise the conclusions of this enquiry in a new report for submission to a European conference to be held at Geneva on the occasion of the next Assembly of the League of Nations.

**

His Majesty's Government has carefully considered the question and has the honour to state, in the first place, that it has no desire to withdraw its support of the proposal expounded by M. Briand at the meeting at Geneva in September of last year, but will continue to give increasing attention to the examination of this proposal. Although it realises the serious nature of the obstacles to be overcome, it still regards the scheme as full of promise for the future.

The political and economic crisis from which Europe is suffering necessitates a remedy commensurate with its gravity. In view of the present situation, it is impossible for Spain to stand aloof or to shirk her responsibilities by refusing to examine any possible remedy submitted for her consideration.

**

His Majesty's Government is willing, in principle, to take part with all Governments in the European conference which it has been proposed to hold at Geneva on the occasion of the next Assembly of the League of Nations. In announcing its decision, it desires, however, to indicate its views both with regard to certain reservations made by M. Briand himself and to all the points enumerated in the Memorandum. In order to avoid any misunderstanding, it desires to give the following summary of those views:

1. In present circumstances, Spain considers it essential that any system of European co-operation should be in harmony with the League of Nations and be kept within its framework.

2. The special relations of Spain with the Spanish-American countries constrain her not only to lay particular stress on the observations set forth in the previous paragraph in so far as they apply to her position and the position of South American countries within the League, but also explicitly to reserve her opinion on any proposal which in her judgment might in any way affect the ties between Spain and Spanish-American countries established by their common origin and culture and happily maintained by the Governments concerned.

3. As M. Briand points out, special care should be taken to avoid the adoption of measures which, although they are not directed against anyone, might affect the friendship of, or impede co-operation with, other countries or groups of countries.

4. There must be no interference with the principle of the absolute sovereignty and complete political independence of States.

5. In any discussion relating to a European Union, Spain must take into account her interests as regards the Spanish possessions and protectorates in Africa, and also the special situation in the Union of other countries which have colonies in other continents.

6. Subject to these reservations, His Majesty's Government would agree, as an initial and symbolic pact, to get into touch with other Governments at periodical or extraordinary meetings for the joint examination of all questions likely to be of primary concern to the European nations as a whole.
7. The question whether it is necessary to create a permanent, representative and responsible body consisting of delegates of all the European countries Members of the League should be reserved for the next meeting at which, as proposed in the Memorandum, the powers to be conferred on that body and the organisation of its chairmanship and sessions should be settled, subject to the necessary governmental or parliamentary approval or ratification.

8. In view of the obvious importance of the observations contained in the Memorandum with regard to the "need for an executive body in the form of a permanent political committee", not only the composition and powers of the members of that committee, etc., should be referred to the next meeting, as proposed by M. Briand, but the principle of limitation underlying the proposal should, in particular, be left to it. Due account should be taken of the experience gained from the working of the League, more especially in the relations between the Council and the Assembly.

9. His Majesty's Government does not think that there is any objection to the initial work being carried out by the League; according to the Memorandum, this work might be undertaken by the above-mentioned committee, both as regards the general examination of every method of giving effect to, and applying, the proposed scheme, and the preparation of a general inventory of the programme of European co-operation.

10. It seems clear that the examination of questions relating to the proposed Secretariat, its seat, organisation, etc., will not be possible until the questions raised by the proposals relating to the "representative body" and the "executive body" are settled.

11. His Majesty's Government, in accordance with the statement in the Memorandum to the effect that the "need for laying down in advance the essential principles which shall determine the general conceptions of the European Committee and guide it in the enquiries which it makes for the purpose of preparing the programme of the European organisation" should be reserved for consideration at the next meeting, does not consider it necessary to go more fully into this matter, the importance of which is shown by the list of subjects that it covers:

(a) The general subordination of the economic problem to the political problem; (b) the principle that European political co-operation should be directed towards this essential object; (c) the principle that the economic organisation of Europe should also be directed towards this object.

12. Neither has His Majesty's Government any objection to the study of all questions of practical application being reserved either for the next European Conference, or for a future European Committee, the advisability of this course having been recognised by M. Briand. These questions are as follows:

(a) The definition of the field of European co-operation, particularly in the following spheres: (1) general economies; (2) economic equipment; (3) communications and transit; (4) finance; (5) labour; (6) health; (7) intellectual co-operation; (8) inter-parliamentary relations;
(b) Definition of the method of European co-operation;
(c) Definition of every method of co-operation.

The Spanish Government feels bound to point out at this stage that all these questions appear to be entirely suitable for examination by the League without any necessity for setting up new bodies of a similar kind.

* * *

This is the reply of the Spanish Government to the French Government's Memorandum, and the Spanish Government agrees with the French Government that the enquiry should be limited for the moment to the points covered by that Memorandum. It fully realises the necessity of proceeding from the simple to the complex and likewise shares the French Government's hope that in the course of time, by a process of constant evolution and continuous growth, the idea of a "European Union" may duly bear fruit.

The French Government may rest assured that the Spanish Government will do its utmost, if the occasion arises, to contribute to the fulfilment of the great idea on which M. Briand's Memorandum is based.
REPLY FROM THE NETHERLANDS GOVERNMENT

(June 30th, 1930)

[Translation.]

1. Her Majesty's Government has carefully studied the Memorandum submitted by the French Government on the organisation of a system of European Federal Union. This study leads it to make the following reflections:

It considers that the innumerable horrors and privations involved by war on large scale cannot be too constantly borne in mind, and that a lively apprehension should be entertained of the disastrous consequences of a fresh international conflagration. Any serious endeavour to minimise such a possibility and to develop co-operation between nations is therefore assured of a warm welcome from Her Majesty's Government. Hence the Netherlands representative fully associated himself, at the Geneva meeting of September 9th, 1929, with the views of the representatives of the other Powers who declared themselves desirous of studying the proposals to be put forward in the Memorandum which the French Representative had foreshadowed, and which was to contain details regarding the institution of a permanent system of contractual union aiming at the rational organisation of Europe. It was in the same spirit and with the most profound interest that the Netherlands Government has studied the ideas put forward in the French Government's Memorandum of May 1st last.

2. Her Majesty's Government considers that the Memorandum is right in referring to the "collective responsibility in face of the danger which threatens the peace of Europe from the political as well as from the economic and social points of view as a result of the essential lack of unity in the organisation of Europe". It holds that the co-ordination of the economic and moral forces of Europe is of the very first importance to all the Powers of this continent. Clearly, however, this work of co-ordination cannot be successful unless States are ready to limit the exercise of their sovereign rights to some extent—as, indeed, they have already done by signing the Covenant of the League of Nations. A conception of sovereignty leaving no place for the voluntary acceptance of certain limitations of the powers of States should, in Her Majesty's Government's opinion, be ruled out as incompatible with the essential nature of international relations.

3. The Netherlands Government has been glad to note the French Government's opinion that, in seeking a formula of European co-operation, nothing must be done that might weaken the authority of the League of Nations. It agrees with the French Government that the tendency to organise the commonwealth of nations on a world basis, which has made itself felt since the war, is not necessarily incompatible with more limited understandings. But this does not prevent it from thinking that every attempt to constitute a European combination must find its justification in its contribution to the organisation of a worldwide commonwealth of nations. The Covenant of the League of Nations only admits of regional agreements in so far as they harmonise with the idea of this more comprehensive association. Nor must it be forgotten that, even if based on this principle, a continental group system might in practice aggravate differences between continents or create new ones. If new antagonisms and fresh causes of tension were to be the consequence, a co-ordination of European interests would be of little value, and it would be better to keep to the Covenant's system of harmonising antagonistic interests on a worldwide basis. Realising how all the nations of the world are interdependent, the Netherlands Government—which must always bear in mind that the Kingdom does not consist of its European territory alone—considers that this is one of the most difficult aspects of the problem, and one that must be studied with the closest attention.

4. In this connection, the Netherlands Government has noted with great satisfaction the French Government's statement that its proposal implies "a conception absolutely contrary to that which formerly led to the creation in Europe of Customs unions tending to abolish internal Customs barriers in order to erect on the boundary of the whole community a stiffer barrier—that is to say, in order to create in practice a weapon against the States situated outside these unions". The Netherlands Government entirely shares this view, and it would be unable to participate in the creation of an international instrument of discrimination.

5. It is obvious that no scheme for a federal union of States can succeed unless it is founded on a solid basis of common interests. There can be no doubt, indeed, that the countries of Europe have several interests in common, among which the maintenance of peace, the reduction of armaments and a better organisation of trade are perhaps the most important. But here, again, arises the question whether these interests, great as is their importance to Europe herself,
are not equally important to a wider sphere, or whether some of them have a specifically European character and might serve as a substratum for the proposed union. The French Government's Memorandum indicates some of these factors, but without analysing them. Her Majesty's Government considers it essential that this side of the problem should be carefully studied before the organs which are to constitute the backbone of the proposed union are established, since it does not look upon a certain measure of geographical unity as an adequate basis in itself.

6. If a careful study of the elements of the problem under consideration led to the conviction that a federative organisation of Europe as a partial unit in the universal sphere of the League of Nations was possible and desirable, it would be essential, in our view, that the European association should be a general one. If it had only a partial character, it would contain a certain element of arbitrariness which could not be conducive to the success of the scheme. In fact, it would probably be doomed to failure if all the European Powers, which entertain close political and economic relations with one another, did not participate without exception.

7. As regards the main principles that must preside over the European organisation, the French Government postulates the general subordination of the economic problem to the political problem. All possibility of progress in the direction of economic union being, in its view, strictly conditioned by the question of security, it is on the political plane that the constructive effort to give Europe an organic structure should first of all be exerted. Such a conception might, in the French Government's view, involve the general development of the system of arbitration and security for Europe as a whole, and the gradual extension to the entire European community of the policy of international guarantees inaugurated at Locarno, until the separate agreements or series of separate agreements could be incorporated in a more general system. As regards this point, the Netherlands Government feels obliged to make every reservation. It does not believe that a general reduction of Customs duties must necessarily be preceded by, and subordinated to, the conclusion of an agreement in the purely political sphere.

Cannot attempts to lower Customs barriers be continued side by side with efforts to establish a political entente? Such a reduction would be likely to eliminate one of the most serious threats to international harmony, and would therefore constitute in itself one of the chief factors in bringing about a regime of security. The Netherlands Government quite admits that political security has to be guaranteed in other ways as well as by economic disarmament; at Geneva it has given evidence of its sincere desire to find a solution for this problem by common agreement.

The Netherlands Government feels bound to add that it is by no means convinced that the solution of the question of security will be much advanced by confining it to European States alone. It has not the impression that the difficulties which have hitherto hampered the success of the League's efforts in this direction have been caused or aggravated by the presence of non-European States.

8. Her Majesty's Government wishes for the moment to confine itself to these few observations. It thinks that the ground is not yet sufficiently prepared; exchanges of views will be useful, and, in fact, seem essential, to decide how further progress is to be made. It wishes to express once more its keen appreciation of the step taken by the French Government. This step is a fresh manifestation of the spirit of international co-operation, which is always assured of the most cordial welcome from Her Majesty's Government. Hence the difficulties which, in the present state of the world, must inevitably attend the realisation of this initiative will only serve to stimulate the Netherlands Government to pursue still farther the study of the complex problems raised by this grave question.
No. 3.

REPLY FROM THE FINNISH GOVERNMENT

(July 4th, 1930.)

[Translation.]

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

The Finnish Government, having read with great interest the Memorandum submitted by the French Government, warmly welcomes its general idea. For a long time past a spirit of European co-operation has existed in many directions; and, side by side with the development of international communications in recent times, this European fellow-feeling has assumed more and more varied forms. For the sake of the future evolution of our continent, it is undoubtedly important that this fellow-feeling should be further developed. The French Government’s Memorandum is to be welcomed as a sign that opinion in Europe is growing ripe for the organisation of closer co-operation between the nations of Europe.

The first step in this direction is to awaken a clear realisation of the European community of interests. The Finnish Government notes with the greatest satisfaction that the central idea of the French Government’s Memorandum consists in emphasising the principle of European moral union.

The most important basis of modern international policy is the League of Nations, and, although the latter’s work may have given rise to criticism on certain points, no effort must be spared to strengthen the authority of that institution. It is essential that, from the outset, the future European organisation should stand in clear relationship to the League of Nations. Hence, European co-operation must, as the French Government’s Memorandum emphasises, be organised in such a way as not to weaken the League’s authority, restrict its field of action, or place difficulties in its way; on the contrary, co-operation should supplement and strengthen the League’s work. If the countries of Europe federated themselves in such a way as to be able to deal with certain problems specially concerning our continent with a competence based on affinities of race and civilisation, the result might be a rational extension of the League’s work in the direction of a more specialised organisation. To bring about this organisation, the Finnish Government considers it necessary that the future European union should be organised within the framework of the League of Nations and should operate in the closest co-operation with its organs.

The Finnish Government thinks it natural to seek the co-operation of the greatest possible number of countries belonging geographically to Europe. In the Finnish Government’s opinion, one of the preliminary conditions of the proposed European Union is that, at any rate, the European countries permanently represented on the Council of the League of Nations should all participate. Furthermore, for the sake of European union, it would be important to give the European States who might not wish to belong to the Union an opportunity of taking part in the work of European co-operation in so far as their interests or wishes permit, in the same way as States not belonging to the League of Nations have, from time to time, shared in various special work of the League.

Obviously, the European Union should not be directed against any other continent or any other State or group of States outside the Union; and obviously, too, it should be based on respect for the sovereignty and mutual equality of the States’ members, as in the case of the juridical system of the League of Nations. In the different countries of Europe, owing to the national character and historical evolution of each country, conditions vary widely. It will be important to respect the individuality of each nation, whether large or small, European co-operation being based on the interests common to all.

OBSERVATIONS CONCERNING THE DIFFERENT POINTS OF THE MEMORANDUM.

After these general remarks, the Finnish Government has the honour to submit a few observations concerning the various specific points outlined in the French Government’s Memorandum.

I.

The Finnish Government is favourably disposed, in principle, towards the idea of officially recognising, as soon as conditions are propitious, the principle of European moral unity in the form of a general European pact. Clearly, at the outset this pact should take a very simple form.
II.

In its Memorandum, the French Government has put forward very interesting proposals regarding the European Union. This applies particularly to the suggestion that European co-operation should take the form of an annual conference of the representatives of the States members. The creation of a sort of permanent secretariat to prepare the work of the conference, to take administrative steps for the execution of the conference’s decisions, and to act as a central bureau for the countries of Europe, might well prove to be of value in the future. On the other hand, the Finnish Government is not convinced that, at the present time, it would be advisable to establish a permanent political committee, specially appointed to act as the executive organ of European co-operation. Instead of such a special committee, it might be possible to consider a system under which the Foreign Minister of the country whose representative had been elected President of the conference would act until the next conference as President of the European organisation, and he and the diplomatic representatives in his country of the States members would form a sort of council of the organisation in between the conferences. This system would not, of course, preclude the Foreign Ministers in case of need from taking the place of the diplomatic representatives of their countries in the event of a particularly interesting question coming before this council.

III.

As soon as the principle of European moral union has been asserted by means of a pact concluded between the countries of Europe, it will be possible to develop union and political co-operation between peoples on this basis, which will undoubtedly contribute towards consolidating peace in our continent. Furthermore, as European solidarity increases, progress may also be anticipated in the sphere of international economic co-operation, a sphere in which the absence of this element has provoked a considerable degree of stagnation and even a setback, despite the hopes aroused by the International Economic Conference of 1927.

Considering, however, that the preparation of a programme of European organisation requires a thorough study to be undertaken jointly with a view to fixing its foundations and extent, the Finnish Government is of opinion that it is not necessarily for the moment to embark upon a detailed examination of the main principles which must guide the work of the proposed organs of the European Union. It therefore confines itself to drawing attention to the interdependence which always exists between political and economic problems, and to emphasising the importance of political co-operation; although, in its opinion, it is not yet possible or even necessary to define the method of organising this co-operation and the direction which it should take.

Nevertheless, the Finnish Government wishes to draw immediate attention to the question whether the future European Union should not undertake an examination of the organs of conciliation and arbitration created by bilateral treaties between European States with a view to developing and standardising them.

IV.

As regards the determination of the field and methods of European co-operation, the French Government in its Memorandum considers the advisability of leaving this to the future organs of the European Union—namely, the conference or the permanent committee.

In several of the branches mentioned in the Memorandum, a certain co-operation already exists between European countries; but it is desirable that this work should be better centralised, organised and developed. Hence, the Finnish Government regards with interest the questions enumerated by the French Government and confines itself, as the question now stands, to expressing the opinion that the list of questions to be studied might usefully be supplemented—for example, by adding the problem of the passport regime.

CONCLUSION.

While warmly welcoming the idea of closer co-operation between the countries of Europe—this co-operation being based on the principle of moral union between them—the Finnish Government is of opinion that it would perhaps be premature to endeavour for the moment to put forward concrete proposals without studying them in common. While readily endorsing the idea of an exchange of views on European co-operation at this autumn’s Assembly of the League of Nations, the Finnish Government expresses the opinion that the best way of promoting the great ideal on which the French idea is based would be to appoint on that occasion a committee of enquiry consisting of representatives of all the countries of Europe or of some of them, in order to study in detail the French Government’s Memorandum and the opinions expressed in this connection by the different Governments.

This committee might closely examine the political, economic, social and other conditions of European co-operation, draw up any plans it might deem necessary, and consider the creation, at the most opportune moment, of the political and administrative organs of European organisation. The report and conclusions of the committee might in due course be submitted to the various Governments so as to give them an opportunity of expressing an opinion on its concrete proposals. In this way, the Finnish Government thinks a first step might be taken towards the achievement of the French Memorandum’s aim—the consolidation of peace and solidarity between European peoples.
No. 4.

REPLY FROM THE ITALIAN GOVERNMENT

(July 4th, 1930)

[Translation.]

The Fascist Government have examined with the greatest care the "Memorandum on the Organisation of a Regime for a European Federal Union" which the Government of the French Republic have transmitted to them, and which is the first step in that procedure of consultation agreed to by the representatives of the twenty-seven European States, Members of the League of Nations, at the meeting held in Geneva on September 9th of last year. The Fascist Government are ready to co-operate willingly in this procedure, as they have done in the case of all the initiatives aiming at the work of peace and at the material and moral reconstruction of Europe. Meantime, they thank the Government of the Republic for the opportunity afforded them to express their opinion even now on a definite proposal and to contribute some remarks to that preliminary work of elucidation of the principles of European co-operation which, as the Government of the Republic have themselves recognised, must precede any collective discussion.

I.

The Fascist Government are, in the first place, of the opinion, and in this they find themselves in agreement with the Government of the Republic, that any system of a European Union should be understood as a system of co-operation between the States of Europe "based on the idea of unity and not on the idea of unit", and in which the absolute sovereignty and political independence of all the member States are fully respected. Indeed, they are of the opinion that the formula used in the Memorandum of the Government of the Republic—"the institution of a federal tie should not interfere in the least with the sovereign rights of the member States of a de facto association"—should be applied integrally, and should be directed more especially toward ensuring protection to the rights of the smaller countries, effecting the last distinction between victorious peoples and defeated peoples, and promoting the establishment of conditions of absolute equality between all the States.

The Fascist Government are no less convinced of the necessity that any proposal for a European Federal Union be harmonised with the structure and with the work of the League of Nations; indeed, as stated farther on, they consider this problem of such essential importance that it requires to be settled before all others. Nevertheless, the Fascist Government do not share the opinion of the Government of the Republic that, to ensure co-ordination or the subordination of the European Federal Union to the League of Nations, it would be necessary at least to limit at first the right to membership in the Union to those States only which are Members of the League of Nations.

This reservation, which is certainly inadequate to solve the complex and delicate problem of the relations between the European Federal Union and the League of Nations, seems to the Fascist Government to run counter to the very principles underlying the European Federal Union, and it is certainly in conflict with its aims as defined and set forth in the Memorandum of the Government of the Republic. That Memorandum states that the European Federal Union should have as its object the development of the possibilities of cohesion "in the grouping of the material and moral forces of Europe" and a "closer co-ordination of the European economic systems"; that it should aim at remedying the dispersion of energy resulting from economic subdivisions accentuated by the new political frontiers and new Customs' barriers set up by the Treaties of Peace; and, finally, that it should aim at securing a joint solution of technical problems and "the rational organisation of Europe" based on a "de facto solidarity in which the Nations of Europe are called by their geographical position to participate." Now, it seems to the Fascist Government that, with these ends in view, the participation of all the countries between whom this de facto solidarity exists is necessary or, at least, desirable, precisely because of this de facto solidarity. The Fascist Government would therefore call the attention of the Government of the Republic to the advisability of suggesting to the other Governments concerned that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the Republic of Turkey be invited to take part in the work of elaborating the proposal for a European Federal Union, and, therefore, in the meeting to be held at Geneva on the occasion of the next Assembly of the League of Nations.

The Fascist Government are also led to make this suggestion by the consideration of the fact that the European States, which certainly desire the co-operation in the League of Nations
of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and of the Turkish Republic, should do all in their power not to prejudice the adherence of these two countries to the proposed Union by bringing them up against the fait accompli of a procedure set on foot without their participation.

The Fascist Government consider that the European Federal Union can only be conceived of as a union of all the States of Europe, or at least of all those States whose economic and political importance makes them decisive factors in the life of Europe. For, if this were not the case, the European Union would become a system of one or more large States co-ordinated with a group of minor States, and would represent, not a régime of European co-ordination, but a régime of European secession, the subdivision of Europe in groups and in contrasting systems. European solidarity should mean the solidarity of all Europe; a principle which, if it cannot now be driven to its ultimate logical consequences, should nevertheless be respected and carried into effect to the fullest extent allowed of by conditions as they are.

II.

But what might be described as the constitutional problem involved in the European Federal Union seems to the Fascist Government still more vast and complex. It is not only a question of defining a system of European solidarity and cohesion, but of defining a system which can fit perfectly into the framework of world solidarity and cohesion.

The ties which bind together all the countries of the several continents are, indeed, of no less importance than those which bind together all the countries of Europe. It is true that Europe represents a geographical unit which may be taken as the basis for the solution of specific technical problems affecting the reciprocal relations of the European countries, but she does not represent a unit of civilisation which can be isolated for the solution of problems concerning the political and economic organisation of the world. Modern civilisation cannot be taken to pieces. The material and moral progress it has achieved have determined, on effective and complex bases, a de facto intercontinental solidarity between the Nations. And it is precisely on this de facto solidarity, universal in character, that the League of Nations is founded.

