Personal and Confidential.

Dr. J.W. Beyen.

hisei T gui DSP2 gening. DWE

The Hague, January 25, 1954.

My dear Ambassador,

Now that the First Chamber has accepted the E.D.C .-Treaty - we hope to deposit the instrument of ratification as soon as her Majesty has signed the Bill - I am giving some thought to the next steps to be/set on the arduous path towards European unity.

As to E.D.C. we still do not know what the French will do. The Italian attitude will, as far as I can judge, depend very much on what the others will do. I cannot imagine they will remain out, provided everybody else goes along. Anyway their attitude is not necessarily connected with any particular aspect of the E.D.C. Treaty. On the French side however we have to expect proposals to change this or that aspect. As we know already, there is a proposal from the side of a Senator to change the supra-national character of E.D.C. It is not easy to see why this would bring about a situation more acceptable to France then E.D.C. or to the solution, so violently opposed by France of accepting Germany as a member of N.A.T.O. But I suppose logic has not too much to do with all this, and the explanation is, in all likelihood, the horror in some quarters, of anything supernational. Still, we have to reckon with quite some response to a proposal of that kind in certain circles outside France. I have all the respect, due to other people's opinion, for the attitude of those who openly declare they will not have anything to do with supernational solutions. But, lately, by some of the antagonists against such solutions a device is being used which may be dangerous because it tries to fight

His Excellency Mr. H. Freeman Matthews. Ambassador of the United States of America. THE HAGUE.

I am quite sure the French Senator's proposal for a non-supra-national solution of the European Defence problem will keep the name E.D.C. and continue to talk about an European Army. We will have to wait and see whether proposals of this kind will win the day in France - nobody knows, maybe when it is studied, the French will not like it any better then the E.D.C. I hope they will not ignore the element of time of which Mr. Dulles spoke so aptly in his speech; you will have noticed this speech played a rather prominent part in last week's debate in the First Chember.

The same tendency to agree to the name but to shy away from reality appears, but from more authoritative French side, in connection with the proposals for a European Political Community. The attitude on our side has always been that we do not care for the name, and still less for the trappings of a European Political Community, unless something is brought into being which can develop real solidarity in Europe - and real solidarity means foremost economic integration. We regret that this should be striven at in the limited cicle of six nations. But so far only those six are willing to accept the principle of a supernational authority. Without such authority one would do no more then create another O.E.E.C. combined with an assembly like the Council of Europe, this time with only six partners. And then, we do not want a sort of protectionist group of six. That is why we do not want a series of "High Authorities" for subsequently integrated sectors of production. We trust the Coal and Steel Community will avoid protectionism - but we would not feel so certain about combinations nearer the consumer's field.

alrhayle

Now I feel no great worries about proposals to do nothing but create thesshell of a European Folitical Community also many of the strongest protagonists of "United Europe" are dangerous in this respect, because, in their eagerness they would rather have an empty shell than no egg at all. But even for them it should not be too blatantly a sham. What I fear more is the proposal to start with "capping" Coal and Steel and E.D.C. and then

gradually add other communities by separate treaties. This is more or less what was envisaged during the days when E.D.C. was signed (vide text of art. 38). We would not like it for the reasons I just indicated. But what is worse, we would not expect that any ulterior treaties would ever come into being. What we would then have is worse than an empty shell. We would have a top organisation over Coal and Steel and E.D.C. with no other task then to get in the way of those two organisations.

The danger of proposals of this kind is, however, that it is so "pleusible". Why not start with what exists and do other things later. In fact it is now proposed from the side of those who regretfully accepted Coal and Steel and R.D.C. and want to get away with as little as possible beyond what - from their point of view unfortunately - happens to exist anyway, in a form which placates the enthousiasts for a United Europe at very little cost.

I would not bother you with all this which is certainly not new to you, if it were not for a possible conjecture which may put the Netherlands in a very disagreeable position.

It may be that the acceptance of E.D.C. in France will be linked to the existence of a European Political Community of some sort. The French Government so far never made the connection but it might be made a condition by some political Party. A Political Community, doing nothing but capping Coal and Steel and E.D.C. might then come in handy. It would not mean anything but please those who would be willing to believe it means something. And the Dutch, who were the first to ratify E.D.C., could be manoeuvred in the position of the bad boys obstructing B.D.C. because they refuse to accept a Political Community which means nothing. This would really be "l'ironie du sort" and I do not like to wait for this "sort".

I know that your Government not only appreciates our policy towards E.D.C. but approves of our point of view in respect of the Political Community and economic integration. This gives me the courage to draw your personal

attention to a situation which need not at all - but might - arise.

With kindest regards,