FRANCE

(1) "We are uniting, with the intention of providing a common and reciprocal protection. We want to discourage in advance any aggression, by making it more and more dangerous for the aggressor. Only a potential aggressor could legitimately consider it aimed at him."

Robert Schuman, French Minister of Foreign Affairs.
Remarks at NAT signing ceremony, Washington, D.C., April 4, 1949.

---

(2) "The conception of European neutrality in a world divided between democracy and communism is an illusion inviting aggression.

"We must not wait to be dragged to the edge of the abyss in order to impose upon ourselves the necessary discipline. The sacrifices which each citizen, like each nation, must make for peace, for its organization, for its defense, - have they anything in common with the mourning and ruins in which a new conflict would precipitate the world?

"In the chaos and anxiety, there is one hope: to make the aggressor understand that aggression does not pay.

"Quoting Raymond Poincare - 'Our peaceful and humane words will have a better chance of being heard if we are known to be more united, better armed, and more resolute.'"

(Vincent Auriol - Excerpts from speech at Bar-le-Duc, as reported in "New York Herald Tribune", 24 July, 1950)

---

(3) "Our effort is perhaps our last chance of building a peaceful Europe and to protect her against war by making her capable of living."

(Robert Schuman - before the "Conseil de la Republique" vote of the budget of German and Austrian Affairs)

---

(4) "...we take precautions. We must impose on ourselves a vigorous effort of defense, we must associate that effort with England and the United States, who, like us, wish to defend the peace without the spirit of offence against anyone, and who, like us, hope that all countries of the world will end by signing an agreement to control armaments and to give each country security.

"If we remain united and resolve to defend the respect of our liberties, if we are not isolated but are associated with friendly powers, then we have the strength and the solid reasons for confidence and hope."

(Premier René Pleven, in a New Year's Day radio address to the people of France. "New York Herald Tribune", January 2, 1951)

R. Schuman

(5) "The history of contemporary France is a succession of aggressions she has endured and of attempts she has made to avoid them. Three times in seventy years she has been invaded. The first time, she was the sole victim of the aggressor. From 1914 to 1918, half of our Continent was submerged under the wave of aggression. And the last war overflowed Europe; the invasion became transcontinental, not only because of alliances, but also because of the immensity of the means of action. Invasion crosses neutral frontiers; neither distance nor natural obstacles can stop it any longer.

"In the past the peoples menaced by it too often allowed themselves to be surprised by it. The teaching of experience has led them to draw together. They have placed their confidence in international organization for peace and security. France has constantly supported these efforts and nurtured this great hope. She remains fervently attached to it because she is convinced that in the end humanity will submit to the exigencies of solidarity.

"But she is obliged also to recognize that collective organizations, as they function today, have not yet acquired the necessary efficacy. The Charter envisages the possibility of regional pacts. It **authorizes** its Members to organize individually or collectively for self-defense in conformity with the principles of the Charter.

"France ardently desires that the United Nations may become one day strong enough to assure by itself peace and security in the world, thus rendering any individual initiative unnecessary.

"But, meanwhile, the governments which bear the fearsome responsibility of guarding the independence of their countries have no right to put their trust in partial guaranties. It would be criminal for them to neglect a single opportunity, or a possible aid, for the preservation of peace.

"The exclusive concern of France is to make impossible any invasion of her own territory or of the territory of peace-loving nations. Our aim cannot be restricted to the winning of a war which might be forced upon us, a war which, even if we win it, would leave Europe ravaged and depopulated. We want to avoid such a war by becoming, together, strong enough together to safeguard peace.

"Who, in justice, could reproach us for such an attempt? What sincere friend could take offense at it? In the past, France has been sufficiently respectful of her obligations and true to her friendships, sufficiently alerted also by dreadful experience to be beyond all suspicion.

"There is no contradiction between two treaties when both have as their object to guarantee the security of the same country but are concluded with different guarantors. The multiplicity of possible risks necessitates a multiplicity of precautions. This answer we gave to Germany when, in 1935, she took objection to the Franco-Russian Treaty, incompatible,

(5) according to her, with the Locarno Pact. Today, we give it to the USSR, with whom we remain bound by a defense pact against a possible German menace and by the obligation we accepted never to associate ourselves with any threat directed against her. We shall scrupulously honor this obligation. When we expand the network of our friendships, old and new, do we in fact repudiate a friendship which does not satisfy all our need for security? Is it a threat to anyone when we take out insurance against all risks, when we organize a system of common defense against any attack, whatever its nature?

"We are uniting with the intention of providing a common and reciprocal protection. We want to discourage in advance any aggression, by making it more and more dangerous for the aggressor. Only a potential aggressor could legitimately consider it aimed at him. Our conscience is clear. In signing this pact, France solemnly proclaims her absolute determination to maintain peace. It is not for herself alone that France wants peace, for she knows that peace has become the indivisible property of all and that, by allowing it to be compromised by one of us, we would all lose it together.

"Nations are more and more convinced that their fates are closely bound together, that their salvation and their welfare can no longer be based upon an egotistical and aggressive nationalism, but must rest upon the progressive application of human solidarity." *

---

*Translation from the French of a speech given by
His Excellency Robert Schuman,
Minister of Foreign Affairs of the French Republic,
at the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty in
Washington, D.C., on April 4, 1949.

(6) "...In our anxiety to win the peace, we want the whole world to be convinced that we seek only to defend ourselves"....