The work of the League of Nations has only made a beginning. However remarkable may be the results it has secured in these ten years of existence, the League of Nations still has before it a vast, complex and difficult task to perform. To achieve its work it must be protected against all dangers that might weaken its efficiency and diminish its authority and prestige.

Now, the proposal set forth in the Memorandum of the Government of the Republic is intended, according to the very words of that Memorandum, to "establish a permanent régime of agreed solidarity and the rational organisation of Europe" and a "bond of solidarity which will enable the European nations to acquire at last consciousness of European geographical unity". In short, it outlines a continental grouping which, if carried into effect, might in time tend, not only to undermine the principle of the universality and interdependence of the political and economic phenomena and relations existing between all the peoples of the world, but also to determine the formation of other continental groupings, thus endangering the organic unity of the League of Nations.

In any case, the Fascist Government do not think it possible that the European Federal Union should be organised on the same material lines as the League of Nations. It seems to the Fascist Government that, if the European Federal Union were to reproduce on a reduced scale the organisation of the League of Nations, the problem of its relations with the League would be complicated rather than solved. It appears, however, that the Memorandum of the Government of the Republic is drawn up on the fundamental concept that the Federal Union should be a European version of the League of Nations.

In the opinion of the Government of the Republic, the European Federal Union should have a constitution similar to that of the League of Nations, with an annual assembly on which all member States would be represented, a council on which only some of the members of the Assembly would sit, and a secretariat. This organisation, which many legitimate motives made it advisable for the League of Nations to adopt, does not seem to the Fascist Government suited to such an organisation as the European Federal Union.

As the States which should enter the European Federal Union would be called upon to form a régime of permanent reciprocal solidarity, it is only fair that all, without exception, be guaranteed full and permanent participation in the constitutional working of the Union. The creation of a council on which the representatives of some only of the States would sit, even if in rotation, while absolute and full representation would be limited to the annual assemblies only, would not, in the opinion of the Fascist Government, afford such a guarantee, and it would place the smaller States in a position of inferiority. It is, indeed, evident that it would not be possible to avoid in practice that, as in the case of the constitution of the League of Nations, the major European States would, either by right or in practice, each have a permanent seat on the council, while the other seats would be competed for among the smaller countries. This would lead to the classification of the States in an order of precedence, a classification which the Fascist Government deem it advisable to avoid, as it would imply undermining that principle of the absolute respect of sovereignty rights which the Memorandum of the Government of the Republic declares it places at the very basis of the proposal for a European Federal Union.

The Fascist Government are therefore of the opinion that all States without distinction which enter as members of the European Federal Union should have permanent representation on the council, which should be the only deliberative and executive organ of the European Federal Union.
III.

As a basis for the essential policies of the Union, the Government of the Republic have laid down some principles affecting the very conception of the Union, and on which the Fascist Government consider it indispensable that a clear preliminary understanding be reached.

The Government of the Republic seem desirous of subordinating all action in favour of European co-ordination to a clearly defined union secured in the political field, a subordination which, in the opinion of the Government of the Republic, is “strictly determined” by the exigencies of the problem of security. In other words, the Memorandum of the Government of the Republic seems desirous of establishing a rigid logical sequence between security, a European Federal Union, and a regime of economic solidarity, each of these factors following strictly, and in the above order, on the other.

Now the Fascist Government do not feel that they can give the same interpretation of the premises and of the aims of the European Federal Union as that set forth in the Memorandum of the Government of the Republic. It is evident that the problem of economic solidarity starts from essentially political premises; but it is no less true that, if the European Federal Union is to be fitted into the framework of the system of the League of Nations, its political premises cannot be other than those on which the Covenant of the League of Nations rests, and which are not exclusively premises of security.

The Covenant is an organic whole in which all or at least the most important factors and methods required for the maintenance of peace are considered. The Covenant clearly states that these methods are the limitation of armaments, the guarantee against aggression, the pacific settlement of international disputes, and it co-ordinates these methods in an organic system for peace based on disarmament, arbitration and security. On the harmonious growth of this system depends the organisation of peace, the working of the League of Nations, and, therefore, also the fundamental conditions for any proposal for a European Union.

Now the Fascist Government consider that this development, at the stage of international organisation at which Europe has now arrived, should not consist in building up a rigid system of security, but in carrying out the definite pledges of disarmament given in the Covenant of the League of Nations by the States signatories thereto, pledges which, so long as they remain unfulfilled, threaten that very system of security so laboriously constructed.

The system of security, or at least a system of security, already exists; it is afforded by the Covenant of the League of Nations, by the Pact for the Renunciation of War, and by the Treaties of Locarno. This triple guarantee can, if completed by the actual reduction of armaments, afford a legal, political and moral barrier against war, but it does not represent any effective guarantee if it is itself open for rivalry in armaments and competitions of strength.

The idea of security, taken in an absolute sense, leads to the idea of the need of armaments, and armaments have always, and at all times, led to anxiety, suspicion, a state of insecurity of all and each, a mentality of danger and difference, a spirit of war.

If the ultimate aim of the efforts which it is desired be made towards a European Federal Union really be to secure closer co-operation between the Nations of Europe, the first thing which must be settled is the problem of the general reduction of armaments. Disarmament, this essential principle which is neither expressly nor incidentally formulated in the Memorandum of the Government of the Republic, affords, in the opinion of the Fascist Government, the real starting-point for effective efforts in favour of moral cohesion between the Nations, for the full settlement of the general problem of security, and for giving practical effect and a basic raison d’être to any proposal for a European Federal Union.
[Translation.]

The Federal Government has received the Memorandum, dated May 1st last, on the organisation of a system of European Federal Union and has carefully studied it. In submitting its reply, it wishes first of all to congratulate the French Foreign Minister on the judicious manner in which he has dealt with the problem of European association and has determined the guiding principles likely in his opinion to bring this problem nearer to solution.

The unsatisfactory position of present-day Europe, both from the political and economic points of view, is nowhere more painfully and clearly felt than in Central Europe, and nowhere has a more diligent search been made for methods and expedients likely to remedy this situation. If, nevertheless, no important successes have hitherto been achieved, the reason, in the Federal Government's opinion, is that all the efforts hitherto made have been isolated, and, in the absence of a wider and more general cohesion and political conception, were aimed only at remediating certain symptoms and made no attempt to find either a universal or regional solution for the fundamental political and economic problem.

If the Memorandum of May 1st aims at establishing this cohesion by means of a general movement which would bring about an association of the peoples of Europe and would reveal to them the ties of moral union that necessarily bind them together—a movement which, by introducing a new element into the interplay of forces, would be of the greatest moral importance to the future intellectual and political development of peoples—the Federal Government is ready to give its full and entire assent, and Austria would assuredly not stand aside if the expediency of a pact giving expression for the first time to this movement was generally recognised.

If, in some quarters, the fear is expressed that the Union established by such a pact might constitute a weapon of offence and a threat directed against countries or groups of countries remaining outside the Union, the Federal Government is convinced that, from the first day of its existence, the Union will make a point of dispelling this apprehension in the most striking and conclusive manner. In order to avoid, from the very first, as far as possible, any ground for such fears, it will be important to seek the co-operation of the greatest possible number of States and provide an opportunity for the constant and friendly assistance of the States which may eventually remain outside the Union, but whose economic and political life is closely bound up with that of its members. Apart from all other considerations, such a policy will be essential for the Union's very existence; for the ties existing between the members of the Union and the States situated, in the nature of things, outside the Union are of too long standing and too intimate not to prevail, in the case of disputes, over the newer and slighter ties created by the Union.

The same applies to the relations of the Union with the League of Nations, which, according to the views expressed in the Memorandum and entirely shared by the Federal Government, must retain its position as the supreme organ, taking the final decision in all questions connected with the work of European pacification and co-ordination. The League of Nations, owing to its admirable organisation and high moral authority, has unique qualifications for performing the universal task which has been entrusted to it, so that even its partial elimination would have seriously detrimental results. The Federal Government is therefore glad to see, from numerous indications in the Memorandum of May 1st, that the French Government, like the Federal Government, is convinced that the Union must not only be connected with the League of Nations, both from the legal point of view in virtue of Article 25 of the Covenant and in practice by being situated at its headquarters, but that it will be embodied organically in the League of Nations, which will thus have at its disposal new machinery suitable for its purely European tasks, and will hence be equipped for pursuing its high ideals even more efficiently than in the past.

The Memorandum provides for the organisation of a European conference, of a permanent political committee, and of a secretariat staff which will have to avail itself as far as possible of the services of the Secretariat of the League of Nations. In the Federal Government's opinion, however, it might be necessary to create a small special secretarial staff for certain presidential business of the European Union. As regards the main work of the secretariat, however, they would fit in almost completely with the work already entrusted to the Secretariat of the League of Nations. This view of the Federal Government is confirmed by the enumeration of the duties which, according to the Memorandum, would be assigned to the sphere of European co-operation. With very few exceptions these tasks have already been the subject of careful studies on the part of the organs of the League of Nations, and particularly of its Secretariat. It is true that these studies, in accordance with the universal character of the League of Nations,
have hitherto only been carried out on an entirely general plane. However, the material produced and
that in course of preparation naturally also includes European problems in its universal scope.
There would be no serious difficulty in separating the purely European problems and the European
aspect of universal problems from this universal material for the needs of the European Union.

It may be asked whether the Secretariat of the League of Nations is qualified to assume such
tasks which only concern a regional group of States. It may be pointed out that the organs of the
League and of the Secretariat have frequently dealt with questions which in the nature of things could only concern a limited number of Members of the League. Among others, mention
might be made—quite apart from special tasks undertaken in the financial sphere, which, although
of a local character, were nevertheless of great universal political importance—of many social
and health enquiries carried out by the League of Nations and dealing with essentially local and
even purely extra-European interests. There would therefore be no objection to the Secretariat
of the League dealing in future, as regards subjects connected with European co-operation, with
the specifically European aspects of the questions already before it.

The results of this work of the Secretariat would then be submitted (if necessary through
technical committees) to the permanent committee. The Federal Government, being unable
at present to form a clear idea of the first question to be solved by European co-operation, does
not feel able to pronounce on the necessity and expediency of this body. If, none the less, after
the adoption of the general programme of European co-operation, the necessity arose of setting
up an executive organ apart from the European Conference, the permanent committee should,
in the Federal Government’s opinion, occupy in relation to the Council of the League of Nations
a position somewhat similar to that formerly held by the “Austrian Committee” at the time of
the discussions relative to the Austrian loan, or other similar committees in which the Powers concerned took part, whether they were Members of
the Council or not. Such a “European Committee”, irrespective of the coincidence of its sessions
with those of the Council of the League, should remain, as regards the rotation of its members

The elaboration and execution of the Union’s programme will be a matter for the European
conference, which, under the terms of the Memorandum, will have to be constituted at the
Eleventh Assembly of the League of Nations. The powers of this Conference, consisting of
responsible representatives of all the countries of Europe, might usefully be derived from a
resolution in this connection adopted by the Assembly of the League of Nations; this would
not only emphasise the idea that the supreme authority in all questions relative to the pacification
and organisation of the world belonged to the community of States represented at the Assembly
of the League of Nations, but would ensure that the attempt to arrive at closer European
co-operation should be regarded by the non-European Members of the League as desirable,
and that it should enjoy their active sympathy. To illustrate the procedure which the Federal
Government has in mind, reference may be made to the Preliminary Conference with a view
to Concerted Economic Action, held at Geneva from February 17th to March 24th, 1930, in
virtue of a resolution of the Tenth Assembly of the League of Nations, which provides an
example of the possibility of dealing, within the framework of the League and an essentially
European conference, with questions chiefly concerning Europe, and at the same time of taking
the necessary steps to reach an agreement with the non-European countries.

The Federal Government therefore believes, in the sense indicated above, that the machinery
contemplated in the Memorandum for a European Union could and should be embodied, in full
harmony with the League of Nations, in the machinery of Geneva.

As regards the methods proposed in the Memorandum, the Federal Government considers
—while recognising the favourable influence on the work of political co-ordination of successes
obtained in the sphere of international economic relations—that a decisive step towards the
rational development and organisation of the economic forces of Europe cannot be made until
all possibility of war between the European countries has been removed. The gratifying steps
taken to establish peace in Europe, particularly by means of the Covenant of the League of
Nations, the Locarno and Hague Agreements and the Pact Against War, undoubtedly constitute
a great step towards the lasting and final pacification of our continent; but there still exist
political problems of the first importance which—in accordance with the principle of the full
equality of rights between all the members of the community of European peoples—must be
solved in a new European spirit and possibly by fresh methods yet to be devised, before European
peace can be considered assured and guaranteed against all possible contingencies. The preparation
of these solutions from the intellectual, political and technical points of view, in close liaison
with the League of Nations, will be one of the principal tasks of the future Union, and this task
will have to be accomplished under the permanent political direction and control of the
European Governments.

But, in addition to these great political questions affecting the future of our continent,
there are questions which demand immediate solution and which, in some cases, are already
sufficiently far advanced for settlement. Most of these are economic questions, such as those
enumerated in Section IV, and their member might easily be increased. It is in this domain
that the need for a rational exploitation of the vital forces of this continent is the most directly
and clearly felt. Important preparatory work has already been done in this sphere, and it is
to be hoped that a great deal more will yet be done.

It is only if the Governments of the different countries, realising the urgent necessity of
achieving positive results, actively encourage and energetically pursue this economic work, that
this hope will not be disappointed. This work should therefore not be left in the hands of experts,
who are unavoidably liable to be influenced by the momentary exigencies of their national economic
environment, but should be concentrated in the hands of the foremost political representatives
of the different Governments, which alone can be expected, and indeed required, to perform their task in a spirit which, being capable of rising above the apparent necessities of the moment, will best serve the true national interest and that of the European commonwealth.

On these lines the Federal Government would willingly co-operate to the best of its ability, in a spirit of conciliation and European union, in the great work of European co-ordination in which the French Foreign Minister has invited the peoples and Governments of Europe to participate. The Federal Government feels that it should give sincere and loyal co-operation of this kind both because of the innumerable sacrifices which a recent and still painful past has imposed on the peoples of Europe, and for the sake of the coming generations, who are entitled to expect that a better and more serene future will be prepared for them by the men of to-day.
No. 6.

REPLY FROM THE ESTONIAN GOVERNMENT

(July 8th, 1930).

[Translation.]

The Estonian Government has examined, with all the care that the importance of the problem demands, the Memorandum on the Organisation of a System of European Federal Union which the French Government was good enough to forward to it on May 17th last.

The Estonian Government has always supported any action for the improvement of the political, economic and cultural relations between the various parts of Europe. It has welcomed every plan for investigating the means of strengthening the feeling of community and union between the European States, of creating in this way a firm basis for effective and practical co-operation between those States, and of thus ensuring a better future for Europe.

I.

With regard to the methods of work to be followed for achieving the aim in view, the Estonian Government considers that the French Memorandum contains suggestions of undeniable value. It agrees in principle to undertake “to get into touch regularly at meetings held regularly or on special occasions to examine in common all questions likely to be of interest primarily to the commonwealth of European peoples”. If these meetings are to obtain the desired results, if they are to ensure that the cultural potentialities of Europe, with its ancient traditions, will not only retain their original character but also be able to develop normally and usefully, and if the European nations are to be induced unanimously to carry out the tasks indicated in the Memorandum, the proposed organisation must be able to rely upon the co-operation of all the nations of Europe. It must be understood, as the Memorandum very rightly emphasises, that the growth among the European States of a greater appreciation of their common moral and material interests should not result in any opposition between the new organisation and other ethnographical combinations. The Estonian Government wishes particularly to emphasise that the new organisation should not in any way restrict the normal work of the League, which is a more universal organisation; further, it should not diminish the interest taken in the League’s work by the non-European States, the co-operation of which in questions concerning either all the Members of the League or the European States in particular has often been very important.

II.

With regard to the organs that should be created to enable the European Union to do valuable work the Estonian Government cannot at present express any final opinion. It seems to it that, at the beginning and in the present state of affairs, the wisest course would be merely to create a representative organ in the shape of a “European Conference”, such as that proposed in the Memorandum. Future experience and the progress of the work will indicate what organs might be useful and necessary.

III.

As to the programme set out in Section III of the Memorandum, the Estonian Government recognises the force of the argument that the economic problem should be regarded as dependent on the political one. It considers, nevertheless, that the economic sacrifices to be made on behalf of the Commonwealth could only be justified if the proposed system of international undertakings between the various European States, instead of relating merely to the political organisation of Europe, also regulated as satisfactorily as possible the economic relations between its different parts.

IV.

Lastly, the Estonian Government considers that an excellent opportunity for drawing up the programme of future work, and determining the order in which the questions set forth in Section IV of the Memorandum might be usefully discussed, would be afforded by the first European Conference. The Estonian Government will, of course, give definite instructions to the delegation representing it at that Conference. It hopes at the same time that the French Government’s generous attempt to associate all the European States actively in this movement will secure a favourable response from the various Governments, thus strengthening the unanimous determination of the States to do their utmost to carry out the important work indicated in the Memorandum.
No. 7.

REPLY FROM THE ROUMANIAN GOVERNMENT

(July 8th, 1930.)

Translation.

1. The Roumanian Government, having examined the Memorandum of the French Government on the Organisation of a System of European Federal Union, is glad to note that it agrees with the principles laid down in that Memorandum, and declares that it will co-operate to the full in realising the plan for a European Federal Union.

2. The urgent necessity for saving the peoples from the disastrous convulsions of wars, which are capable of destroying civilisation itself, makes it a duty for the civilised nations to work with all their might for the consolidation of peace.

Such consolidation, and the enduring prosperity of the peoples, can be definitely ensured only by active and permanent co-operation between the nations in both the political and economic fields.

Universal co-operation must, of course, be the ultimate object in view, and that, moreover, is the mission of the League of Nations.

Regional, political and economic co-operation—such as that proposed—would, however, if carried into practice, greatly further the aims of the League and might be used as a fulcrum for Universal and harmonious co-operation between the nations, putting an end forever to a past of isolation and hate.

Roumania considers it a duty to share in this great work.

3. It follows from what we have just said—and it is, moreover, expressly stated in the French Government’s Memorandum—that the proposed plan must be carried into practice within the framework of the League.

This is natural, for otherwise the European Federal Union would tend to take the place of or supplant the League.

The principle of the incorporation of the European Federal Union in the framework of the League is, however, essential from another point of view also.

It is only within that framework that the proposed organisation would rest on a definite basis, recognised by all the countries Members of the League—viz., on respect for treaties, and on the territorial integrity and the independence, sovereignty and equality of the States.

4. The serious economic crisis, which has become almost universal calls for urgent remedies and has, moreover, made economic problems one of the main preoccupations of most countries.

Without disputing the general dependence of the economic upon the political problem, it would hardly be right to deduce that economic co-operation could not be organised without preliminary political co-operation. A very elastic political understanding would, we think, be enough to enable close co-operation to be organised in the economic field.

5. With regard to the representative and executive organs proposed by the Memorandum, the Roumanian Government is of the opinion that, at the beginning, it would be enough, apart from the European Conference which will meet periodically, to create a provisional Secretariat, whose special duty it would be to collect all the necessary documents and examine the problems referred to by the Memorandum and other problems indicated by the various States.

The results of this work would be submitted to the European Conference of the following year.

6. The Roumanian Government, which is participating in the Conference which is to meet at Geneva in September, during the general Assembly of the League, will then examine the concrete suggestions of the Memorandum and also any proposals made by other Governments.

It is convinced that the French Government’s plan for a Federal Union will mark the beginning of a new era in international life. The gradual application of this plan, establishing an harmonious co-operation between the peoples will prepare for the civilised nations a future of fraternity and happiness.
No. 8.

REPLY FROM THE POLISH GOVERNMENT

(July 10th, 1930).

[Translation.]

The Polish Government has always attached the greatest importance to endeavours to strengthen the bonds of solidarity among the nations of Europe. Having examined the Memorandum of the French Government of May 17th, 1930, on the Organisation of a System of European Union it cannot but greet with lively satisfaction this welcome step, in which it desires most cordially to take part. M. Briand’s statements on the subject at the tenth Assembly of the League of Nations, followed by the unanimous decision of twenty-seven Governments to entrust the French representative with the task of indicating the main points of the proposed organisation, which are now set forth in the Memorandum of May 17th, have brought the problem of the European Union into the sphere of practical politics. Poland, which, at the tenth Assembly, unreservedly supported M. Briand’s proposals, now accepts the idea of a European union, and declares herself ready to participate in any preparatory work which the first European Conference may consider necessary.

The Polish Government, endorsing the main idea of the Memorandum, considers that the European Union should be based upon security, guaranteed to all the States alike, and also upon respect for the sovereign rights and political independence of the States. In order to create an atmosphere of mutual confidence, it would perhaps be advisable, when organising the European Union, constantly to bear in mind the principles on which the Geneva Protocol was based.

By thus adopting a common viewpoint with regard to the whole essence of European political life, the European States might more easily reach agreement upon other problems of common interest—in the economic field, for instance. This would also be in accordance with the idea of the Memorandum that the European Union should pave the way for the establishment of closer economic ties by dealing in the first place with the problem of political security.

The Polish Government agrees with the view that the European Union should also deal with the problems—examples of which are given in the French memorandum—that are of special interest to the European nations as neighbours on the same continent.

The Memorandum emphasizes that the European Union could in no case be directed against any nation or group of nations. This principle is, in the opinion of the Polish Government, unassailable. The Polish Government could not participate in an organisation, the aims of which were inconsistent with the conception of international co-operation. The idea of the Union of European States itself was formed so as to further, by establishing greater harmony among the nations of Europe, the cause of universal co-operation.

Nor, of course, can the Union be regarded as anything other than a regional understanding within the framework of the Covenant of the League, which is, and always will be, the supreme law for all the Members of the League. The aim of the Union should, in the opinion of the Polish Government, be to lay, by settling European problems, the foundation for a more effective execution of the obligations of the Covenant. The creation of the Union on this basis, far from weakening, might strengthen the organisation of the League.

