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 ethnical 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 multi-lateral 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 preclude 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.
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 view 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-juridical 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 born of 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—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 Government’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 cooperation 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 Czechoslovak 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 so 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 to contend undoubtedly make 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 untrammelled 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 of 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.
No. 18.

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 cooperation 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.
No. 19.

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.
No. 20.

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.
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.
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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 cooperation 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 promote. 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 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 emphasizes 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.
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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 unsparing 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 continents 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 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 worthy 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 mutual 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.

* * *

In conclusion, the Irish Government desire to emphasise the importance of devising means which will ensure close and active collaboration between the associated States of Europe and other States. The Irish Government feel that, at every stage of the new development, opportunity should be afforded to other States for a frank expression of their views on that development in so far as it affects their own interests and, in the case of States Members of the League of Nations, in so far as it affects the interests of that organisation. The Irish Government attach great importance to this procedure, which, while permitting the free development of the European idea, will ensure its harmonious setting in the scheme of worldwide peace and co-operation.
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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 IIIA), 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.
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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 beneficient 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.
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 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 cannot dispose to anticipate the future to the extent of accepting 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 co-operation 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. Plurilateral commercial agreements, amongst other things, are certainly capable of realisation. Of European economic problems show that co-operation in the purely economic field is possible. Plurilateral 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, all that is 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 remoter or more 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 obstacle to the European States' considering in concert the problems which specially concern them, and endeavouring to establish closer co-operation among themselves". Several Governments 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 in complete 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 21 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 much 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

---

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 Finnish 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 "effacing 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."
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 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 contact with the other European Governments.¹

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,² or giving only provisional replies on account of certain necessary enquiries,³ or expressing individual views, on the acceptance of which they do not, however, appear to make their accession to the agreement conditional.⁴

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 being 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 accurately 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 the 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, Luxemburg and Portugal propose that the question be discussed at

¹ Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Irish Free State, Latvia, Luxemburg, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Spain, Yugoslavia.
² Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden.
³ Albania, Greece.
⁴ Great Britain.
⁵ Bulgaria, Germany, Hungary, Lithuania.
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

1 Denmark, Finland, Italy, Latvia, Roumania.
2 Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland.
3 Austria, Denmark, Finland, Latvia, Roumania.
4 See also the replies from the Bulgarian and Swiss Governments.
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 development 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 if 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 **Rumanian** 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, but 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

---

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. Conception 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 adverting 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—preceeding 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.