

open to subsequent adherence by any and all other governments, binding the parties thereto not to resort to war with one another. The precise language to be employed in such a treaty is a matter of indifference to the United States so long as it clearly and unmistakably sets forth the determination of the parties to abolish war among themselves. I therefore renew the suggestion contained in my note of January 11, 1928, that the Government of France join with the Government of the United States in transmitting to the British, Italian, German and Japanese Governments for their consideration and comment the text of M. Briand's original proposal, together with copies of the subsequent correspondence between France and the United States, as a basis for preliminary discussions looking to the conclusion of an appropriate multilateral treaty proscribing recourse to war.

Accept [etc.]

FRANK B. KELLOGG.

*Translation of note of March 30, 1928, from the French Ambassador at Washington to the Secretary of State of the United States*

MR. SECRETARY OF STATE: In reply to your note of February 27 last regarding the proposal for a multilateral treaty proscribing war, I have the honour to inform Your Excellency that M. Briand has been pleased to find in the observations which you have submitted for his consideration a new and cordial affirmation of the common inspiration which animates our two Governments, equally anxious to co-operate in an international movement toward the effective establishment of peace in the world. Assured of such a solidarity in the pursuit of an identical purpose, M. Briand remains convinced, as does Your Excellency, that a mutually acceptable formula may well result from the exchange of views which has taken place up to now between our two Governments, if on both sides there is a disposition to adhere to those essential realities which must be preserved in this discussion, by subordinating thereto those differences of form to which questions of terminology not affecting the substance of the discussion may upon analysis be reduced.

That is to say, that the French Government at this point of the discussion, when all the aspects of the problem have been examined, proposes to adopt as practical a point of view as possible and to facilitate as far as it can the effort of the American Government in the direction of an immediate decision.

The observations which M. Briand has ventured to offer in support of his last suggestion were inspired by a very sincere desire to facilitate in a practical manner the realization of the proposal for the contemplated multilateral treaty by pointing out the conditions best adapted to bring about the consent thereto of all the Governments whose agreement is necessary. The French wording, therefore, tending to limit to war of aggression the proscription proposed in the form of a multilateral rather than a bilateral treaty, was intended to obviate in so far as the American plan was concerned those serious difficulties which would assuredly be encountered in practice. In order to pay due regard to the international obligations of the signatories, it was not possible, as soon as it became a question of a multilateral treaty, to impart thereto the unconditional character desired by Your Excellency without facing the necessity of obtaining the unanimous adherence of all the existing states, or at least of all the interested states, that is to say, those which by reason of their situation are exposed to the possibility of a conflict with any one of the contracting states. In the relations between the states of the American Continent there are similar difficulties which led the American Government at the Pan-American Conference at Habana to approve a resolution limited to the very terms "war