The Polish Government is not yet in a position to make at once detailed suggestions in reply to all the questions in the French Memorandum. A general discussion at the Conference of European States, the date of which has been fixed for September next, will no doubt afford valuable guidance as to the lines on which the further preparatory work should be conducted. The Conference might then appoint a Committee of Enquiry to examine the problem and make suggestions to the Governments of the European States. In this way, the Conference could, at its subsequent meetings, take up the problem of the creation of the European Union with a full knowledge of the situation. The Polish Government would nevertheless agree to any other procedure approved by the States concerned when they meet in September next. Whatever procedure may be adopted, however, it is the steadfast hope of the Polish Government that the French Government’s generous action will, for the good of humanity at large, be most cordially welcomed by the European nations.
No. 9.

REPLY FROM THE GERMAN GOVERNMENT

(July 11th, 1930).

[Translation.]

I.

Owing to the community of European interests, the European States were led last autumn to meet for the purpose of a first discussion. The considerations which at that time decided the German Government to take part in this meeting still retain their force for Germany. The European countries, far from being in a state of steady equilibrium, are suffering from anxieties and differences of every kind. The general political and economic organisation of the Continent, as that organisation at present exists, hampers a development which would be in harmony with the natural conditions of life of the various peoples. The material and moral consequences of this state of affairs are becoming more and more evident. Accordingly, the European Governments are compelled to consider what possibilities exist to meet, by common action, the imminent dangers to which their countries are exposed.

The German Government therefore welcomed the step taken by the French Government in submitting, in its Memorandum, the details of the European problem for discussion and in giving its own opinion on this problem. It is only natural that the various countries should regard the work to be done from their own special points of view and therefore from different angles.

No country can feel the defects in the structure of Europe more strongly than Germany who, situated as she is in the centre of the continent, is specially affected by these weaknesses and their consequences. No country has a greater interest than Germany in the removal of these defects. The German Government is therefore very ready to co-operate in the solution of the problem and is willing to take part in an exhaustive discussion during the meeting of the League of Nations next autumn. It is of opinion that the final aim should be to consider, in a spirit of accommodation, a bold reform of conditions which are recognised as untenable, and thus to lead to a genuine European pacification which can be founded only on the principles of justice and equality.

II.

The international problems capable of a definitely European settlement should first of all be determined; this is a question which should be examined with great care. Any step directed against other countries or continents should be avoided; in certain fields there is a much stronger reciprocal action and reaction between European and extra-European countries than between some countries within Europe itself; it would be a mistake to try to restrict such relations between different continents. Nor should certain European countries be alienated from European co-operation. Moreover, account must be taken of the difficulties arising from political and Customs unions existing between certain European States and extra-European territories. A European programme should, as regards its actual contents and the geographical area to which it is to apply, therefore be as flexible as possible. To exclude European countries which are not Members of the League, such as Russia and Turkey, would be contrary to the practice rightly followed in the past.

III.

The French Government emphasises the necessity of dealing with the European problem from the political side and of taking up economic problems only after certain preliminary political conditions have been regulated. The German Government entirely shares the French Government’s view on this point, inasmuch as it is also convinced that the difficult situation in which Europe is placed is largely due to the present political arrangement of our continent. Accordingly, if the existing difficulties are to be completely removed, these political causes cannot be neglected. The German Government thinks that its views as to the settlement of these political problems are generally known. It has set out these views on many occasions and would only now refer to its attitude during the discussion of the problems of security, disarmament, national minorities and the development of certain articles in the Covenant of the League of Nations. The German Government, however, desires to point out once more on this occasion that the success of every effort to improve the political situation in Europe will depend on the application of the principles of the complete equality of rights, equal security for all, and the pacific adjustment of the natural and essential needs of the peoples. Where existing conditions are at variance with these principles, effective means will have to be found to secure their modification. It would be hopeless to try to build a new Europe on a foundation not strong enough to support a real organic evolution.
IV.

Apart from political considerations, there are no doubt possibilities in the purely economic sphere which must be investigated and utilised in the interests of European progress. Closer co-operation in this domain should not be made to depend on the establishment of greater security. On the contrary, any understanding in the economic sphere will largely contribute to strengthening the feeling of union, and thereby the sense of security as well.

The agricultural depression and the difficulties experienced by manufacturers in finding markets for their products must form the starting-point of the enquiry into the European economic crisis. Ways and means will have to be sought to secure larger markets and to promote the exchange of commodities between the essentially agricultural and the essentially industrial areas of Europe.

Disappointment at the results of the efforts so far made, and the checks experienced after the 1927 Economic Conference, should not be admitted as a reason for doing nothing, especially as the endeavours then made were a first experiment in a new field of international activity, and the economic situation of the past few years was not favourable for these endeavours. In the German Government’s opinion, it is therefore desirable to continue the efforts designed to alleviate the economic difficulties of Europe and, above all, to improve the European Customs policy. The German Government would here refer not only to the points mentioned in Chapter IV of the French Government’s Memorandum, but to the decisions of the World Economic Conference and the Protocol of March 24th, 1929, regarding future negotiations. The German Government is of opinion, moreover, that, when the European economic problem is dealt with, the following points of view should not be overlooked:

While it is essential that the Governments themselves should deal with the European problem, there can at the same time be no doubt that governmental measures alone cannot effectively remove the difficulties from which Europe is suffering. There will be important fields in which the representatives of trade and industry will themselves have to take this work in hand. An important place must still be reserved in the new organisation of European economic life for direct agreement between certain economic branches that are based on private industry. It will be for the Governments to bring their common economic policy into harmony with the free play of the forces in operation.

When economic questions are dealt with, special prominence should not be given to military considerations. Otherwise, important producing groups would remain outside the agreement, and serious obstacles would be placed in the way of a logical division of economic activities.

Consideration must be given to all the consequences which certain countries experience owing to their special situation, in particular their social structure and the financial charges laid upon them as the result of the war.

V.

As regards organisation, the French Government in its Memorandum rightly emphasises more than once the intimate relationship which should exist between the work of the League of Nations and European co-operation. The German Government concurs in the view that the efforts to secure European co-operation must not injure the League of Nations. No step should be contemplated which could lead to isolating Europe from other continents and which might result in the formation of other groups within the League. One of the essential features of the League of Nations from its foundation has been the participation of all the Members in the great problems of every continent. Any tendency to form continental groups might weaken this uniform and general interest and react prejudicially on the structure of the League. Account will therefore have to be taken of the effects of any closer form of European co-operation on the League of Nations, and the question of these effects must, if necessary, be submitted to the League for its decision. This is particularly necessary since, as regards its most fundamental and universal tasks, the League is still in its initial stage; it is therefore absolutely indispensable to strengthen it for dealing with these tasks and promoting their settlement. Even if these anxieties in regard to the League are generally admitted, we are yet extremely doubtful whether it would, in practice, be possible to take due account of these feelings of anxiety, when any attempt were made to create, at the outset, special organs for European co-operation. In no case should there be any change in the methods and organisation employed for questions with which the League has already dealt or is dealing.

VI.

The German Government desires to confine itself for the moment to these observations on matters of principle. It is of opinion that the immediate and essential tasks is to form a first general idea of the subjects which might and ought to be dealt with in a scheme of European co-operation. It hopes that valuable suggestions will be made at the meeting held at Geneva next September, which, in its opinion, should be open to European countries that are not Members of the League and to non-European States. The German Government intends to set out and develop its own observations at this meeting. All the documents submitted at that meeting will have to be examined and classified with a view to furnishing a basis of discussion. Once the various aspects of the general problem have been clearly defined, it will be possible to proceed to the examination of the policy to be pursued subsequently.
REPLY FROM THE DANISH GOVERNMENT

(July 11th, 1930.)

[Translation.]

The Danish Government has received with very great interest the Memorandum which has been sent to it by the French Government in accordance with the decision taken at the meeting held at Geneva on September 9th, 1929, and which is to be used as a basis for the discussions on the proposed European co-operation. The Royal Government desires to express the lively satisfaction with which it greets this bold plan. All who realise the general uneasiness which, after eleven years of peace, still prevails in Europe, cannot but welcome endeavours to develop the spirit of co-operation among the nations of Europe, and thus to guarantee the atmosphere of tranquillity that is one of the primary conditions for the economic reconstitution of Europe. The creation of a framework of European co-operation, corresponding in greater or less degree to the framework of Pan-American co-operation, is beyond all doubt desirable.

The Danish Government has construed the ideas set forth in the Memorandum, not as a scheme of organisation, but as a statement of the problems that will arise when this new idea is brought up for discussion. It is of opinion, moreover, that this statement includes all such problems, and indicates all the questions that should, in the present circumstances, be taken into consideration.

With a view to the future discussions in connection with the negotiations that took place at Geneva on September 9th, 1929, certain observations relating to the various main points are given below. These observations are, of course, purely provisional.

The Danish Government and people greet with considerable favour the idea of organised co-operation between the European States. There is, certainly, a group of questions which, for reasons of political geography, are of peculiar interest to the European States, and can far more readily be solved when these States are alone considered, without its being necessary to take account of the different conditions that may obtain in other parts of the world. It must, however, be borne in mind that some European States have territories in other continents, or are closely linked with non-European countries, and that the development of means of communication has immensely extended the field of action which is common to all continents. Accordingly, the more universal organisation, as created in the League of Nations, must beyond all doubt continue to be the main one, and the Danish Government agrees with the French Government that European co-operation should be restricted to the framework of the League, so that the League may be in no way weakened or hampered, and should take a form which would not create any opposition between European interests and the interests of other parts of the world.

The Government readily accepts the idea of concluding a convention in which the European Governments would undertake "to get into touch regularly at meetings held regularly or on special occasions to examine in common all questions likely to be of interest primarily to the Commonwealth of European peoples."

It is also of opinion that all States Members of the League that have territory in Europe should be invited to accede to this convention, and that it considers it absolutely necessary for the conclusion of the convention that all the most important of those States should accede. Co-operation between a limited number of European States Members of the League must be regarded as directly detrimental both to the League and to specifically European interests. An experiment in European organisation under such unfavourable conditions would damage the cause of European co-operation instead of furthering it.

It must also be regarded as essential to secure at the outset a certain measure of co-operation between the proposed association and the Powers possessing territory in Europe which are not Members of the League, so that the form of any possible participation by these Powers in the discussions, as provided for in Section II B, paragraph 2, may, as far as possible, be defined immediately. While the participation of the States in question in the capacity of members of the proposed association might, perhaps, so long as they are not Members of the League, entail certain difficulties in relation to the latter, there would be no obstacle to regular co-operation on their part under a procedure similar to that under which they already take part in many of the League's proceedings.

In view of the necessity of securing the accession of practically all the European States which are Members of the League, the stipulations of the proposed convention must necessarily be limited to those that are most essential. Moreover, it would doubtless be necessary, in accordance with the observations on page 6, paragraph 2, of the French Government's Memorandum, to state explicitly that the organisation in question is set up for the purpose of joint discussion, but is not competent to take resolutions on behalf of the association of participating States. Further, it seems hardly possible to specify in the convention itself the questions which might be laid before
the conference for discussion; it will certainly be preferable to allow the subjects, a joint examination of which is more particularly called for, to be chosen in the light of experience.

With regard to the practical organisation of the proposed conference, there can be no doubt a good thing that the French Memorandum should have indicated the various organs through which these discussions might be conducted. It may, however, be argued with reason that if all the organs enumerated in the French Memorandum were to function, the League organisation would be duplicated, and to such a degree that there could not but be some opposition on the part of States Members. The actual danger of such a preliminary examination of questions would, it is true, be, on the whole, only small, since agreement among the countries of Europe is often extremely difficult to attain. On the contrary, exchanges of views among them would certainly help in many cases to remove difficulties which the League might otherwise be unable to overcome. If, however, such discussions were to be held in a group of organs exactly corresponding to the organs of the League, it would hardly be possible to prevent stirrings of mistrust among the non-European Members, while it would likewise be difficult to obviate duplication.

If only for this reason, the Danish Government is of opinion that the proposed organisation should be restricted to the one essential element—the “European Conference”, at the sessions of which the delegates of all the Powers forming the association would meet, while certain other States might also be invited to send representatives according to a procedure similar to that already followed in the case of conferences organised by the League.

The Danish Government supports the proposal in the French Memorandum that “the post of Chairman of the European Conference should be filled annually and in rotation”. Meetings should, in the opinion of the Danish Government, be held regularly—probably once a year. At meetings held regularly, the various States could submit the questions they wished to have examined, without attracting the same notice as in the case of special conferences convened for the discussion of certain particularly difficult problems. The establishment of regular sessions would not preclude the holding of special meetings if necessary.

The question arises whether the meetings should take place at Geneva or in the different countries in rotation. In the latter case, the chairman of each annual session might be chosen from the country in which the meeting is held, while two vice-chairmen would be appointed from among the representatives of the other States. Possibly, however, it may, for practical reasons, be preferable to hold these conferences—which might take place at the close of the annual meetings of the League Assembly, either during the last days of these meetings, or immediately after—in Geneva. It would be very difficult to hold the conferences before the Assembly, for they might then be regarded as affording an opportunity of biasing the Assembly’s decisions in favour of specifically European points of view. Consideration should, however, be given to the desirability of holding meetings independently of the sessions of the League Assembly, in view of the limited time available and the difficulty that many delegates would find in extending their stay at Geneva. If the conferences were to be held a few months after the September Assembly, they might, in certain cases, help to remove obstacles to the execution of decisions of the League Assembly in Europe.

The meetings might possibly be held immediately after one of the ordinary sessions of the Council, at which the representatives of some of the States in question have to be present. The delegations of the various States should of course be fairly small, but should consist of more than one delegate, so as to enable any countries that so desired to send representatives of the chief political parties.

While the Danish Government thinks it desirable, for these reasons, to institute conferences at which questions of peculiarly European interest could be discussed, it considers, on the other hand, that it would not be possible, nor even, in the present circumstances, desirable, to set up a “permanent political committee” corresponding to the League Council. This would be too obvious an imitation of the League organisation. The “permanent political committee” could hardly do any serious work without trespassing on the province of the League Council. Moreover, when its composition was being determined, the same difficulties would arise as arose in the League with regard to the composition of the Council, with undesirable results: “Will there be permanent members?” “What will be the method of election?” “Will some members be re-eligible?” etc. The States would thus be confronted by a group of problems which, in the present circumstances, might well be insoluble.

Similarly, the Danish Government is of opinion that it would not be necessary, nor even advisable, to set up a secretariat similar to that of the League, or special technical committees corresponding to the various League Committees. The creation of another secretariat would certainly result in duplication in many cases. The Government considers that in cases where a question had to be worked up by a Secretariat or technical Committee, it would be possible to find some arrangement whereby the secretariat and committees of the League could undertake this work. The negotiations in connection with the tariff truce showed that a question which seemed to be, at present, of purely European character could be satisfactorily discussed within the framework of the League. States which had no essential interest in the question did not send representatives, or else the representatives of such States took only a small part in the proceedings and did not in any way hinder the discussions of the European representatives.

In the intervals between the annual conferences there would, of course, be some current business to be done—drawing up records of the last conference and the agenda of the next, convening ordinary, and possibly extraordinary, meetings, etc. These duties might, however, be entrusted to the State that had supplied the chairman at the last session, acting in conjunction with the two States to which the vice-chairmen belonged. It is thought, however, that it would perhaps be preferable to arrange, with the League authorities, if possible, for the League Secretariat to undertake this work.
With regard to the scope of the discussions of the European conference, the Danish Government is of opinion that the conference should devote its attention, first and foremost, to those economic problems which, on account of conditions of political geography, are specially suitable for discussion and settlement by the European States alone, or in the case of which certain difficulties peculiar to Europe have to be removed.

There is no doubt that a large number of the difficulties that are hampering the economic life of Europe are due to the dispersion of energies in agricultural and industrial production, caused by Customs frontiers. An organisation under which gradual progress could be made towards a rational division of labour corresponding with geographical and social conditions in the various countries, would contribute immensely to the general improvement of economic conditions in Europe and would greatly benefit the European States, as well as the other parts of the world interested in trade with Europe. The solution of this highly complicated problem would certainly be the main task in the first phase of a European understanding.

With regard to the economic questions to be examined, the Danish Government is in full agreement with the aims indicated in Section IV A, paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4, of the French Government’s Memorandum. It considers it preferable that the conference should restrict itself provisionally to those fields which, as a general rule, cannot well be dealt with by the League in accordance with the usual procedure. It would not, however, be advisable to specify in advance the subjects that might be discussed. The choice of these subjects will depend upon circumstances, and the participating States might certainly, without any danger of unfortunate consequences, be given the right, to submit, before the meeting of each conference, proposals for the agenda, among which the conference would make its choice.

Among the subjects for discussion at the conferences, problems of an essentially political character might also be brought forward, but it is difficult to see how far such problems could usefully be discussed at the proposed conferences. In any case, however, conferences of this kind would afford those participating in them valuable opportunities for confidential exchanges of views.

Since the French Memorandum mentions a possible development on the lines of the Locarno Treaty, the Danish Government is obliged to emphasise that it could not consider a possible extension of sanction obligations similar to those contracted in those Treaties, to include all the participating States in a future convention, either as guarantors or as guaranteed. Previous negotiations have shown that such an idea cannot be accepted by a large number of States. The Danish Government has always maintained the view that, until the effective reduction of armaments provided for in Article 8 of the Covenant of the League has been achieved, no sanction obligations other than those contained in the Covenant and interpreted in 1921 by the Assembly resolutions can be contracted. It would call attention to the observations made in 1922 and 1923 in the Third Committee of the Assembly, when the draft Treaty of Mutual Guarantee was being discussed, and in 1924 during the discussion of the draft Geneva Protocol. The Danish Government is still of opinion that sanction obligations wider than those of the Covenant would diminish rather than increase the security of States, so long as military armaments on a large scale are maintained in the various countries. It also considers that the examination of the question of security falls naturally within the province of the League, and that a special discussion of the matter, engaged in during the negotiations with regard to European co-operation, would, in present circumstances, make those negotiations more difficult, and could not lead to any result.

On the other hand, the Danish Government firmly upholds the principle which is at the root of the reciprocal undertakings inserted in the Locarno agreements, and which, later, was recognised by all the States that adhered to the Pact of Paris of 1928, that no endeavour should be made to change existing frontiers by force. It desires to call attention to the draft Convention drawn up and published by Denmark a few years ago, according to which changes in frontiers could not in future be justified by war (see “Report of the Temporary Mixed Commission for the Reduction of Armaments”, document A.35.1923.IX, page 28).

As to the best means of preparing the way for useful negotiations at the European conference, the Danish Government quite agrees that close co-operation with the European groups of the Inter-Parliamentary Union would be most valuable.

The Danish Government fully realises that, when the time comes to carry into practice the idea which M. Briand stated at the meeting on September 9th, 1929, there will be considerable uncertainty as to the actual shape it should be given. The work begun last year at Geneva is necessarily one of long duration. It seems, however, most important, in the present state of Europe, there should be closer co-operation among the European nations. During the proposed negotiations, it will be seen how much vitality there is in the idea of European co-operation, and how far such co-operation can be achieved by way of increasing the security of nations and guaranteeing to Europe the tranquil conditions necessary for economic and intellectual work.

In accordance with the principles stated above, the Danish Government is ready to participate, at the next session of the League Assembly, in the negotiations in regard to European co-operation proposed in the French Government’s Memorandum.
No. 11.

REPLY FROM THE GREEK GOVERNMENT

(July 12th, 1930).

[Translation.]

With reference to the Memorandum on the Organisation of a System of European Federal Union, which the French Government has been good enough to forward to it, the Greek Government has the honour to communicate the following observations:

1. The Greek Government has examined this Memorandum with the greatest interest and with very real appreciation.

2. It considers that the proposal for organising a system of economic and political co-operation, regularly maintained and methodically pursued, among the European States, in the spirit and within the framework of the League of Nations, is in harmony with the highest aspirations and the real interests of the European peoples.

3. It believes that this Memorandum affords a very valuable practical basis for the discussions of the European Conference which, as the Memorandum proposes, might be held at Geneva during the next session of the League Assembly, and it is ready to send representatives to that Conference. It will have an opportunity during this discussion to present such observations in regard to the various points mentioned in the Memorandum as are suggested to it in view both of general European interests and of the special interests of Greece.

4. Greece would welcome the eventuality of Turkey, like herself a Balkan and Mediterranean Power, becoming a member of the European Federal Union.
No. 12.

REPLY FROM THE LITHUANIAN GOVERNMENT

(July 14th, 1930.

[Translation.]

Having very carefully examined the French Government's Memorandum on the Organisation of a System of European Federal Union, which was forwarded to it on May 17th last, the Lithuanian Government is glad to state that it agrees with the general ideas which influenced the French Government in taking this step, and also to announce fortwith its firm intention of co-operating to the best of its ability in carrying the proposed system into practice.

The Lithuanian Government here desires to emphasise that, since its re-birth to independent life, the Lithuanian nation has unremittingly pursued the ideal of peace based upon true justice—an ideal which influenced Lithuania to enter the League of Nations, and which is alone capable of assuring to all the peoples of the world an opportunity for the harmonious development of their moral and material powers.

The Lithuanian Government feels bound, however, to make certain observations, which are prompted solely by the desire that the work undertaken on the initiative of the French Government should succeed.

I.

If the European Union is to become at the outset a living fact, productive of desirable results, the interests and sentiments that unite the nations in the pursuit of a common ideal must—it seems to the Lithuanian Government—prevail, within the Union, over opposing interests and sentiments. Obviously, therefore, the Union could not develop on the intended lines so long as serious antagonisms and inflexible oppositions, resulting from acts for which no just reparation has been made, still exist between its members.

It is inconceivable, indeed impossible, that an atmosphere of relaxed tension, friendship and confidence could be created between the future members of the Union on any other basis than that of a scrupulous respect for equity and the rights of all.

II.

Moreover, once this atmosphere of confidence and harmony has been created, it is of paramount importance that the Federal Union should include as many European States as possible, and that none should be excluded.

III.

The Lithuanian Government is convinced that a general pact, in which the considerations outlined above were taken into account, would be of unquestionable value for the consolidation of peace between the nations. It fully agrees with the French Government that such a pact should be incorporated within the framework of the League, which has a more comprehensive aim in view and embraces wider horizons.

IV.