(Translation from "Le Monde", December 12, 1950.
Speech of M. Robert Schuman, French Foreign Minister, who spoke in Brussels on December 11 under auspices of European movement)

---

(7) "There is only one road to peace: the sincere agreement of all and control in the framework of the United Nations. As long as this accord has not been reached, to refuse our country the means of defending itself would be to condemn it to war, occupation, servitude. France can live in peace with all peoples and guard the institutions which guarantee individual liberty and parliamentary democracy. We respect the patriotic feeling which spurs the U.S.S.R. to increase its armed forces, but we feel the same sentiment; we do not wish to be dragged into any adventure, any aggression, but we shall not leave our territory unilaterally disarmed. We do not wish our military weakness to be an invitation to aggression, nor that France alone shall, again, protect Western Europe and support, as in 1940, the weight of aggression.

"We do not wish to see that again. Also, we feel no humiliation about receiving arms which arrive to replace those which were destroyed in a battle that was lost, but in which we defended the cause of all.

"In order to obtain these arms, we have contracted only one obligation: that of using them only against aggression."

(Translation from "Le Monde" of March 17, 1950.
M. René Pleven at National Assembly Debate on M.D.A.P. ratification, March 16, 1950)

---

(8) ..."Our aim, our sole aim, is to preserve peace....."

(from the "New York Times", August 8, 1950.
Excerpt from text of the French Government's defence note submitted to the United States Government on August 7, 1950)

---

(9) ..."Our Constitution, our degree of civilization, our principles, forbid us such a war. It must be understood that we shall never attack, but that we shall oppose, with all our forces, anyone penetrating our soil or our zones of occupation"....

(Translation from "Le Monde" of August 29, 1950.
Excerpt from M. Jules Moch's speech at Sète on August 28, before the Socialist Federation)

---

(10) ..."The foreign policy of the government, like that of all its predecessors, is permanently concerned with the defence of peace... ~~l'ingérence étrangère which is manifested in the affairs of numerous States~~...

"There are only two attitudes possible before such a situation: submission or courage.

(Represent Ahead)

/pg. 5

(10) Cont'd. "Submission finds natural allies in all that is feeble and selfish in the hearts of men. But at the end of submission there is only humiliation, deportations, enslavement, destroyed homes, profaned altars, wiped-out civilizations.

"The other attitude is called courage. It demands efforts, sacrifices, but in the present circumstances courage is peace.

"To shelter Europe from a surprise of the Korean type, the free peoples should, as soon as possible, assemble together a protecting force to which the French Government has spontaneously fixed, in view of the requirements set out by the military experts of the nations associated for their defence, France's contribution in peace-time at 20 divisions, plus corresponding air defence...."

(Translation from "Le Monde", September 4, 1950.
M. René Pleven, Speech at Strasbourg)

---

(11) ..."Peace depends essentially on one alternative: the co-existence or incompatability of two worlds, that which we consider the free world and the other.

"War usually results from a tragic misunderstanding on the status of forces. Because we do not wish war, we do not wish misunderstanding. We think that it can be avoided or cast aside only by the show of a will for peace that is strongly organized and sufficiently widely deployed.

"Now is the time to join the immense and powerful party of men who are free and who wish to remain so all the time. Liberty is when one hears ~~sounds~~ the doorbell at 7 o'clock in the morning and knows that it is the milkman and not the Gestapo. The side we choose is, according to the preachings of Valéry, that where the search for universal happiness is not accompanied by mass shootings".....

(Translation from "Le Monde", April 18, 1950.
M. Georges Bidault's speech at the Fair at Lyon)

---

(12) ..."There is only one way to protect oneself, and it is to respect the adage: 'All for one, one for all'....

"There is no happiness without liberty, and there is no liberty without courage....

"On your granite coast, you know that no storm can overcome the resolution and tenacity of men, as long as they keep themselves ready, as long as they feel united, as long as each one understands that salvation cannot be found in isolated action, but in an effort to which each person devotes himself wholeheartedly without an arrière-pensée, as long as all necessary precautions have been taken before the danger. It is this condition which guides the efforts undertaken by the Government to tighten the organization of collective security and to create the conditions of efficacity and common defence for the increase of forces which France can put at the service of peace."

(Translation from "Le Monde", August 15, 1950.
M. René Pleven, speech at Saint-Brieuc, August 14, 1950)

---

(13) "We do not arm ourselves against anyone, we arm ourselves against war.

"The reason for past wars was the erroneous idea of a people and of a Government ~~xxxx~~ about military supremacy. On the day when a similar idea can no longer exist, disarmament will be able to take place.

"A general and total control of atomic weapons is necessary. That is what France ~~wishes~~, ~~She~~, ~~no more than~~ the United States, ~~does not accept the possibility~~ inevitability of war."

(Translation from "L'Aube", June 11, 1950.
M. René Pleven, before the Council of the Republic, June 10)

---

(14) "It is certain that Russia's expenditures for war amount to 13 percent of the national revenue, a percentage clearly superior to that of other countries; that she maintains under arms, in peace time, about 175 active divisions, of which at least one-third are mechanized or blindées, corresponding to an effective force of 2,800,000 men supported by about 19,000 planes and 25,000 tanks.

"Certainly, it is necessary to see the two aspects of the problem. These forces are spread out over immense spaces and a large number of units must watch and occupy the satellite States which are badly resigned to their fate. Neither Mr. Shinwell in London nor I here wish to say that we know the Russian plan of battle -- the Assembly will simply accept the knowledge that the effective forces immediately available for a sudden attack would be very inferior to the figures which I have quoted.

"That justifies the pacts signed and the organization of forces sufficient to discourage all threat of aggression, especially when it will be proved, sooner or later, in Korea, that aggression does not pay, it cannot pay and it should not pay."....

(Translation from "Le Figaro", July 31, 1950.
M. Jules Moch, Debate in the Assembly on national defence)