It also seems that great caution should be exercised in settling the difficult problem of the organs to be created for the Federal Union. In the opinion of the Lithuanian Government, a European Conference, on which all the States members of the Union would be represented, would be the most suitable organ for the new institution.

It would perhaps be necessary to set up a fairly large Committee to prepare the work of the Conference, the question as to whether this Committee should be permanent being decided later, when the Union itself had begun to operate.

With regard to the establishment of a permanent Secretariat, the Lithuanian Government fears that such an organisation might involve a duplication which would be detrimental to the work of the League Secretariat.

V.

The Lithuanian Government, while adopting the essential principles stated in Section III of the Memorandum, which are to determine the general conception of the organs entrusted with the preparation of the programme of the European organisation, reserves the right to amplify these principles during the discussions which will necessarily take place among the States invited to participate in the European Conference.

VI.

The questions raised in Section IV of the French Memorandum, which is a kind of draft programme that the French Government undertook to draw up for discussion by the coming European Conference, are regarded by the Lithuanian Government as of capital importance, but cannot, in its opinion, be given final shape until the Union has actually begun to operate.
No. 13.

REPLY FROM THE NORWEGIAN GOVERNMENT

(July 12th, 1939).

[Translation.]

The Norwegian Government has read with real satisfaction the Memorandum on European co-operation prepared by the French Government in accordance with the resolution adopted at the meeting held at Geneva on September 9th, 1929, this Memorandum having been forwarded to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs at Oslo under cover of a letter from the French Minister dated May 17th last. The Norwegian Government desires to express to the French Government its sincerest thanks for its action in this matter, which is inspired not merely by high principles, but by true insight.

The Norwegian Government is fully aware of the great difficulties inherent in this proposal, and the numerous objections which may be raised. On contemplating, however, the present situation of Europe, divided as it is by national and Customs frontiers into twenty-nine separate States, each of which follows a more or less independent policy, and which are unable to establish even the elements of mutual co-operation, organisation and the allocation of work—indispensable though these be to the progress of international economic development—the need for better organisation becomes manifest.

The Norwegian Government agrees with the opinion expressed in the French Memorandum that there are no grounds for stating that European co-operation on the lines suggested could weaken the authority of the League of Nations. On the contrary, efforts in this direction cannot but enhance the League's prestige, since they are closely bound up with the League's aims. Owing to the comprehensive nature of its work, the League must surely note with gratification, and encourage such an endeavour to create peace, tranquillity and satisfactory conditions in the Continent of Europe, which forms so important a part of its domain.

The League of Nations as a whole, therefore, is bound to benefit by an endeavour to solve European problems in the light of co-operative and collective organisation; nor is there any sound reason for describing these efforts as directed against, or likely to produce disagreement with, other parts of the world. It must surely be to the advantage of every Member of the League that Europe should no longer remain in its present state of disorganisation. The creation of a healthy, well-organised and contented Europe would, in truth, benefit the whole of humanity.

If agreement exists on this point, the next question is, "In what way can Europe secure a better organisation?" Here, the Norwegian Government is prepared to endorse many of the ideas contained in the French Memorandum, though it feels that efforts to secure positive economic co-operation should precede any attempt to establish a collective organisation of a more political character. The Norwegian Government and Norwegian public opinion have always been opposed to the formation of groups or ententes within the League of Nations. They regard these as an element of danger, and fear a return to those alliances which, having been ranged by competition and rivalry into opposing camps, constitute a threat to peace and universal goodwill.

Co-operation between all the nations of Europe is, however, quite another matter, since such co-operation would counteract the various groupings of interests that should be avoided. The relationship between various European States and peoples outside Europe—dominions and colonies—and the nature of the relationship due to the common origins or mutual friendships of Anglo-Saxon or Latin peoples, would seem absolutely to preclude the idea of organised co-operation in Europe creating any sort of contrast which might endanger peaceful relations with non-European States.

As regards the various points in the French Memorandum, the Norwegian Government would make the following observations:

I.

The Norwegian Government is of opinion that a simple agreement should be prepared, laying down and defining the methods of European co-operation. The agreement should be very brief and the wording very general, so that co-operation might evolve freely on natural lines in accordance with future requirements.

The agreement should be so drafted that all European countries which are or may become Members of the League of Nations could accede thereto.

II.

With regard to the organs which would be required to realise such co-operation, the Norwegian Government is of opinion that it would be sufficient, in the early stages, for the first European delegates to the Assembly of the League to meet regularly in conference during the ordinary session
of the League Assembly. If necessary, however, extraordinary conferences might also be convened. This rule, and the proposal put forward below in connection with the permanent committee and the secretariat, would serve to emphasise the connection with the League of Nations and would avoid confusion, the overlapping of work, and so on.

The president of the European conference should hold office for one year, and should be designated under a system of rotation.

A permanent committee should be organised which, at the beginning, might consist of the European Members of the Council of the League.

Whenever this committee dealt with questions of interest to a State not represented thereon, that State would be entitled to send a representative to the committee.

As the whole of this organisation ought to form part of the general organisation of the League of Nations, the Secretariat of the League should be able, in conjunction with the permanent committee, to organise the necessary secretarial services.

III.

Clearly the two factors, economic and political, of the proposed co-operation are intimately connected, and are, indeed, interdependent. The Norwegian Government, however, finds it difficult to abandon the view that it would be more natural to base European co-operation on the solution, in the first place, of economic problems, since it feels that result could be more easily obtained in this sphere, in which the shortcomings of the present system are most obvious, and since the existing economic situation causes serious difficulties to a large number of European countries.

There exist in Europe, as the Memorandum states, 20,000 kilometres of Customs barriers, and it would seem, unfortunately, that the differences created among European States as a result of Customs policy are continually tending to raise those barriers still higher. In point of fact, this situation threatens, not merely the material prosperity, but even the peace of Europe. An endeavour to restrict the armaments of Customs policy is as important as an attempt to reduce armies and navies. The reduction of military armaments will be a natural consequence of better and more cordial relations in the domain of commercial policy.

The Norwegian Government does not mean to suggest that, in drawing up the plan for European co-operation, the political side of the question should be neglected. But here the position is specially difficult; national and historical considerations carry great weight, and, moreover, many countries (including Norway) would certainly find it difficult to accept any system involving military obligations.

The Norwegian Government is therefore of opinion that the work of European co-operation should first be begun in the economic field. It believes that such co-operation would naturally lead to an increasing measure of political co-operation between the various States, as present and future needs dictate.

Nevertheless, if disappointment is to be avoided, progress in the economic field will have to be slow, the aims being kept within modest bounds. The situation and circumstances in the various parts of Europe are still so varied that many important questions can only be solved gradually as the present situation improves.

IV.

The list of special questions set out in the Memorandum is a very detailed one. The Norwegian Government, however, considers that it might be preferable, instead of defining in advance the details of the various problems to be studied, to allow the future itself to determine to a certain extent the more precise form which the proposed co-operation should take.
No. 14.

REPLY FROM THE PORTUGUESE GOVERNMENT

(July 12th, 1930).

[Translation.]

The Portuguese Government has given most careful consideration to the Memorandum on the Organisation of a System of European Federal Union submitted to it by the French representative at Lisbon on May 17th of this year. In this Memorandum, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the French Republic indicates the main points to be examined by the Governments of the European States Members of the League of Nations, which, at the meeting at Geneva on September 9th, 1929, unanimously recognised the advantage of studying the possibility of creating a federal bond among the nations of Europe with a view to the discussion and settlement of questions of common interest.

Portugal, which is at all times ready to co-operate in any effort for the consolidation of peace and the settlement of international problems, is in principle prepared to examine, in conjunction with the other European States invited to do so, the points indicated in M. Briand's Memorandum. She nevertheless considers it indispensable in the first place, and in order not to hamper the realisation of the aims in view, that the study of these problems should be gradual and that the discussion should be confined to those in regard to which the probabilities of success are greater than the risks of failure.

It should also, in the Portuguese Government's opinion, be clearly understood that the idea of a Federal Bond or Federal Union among European nations would not involve any interference with, or curtailment of, their independence and political integrity, or the relinquishment by any one of them of their sovereign rights.

It is also necessary to specify that, in contemplating a Federal Union, the European States have no intention of diminishing the ties between them and their colonies, or of consenting to any restriction of their rights over those territories or to any interference in strictly colonial questions. Those territories should be regarded as component parts of the actual structure of each State; otherwise, the proposed federation would be based on a false conception of the constitution of the European State.

The Portuguese Government also deems it essential that, in any action towards a general European agreement, care should be taken both in the course of the actual negotiations and in the conclusions adopted, to avoid any exclusive tendency which might arouse the mistrust of, or give offence to, other continents or nations which, although they are geographically distant, are connected by their ethncal origin and language with certain European countries. This point is of special importance to Portugal, owing to the ties which unite her to the great Brazilian nation and which the pact cannot be allowed to impair.

The Portuguese Government also considers it a fundamental principle that the pact, as expressly stipulated in the Memorandum, should not in any way invalidate the bilateral or multilateral agreements between States or groups of States or reduce the scope or efficacy of the bonds of alliance or friendship which are fundamental and traditional factors of the international relations of certain countries.

After stating these general views, the Portuguese Government will now briefly indicate its opinion on the four points of the Memorandum submitted.

I.

The Portuguese Government recognises that it would be advantageous for European Governments to keep in touch with each other by means of meetings held regularly or on special occasions for the joint examination of questions affecting the peaceful organisation of Europe as a whole and its economic prosperity.

The Portuguese Government nevertheless considers that, if these meetings are to be of value, the problems must be examined gradually, as stated above, only those being dealt with which are not likely to arouse susceptibilities or lead to irreconcilable differences of opinion between two or more signatories, such as might jeopardise or prejudice all possibility of a settlement in the near future.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic is strongly of opinion that the agreement or pact to be concluded should be kept within the framework of the League of Nations and should not in any way restrict or interfere with the League's action. As a zealous Member of the League, the Portuguese Government would lay special stress on the necessity of avoiding any impairment of the activities of this international organisation, since it would seem difficult to render a European pact a purely regional agreement. Owing to the number and importance of the nations invited to sign it, it is bound to have worldwide effect.
The Portuguese Government also agrees with the view expressed in the Memorandum that no question of interest to Europe as a whole can be treated with any possibility of a concrete settlement except by the European countries affiliated to the League. The Portuguese Government also recognises that certain of the objects in view might, perhaps, be attained, in so far as their attainment is at present possible, within the League itself.

II.

Although it recognises that special bodies may have to be established to ensure the studies, work and representation of the proposed European Union, the Portuguese Government considers that the formation and duties of any body of this kind are points in the scheme which require most careful consideration, owing to their complexity and the difficulties involved. The Portuguese Government is of opinion that all possibility of the predominance of certain Powers, whether direct or by means of groups, should be eliminated, not only by the procedure indicated in the Memorandum for the organisation of the chairmanship, but also through the internal constitution of those bodies, since such predominance would be contrary to the idea of a community of nations and to the general agreement which it is sought to bring about.

The complete subordination of other influences to this idea of a community of nations and the absolute juridical equality, both in theory and in practice, of the nations represented on those bodies are regarded by the Portuguese Government as essential for the execution of any scheme of this kind.

It is equally necessary that the action of those bodies should not overlap that of similar organs of the League nor hinder or restrict its work.

III — IV.

The Portuguese Government considers that these two points of the Memorandum are very closely connected.

Security, the pacification of minds, and agreement and co-operation in the political sphere appear to it to be essential to any progress in the direction of an economic union. It is also, however, of opinion that there are special difficulties in the economic and social domains which have only a very slight connection with political conditions and cannot be solved by the latter alone.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic accordingly considers that the joint examination of economic problems need not necessarily be preceded by the solution of political problems; on the other hand, such solution will be facilitated, as economic difficulties are removed, by means of general agreements. The Portuguese Government feels that these combined efforts should prove the best means of achieving the admirable ends which the Memorandum has in view.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic appreciates the motives of the French Minister for Foreign Affairs and would repeat that it is ready to co-operate in any effort made by the Powers for the peaceful reconstruction of Europe.
No. 15.

REPLY FROM THE HUNGARIAN GOVERNMENT.

(July 14th, 1930.)

[Translation.]

The Hungarian Government has studied with the closest interest and attention the Memorandum on the Organisation of a System of European Federal Union submitted to it by the Government of the French Republic on May 17th last. After carefully examining all the parts of the Memorandum, the Hungarian Government, while expressing its profound admiration for the principles which the Memorandum embodies, desires to make certain observations which have occurred to it in studying M. Briand's proposal, and which must, it thinks, be taken into consideration if the object mentioned at the end of the Memorandum, "To unite in order to live and prosper", is to be achieved. The Memorandum contains so many useful ideas and raises so many questions of the greatest importance to the future progress of Europe that it is hardly possible to deal with all the aspects of the problem.

The Memorandum expounds a principle which will doubtless meet with the unanimous support of all countries called upon to participate in the great work of organising a European association—namely, the absolute sovereignty of States and their equal rights in the proposed Union. The Hungarian Government desires to state its opinion that the idea of sovereignty and equal rights must, above all things, be so interpreted as to remove, when the European Federal Union comes to be established, all inequalities the practical consequences of which make it impossible for certain countries to exercise their full sovereign rights. The Hungarian Government also desires to state its view that certain agreements between certain countries are contrary to the principles for the pacific organisation of the European community as defined in the Memorandum and could not, without jeopardising the harmony and effective co-operation between the participating nations, be maintained in a new Europe based on the principle of equal rights.

The Hungarian Government unhesitatingly accepts the principle laid down in the Memorandum to the effect that European co-operation must not weaken the authority of the League of Nations. In its opinion, one of the essential conditions for the establishment of the Federal Union is that the Union should fill certain gaps in the League Covenant and thus facilitate pacific co-operation between European nations. This is the more necessary in that certain provisions, forming an integral part of the League Covenant which might, if they were brought into operation, introduce into the general political situation in Europe a certain elasticity which it at present lacks, are not employed effectively and in a manner commensurate with their importance for the universal organisation of peace. Moreover, no authentic interpretation as to the procedure for their application has yet been found. Furthermore, the Hungarian Government ventures to point out in this connection, that, although it fully realises that the proposed conference will not deal with the revision of the treaties, it could not agree to a solution of the problem which, by excluding the possibility of future revision, perpetuates the present situation created by the treaties. The Hungarian Government considers that efforts should be made, either through the new organisation or outside it, to find a means for the peaceful settlement of disputes of a non-judicial nature and even for the most difficult political questions which might arise between States members of the association, because it is firmly convinced that, otherwise, the great goal of universal pacification will never be achieved.

Another question which seems to call for more detailed examination is that of the equality of States in the bodies proposed for the new association. This equality does not exist under the present organisation of the League (we need only mention the distinction between States which are permanent or semi-permanent Members of the Council and other States). The Hungarian Government is pleased to note that the Memorandum aims at preventing any predominance of this kind on the part of certain European States.

The Hungarian Government feels bound to touch on another question which affects Hungary more closely than any other country in Europe: that of national minorities; though it entirely adheres to the principle laid down in the introduction to the Memorandum that the European association would not be qualified to deal exhaustively with problems which are within the competence of the League. The sole object of the Royal Government in mentioning the question of minorities is to draw attention once more to this vital problem, which, if it is not settled satisfactorily, will constitute one of the most serious obstacles to the pacification of men's minds in Europe and to the success of the proposed task.

Hungary, whose political aspirations do not go beyond European territory, does not propose to deal with the question of bringing the European Union into line with the interests of extra-European States, since it is of opinion that the settlement of this problem is a matter for States having extra-continental interests. As Hungary is particularly interested in questions relating to certain parts of Europe, inter alia the Balkan Peninsula, she considers it desirable that the Union should extend to Turkey, to which she is bound by the bonds of a traditional friendship.
The Hungarian Government fully realises that the problems to which it has drawn attention and the questions which it understands have been raised by other Governments are very difficult to settle, and that the Conference will thus have a serious and complicated task before it. In view of this, the Hungarian Government is inclined to think that it might be best to place at the head of the programme M. Briand's original proposal, which he expounded so eloquently last September at Geneva, and to endeavour first of all to organise co-operation in the economic sphere. In reaching this conclusion, the Hungarian Government has been guided by two considerations. On the one hand, the world economic crisis is weighing most heavily upon Europe, which has not yet recovered from the consequences of the war, so that the most urgent problem appears to be the re-establishment of the European economy. Further, the Hungarian Government is convinced that, if a certain amount of co-operation could be established and certain differences in the economic sphere be eliminated, this would create an atmosphere favourable to the solution of the most important political problems. In that case, it would not be necessary to discuss some of the questions raised in the present Note, and many nations—including Hungary—would be in a position to give their full support to the new Union.

The Hungarian Government will certainly send representatives to the proposed European Conference, and is prepared to discuss in a conciliatory spirit with the representatives of other European countries, the questions mentioned above, and any other problems which may arise.
No. 16.

REPLY FROM THE CZECHOSLOVAK GOVERNMENT

(July 14th, 1930.)

Translation.

The Czechoslovak Government has carefully considered the Memorandum of the French Government on the Organisation of a System of European Federal Union; it examined the question with interest and attention, for the conviction that the matters to be dealt with are of great importance for the solution of the main problems which concern mankind. It did so, moreover, in a most sympathetic spirit, as the Memorandum has in view objects which Czechoslovakia, since her restoration, has striven to attain—objects which have consistently determined her external policy.

The conclusions at which the Czechoslovak Government has arrived may be summed up as follows:

Czechoslovakia, as is evidenced by her membership of the Little Entente and her co-operation therein, and by the part which she took in the work of Locarno and, generally speaking, in the various post-war efforts to organise peace in Europe, has always held that regional understandings, as provided for in Article 21 of the Covenant, can do much to facilitate the mission of the League of Nations. Czechoslovakia has always been of opinion that the natural starting-point for the organisation of co-operation, to include all peoples, consists in co-operation between States situated in the same geographical area—larger or smaller as the case may be—for it is of great importance that neighbouring States should work together. Such States always have a great many common or cognate interests, but there are also points on which their interests conflict. From the very nature of present-day politics and political problems, politicians, parties, the Press and other organs of public opinion, in modern States and groups of States, often tend to react to and accentuate the questions on which their several States are divided, forgetting the common interests which should bring them together. It is accordingly the duty of responsible political representatives (and this would also be in the interest of the League's work) to record and define with increasing precision the common or cognate interests of those States, and thus to promote, improve and develop between them co-operation designed to achieve the objects laid down in the Covenant. In this process it is often found that no real opposition exists between the countries on points on which they were supposed to be divided. Further, real divergencies can be more easily settled if the common interests are known and borne in mind. In any case, once they come fully to realise their common interests, States will no longer wish to resort to force for the settlement of their disputes.

The Czechoslovak Government has always advocated organised co-operation between States within restricted geographical areas. It is in favour also of organising such co-operation over a wider area—that is, between all European States. Doubts have been expressed, however, in several quarters as to whether this plan can be carried out in practice. But the Czechoslovak Government is of opinion that, after the terrible disasters consequent on the war, all statesmen who realise their duty should examine seriously any suggestions to this end and neglect no proposal whereby they might be put into effect. The Czechoslovak Government also welcomes the proposal contained in the French Memorandum that a plan be framed and preparation made for such an organisation, and is itself prepared to participate to the utmost of its power. It is of opinion—now that the Hague and Paris Conferences have practically liquidated the world war, that discussions could be begun and preparations made to provide for such organisation. At the same time, however, it fully realises that the task will require much time, and great caution, that progress can only be made by stages, and that the effect of every step should be thoroughly tested and its success assured before the next is taken. The Czechoslovak Government, in accepting the proposal contained in the Memorandum, does so with the conviction—a conviction shared by the French Government—that participation in organised co-operation between the European States will in no way affect the principle of the sovereignty of the States in question or their equality of rights as formulated in the Covenant of the League of Nations. At the same time, the Czechoslovak Government is persuaded that this organisation, instituted as it would be in the interests of organised co-operation between all the States of the world, admits perfectly of the further participation of European States possessing extensive and important interests outside Europe, that it cannot be in any way directed against any extra-European State or group of States, and that it is naturally bound to operate in conformity with the spirit of the League of Nations and in full harmony with the latter, a point which the French Memorandum has already emphasised. The preparatory work for establishing this organisation could thus very well be carried out in close co-operation with the League of Nations.

The Czechoslovak Government is accordingly prepared, under the conditions indicated above and together with the other European States, to enter into a general undertaking that
representatives of the contracting Powers shall hold regular or special sessions to examine in
common all questions likely to be of interest to the European States.

The Czechoslovak Government is of opinion that it might perhaps be expedient if, at the
meeting of representatives of the European States to be held at Geneva during the Eleventh
Session of the Assembly of the League of Nations, a Committee of Research could be instituted.
Within the scope of the conclusions that may be embodied in the replies to the French Govern-
ment's Memorandum and the discussion to which such conclusions may give rise at the September
meeting, this Committee would prepare for the meeting next year a draft statute of organisation
which would settle upon, among other things, the organs to be at the disposal of the organisation
of European States. This statute should include only the most fundamental rules within the
framework of which the organisation of European co-operation would gradually evolve in the
light of experience. Among these rules would be one concerning the actual conception of co-
operation between the European States. Such co-operation, in so far as problems of a political
and economic nature are concerned, — since these two groups of problems stand in a continual
relation of interdependence one to another — would, in the Czechoslovak Government's view be
manifested sometimes in the political and sometimes rather, in the economic sphere. Further,
the statute should define, by general and elastic rules, the various fields of activity, the extent
of that activity and the methods of European organisation. The suggestions in the matter
contained in the French Memorandum will be found to furnish certain valuable indications in
this matter. Within the various spheres laid down in the statute, the organisation, in order not
to counteract or thwart the action of the League of Nations, would act independently only if and
in so far as the League of Nations had not already dealt with the particular problem. Otherwise,
it would tend, as a general rule, simply to record, define and, if necessary, formulate the interests
of the European States in regard to the questions dealt with by the League of Nations and, first
and foremost, it would employ its efforts to facilitate and, if need be, to ensure the execution of
the decisions or recommendations of the League of Nations. It will perhaps be necessary to
consider whether the Committee of Research should not draw up the draft rules concerning the
work of the European organisation in conjunction either with a committee to be appointed for the
purpose by the League of Nations or with the League Secretariat.

As may be seen from the foregoing considerations, the Czechoslovak Government is in full
agreement with the principles enunciated in the French Memorandum, of which it desires simply
to emphasise certain passages. As regards points of detail and specific questions, it will have
a further opportunity of explaining its point of view at the September meeting of representatives
of the European States.

I would ask you to be good enough to communicate to the French Government the Czechoslo-
vak Government's views concerning the Memorandum on the organisation of a System of
European Federal Union, and I would request you, at the same time, to impress the French
Government that the Czechoslovak Government regards the proposal contained in the said
Memorandum as worthy in every respect to rank with those other manifestations of the generous
and pacific spirit of France, which have at all times given such great an impulse to the progress
of mankind.
No. 17.

REPLY FROM THE SWEDISH GOVERNMENT.

(July 14th, 1930.)

[Translation.]

The Swedish Government has considered with the greatest interest the Memorandum on the organisation of a European Federal Union drawn up by M. Briand at the request of the representatives of twenty-six European States, and has subjected it to exhaustive consideration.

The many political difficulties and the grave economic crises with which post-war Europe has undoubtedly made closer co-operation between the States of Europe appear desirable and even necessary. The Swedish Government, which within the limit of its powers has consistently endeavoured to exercise its influence in favour of an appeasement of current antagonisms of European interests, can only hail with sincere satisfaction and with complete sympathy any initiative towards rendering co-operation between the European States more intimate and of greater value. It is in this spirit that it has considered M. Briand's Memorandum and that it declares itself ready to take part in the discussions which are to take place in Geneva on the basis of the proposals formulated in that document.

The Memorandum affirms the necessity of a close connection between the proposed organisation of the European States and the League of Nations, whose authority the proposed organisation is in no sense designed to weaken. The Swedish Government desires to emphasise this point, and to observe that the present organisation of the League of Nations appears to it to afford to the widest possible extent, and within the limits of the Covenant itself, the possibility of untramelled and effective co-operation between the European States. It appears to the Swedish Government, also, beyond question that the work of the League of Nations has consisted up to the present to a very great extent in seeking for the solution, and in attempting the settlement, of questions which have been primarily European interest, while the assistance given to this work by States outside Europe has, in a number of cases, in its opinion had satisfactory results. It accordingly considers that the co-operation of the European States should be organised in such a manner as to realise the greatest possible degree of effectiveness, while at the same time avoiding anything that could weaken the interest of extra-European States in the League of Nations and so threaten to create obstacles to that development of the League in the direction of universality which is the aspiration of all its Members.

In view of the considerations set forth, above, the Swedish Government hesitates to support the idea of creating immediately a European association provided with a complete organisation, holding annual conferences, and having an executive committee and secretariat of a more or less permanent character. The Swedish Government thinks it might perhaps be wiser to restrict action at the outset, and, until the necessary experience has been acquired, to the summoning of the European States in the course of the ordinary meetings of the League of Nations, in accordance with a procedure which might be determined in advance, with a view to joint deliberations, whenever the settlement of questions which have a direct interest for the European nations appear likely to be advanced by this form of proceeding. The Swedish Government desires to state, on this occasion, that certain questions in the economic field, though difficult of solution, appear to it more suitable for, in the first instance, such collective consideration. Nor does there appear to be any objection to the European States being summoned to meet in conference, independently of the ordinary meetings of the League of Nations, where this form of procedure seems likely to settle a question of special interest to Europe.

The Swedish Government further ventures to express the opinion that, in order to attain the favourable results which the Memorandum contemplates, the organisation of the European States with a view to closer co-operation should be conceived in such a manner that the proposed organisation, whatever its form, will comprise the great majority of the European States, including all those represented permanently on the Council of the League.

The Swedish Government has, finally, the honour to announce that, in accordance with the above considerations, it is authorising its representatives at the coming Assembly of the League of Nations to co-operate in the efforts which may be made on that occasion to organise closer co-operation between the European States.
REPLY FROM THE LATVIAN GOVERNMENT

(July 15th, 1930).

[Translation.]  

On May 17th, 1930, the Government of the French Republic handed to the Latvian Government the Memorandum on the organisation of a system of European Federal Union, at the same time expressing its desire to have a reply before July 15th. Having considered the Memorandum with great care and with the greatest sympathy, the Latvian Government has arrived at the following conclusions with regard to the principal questions raised therein.

The Latvian Government warmly congratulates the Government of the French Republic on its generous attempt to create a sense of European solidarity by a scheme of constant co-operation among the peoples of Europe, linked, as they are, by the origins of their civilisation and by their geographical position.

The idea of closer international co-operation on a basis of mutual confidence meets with the entire approval of the Latvian people and Government. At the various international conferences which have taken place with a view to establishing more intimate co-operation between States in the political and economic fields, Latvia has always taken her place amongst the countries that have championed the most liberal principles of international union. The Latvian Government is accordingly quite ready to lend its most loyal aid in organising a system of European Federal Union.

Coming to the first question of the Memorandum, the Latvian Government entirely approves the suggestion that the Governments should come to an agreement to place on record by a pact, drawn up on as general lines as possible, that they formally commit themselves to regular consultations at periodical or extraordinary meetings for the purpose of considering questions which are of concern primarily to the community of European peoples. At the same time, the Latvian Government desires to lay special stress on the fact that, in its opinion, the co-operation of peoples within the European system can only be effective if no country is excluded from the Union. In the contrary event, co-operation among the European peoples, incomplete as it still is, might be seriously endangered, and the results would perhaps be entirely contrary to the objects which the authors of the Memorandum had in view.

In considering the question of the need for machinery which will secure for the European Union the organs essential for the accomplishment of its task, the Latvian Government has endeavoured to forecast the future aspect of the relations between the proposed organisation and the League of Nations. The European Union should in no case weaken the authority of the League or deprive it of any part of its duties. To avoid such a possibility, the Latvian Government considers that the new organisation, while remaining within the framework of the League, should not be equipped with organs comparable to those of the latter. It would surely be better to rest content with the “European Conference” as sole organ of the European Union, the officers of the Conference being in a position to arrange for the despatch of administrative business during the periods between the meetings of the Conference. The creation of the European Union will undoubtedly take some time. At the outset, its most important task would be to co-ordinate the policy of the European States. The “European Conference” would be a body perfectly adapted to the purpose, and would fulfil its functions without appearing to be, and without in fact being, an organisation duplicating that of the League.

The Latvian Government has no objection to raise to the main lines of the programme set out in the third article of the Memorandum. Judging by the experience acquired at recent big economic conferences, it considers this programme the most rational.

With regard to the points raised in the fourth section, the Latvian Government does not feel that they need be dealt with in the present reply; they should be examined by the coming conference of the European States.
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REPLY FROM THE LUXEMBURG GOVERNMENT.

(July 15th, 1930).

[Translation.]

The Grand Ducal Government has given careful consideration to the Memorandum of the Government of the French Republic on the organisation of a system of European Federal Union. Conscious of the advantages which an association of the European States would have for the future of Europe, it adheres without hesitation to a plan the aim of which is to establish, by treaty obligations, political and moral union among the peoples of Europe. It readily agrees, therefore, to be represented at the conference which the French Government proposes to hold at Geneva in September next.

The foreign policy of the Grand Duchy has always been inspired by a traditional friendship for all foreign States, and the Grand Ducal Government accordingly welcomes the assertion of the principle that the proposed European organisation cannot be opposed to any ethnographical combination, even outside the League, either in Europe itself or in other continents.

The Grand Ducal Government is also in agreement with the Government of the French Republic in recognising that the formation of the federal union desired by the European Governments cannot affect in any way any of the sovereign rights of the States which are members of such an association, and that it is on the plans of absolute sovereignty and of entire political independence that the understanding between European nations must be brought about.

I.

The Grand Ducal Government has noted with lively satisfaction the assertion in the French Government's Memorandum that the proposed association will be established within the framework of the League of Nations, and that its object will be to prepare and facilitate the co-ordination of those activities of the League which are essentially European. While such subordination of the Union to the League does not necessarily restrict the new association to States which are Members of the League, so far as either the tasks immediately before it or its future development are concerned, it may appear desirable that the work of the League and of the Union should be organised on common principles of co-operation and understanding finding equal recognition in the Covenant of the League and in the Pact of the Union.

The Grand Ducal Government accordingly recognises the great utility of a general Pact, indicating the essential objects of the new association and the general direction of its common policy.

II.

The coming European conference, while laying down the direction and the extent of future work, will be best able to indicate the nature and the number of the organs required for the execution of the task proposed. The Grand Ducal Government is of opinion that it would contribute to the object in view if all the European States were admitted to participate in the political and administrative organisation of the Union. This continuous co-operation of every people will create a sense of collective responsibility, which is so necessary for joint action, and will strengthen the consciousness of the interdependence and mutual assistance on the basis of which the European community should develop.

III.

(a) Referring to the need for laying down in advance the essential principles which shall determine the general conceptions involved in the preparation of the programme of the European organisation, the Memorandum observes that it is essential to bring on to the political plane at the outset the constructive effort tending to give Europe its organic structure. While fully recognising the great utility of a preliminary political agreement the Grand Ducal Government is nevertheless of opinion that there is no such absolute subordination of the economic to the political problem as to render impossible an agreement in the economic field in default of a political agreement. The Grand Ducal Government is in fact convinced that an understanding in the economic field and in the matter of tariffs would tend to reconcile the political interests of the European States to a considerable extent.
(b) The Grand Ducal Government is happy to note that in the organisation of European political co-operation the Government of the French Republic attaches great importance to the development of international arbitration. The Grand Ducal Government adheres to this view without reserve, and is ready to see in the general extension of international arbitration a sure pledge of the consolidation of peace. The Grand Ducal Government likewise applauds the extension of the policy of international guarantees inaugurated at Locarno, though it realises that in any system of mutual assistance its co-operation can only be very limited, inasmuch as the geographical situation of the country and the complete absence of military resources compels it in all cases to observe strict military neutrality.

IV.

The definition of the field of European co-operation and its methods of organisation will raise, as the French Government's Memorandum observes, a number of problems in every sphere of international work. The Grand Ducal Government reserves its right to indicate its attitude in regard to any problem without exception which may be considered by the coming European conference.
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REPLY FROM THE ALBANIAN GOVERNMENT

(July 16th, 1930).

[Translation.]

The Albanian Government has welcomed all attempts at organisation with a view to the consolidation of peace. It has considered with particular interest the important scheme of the Government of the French Republic for European Federal Union, considering as it does that international peace and security, which is the object of the scheme, is a fundamental and indispensable condition if States, and particularly the small States, are to organise themselves, to prosper and to increase their well-being. In consequence His Majesty's Government most warmly supports M. Briand's plan, confident that the realisation of this ideal in creating new links between the European peoples and strengthening those which already exist will put an end to the tension which at present affects international relations.

The Albanian Government is happy to note that the Government of the French Republic does not intend the new European association to be anything which might adversely affect the work of the League of Nations and the confidence which the peoples cherish of seeing the League become one day the uncontested arbiter in the relations of States with one another. As regards the essential principles which should guide the Federal Union, the Albanian Government holds that in the economic field there are problems easier to solve—the solution of which, by increasing the mutual confidence of the States and the process of effective pacification, will render more easy the consideration of the political questions.

As to the other points of the Memorandum, the Albanian Government reserves the right to formulate its views at the coming international conference which will deal with the organisation of the Federal Union, the realisation of which it regards as of the utmost importance for the good of humanity.
REPLY FROM THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT

(July 16th, 1930).

His Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom have examined with profound interest the proposals for the organisation of a system of European Federal Union made by the French Government in their Memorandum of May 17th. They are of opinion that proposals so important in their purpose and in their scope require careful and prolonged consideration. His Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom would furthermore feel it their duty to undertake that consideration in consultation with all His Majesty’s Governments in the British Commonwealth.

2. They are nevertheless desired to comply with the request of the French Government that they should send in their observations on the proposals put forward in the Memorandum not later than July 15th. They have accordingly decided to address this Note to the French Government, but they wish it to be understood that the comments and suggestions which it contains are of a preliminary and tentative kind.

3. His Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom understand from the Memorandum that the fundamental purpose which the French Government have in view is to divert the attention of the peoples of Europe from the hostilities of the past and from the conflicts of interest between them which are sometimes alleged to exist, and to fix their attention instead upon the more important common interests which to-day they share. The French Government hope that by their proposals they may promote closer co-operation among the nations and Governments of Europe, and thus strengthen the safeguards against another European war.

4. With this purpose His Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom are in the fullest sympathy. It is an axiom of His Majesty’s Government’s policy that the first of British interests is peace, and measures calculated to ensure peace will therefore secure their ready and warm support. They earnestly hope that the initiative of the French Government may bring about a better understanding by the European peoples of the common interests which they share, and may thus lead both to greater mutual confidence and trust among their Governments, and to a diminution of the obstacles to international trade and economic co-operation which now exist.

5. His Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom are also in agreement with the French Government in thinking that it is primarily in respect of economic relations that closer co-operation between the nations of Europe is urgently to be desired.

6. They further agree that, if effective economic co-operation and concerted action are to be secured, it is essential that economic questions should be considered not one by one, nor in respect of isolated interests, but as a whole, and from the wider point of view of the general interests involved. Progress on such questions depends on the extent that Governments and public opinion in the various countries can be brought to realise the vital importance of their common interests and the advantages each will derive from measures of greater international solidarity. While, as the French Government recognise, the independence and national sovereignty of each country have to be respected, as well as the special ties affecting particular groups of nations, much can be done by political authorities to promote a wider outlook on economic questions, and, in so far as political action is directed to that object, His Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom agree to the proposal made in the Memorandum for the association of economic and political authorities.

7. In respect, however, of the methods proposed by the French Government for the realisation of their purpose, His Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom feel more difficulty. They are not confident that mature examination will show that the establishment of new and independent international institutions is either necessary or desirable.

8. If they have rightly understood the proposals contained in the Memorandum, the French Government suggest the creation of a new European Conference and Executive Committee, and perhaps also of a new European secretariat. These bodies would in no way derive their authority from the Covenant or from Part XIII of the Treaty of Versailles; they would in no way be controlled by the rules and safeguards which those instruments provide; they would be in no way organically connected with the League of Nations; they would only correlate their work with that of the organs of the League in so far as they decided by specific and spontaneous decisions to do so in any given case that might arise. Since the organs of the League have already
begun work on virtually the whole of the programme of practical action which the Memorandum puts forward, it is difficult to see how these new European institutions could operate without creating confusion, and perhaps also a rivalry, which, however little it might be intended or desired by the European Governments, could hardly fail to diminish both efficiency and the authority of the organs of the League.

9. Apart from this very difficult problem of co-ordination, His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom think it possible that an exclusive and independent European Union of the kind proposed might emphasise or create tendencies to inter-continental rivalries and hostilities which it is important in the general interest to diminish and avoid. It is in their view essential that the measures taken for closer European co-operation should not cause anxiety or resentment in any other continent. Unless this object is kept continually in view, His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom are satisfied that even wider interests, both of Europe and the world, may be seriously endangered. It will be plain to the French Government that in this connection there are special considerations of which His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, as a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, must take account.

10. Moreover, His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom are inclined to believe that the purpose which the French Government have in view can be effectively secured by so adapting the proposals put forward in the Memorandum as to bring them fully within the framework of the League of Nations. They are impressed by the fact that the Warsaw Health Conference of 1922, and the reconstruction of Hungary and Austria—to name only a few of many examples that might be taken—were matters of European interest and concern, and yet were effectively dealt with by the existing machinery of the League. They are, therefore, convinced that it would be possible, perhaps by establishing European Committees of the Assembly, of the Council and of the technical organisations of the League, or perhaps in other ways, to create whatever machinery is required for promoting closer European co-operation without incurring the risks and difficulties which a system of new and independent institutions might involve.

11. His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom believe, however, that these are questions which can only be adequately dealt with in open discussion among the Governments concerned, after each Government has had time to examine fully and in all their aspects the proposals which have been made. Since, for the reasons above suggested, these proposals affect intimately not only the Governments of Europe, but the Governments of all the Members of the League, His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom hope that the French Government may think it desirable that their Memorandum should be placed upon the agenda of the next Assembly.

12. His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom earnestly hope that these tentative comments and suggestions may meet with the approval of the French Government, and that by some such procedure as that above suggested, practical results of real value may be secured.
No. 22.

REPLY FROM THE BELGIAN GOVERNMENT

(July 17th, 1930).

[Translation.]

The proposal of the French Government for the organisation of a system of European Federal Union is conceived in a liberal spirit which calls for the sincerest approval.

Its object is to consolidate peace and develop general prosperity.

The Belgian Government accordingly adheres entirely to the principle of the European Union. In so doing, it confirms the favourable view unanimously taken by the qualified representatives of the several States assembled at Geneva on September 9th, 1929. At the same time, it declares its readiness to associate itself with whatever efforts may be made to attain this great ideal.

Following the procedure which was approved by general agreement, the French Government's Memorandum defines the points requiring further study, on which the other Governments are invited to state their opinions forthwith. The fundamental point is to settle how the entente of European States is to be conceived, and what means and what methods should be adopted for its realisation.

The French Government suggests that it should be based on a convention, and should take the form of a system of federal union.

The French Government is at pains, however, to add that the entente should be realised within the framework of the League of Nations. "The search for a formula of European co-operation in conjunction with the League of Nations, far from weakening the authority of that body, should not, and could not, tend but to increase it, for it is in close keeping with the ideals of the League."

"It is in no way proposed to form a European group outside the League of Nations, but, on the contrary, to bring European interests into harmony under the control of, and in conformity with, the spirit of the League of Nations, by creating within its universal organisation an organisation which, for being limited, would be all the more effective. The creation of a system of federal organisation in Europe would always be placed to the credit of the League of Nations as a factor of progress, of which even nations outside Europe could reap the benefits."

His Majesty's Government agrees entirely with this preliminary observation, which it regards as fundamental. It implies, in the view of His Majesty's Government, that the European entente should be brought about by the development of the institutions of the League of Nations, and that the main object should be to extend and perfect these institutions.

The lack of co-ordination from which the material and moral forces of Europe suffer does not, in fact, constitute a new problem. For the last ten years it has been the subject of consideration and study, and of important discussions both at the meetings of the Assembly of the League of Nations and at great international conferences summoned under the League's authority, such as the Brussels Financial Conference of 1920 and the Geneva Economic Conference of 1927.

With these considerations in mind, the head of the Belgian delegation at the Tenth Assembly drew attention to the economic situation of Europe, and deduced the necessity for collective understandings. Eminent statesmen expressed themselves in the same sense. After an exhaustive discussion, a solution was adopted tracing the lines of concerted action.

The first conference was to be held at an early date. It was summoned by the Council of the League and met at Geneva in February. The main subject for discussion was the state of trade in Europe. All the European States that are Members of the League of Nations took part, while three States alone of other continents were represented. Two Acts issued from its discussions, and these were signed by the European States alone. The first of these Acts is a preliminary measure designed to secure the temporary stability of trade and Customs tariffs in Europe. The second Act fixes the programme of the collective negotiations which the twenty-three signatory States have agreed to conduct in the more tranquil atmosphere which the previous agreement should procure. The aim of these negotiations will be to establish closer co-operation between European countries, to improve the system under which their production and trade are carried on, and to extend their markets. The negotiations will take place under the auspices of the League and with the support of its Economic Organisation.

The experience thus acquired affords at once a valuable lesson. It shows that the principle of universality on which the League of Nations is based is no obstacle to the European States considering in concert the problems which specially concern them, and endeavouring to establish closer co-operation among themselves. It shows also that a European entente is feasible within the sphere of action of existing organisations.

Nor is it a complete innovation. The French Government's Memorandum pertinently makes this point when it observes that "the League of Nations itself, in the general exercise of its
activities, has more than once had to take into account this geographical unity which Europe represents, and for which common solutions may be found which could not be imposed upon the whole world. Certain questions which the League has had under consideration for a number of years past are specifically Continental. Such, in particular, are questions of communication by water, road and rail, and the transport and distribution of electric power.

In order to attain the object which the Government of the French Republic submits to Europe, His Majesty’s Government considers that it is a fundamental necessity to proceed further with the action already in progress within the League organisation. Such action must, at the same time, be intensified and rendered more systematic, and the organs of the League must be adapted to the purpose by a process of judicious specialisation. By these progressive efforts and by these wise methods the European Union will take shape without any danger to the authority of the League or the harmony between its constituent parts. The apprehensions which any innovation in the international sphere is apt to induce will thus be dissipated.

These are the general considerations which the Belgian Government has wished to set forth before giving its opinion on the various points submitted for its consideration.

I. NEED FOR A GENERAL AGREEMENT.

The Belgian Government approves the idea of a general agreement affirming the principle of the moral union of Europe, and placing formally on record the existence of a union between the European States. The terms of such an agreement cannot be determined until after the exchanges of views regarding the report of the French Government at the next Assembly of the League, when the principle of the Union is definitely accepted by the Governments.

In accordance with a suggestion put forward by the French Government, Belgium is of opinion that it would be desirable to lay down, in the proposed agreement, that the work of the European Union will be carried out within the framework of the League of Nations, and will consequently remain subject to the provisions of the Covenant, which forms a basis accepted by all the States consulted.

II. NEED FOR MACHINERY WHICH WILL SECURE FOR THE EUROPEAN UNION THE ORGANS ESSENTIAL FOR THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF ITS TASK.

The Memorandum proposes the creation of two bodies—one representative and responsible, the “European Conference”, and the other executive, political and permanent, the “European Committee”. The Memorandum suggests that the first body, composed of representatives of all the European Governments which are Members of the League, should be the primary directing body of the Union in conjunction with the League of Nations, and that its powers and organisation should be settled at the next meeting of the Governments.

The Belgian Government recognises the desirability of a conference including the representatives of all the European Governments which are Members of the League. It is of opinion that the discussions which will take place at the coming meeting in Geneva can alone throw light on the rôle of the conference, its powers, and its methods of work.

It does not, however, think that it is desirable to create an executive organisation in the form of a permanent political committee. For the moment “it is of essential importance”, to quote the terms of the Memorandum, “to limit ourselves to outlining certain very simple ideas”.

The framing of the programme of European co-operation and the consideration of methods of carrying it into effect are matters for the conference. The latter could, if necessary, entrust the task to commissions chosen from among its members, the direct control of which would rest in its hands.

The Belgian Government considers, as it has said above, that European co-operation should be established by developing the institutions of the League of Nations which can most usefully devote themselves to the matter, while adapting them to this new task by a judicious process of specialisation. It holds that the secretarial work and the collection of information and studies necessary for the European conference should be entrusted to the competent branches of the Secretariat of the League of Nations, in conformity with the procedure adopted for collective economic action.

III. NEED FOR LAYING DOWN IN ADVANCE THE ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLES.

The French Government’s Memorandum mentions, in the first instance, amongst the essential principles, the general subordination of the economic problem to the political problem. It insists on the necessity of bringing on to the political plane at the outset “the constructive effort tending to give Europe its organic structure”, and it emphasises the point that security is at the root of all economic progress.

No doubt the co-ordination of economic work cannot readily progress where confidence and security are lacking. The extension of the conciliation, judicial settlement and arbitration procedures, the numerous local agreements on the model of the Locarno Treaties, and the progressive reduction of the various forms of armament, are calculated to promote economic co-operation between nations.
But the opposite proposition is equally true. As a resolution adopted on the proposal of the French delegation by the Sixth Assembly of the League of Nations stated: "Economic peace will largely contribute to security among the nations."

The two main motives of the action of peoples, the political and the economic motive, interact, neither being subordinated to the other.

Important as are the political problems, it cannot be disputed that joint action by the European States in the economic field is to-day imperative. It not merely represents a great aspiration; it is imposed by the facts. The present conditions of production demand increasingly wide bases, and experience is already revealing in striking fashion the inferiority of Continental producers who are confined within the limits of too narrow economic units. The collective action which has been undertaken in conformity with the resolution of the Tenth Assembly is one of those forms of action whose benefits appear most certain and most immediate.

IV. Advisability of Reserving, either for the Next European Conference or for the Future European Committee, a Study of all Questions of Practical Application.

Questions of application would be reserved as subjects of study for future meetings of the conference. The character and limits of the sphere of European co-operation, the methods to be employed, and the forms in which the Union would work in conjunction with countries outside it, would there be determined.

The Belgian Government is of opinion, in agreement with the Memorandum, that it will be advisable to wait, before discussing these questions, till the coming meeting at Geneva has laid the foundations of the system of European Federal Union.

In communicating to the Government of the French Republic the observations which its consideration of the Memorandum has suggested, the Belgian Government desires to express once more the keen interest and profound sympathy with which it has welcomed the great idea that His Excellency M. Briand had already sketched in outline at Geneva in September last. Belgium trusts that unanimous agreement will be forthcoming, so that the European Federal Union may become a fact, and its work for prosperity and peace be crowned with success.
No. 23.

REPLY FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF THE IRISH FREE STATE.

(July 17th, 1930).

In accordance with the procedure agreed upon at the preliminary meeting of representatives of European States, Members of the League of Nations, held in Geneva on September 9th, 1929, the Irish Government have the honour to submit their views regarding the Memorandum on the organisation of a system of European Federal Union, forwarded for their consideration by the Government of the French Republic.

The Irish Government desire at the outset to proclaim their admiration of the able and felicitous manner in which the subject has been presented by the French Government, and their lively sense of the service already rendered to the high ideal of European Union by the unsparking energy and boundless enthusiasm with which the Government of the French Republic have discharged the task entrusted to them by the European States.

* * *

Before offering their observations with regard to the different points upon which they have been invited by the French Government to give their opinion, the Irish Government desire to indicate their attitude towards the general principle with reference to which the Memorandum of the French Government has been prepared, and upon which the proposals and suggestions set out therein are based.

The Irish Government frankly recognise that the geographical contiguity of the States of Europe creates between those States a natural bond which must, in the stress of European and world conditions, come to constitute a factor tending towards a closer association of those States for political and economic purposes.

But the extent to which this natural bond is accompanied in the various States by a sense of common interest must altogether depend on factors—geographical situation, racial affinities, historical traditions, etc.—which differ in the various States. Obviously, the Irish Free State has an active interest, from the political as well as the economic and social points of view, in every circumstance which affects the peace and well-being of Europe, but it is equally obvious that her concern cannot be so proximate as that of those of her sister States of Europe, whose interests are more intimately bound up with the destiny of the European Commonwealth. It is only natural, therefore, that the sentiment of the Moral Union of Europe should not be felt so forcibly in the Irish Free State as in other nations of the Continent. There is, moreover, in this connection a further important factor which must be taken into consideration. For many decades Ireland was a country of heavy emigration, and the many millions of the Irish Race, which may be numbered to-day among the populations of the American and Australian continents, constitute between the Irish Free State and those regions of the world a bond of moral union in no degree less binding than that which exists between this country and the other European States.

I. NEED FOR AN AGREEMENT OF A GENERAL ORDER, HOWEVER SUMMARY IT MAY BE, TO AFFIRM THE PRINCIPLE OF THE MORAL UNION OF EUROPE AND TO PLACE NORMALLY ON RECORD THE EXISTENCE OF THE SOLIDARITY ESTABLISHED BETWEEN THE STATES OF EUROPE.

Coming, therefore, to the concrete proposals of the French Government, a General Pact which, while affirming the principle of the Moral Union of Europe, took no account of the ties which link the Irish Free State with other countries would only partially express the true orientation of Irish political consciousness. Such ties are largely of a sentimental order, but they are concrete and objective factors in the examination of a proposal that the States of Europe should affirm as a principle their sense of the bond of moral union existing between them, and, starting from that principle, should aim at the establishment of a system of federal organisation.

The Irish Government do not feel called upon at this stage to indicate their attitude towards any Pact of a general character that might be drawn up in accordance with the proposals made in Section I of the French Government's Memorandum. They consider, however, that an agreement of the kind indicated, would have the best chance of success if it were framed directly under the auspices of the League of Nations and were confined in principle to a simple recognition of the fact that the geographical collocation of the States of Europe gives rise to interests and problems peculiar to Europe, which it is the peculiar concern of the European States to co-ordinate and solve.
Moreover, the Irish Government consider that in its practical application, such an agreement should be based on the principle that each State party to the Agreement is the sole judge of the manner and extent to which it should co-operate in the pursuit of the objects of the association. In the view of the Irish Government, conditions in Europe are not yet such, nor is the sense of common interest yet so strong, that any agreement which went further and imposed on the parties to it a collective responsibility in matters in which they were not individually concerned, could be expected to meet with more than a very limited measure of acceptance.

II. NEED FOR MACHINERY WHICH WILL SECURE FOR THE EUROPEAN UNION THE ORGANS ESSENTIAL FOR THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF ITS TASK.

To the question of the machinery designed to secure for the European States the organs essential for the attainment of their common objects, the Irish Government have given especially earnest consideration, in view of the reactions which the establishment of the comprehensive machinery proposed in the Memorandum must have on the organisation of the League of Nations.

The Memorandum proposes, as the primary directing organ, a European Conference composed of the representatives of all the European Governments who are Members of the League and an executive organ in the form of a permanent political Committee composed of the representatives of a certain number of the members of the Conference. A permanent Secretariat, and the formation of technical Committees are also foreshadowed.

It is proposed that the Conference should meet at Geneva at the same time as the Assembly of the League of Nations, and that the meetings of the executive committee should be held also at Geneva, and should coincide with those of the Council. It is also proposed that the secretariat should have its seat at Geneva.

The Irish Government consider that the establishment of such machinery, and, more especially, the suggested juxtaposition of the organs of the European association and the machinery of the League of Nations, could not fail to have reactions which might eventually result in rendering ineffective the work of both organisations, and this possibility constitutes in their view, an aspect of the present proposals which calls for most careful examination by the Governments of all the States concerned. The pacific organisation of Europe is an ideal to which the Irish Government have already demonstrated their attachment, but in the pursuit of this ideal the Irish Government would hesitate to take any step which was, even remotely, likely to endanger the progress of the work of the League of Nations in the interests of universal peace.

This consideration suggests the query whether the effective pursuit of the objects of the proposed association necessitates the creation of new organs such as those now proposed, which would exist and function more or less independently, within the framework of the League of Nations. The answer to this query would very largely depend upon the trend of the policies to be pursued and the nature of the activities to be carried out by the new association. In this connection, the Irish Government take the view that the primary object of any association of the States of Europe should be the complete realisation among its members of the various policies and programmes already adopted, or in the future to be adopted by the League. It is common knowledge that, even among European States, many of these policies and programmes still await full practical acceptance, or development, and in so far as and as long as this condition of things persists, their realisation constitutes an ideal, to the pursuit of which the concerted efforts of the States of Europe would be most worthily and fruitfully directed, and in the attainment of which the fullest aspirations of the European Commonwealth would find fulfilment.

In the work of preparing the way for this consummation, the Irish Government consider that the existing resources at present at the disposal of all States Members of the League should be utilised to the full, and that, if this is done, those resources will be found fully adequate. The Irish Government are not convinced that the common objects of the States of Europe would be brought nearer to realisation by entrusting their attainment to new and untried machinery.

III. NEED FOR LAYING DOWN IN ADVANCE THE ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLES WHICH SHALL DETERMINE THE GENERAL CONCEPTIONS OF THE EUROPEAN COMMITTEE AND GUIDE IT IN THE ENQUIRIES WHICH IT MAKES FOR THE PURPOSE OF PREPARING THE PROGRAMME OF THE EUROPEAN ORGANISATION.

It is observed that the third point set out in the Memorandum is based on the assumption that the proposed association will set up a European Committee, part of the functions of which will be the preparation of the programme of the European Organisation. The views of the Irish Government on the question of the machinery of the proposed association of the States of Europe have been set out in the preceding paragraphs, and their observation on this third point must accordingly be read in conjunction with those views.

Whatever machinery is eventually adopted for the attainment of the ends of the proposed association, the essential principles which would determine its operation and should guide it in the exercise of the functions entrusted to it must clearly, in the view of the Irish Government, be fully discussed and agreed upon beforehand. The Irish Government consider that this point is one for examination at the next European meetings. They are also impressed with the special importance of ensuring, as suggested in the Memorandum, that the technical and expert elements in the work of the proposed association would be subject to constant political control and guidance.
The essential principles which the French Government suggest should govern the concerted action of the European States raise issues of the greatest importance, and merit the closest examination of all the States interested in the formation of the new association and in the preservation of the peace of Europe and of the world.

These principles, as formulated by the French Government, depend upon the thesis that the inauguration of a truly liberal tariff policy in Europe is strictly governed by the question of political security, and that the question of security itself is intimately bound up with that of the progress that can be made on the road to political union. Such a thesis calls for more exhaustive discussion than can be accorded to it within the limits of this reply, but an opportunity of examining it in detail, will, no doubt, arise during the consideration of the third point at the next European meeting. The Irish Government may, however, at this stage indicate their view that the guarantees afforded by the Covenant of the League of Nations and the security enjoyed by States by virtue of their rights as Members of that organisation should, if these advantages receive their due recognition in the consciousness of the peoples of Europe, ensure the maintenance of a political environment, in which practical schemes for the organisation of the material forces of Europe, which would take full and sympathetic account of existing variations on the level of economic development, could be pursued to success in an atmosphere of confidence and mutual trust.

The Irish Government are satisfied that, within the four corners of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and of the programme drawn up by the League of Nations Committee on Arbitration and Security, are to be found the maximum guarantees that can be mutually accorded by sovereign States freely associated for pacific ends. No doubt the highest possible degree of security is attained when a group of States become bound together in a political union or federation; but it is difficult to conceive how an association of States could afford its members a higher degree of security than that guaranteed to its members by the League of Nations, without at the same time necessitating some departure from those principles of free association and national sovereignty upon which the organisation of the League is based. In this connection, the Irish Government note with satisfaction the essential reservations provided for in the Memorandum. They do not hesitate, therefore, to declare their view that the Irish Free State could not become, nor remain, a member of any combination of States that did not take as a fundamental principle the freedom of association of its members, or which involved any derogation from the rights of this country as a sovereign State.

The third essential principle which it is suggested should be laid down in advance for the guidance of the European Committee concerns the economic organisation of Europe. The Irish Government are always prepared to co-operate to the full in any scheme which would have for its object the raising of the standard of human well-being, and are ready to give every consideration to any proposals having that end in view. It is obvious, however, that no proposal designed to bring about the better economic organisation of Europe as a whole is likely to meet with acceptance unless it takes proper account of the economic conditions prevailing in the States of Europe individually. For reasons upon which it is not necessary here to enter, the Irish Free State is still at an early stage of its industrial development. No country so situated could reasonably be expected to make economic sacrifices for the establishment of a common market in Europe before it felt assured that it was in a position to secure its due participation in that market. The justice of this attitude has been confirmed by the Economic Consultative Committee of the League of Nations, who expressed the view that, in the execution of the measures recommended by the World Economic Conference of 1927, account should always be taken of the provisos and reservations necessary to meet the just demands of States which are still at an early stage of their industrial evolution.

IV. ADVISABILITY OF RESERVING, EITHER FOR THE NEXT EUROPEAN CONFERENCE OR FOR THE FUTURE EUROPEAN COMMITTEE, THE STUDY OF ALL QUESTIONS OF PRACTICAL APPLICATION.

The Irish Government are of opinion that it is desirable to reserve to the next meeting of European States the examination of the fields in which the States of Europe might profitably pursue a policy of co-operation, and of the methods by which that policy should be carried out. They consider that this examination might well be directed to the subjects referred to in Section IV of the Memorandum, and should be conducted with the object of discovering how best the conventions established and the recommendations formulated by the League of Nations may be brought into force between the States of Europe, and how the existing resources of the League may be utilised to the fullest advantage in the interests of European co-operation.

...
REPLY FROM THE BULGARIAN GOVERNMENT

(July 19th, 1930.

[Translation.]

The Bulgarian Government views the idea of the organisation of a European Federal Union with the greatest sympathy. It has accordingly received with much satisfaction the Memorandum of the Government of the French Republic dated May 1st, and has carefully examined its contents. The Bulgarian Government is convinced that there is a real union between the peoples and countries of Europe, which should be organised in order to derive therefrom all its inherent advantages for the peace, progress, and well-being of the European community. In this work it is fully prepared to make its modest contribution.

The Bulgarian Government realises, together with all the other Governments, the many difficulties of this task, difficulties which are in great part due to the profound political and economic disorder of Europe which resulted from the great war, and from the moral disunion, mistrust and resentment which are its corollary. But the very existence of this harmful situation renders the problem of the organisation of Europe even more necessary and more pressing by imposing upon all countries the obligation to concentrate their efforts and consent voluntarily to the concessions necessary for the realisation of the projected European Union.

In speaking of concessions, the Bulgarian Government has in mind only such concessions as States grant to one another by mutual agreements freely entered into, which very often are in apparent contradiction with the principle of their sovereignty. Such voluntary limitations occur, not only in relations between States, but also in the internal life of the latter. If, then, voluntary limitations are possible as between State and State, they are still more justified when they are agreed to for the benefit of the European community.

The establishment of the federal connection which is sought for between European Governments cannot in any respect affect any of the sovereign rights of the States which are members of the Union. It is on the basis of complete sovereignty and entire political independence that the agreement between the European nations must be realised. While accepting these fundamental conditions, the Bulgarian Government believes that a place should also be found at the basis of the new organisation of Europe for the high moral conception of protection and of political and economic assistance to the weakest members of the future organisation. This conception is imposed, not only by sentiments of generosity and fellowship, but also by the need for strengthening the work of the European association in its most vulnerable parts.

To give concrete form to this idea, the Bulgarian Government considers that it would be desirable to insert in the Statutes of the new organisation a declaration which, while proclaiming the moral unity of Europe and the complete equality of the participating States, would contain not only the renunciation of war as a means of defending the interests of States, but also the abandonment of all other forms of pressure, except such as may have been ordered by the General Assembly of the association in particular cases. Any State not complying with this rule would commit an act inconsistent with the European Union and would be considered as having placed itself voluntarily outside the European community.

In the same order of ideas, the Bulgarian Government believes that one of the first tasks of the European Union should be to facilitate and urge on the execution of certain clauses of the Peace Treaties and of the Covenant of the League of Nations, such as the clauses in regard to minorities and disarmament, which, in spite of their clear and categorical form, still remain unexecuted and are creating between the States concerned an atmosphere of tension and mistrust. If the relations of a large number of European States are governed by the Peace Treaties, and if the defects in these Treaties cannot at present be corrected in accordance with the Covenant of the League of Nations (Article 19), then the execution of certain clauses which are inspired by a sense of justice and equity becomes all the more necessary. Full and equal execution, for all, of the Peace Treaties and of the Covenant of the League of Nations is the necessary condition for placing all the peoples of Europe on a situation of legal equality, in conformity with the fundamental idea of the Memorandum, so as to arrive at the creation of the moral unity of Europe on the basis of mutual confidence, without which the high ideal of a European community is in danger of causing disappointment.

The Bulgarian Government approves entirely the ideas set forth in the Memorandum with regard to the situation and operation of the proposed organisation in relation to the League of Nations. While recognising the difficulties of finding at the present time a formula which defines in precise and concrete form the sphere of competence of the two institutions, the Bulgarian Government thinks it well to state at once that it entirely shares the idea that the European organisation should not in any way diminish the competence or authority of the League
of Nations or encroach on its powers. On the contrary, it should facilitate and supplement the work of the latter by conforming to its views. Accordingly, it would, perhaps, be well to consider the practical desirability of entrusting to the new organisation the initial consideration of all political questions which concern Europe exclusively.

I. NEED FOR A GENERAL AGREEMENT, HOWEVER SUMMARY IT MAY BE, TO AFFIRM THE PRINCIPLE OF THE MORAL UNION OF EUROPE AND TO PLACE FORMALLY ON RECORD THE EXISTENCE OF THE SOLIDARITY ESTABLISHED BETWEEN THE STATES OF EUROPE.

The Bulgarian Government accepts the principle that the European States should form an organisation aiming at moral union, with mutual obligations of a political, moral, material and social character towards one another, thus giving concrete form to the union of the European nations. Such a conception comprises the aims of the new organisation. For the realisation of these aims the Bulgarian Government considers that the participation of all the European States is desirable. Any exclusion would more or less diminish the efficacy of the measures for the organisation of the political and economic co-operation of Europe. The consideration put forward in the Memorandum that, "to demonstrate more clearly the subordination of the European association to the League of Nations, the European pact should be confined at first to the European States which are members of the League", does not appear decisive to the Bulgarian Government, since the same object can be attained by the acceptance on the part of all the members of the European Union of the principle of the co-ordination of the special work of the Union to the general work of the League of Nations. Lastly, though temporary obstacles may at present exist to the participation of Russia, this is not the case in regard to the participation of Turkey, a country which not only has territory in Europe but, unlike Russia, has a political regime which is recognised in constitutional and international law and maintains regular relations with all the European States.

II. NEED FOR MACHINERY WHICH WILL SECURE FOR THE EUROPEAN UNION THE ORGANS ESSENTIAL FOR THE EXECUTION OF ITS WORK.

On this point, the Bulgarian Government accepts in their entirety the suggestions contained in the Memorandum. It ventures to add certain observations on points of detail. It would be desirable to make provision in the organisation of the governing organs of the Union for two vice-presidents of each such organ in addition to the presidents, as also for the participation of all the States which are members of the Union on full and equal terms at the European Conference. If the same principle cannot be applied to the composition of the permanent political committee, it would be desirable to fill the posts on this committee by rotation. The procedure to be followed in the working of the organs of the new organisation should be much simpler and more rapid than that of the League of Nations.

III. NEED FOR LAYING DOWN IN ADVANCE THE ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLES WHICH SHALL DETERMINE THE GENERAL CONCEPTIONS OF THE EUROPEAN COMMITTEE AND GUIDE IT IN THE ENQUIRIES WHICH IT MAKES FOR THE PURPOSE OF PREPARING THE PROGRAMME OF THE EUROPEAN ORGANISATION.

On this further point, the Bulgarian Government is of opinion that the views expressed in the first part of the present reply, together with the definition appearing in Section II of the European Union, substantially indicate the principles which the Committee might follow in its work. In any case, it would be preferable to entrust consideration of the solution of this question to the General Assembly of the European Union. In general, the Bulgarian Government believes that these principles cannot differ essentially from those of the League of Nations.

* * *

As regards the subordination of the economic problem as a whole to the political problem, the Bulgarian Government, although it is in agreement with the considerations contained in the Memorandum (Point III), considers that the interdependence of the two problems is such that it is often impossible to separate them. It will consequently be difficult to act on the principle above indicated in the practical work of the new organisation. Moreover, whatever the final solution of this point, it is absolutely essential that States which enjoy fewer economic or financial advantages should be protected from any sort of economic or political domination.

* * *

As regards the principle of European co-operation, the Bulgarian Government is of opinion that the general application of the system, so often adopted, of separate pacts is not likely to constitute a substantial expression of the idea of the European Union and of the principle of co-operation between the nations of Europe. The idea of European co-operation would be more effectively furthered by the adoption, in the Statutes of the new organisation, of the principle that any dispute arising between two or more European States should be recognised as affecting the general interest of Europe, and its solution accordingly recognised as coming within the competence of the new organisation.
In regard to the principle of the economic co-operation of Europe (Point C), the Bulgarian Government, while accepting the principle of an economic union, as in the case of the political solution, is of opinion that, having regard to the importance of the problem, it would better serve the end in view if, after the actual principle of economic union was affirmed, the detailed consideration of the question were entrusted to specialists. At the same time, the Bulgarian Government feels it its duty to state at once that, in such consideration of the question, the governing organs should be guided by the fundamental idea that each member of the European Union should be assured the possibility of developing its productive capacity to the utmost in the interest of the European community. That idea tallies, moreover, with the formula in the Memorandum—viz., “the organisation of Europe’s vital forces”.

IV. ADVISABILITY OF RESERVING, EITHER FOR THE NEXT EUROPEAN CONFERENCE OR FOR THE FUTURE EUROPEAN COMMITTEE, THE STUDY OF ALL QUESTIONS OF PRACTICAL APPLICATION.

On this point, which fixes the sphere of action of European co-operation, the Bulgarian Government, while supporting in its entirety the programme set out in the Memorandum, believes that it would be advisable to add to this programme a point with regard to the study of the political questions interesting Europe, which should be submitted to the governing organs of the Union. Such study is essential, not only to amplify and complete the sphere of action of the new organisation, but also to allow it to face the actual necessities of the political life of Europe.

**

In putting forward these observations and suggestions, the Bulgarian Government’s only aim is to contribute to the elucidation of the great problem of the European Union. In so doing, it will certainly continue to help in this great work, without any preconceived opinion and with the sincere desire to assist in the realisation of an idea which is essential for the peace and well-being of the European peoples.
No. 25.

REPLY FROM THE YUGOSLAV GOVERNMENT

(July 21st, 1930).

[Translation.]

The Royal Yugoslav Government desires to express its appreciation of the step taken by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the French Republic in regard to the organisation of a European Federal Union.

The Royal Government considers that the preparatory work for the formation of the Union in itself offers great benefits which deserve to be appreciated at their proper value, apart from all consideration of the possibilities of realising the plan for a Union in the more or less distant future. This preliminary work will, beyond all question, help the parties concerned to make up their minds upon the question and will create a new atmosphere. It will encourage the search, on a new and enlarged basis, for a solution of the problems before the European peoples, by ways and means different from those by which the solution of these problems has been sought in the past. The Royal Government is persuaded that, by its beneficent and peaceful influence, it will contribute largely to a better understanding and a rapprochement of the peoples.

It is in this spirit that the Royal Government, after studying with the closest attention the Memorandum drawn up by M. Briand, has the honour to formulate the following observations in conformity with the invitation addressed to it.

I.

The Royal Government agrees to the proposal that the suggestions contained in the Memorandum of the French Government, together with the opinions of the various Governments on the subject of the Memorandum, should be considered at a conference to meet at Geneva during the session of the League of Nations, the same States being represented at the conference as were represented at the meeting of September 9th, 1929. It appears to the Royal Government that it would be in accordance with the resolution taken at the latter date to entrust the representative of the French Government with the summoning of that conference and with the report on the enquiry made.

II.

The Royal Government is prepared to accept any formula which, while indicating clearly the essential objects of the association with which the Memorandum is concerned, will bind the signatory Governments to maintain regular contact at periodical and extraordinary meetings, with a view to the joint consideration of all questions that primarily interest the community of European peoples.

As there can of course, be no question of anything but a regional association within the framework and under the auspices of the League of Nations, and subordinated to the latter, the association in question will not be able to comprise States other than those that are Members of the League of Nations.

III.

The Royal Government agrees as to the necessity for the creation of the organs mentioned in the second part of the memorandum. At the same time, if the creation of such complete machinery gives rise to reservations on the part of the representatives of certain States at the coming meeting in Geneva, the Royal Government considers that the mere fact of providing for periodical meetings of the Conference and of setting up a secretariat service entrusted with the indispensable investigations and the preparatory work for the conferences, would in itself, as a beginning, undoubtedly constitute a considerable success.

IV.

In the opinion of the Royal Government, the secretariat in question is particularly necessary for what will, in fact, be its primary task—namely, to render possible the consideration of the appropriate measures for realising, within the shortest possible time, the creation of a European organisation for the solution of the questions enumerated in Section IV of the Memorandum. The need of a co-ordinating organisation for the purposes of European co-operation in the majority of the questions enumerated in this section is beyond question already felt, independently of the proposal for a system of European Federal Union. In view of the fact that the majority of these
questions—for example, the regulation and improvement of inter-European traffic, the co-ordination of the work of the European river commissions, agreements between railways, the European system of posts, telegraphs and telephones, and a large number of other subjects which are not enumerated in the Memorandum, such as the construction of international roads, motor traffic, air traffic, the establishment of a European system of canals and the like—are purely regional questions which, while of the greatest importance for the States of Europe, are of very little or, most often, no interest to extra-European States, it is clear that this most important work cannot be entrusted to the League of Nations and its organs.

The League of Nations, as the name implies has only to take into consideration questions which, directly or indirectly, are of common interest to all the Members of the League. It may encourage the formation and supervise the operation of regional organisations; but it cannot be asked to take the place of those organisations, any more than it could reasonably be expected to take the place of particular Governments and to do their work for them.
No. 26.

REPLY FROM THE SWISS GOVERNMENT

(August 4th, 1930).

[Translation:]

The Swiss Government has examined with the greatest interest the Memorandum of the French Government on the organisation of a system of European Federal Union. The Swiss Government has always been aware of the grave difficulties, and even dangers, which may result from the political and economic conditions of present-day Europe. It is therefore ready to consider in a spirit of fellowship and co-operation the possibility of finding adequate mitigations or remedies for this situation. In so doing it is animated by the desire to take a share in loyally studying a problem the full importance of which it recognises, and it is grateful to the French Government for having taken the initiative in raising the question.

The Swiss Government must, however, repeat that it cannot bind itself by engagements that may affect its neutrality, which is the time-honoured basis of the political status of the Swiss Confederation. It is more than ever convinced that the maintenance of Swiss neutrality is " in the true interests of the policy of Europe in its entirety", and it could not therefore contemplate any change in the international status of the Confederation which results from the Act of November 20th, 1815, and from the Declaration of London of February 13th, 1920. Switzerland believes, moreover, that she may claim to have given proof on more occasions than one that the special system which is peculiar to herself within the framework of the League of Nations does not prevent her from usefully co-operating, without foregoing her special rights, in the improvement of international relations and in strengthening general peace.

The Swiss Government has already had an opportunity of stating that, in its view, it is hardly practicable to take into consideration any scheme for a European Union unless it obtains the support of the great majority of European States. A special organisation such as the Government of the French Republic proposes would clearly have no raison d'être unless it corresponded to a need more or less unanimously felt. Otherwise, the proposed Union would run the risk of assuming the appearance of a coalition rather than a genuine federation founded on the common desire to promote, within a specific geographical area, the universal effort in the cause of peace for which the League of Nations stands. Without the support of particular States, the proposal would create antagonism between those who were associated with it and those outside, and this antagonism would still further increase the political and economic disequilibrium, which it is the very object of the European Union to eliminate. It is essential not to run such a risk, particularly as it is not certain that, even if carried out under the best possible conditions, this attempt at association of the States of Europe will remain without effect on other continents.

It has been pointed out in many quarters that the scheme for a European Union might involve a certain danger for the League of Nations. The Swiss Government is not disposed to anticipate the future to the extent of sharing all the fears which have been expressed in this connection. The Government of the French Republic has, moreover, clearly indicated in the Memorandum its intention of avoiding anything which might be likely to imperil the Geneva institution. It has emphasised the fact that "it is in no way proposed to form a European group outside the League of Nations, but, on the contrary, to bring European interests into harmony under the control of, and in conformity with the spirit of, the League of Nations, by creating within its universal organisation an organisation which, for being limited, would be all the more effective". In the opinion of the Federal Council, this is a point of the greatest importance. If it is desired to remove the fears which have been expressed, it is essential to eliminate at the outset anything that might give rise to conflicts of competence or rivalries between the contemplated regional entente and the League of Nations. For Switzerland, as for other countries, the League of Nations represents a great achievement of civilisation in the cause of peace. It corresponds to a vital need, and all action likely to weaken or unsettle it should be avoided. A European Union would no longer be desirable if it meant a limitation of the possibilities of action and development of the League of Nations.

How is harmony between the League of Nations and the Union to be achieved? The problem is a difficult one, and will call for much further consideration and for extensive study. The Federal Council is accordingly of opinion that it is desirable to proceed with great care. It is easy to imagine action by the European Union on general economic questions or in connection with economic equipment, communications and transit, finance or labour, without such action encroaching on the general work of the League. If there are in these various fields interests which are specifically European, they may be subjected without evil consequences to what the French Memorandum calls the "special competence" of the European Union. At the same time, it should not be forgotten that this special competence might, in certain events, extend to the study of problems which are akin to a number of questions that the League of Nations
has already taken up and endeavoured to solve within the limits that existing circumstances allowed. As the circumstances show no appreciable change, it may be asked whether a European Union would arrive at any better results. The question arises particularly in the case of economic problems, a field in which it will probably be difficult to make a clear distinction between matters that should fall under the competence of the one institution and matters that should fall under the competence of the other.

The French Government attaches importance to the subordination of the economic to the political problem. In its view, it is on the political plane that “the broad lines of the economic policy of Europe as well as the tariff policy of each individual European State should be elaborated.” The Swiss Government is also of opinion that economic problems are closely connected with political problems. It is further convinced that an economically prosperous Europe is inconceivable without political appeasement in Europe. The factor of security undoubtedly plays a determining part in this matter. But the security problem is one of those which claim the most earnest attention of the League of Nations. There has been hardly a single session of the Assembly which has not tried to make some contribution to the settlement of this problem. Gratifying, if not decisive, progress has been achieved, particularly in the special field of compulsory arbitration, which is so closely connected with the general problem of security. The League of Nations has not failed in its task, and it will be near the attainment of one of its principal ends on the day when it succeeds in drawing up and putting in force a general convention for the reduction of armaments.

The task thus begun must be continued. The Swiss Government considers that what the countries of Europe are capable of accomplishing between them in the matter of security they can accomplish more effectively within the framework of the existing organisation. The security problem is a universal problem which cannot be finally solved without the cooperation of the other continents. For this reason, the Swiss Government is not sure that the European Union would be wise to take upon itself in some sort the consideration of a question which has been before the League of Nations ever since its creation, and which the League appears capable of solving unaided. Moreover, while excluding this problem from its competence, the European Union might nevertheless contribute effectively to its solution by creating an atmosphere favourable to positive achievements.

The numerous restrictions which at present hamper the economic development of Europe are no doubt due in part to a certain impression of political insecurity. The Swiss Government is, however, of opinion that the European Union might attain some of its objects even though it should decide to take up the consideration of economic problems without waiting until the problem of security is nearer a solution. The agreements which have already provided solutions for a number of European economic problems show that co-operation in the purely economic field is possible. Pluralateral commercial agreements, amongst other things, are certainly capable of realisation. If the attempts to conclude such agreements have not up to the present been entirely successful, that is a consequence rather of difficulties encountered in the economic field itself than of any lack of political cohesion. On the other hand, the territorial limits proposed for a number of agreements have proved in certain cases too wide, particularly in the case of the application of the resolutions of the World Economic Conference, and co-operation within narrower limits might lead to satisfactory results.

In any event, Switzerland, whose keen interest in all that is connected with the problem of international economic co-operation has been displayed again and again, is ready, in accordance with the attitude she has hitherto adopted, to assist in the attempt to improve the economic situation of Europe.

It would no doubt be premature to express an opinion as to the form which the scheme for European Union should take when the time comes. As the Memorandum of the French Government points out, the object is that at present proposed is the drawing up of a “programme of European organisation.” Must this programme make provision for complete machinery “which will secure for the European Union the organs essential for the accomplishment of its task”? Is it indispensable, at the outset at any rate, to have recourse to the creation of a regular executive organisation with a permanent secretariat in addition? Would it not be sufficient to provide for the summoning of conferences, at which certain specifically European questions would be considered and, if necessary, to ask the country in which the conference is held to arrange for the secretarial services required? These are all questions which can only profitably be discussed at a subsequent meeting. The Swiss Government believes it would be better only to have the simplest and most elastic machinery possible. It fails to see any need for setting up a European Union organised on the lines of the League of Nations, with its own permanent services, and for giving it a distinct juristic identity of its own.

The need for special organs is the less apparent in view of the fact that, owing to the impetus recently given by the League of Nations, there has been closer co-operation of late between the States of Europe, particularly in economic matters. These initial results are no doubt capable of development if the action already taken can be followed up under favourable conditions. It is worth mentioning that the “preliminary conference with a view to concerted economic action” had under its consideration all the questions to which the present economic situation of Europe gives rise.

The Swiss Government further reserves the right to develop the points set forth above at greater length at the conference which the French Government proposes to summon at Geneva on the occasion of the next meeting of the Assembly of the League of Nations, at which conference the Federal Council will be represented in accordance with its statement to the National Council on June 25th last.
IV.

REPORT
ON THE RESULTS OF THE ENQUIRY
IN CONNECTION WITH THE ORGANISATION OF A
SYSTEM OF EUROPEAN FEDERAL UNION.
Having, as it was asked to do, consulted the European Governments under the conditions decided upon at the meeting at Geneva on September 9th, 1929, the Government of the French Republic is happy to be able to-day to complete the task entrusted to it within the period agreed upon by laying before the second meeting of the European States Members of the League of Nations the conclusions derived from the enquiry into the organisation of a system of European Federal Union.

First of all, it desires to express its appreciation of the efforts made by all the Governments consulted to bring the enquiry to a satisfactory conclusion.

The Government of the Republic is sure that all the Governments by which it was entrusted with this task will share its gratification at the attitude shown by the replies. The care that all the Governments consulted have devoted to the preparation of their replies demonstrates the importance they attach to such an important task as the material and moral organisation of Europe, and their anxiety to ensure that the ground is systematically prepared. This caution and this diligent preparation may be looked upon as the firmest pledge of the intentions of every Government in regard to the prosecution of the scheme, and there could be no better guarantee than the number and the detailed character of the comments and reservations that have been made. In the present state of the problem, therefore, nothing need detract from such confidence as may be justifiably drawn from an initial consultation.

This is the only general comment that the Government of the Republic will permit itself in framing a purely analytical report, in which it proposes to confine itself strictly to bringing out the views expressed by all the Governments consulted on the various points in the French Memorandum, without interpolating any personal expression of opinion.

This will be a work of mere analysis and elucidation in which every care will be taken to preserve the characteristic views of each Government so far as the number and variety of the opinions permit. In such a general analysis the French Government will necessarily be unable to make special mention of, or textual quotations from, any particular observations that do not represent a fresh view or a mean between other views.

Moreover, while endeavouring to emphasise the positive and constructive elements to be derived from these collected opinions, it will always seek to lay equal stress upon the difficulties to which attention is drawn and the particular observations called forth by the special anxieties of any given Government.

It has thought it desirable to reproduce for reference, together with its analytical report, the full text of all the replies received, in the chronological order of their official delivery.

It will rest with the responsible Governments, after reading this document, to form an opinion free from outside influence as to the propriety of attaching greater importance to the immediate and fundamental reasons, on which all are agreed, for establishing a union of nations than to the more remote or superficial causes of antagonism which may have come to light through normal divergencies of view on particular points that have never yet been discussed. The French Government has made its choice; it retains the fullest confidence in the force of the considerations that justified the collective decision of September 9th, 1929, and have led, during these last ten years, to the systematic development of a pacific organisation for which the nations have evinced a strongly marked regard.

A.

Questions of Principle raised in the Memorandum of May 1st, 1930.

I. NEED FOR CO-ORDINATION IN EUROPE.

When submitting to the other twenty-six European Governments represented at the meeting of September 9th, 1929, the Memorandum it had been asked to draw up, the French Government referred, in justification of the enquiry undertaken, to the unco-ordinated state of Europe in the political, economic and social fields.

The need for co-ordination in Europe is recognised by all the Governments consulted. Some of them merely state its existence and announce their decision to take part in the coming meeting of European Governments; the majority express themselves in very clear terms.

The British Government refers to the need for "a better understanding by the European peoples of the common interests which they share" in order to divert their attention "from the hostilities of the past". It observes that, at all events in the economic field, "closer co-operation between the nations of Europe is urgently to be desired."

The Italian Government declares itself "ready to co-operate willingly" in an initiative "aiming at the material and moral reconstruction of Europe".

The Finnish Government considers that "for the sake of the future evolution of our continent, it is undoubtedly important that this European fellow-feeling should be further developed";
the Greek Government, that “co-operation, regularly maintained and methodically pursued, is in harmony with the real interests of the European peoples”.

The German Government, going so far as to observe that, in its opinion, the structure of Europe requires extensive alterations, considers that “the general political and economic organisation of the Continent hampers a development which could be in harmony with the natural conditions of life of the various peoples”.

Other Governments attempt to measure the consequences of this lack of co-ordination. Attention is called to the dispersal of forces which has so far prevailed, and which calls for “the creation of a framework of European co-operation”. Nobody can deny the existence between different countries of antagonisms accentuated by the action of political parties, the Press, and other organs of public opinion, but organised co-operation would in many cases reveal the lack of any genuine ground for such antagonisms. Opinion is growing ripe, however, for the organisation of closer co-operation between the nations of Europe, and the first efforts in this direction cannot but exercise a beneficent and peaceful influence.

II. INCORPORATION OF THE SYSTEM OF EUROPEAN CO-OPERATION IN THE GENERAL WORK OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

In the Memorandum of May 1st, it was explicitly specified that European co-operation must tend to increase the authority of the League of Nations and diminish the obstacles it might encounter in the accomplishment of its tasks. It was argued that the idea of such co-operation was directly derived from the idea on which the Covenant was based, and that the joint study by the European States of questions of more particular interest to them had no other object than to prepare and promote the settlement by the League, on a worldwide basis, of those general and special problems which, under the terms of the Covenant or the Treaties, it alone is competent to solve.

All the Governments are at one in their anxiety to do nothing that might weaken the authority of the League. The French Government is happy to emphasise the profound regard which has once more been shown for the highest authority engaged in the organisation of peace. To preserve this pre- eminent authority of the League of Nations, not to restrict its field of action or diminish its universality—these are essentials so commonly recognised to-day that many Governments have merely alluded to them as principles calling for no discussion.

Observing that the work of the League of Nations has consisted up to the present to a very great extent in attempting the settlement of questions which have been primarily of European interest, the Swedish Government considers that the co-operation of the European States should be organised in such manner as to realise the greatest possible degree of effectiveness, use being made of the adequate machinery afforded by the League organisation.

A similar idea is put forward by the Belgian Government. It considers, on the one hand, that the European entente should be brought about by the development of the institutions of the League of Nations, and that the main object should be to extend and perfect these institutions’. It also points out that “the principle of universality on which the League of Nations is based is no other than the European States’ considering in concert the problems which specially concern them, and endeavouring to establish closer co-operation among themselves. Entente agreements assert their conviction that, so far from hindering the work of the League, European co-operation could not but assist it in its task, strengthen it with fresh forces, and lay, by settling European questions, the foundation for a more effective execution of the obligations of the Covenant.” The Norwegian Government expresses itself as follows: “There are no grounds for stating that European co-operation could weaken the authority of the League of Nations. On the contrary, efforts in this direction cannot but enhance the League’s prestige, since they are closely bound up with the League’s aims. Owing to the comprehensive nature of its work, the League must surely note with gratification such an endeavour to create peace, tranquillity and satisfactory conditions in the Continent of Europe, which forms so important a part of its domain. The League as a whole, therefore, is bound to benefit by an endeavour to solve European problems in the light of co-operative and collective organisation.”

Certain apprehensions are expressed, not in regard to the actual principle of European co-operation, but in regard to the various precautions that will have to be taken in putting it into practice. The German Government fears the beginnings of European isolation, with the result that other groups would be formed within the League. It considers that account must be taken of the effects of a European agreement on the League, and that the question of these effects must, if necessary, be submitted to the League for its decision.

The Portuguese Government considers that a European Union might, in virtue of its importance, exceed the scope of a regional entente. On the other hand, it urges that existing bilateral or multilateral agreements between States or groups of States must not be invalidated, nor must the scope or efficacy of the bonds of alliance or friendship which are fundamental and traditional factors of the international relations of certain countries be reduced.

---

1 The Netherlands.
2 Austria.
3 Denmark.
4 Czechoslovakia.
5 Finland.
6 Yugoslavia.
7 Czechoslovakia.
8 Poland.
In the eyes of the Czechoslovak Government, the organisation of co-operation among all the States of Europe would no more constitute an impediment to the work of the League of Nations than the establishment of more limited regional understandings in Europe. In an attempt to demonstrate that this European organisation would be complete in harmony with the more general mechanism of the League of Nations, it defines the part that it thinks such co-operation should play: “Within the various spheres laid down in the Statute, the organisation would act independently only if and so far as the League of Nations had not already dealt with the particular problem. Otherwise, it would employ its efforts to facilitate or ensure the execution of the decisions or recommendations of the League of Nations.” It will be necessary to advance step by step with the utmost caution, but the Czechoslovak Government considers that it is the duty of responsible statesmen to neglect no proposal which may lead in the direction of progress.

The Swiss Government likewise alludes to the “vital” importance of ensuring complete harmony between European co-operation and the work of the League.

In the view of the Austrian Government, the European Union, connected with the League of Nations, both from the legal point of view by Article 29 of the Covenant and in practice by the choice of Geneva as its headquarters, can further be embodied organically in the League, which “will thus have at its disposal new machinery suitable for its purely European tasks and will hence be equipped for pursuing its high ideals even more efficiently than in the past.”

III. POSITION IN REGARD TO NON-EUROPEAN STATES AND STATES WHICH ARE NOT MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE.

“The proposed European organisation,” says the Memorandum, “could not be opposed to any ethnographical combination outside the League, either in Europe itself or in other continents, any more than it could be to the League itself.”

Sharing in this respect a conviction that is shared by all the Members of the League, the European Governments were inevitably at one in explicitly asserting this fundamental principle of their co-operation. At the same time, any one of them might quite legitimately have to reckon, in practice, with a special geographical position or a wider expansion of its moral and material interests outside Europe. On this point, therefore, more than on any other, it was important that the consultation should bring out all the aspects of a naturally complex problem.

The British Government points out that, being already a member of a commonwealth of nations embracing several continents, it would have to take account of special considerations and satisfy itself “that the measures taken for closer European co-operation” would not “cause anxiety or resentment in any other continent.”

The question assumes a different aspect in the case of extra-European territories, such as colonies, which have no sovereignty of their own. The Netherlands Government emphasises the fact that it will have to bear in mind its special interests in such territories. The Portuguese Government naturally specifies that the proposed Union should in no way diminish the ties between its colonies and the mother-country, restrict its rights over the colonies, or involve any interference in strictly colonial questions. (Absolute respect for the sovereign rights of States, which must, as all the Governments consulted recognise, be at the root of a European Union, should suffice to dispel all apprehension in this respect.)

Several Governments, laying stress upon the links that have been forged by a common origin, language and culture between their countries and extra-European countries, reserve their opinion on any measures that might possibly affect those links. Akin to these observations is the opinion of the Norwegian Government, which, referring likewise to “the relationship due to the common origins or mutual friendships of Anglo-Saxon or Latin peoples,” thinks that this “precludes the idea of organised co-operation in Europe creating a sort of contrast which might endanger peaceful relations with non-European States.”

With reference to Europe itself, the French Government, regarding itself as limited by the mandate it had received from the European Governments which are Members of the League and from them alone, and desiring to demonstrate more clearly that the European Union would be subordinate to the League, suggested in its Memorandum that, at all events to begin with, the Union should comprise only the European States Members of the League, though provision would be made for effective co-operation with the other States by a procedure which has already been employed at Geneva itself.

While certain Governments do not seem to contemplate in their replies that any States but Members of the League should participate at the beginning, the majority take the view that no European country should be left out—all should either become full members of the Union forthwith or should co-operate more or less closely with it. This question is developed at considerable length in the reply of the Danish Government.

The reasons for these views are to be found as much in geographical and economic considerations as in geographical and economic considerations as in the political inexpediency of leaving any European countries isolated from the rest of the continent. It is not proper, observes the German Government, that certain European countries should be alienated from European co-operation. “A European programme should, as regards its actual contents and the geographical area to which it is to apply, therefore, be as flexible as possible. To exclude European
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1 Spain, Portugal and the Irish Free State.
2 Portugal, Belgium, Yugoslavia and Norway.
countries which are not Members of the League, such as Russia and Turkey, would be contrary to the practice rightly followed in the past." Remarking that the Federal Union is based on a de facto solidarity, the Italian Government thinks that "the participation of all the countries between whom this de facto solidarity exists is necessary or, at least, desirable ". It therefore calls the attention of the French Government to "the advisability of suggesting to the other Governments concerned that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the Republic of Turkey be invited to take part in the work of preparing the plan for a European Federal Union, and, therefore, in the meeting to be held at Geneva on the occasion of the next Assembly of the League of Nations ".

On account of their geographical situation, Greece, Bulgaria and Hungary likewise regard it as desirable that Turkey be included in the Union.

All these opinions seem to show that there is no division on any point of principle in connection either with the participation of the European States which are not Members of the League or with the question of relations with extra-European countries. The Governments will therefore find at their first meeting no serious obstacle to the satisfactory solution of a question which the League itself has already had to solve.

Furthermore, since the opinions given seem to find their main justification in economic considerations, it should be observed that in this respect also the proposed organisation of the Union is sufficiently flexible to permit of any adaptation required. Here the Netherlands Government, taking up an idea explicitly formulated in the French Government's Memorandum, points out that the proposed Union proceeds from a conception absolutely contrary to that which formerly led to the creation in Europe of Customs unions tending to abolish internal Customs barriers in order to erect on the boundary of the whole community a stiffer barrier—that is to say, in order to create in practice a weapon against the States situated outside these unions.

IV. RESPECT FOR THE INDEPENDENCE AND SOVEREIGNTY OF STATES.

In concluding the general observations which precede the statement of the various points in its Memorandum, the French Government points out that "in no case and in no degree may the formation of the Federal Union desired by the European Governments affect in any way any of the sovereign rights of the States which are members of such an association ". Any thought of political domination being obviously out of the question, States would only enter the association to exercise strictly equal rights, as in the League of Nations, under whose control the association is to be placed.

No objection has been raised to this fundamental principle. Even in the extreme form in which it is conceived by the Government of the Irish Free State, it cannot in itself form any obstacle to the organisation of the European Association. As the Netherlands Government observes, "a conception of sovereignty leaving no place for the voluntary acceptance of certain limitations of the powers of States should be ruled out as incompatible with the essential nature of international relations ". Again, as conceived by the Irish Government, which is in agreement on this point with the French Government's Memorandum, the Union "should be based on respect for the sovereignty and mutual equality of the States members, as in the case of the juridical system of the League of Nations. In the different countries of Europe, owing to the national character and historical evolution of each country, conditions vary widely. It will be important to respect the individuality of each nation, whether large or small, European co-operation being based on the interests common to all ". Such a conception would seem entirely to dispel the apprehensions of the Swiss Government, which calls attention to the fact that the neutrality of the Confederation is secured by international instruments.

The point at issue, in fact, is to secure equality among all the members of the proposed Association within the Association itself and in its work—that is to say, that every participating State would exercise, by reason of its commitments to the Association, equal rights in the latter's affairs, without either the obligations or the rights that it derives from other undertakings being affected thereby. The question thus raised at the outset could not be raised in any other form among Governments that are Members of the League of Nations, in which their relations are based on the same conception of equality. The Hungarian Government, however, does not seem satisfied with the question in this form; it would prefer the idea of sovereignty and equality of rights to be so interpreted "as to remove all inequalities the practical consequences of which make it impossible for certain countries to exercise their full sovereign rights ". The Italian Government expresses a similar opinion, holding that "the establishment of conditions of absolute equality between all the States in the Association should have the effect of "eradicating the last distinction between victorious peoples and defeated peoples ".

The general feeling on the subject would seem to be voiced by the British Government when it observes that the fundamental purpose is "to divert the attention of the peoples of Europe from the hostilities of the past and from the conflicts of interest between them which are sometimes alleged to exist and to fix their attention instead upon the more important common interest which to-day they share ".

1 "Each State party to the agreement is the sole judge of the manner and extent to which it should co-operate in the pursuit of the objects of the Association."
B.

Special Questions raised in the Memorandum of May 1st, 1930.

I. NEED FOR A GENERAL AGREEMENT.

The first of the special points submitted to the Governments for their consideration was the need for a general agreement affirming the principle of the moral union of Europe, indicating clearly its essentially pacific object, and placing the signatory Governments under the obligation to get into touch regularly at meetings.

The views expressed on the fundamental principles, and the general conclusion, which is in favour of more effective co-operation among the European Governments, seem to show that such immediate accession could be secured to an agreement involving the signatories in no other commitment than that of taking part in meetings held regularly or on special occasions to examine such questions as they might consider to be of common interest to them all.

Either unconditionally or subject to reservations already universally accepted (incorporation in the League of Nations system, initial limitation to a very simple outline, etc.), most of the Governments have already announced their readiness to bind themselves by treaty to establish some form of regular contacts with the other European Governments.

The other Governments announce their intention of taking part in the European meetings, but without as yet expressing any opinion on the proposed agreement; some discussing only the actual principles of the scheme, or giving only provisional replies on account of certain necessary enquires, or expressing individual views, on the acceptance of which they do not, however, appear to make their accession to the agreement conditional.

The study of the purport of this agreement could not be carried very far at a first consultation. For the most part, the replies, like the Memorandum itself, emphasise the need of bringing content at first with a brief document which would be drafted at the first meeting and could be amplified thereafter as the work of the Union became more clearly defined.

The general observations already received in regard to the incorporation of the European Union in the general machinery of the League of Nations suffice to indicate the lines on which the provisions on this subject to be embodied in the European Agreement should be framed—on the assumption that action is not limited at the outset to a simple declaration of principle, a commission being appointed to define the question, and, in particular, to study the formula outlined by the Czechoslovak Government.

The same applies to the participation of States which are not Members of the League; the methods of arranging this could be considered at the coming European meeting.

II. NEED FOR MACHINERY.

Under the heading "Need for machinery which will secure for the European Union the organs essential for the accomplishment of its task", the French Government proposed to the other Governments, in its Memorandum, that three organs should be set up in conjunction with those of the League of Nations—the Conference of representatives of all the States members of the Union, which would be the responsible directing body; a smaller but permanent Political Committee, which would act both as the committee of research and as the executive body for the conference; and a very small secretariat to register decisions, notify resolutions and carry out the administrative instructions of the President.

Such machinery would lend itself to a wide range of adaptations and simplifications, and we should not be inaccurately reporting the views of the various Governments if we merely enumerated those that do and those that do not regard the establishment of each of these suggested bodies as necessary. Yugoslavia and Bulgaria do, indeed, pronounce in favour of the complete machinery as described above, and the question is not gone into in detail in the Greek and Albanian replies; but every one of the other Governments has suggested a solution differing from the next only in some slight degree.

Great Britain fears that confusion might arise between the League organisations and the new bodies, which would not derive their authority from the League Covenant or from Part XIII of the "Treaty of Versailles." It observes that European committees might be formed in the Assembly, the Council and the technical organisations of the League. Germany, the Irish Free State, the Netherlands and Sweden think that no new bodies should be created until the need for them is felt; while Spain, Luxembourg and Portugal propose that the question be discussed at
the first meeting. All the other Governments recommend the establishment of the supreme body, the European Conference. Some of them do not contemplate attaching any committee to it, while others think that it might be assisted, at all events temporarily, either by a committee or commission of enquiry on any question that may be specially referred to it by the Conference, or by a "European Committee" similar to the Austrian Committee formerly appointed by the League; or, again, as Norway suggests, by a permanent committee consisting, in the first place, of the European Members of the League Council.

A number of Governments think that the secretariat work could be performed by the Secretariat of the League, or organised by it in conjunction with a European committee; others consider that a provisional secretariat, in the form of a secretariat to the President or a central bureau, would be needed at the outset.

From these replies, the general idea to which a large number of Governments subscribe seems to be that of a single conference comprising all States, meeting periodically, and having in the initial stages the assistance of a committee, bureau or secretariat which can devise and construct an organisation during the intervals between meetings.

The replies of the various Governments contain detailed observations which it may be of interest to note.

The Italian Government urges the necessity of securing to all States absolute equality in the projected organisation, and, in particular, representation, not only at the annual meetings, but also in the Union's work between those meetings. The Hungarian Government observes that the memorandum of May 1st aims at preventing any predominance on the part of any one State, but that this equality does not exist under the present organisation of the League.

The Danish Government calls attention to the advantages of holding regular meetings of the European Conference; difficult problems, it argues, can be more easily discussed at regular meetings, which arouse less attention than special conferences. It would be better to hold the meetings after the League Assembly than before, in order to avoid giving any impression of attempting to bias the Assembly's decisions. Consideration should, however, be given to the difficulty that many delegates would find in extending their stay at Geneva. It might also be possible to hold meetings in the different countries in rotation, in which case the chairman would simply be chosen from the country in which the meeting was held, while two vice-chairmen would be appointed from among the representatives of the other States. A similar view is put forward by the Finnish Government, which thinks that, instead of a permanent political committee, the Foreign Minister of the country whose representative had been elected President of the Conference and the diplomatic representatives of the States members in his country might act as a liaison organisation between conferences.

Without going into such great details, most of the Governments agree that the question of the organisation of the Union should be on the agenda of the first meeting, and might be investigated by a committee of research or enquiry.

III. NEED FOR LAYING DOWN GENERAL PRINCIPLES.

The need for determining the general conceptions to be followed in studying the European organisation was the third point to which the Memorandum called the attention of Governments, though it was made quite clear that this point might be reserved for consideration at the coming European meeting.

Holding that progress in the direction of economic union can only be made so far as the nations are assured of security and have solid grounds for mutual confidence, and holding also that the formation of groups on purely economic lines might expose certain nations to the risks of a political domination resulting from an industrial domination by better-equipped countries, the French Government expressed the opinion that the work of organisation should primarily aim at securing the direct co-operation of the responsible Governments on the political plane, with a view to the establishment of a close and permanent pacific union between the peoples of Europe.

A. Interdependence of Political and Economic Problems.

That the improvement of economic conditions can be facilitated by an improvement in political conditions is not disputed by any of the Governments consulted. Most of them lay stress upon this interdependence between the two, but they seem generally inclined to avoid making the one definitely subordinate to the other in practice.

The Albanian Government holds that, "in the economic field, there are problems easier to solve—the solution of which, by increasing the mutual confidence of the States and the process of effective pacification, will render more easy the consideration of the political questions".

The German Government refers to its attitude on the questions of security, disarmament, minorities, etc., but, in connection with the organisation of European co-operation, it recommends that there should be no change in the methods employed as regards questions with which the League of Nations has already dealt or is dealing.

"Apart from political considerations", it writes, "there are no doubt possibilities in the purely economic sphere which must be investigated and utilised in the interests of European..."
progress. Closer co-operation in this domain should not be made to depend on the establishment of greater security. On the contrary, any understanding in the economic sphere will largely contribute to strengthening the feeling of union, and thereby the sense of security as well."

The Austrian Government considers that "a decisive step towards the rational development and organisation of the economic forces of Europe cannot be made until all possibility of war has been removed". Notwithstanding the progress made by means of the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Locarno and Hague agreements, and the Pact against war, there still exist political problems of the first importance which must be solved. But there are also economic questions which demand immediate solution, and are already sufficiently far advanced for settlement.

The Swiss Government expresses itself to the like effect: "The numerous restrictions which at present hamper the economic development of Europe are no doubt due in part to a certain impression of political insecurity", but "the European Union might attain some of its objects even though it should decide to take up the consideration of economic problems without waiting until the problem of security is nearer a solution."

The Hungarian Government states that, in its view, it is the settlement of political questions that would facilitate European co-operation. It could not enter an organisation that would preclude any possible future revision of the Treaties and would make the existing position unalterable, but it of course realises that the European Conference will not undertake such a revision. Similarly, after referring to the question of minorities, it recognises that "the European association would not be qualified to deal exhaustively with problems which are within the competence of the League". It therefore advises that an endeavour should be made "first of all to organise co-operation in the economic sphere."

"It is evident that the problem of economic union starts from essentially political premises", writes the Italian Government, and, in its view, not merely the premise of security should be assured in the first place, but all those on which the Covenant of the League of Nations rests, including disarmament.

The Roumanian Government is of opinion that economic co-operation can be organised without preliminary political co-operation, but this co-operation, like that of the League, should rest upon the principles of respect for treaties and the territorial integrity of States, to which principles the Polish Government also alludes.

The Latvian Government looks upon political security as a condition of economic development. Apart from a few countries which reserve their opinion on the point, the remaining Governments consider that the relation between the political and the economic problem is one of interdependence rather than subordination. "No doubt", says the Belgian Government, "the co-ordination of economic work cannot readily progress where confidence and security are lacking. The extension of the conciliation, judicial settlement and arbitration procedures, the numerous local agreements on the model of the Locarno Treaties, and the progressive reduction of the various forms of armament, are calculated to promote economic co-operation between nations. But the opposite proposition is equally true. As a resolution adopted on the proposal of the French delegation by the Fifth Assembly of the League of Nations stated: ‘Economic relations will largely contribute to security among the nations’. The two main motives of the action of peoples, the political and the economic motive interact, neither being subordinated to the other."

The Czechoslovak Government likewise conceives co-operation among European States as being manifested more predominantly sometimes in the political and sometimes in the economic sphere, since the two groups of problems stand in a continual relation of interdependence one to the other.

The British Government thinks that "it is primarily in respect of economic relations that closer co-operation between the nations of Europe is urgently to be desired". In its view, however, economic questions should be considered not one by one, nor in respect of isolated interests, but from the point of view of the general interests involved, and that much can be done by political authorities to promote a wider outlook on economic questions.

Similar to this observation is that of the Austrian Government, to the effect that economic work should not be left in the hands of experts, who may be limited by the sectional views of economic circles, but should be directed by responsible political representatives, who need only be actuated by the interests of their countries and the interests of the European Association.

It was primarily this question of method that the French Government aimed at elucidating in its Memorandum.

The Government of the Irish Free State also recommends that "the technical and expert element in the work of the proposed Association" should be "subject to constant political control and guidance". It further points out that the countries of Europe have attained varying degrees of industrial development, and observes that no country could contribute to the establishment of a common market in Europe unless it were assured of due participation in that market.

Similarly, the German Government notes that "the agricultural depression and the difficulties experienced by manufacturers in finding markets for their products must form the starting-point of the enquiry into the economic crisis. Ways and means will have to be sought to secure larger markets and to promote the exchange of commodities between the essentially agricultural and the essentially industrial areas of Europe". It holds that military considerations should not place obstacles in the way of a logical division of economic work, and that account must also be taken
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1 The Bulgarian Government also refers to the questions of minorities and disarmament. The Lithuanian Government alludes to difficulties "resulting from acts for which no just reparation has been made."

2 Greece, Spain, Yugoslavia.
of the social structure of certain countries and the financial charges laid upon them as a result of the war.

The Danish Government is of opinion that "a large number of the difficulties that are hampering the economic life of Europe are due to the dispersion of energies in agricultural and industrial production, caused by Customs frontiers. An organisation under which gradual progress could be made towards a rational division of labour corresponding with geographical and social conditions in the various countries would contribute immensely to the general improvement of economic conditions in Europe and would greatly benefit the European States, as well as the other parts of the world interested in trade with Europe."

The Norwegian Government observes that there exist in Europe, as the Memorandum states, 20,000 kilometres of Customs barriers, and that the tariff policy of the European States is continually tending to raise these barriers still higher. This is a threat both to peace and to material prosperity. "An endeavour to restrict the armaments of Customs policy is as important as an attempt to reduce armies and navies. The reduction of military armaments will be a natural consequence of better and more cordial relations in the domain of commercial policy."

"Cannot attempts to lower Customs barriers be continued", asks the Netherlands Government, "side by side with efforts to establish a political entente? Such a reduction would be likely to eliminate one of the most serious threats to international harmony, and would therefore constitute in itself one of the chief factors in bringing about a regime of security."

**B. Concepcion of European Political Co-operation.**

It is, in fact, from the development of economic co-operation—accompanied, according to some of them, by action in the political field—that most of the European Governments, bearing in mind the guarantees already afforded by the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Pact for the Outlawry of War, and the Locarno Agreements, expect the most immediate advance in the direction of security.

Several Governments point out that they could not associate themselves with the introduction of a general system of guarantee or insurance that would involve military obligations. The Danish Government has always maintained the view that, until the reduction of armaments provided for in Article 18 of the Covenant of the League has been achieved, no guarantee obligations beyond those contained in the Covenant can be contracted; indeed, it is of opinion that a special discussion of the matter would, in present circumstances, make the negotiations with regard to European co-operation more difficult. On the other hand, it firmly upholds the principle which is at the root of the Locarno agreements, that no endeavour should be made to change existing frontiers by force; and it refers to the draft Convention it brought forward at Geneva, according to which "changes in frontiers could not in future be justified by war."

The Luxembourg Government, while advertling to its special military position, pronounces in favour of a general extension of arbitration and the policy of international guarantees. The Finnish Government suggests "an examination of the organs of conciliation and arbitration created by bilateral treaties between European States with a view to developing and standardising them. The Polish Government is of opinion that it would be advisable, when organising a European union, constantly to bear in mind the principles on which the Geneva Protocol was based.

**IV. QUESTIONS OF PRACTICAL APPLICATION.**

In the Memorandum of May 1st, it was proposed that all questions of practical application should be reserved for the coming meeting.

The Memorandum gave a list of the classes of question that could be dealt with by the Conference, indicated the various methods of studying them, and emphasised the necessity for determining the forms of co-operation to be established between countries that are members of the Union and countries which remain outside it.

Most of the Governments are agreed that the detailed consideration of this programme should be postponed to a later meeting of the Conference.

The Bulgarian Government proposes that the programme should include political questions. The Finnish Government considers that the question of passports should be dealt with.

In the view of the Spanish Government, on the other hand, the programme could best be examined by the League of Nations in the regular way.

The Government of the Irish Free State thinks that an attempt should be made at the coming meeting to discover how the existing resources of the League may be utilised and how the conventions established by the League may be brought more speedily into force.

The Yugoslav Government lays stress upon the number and importance of the purely regional questions which are of the greatest interest to the States of Europe, but are sometimes of no concern to other countries; it considers that the League of Nations cannot be expected to take the place of the Governments interested for the purpose of settling such questions.

---

1 Denmark, Luxemburg, Norway.
Conclusion.

According to its own conception of its duties, it is not for the reporting Government—after merely giving an analytical summary of the opinions independently expressed by all the Governments consulted—to attempt to draw substantive conclusions. These can only be derived from a collective discussion—that is to say, from the judgment of the European Conference assembled here to-day.

Moreover, the individual replies of the Governments to the Memorandum of May 1st are merely the first elements—preceding any joint deliberation and any real exchange of views—in a comprehensive investigation that is still in its early stages and that cannot, owing to the importance of its subject, be hurried. This preliminary consultation could not be expected to produce general conclusions straightaway—still less final conclusions—as to the scheme as a whole, but only some indications of the procedure to be followed and the first steps to be taken in accordance with the principles laid down on September 9th, 1929.

From among these indications, however, it is the duty of the Rapporteur to extract the most urgent—that is to say, those which seem to call for immediate discussion.

All the Governments consulted share the French Government’s desire to place the proposed Union definitely under the moral authority of the League of Nations. The European Conference should begin to discuss this point fairly soon so as to have sufficient time to consider the conditions and the form in which the Assembly’s views ought to be ascertained.

Several Governments, moreover, have proposed that representatives of States which are not Members of the League should be invited to attend the meetings of the European Conference from the beginning. Here, again, before the point is discussed at all, consideration must be given to the propriety of ascertaining the feeling of the League.

The British Government’s proposal that the consultation itself, in its present form, should be brought to the Assembly’s notice, would mean in practice an equally prompt discussion.

The same would apply to any declaration, resolution or draft motion which it might, as the outcome of the first European meeting, seem proper to communicate to the Assembly.

Accordingly, the representatives of the Governments which took part in the meeting of September 9th, 1929, and whom it was necessary to convene to-day in order that the Rapporteur might acquit himself of his duties under the conditions laid down, must be given an opportunity to hold an initial exchange of views and a discussion on questions of principle before the League Assembly opens, if decisions are to be reached in time for all questions preliminary to the detailed examination of the scheme to be raised in the Assembly.

This discussion might deal, in general, with the main points of procedure, which must be settled before a programme of work can be decided upon.

With regard to the proposal—which meets the views of most of the Governments consulted and is more particularly advocated by the Finnish and Polish Governments—to set up, after a first session of the European Conference, a body to frame the programme for the organisation of the European Union on systematic lines, it will likewise rest with the Conference, if it adopts the principle, to consider under what conditions and within what period its decision on the subject should be reached.

Such are the immediate and preliminary obligations that seem incumbent upon this first European Conference; such, if we consider only the mere mechanism of a procedure freely entered into by twenty-seven European Governments, are the sure indications and the living signs that already affirm the existence of this first manifestation of European union. If, as has been asserted unanimously and with conviction, this Union answers to a vital European need, it will be the task of the forces of evolution, aided by the will of the peoples, to ensure its regular and unimpeded development.

September 8th, 1930.