

THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE.

At the concluding session of the Pan-European Congress at Vienna its organizer and chief propagandist, Count Koudenhove-Kalergi, coupled a hope with a warning. A united Europe is bound to come, he said, but a long road remains to be traveled. The question arises whether the road is not in danger of being made longer by over-advertising the hope. Openly to preach the federation of the peoples of Europe is to irritate nationalist susceptibilities. It is too late to stigmatize as "Balkanization" what was hailed ten years ago as "self-determination." In Central and Eastern Europe there are new nations or aggrandized nations with a population of 75,000,000. They will not rise with enthusiasm to the prospect of merging into a United States of Europe the separate identity they have scarcely begun to taste. To these should be added Italy, which preaches louder than ever the gospel of "sacred egoism." Soviet Russia offers the remarkable spectacle of a would-be Communist and anti-nationalist experiment evolving into a nationally conscious State.

The Pan-European idea at Vienna may be compared with the League idea at Geneva. It is likely that among the framers of the Covenant of the League there was not absent the hope of a United States of Europe to come some day. But it is the virtue of the League that it found the formula for reconciling the facts of today with the possibility of promoting a distant ideal. If a federated Europe shall ultimately come out of Geneva, it will come not as the result of preachment but as the result of practice. The League is a device for reconciling nationality with world peace. In the course of time the nations cooperating for the maintenance of peace may be educated to

the value of cooperation all along the line. But it is a merit of the League system that Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Italy and the little fellows born out of the war are not thrown into a suspicious defensive by the fear that they are being enticed on the road toward national self-surrender.

Perhaps the best illustration of the difference between the Geneva idea and the Pan-Europe idea is found in the economic sphere. Excellent are the resolutions passed at the Vienna congress in favor of a European economic conference to deal with the present unhappy complex of tariff barriers and commercial rivalries. Yet at Geneva, too, the pressing need of supplementing political peace with economic peace has been recognized, and Geneva has debated the question of a European economic conference. But whereas Vienna emphasizes it as a step toward the realization of Pan-Europe, Geneva is content to stress the importance of economic peace for the interests of the nations as they are today. Poland or Czechoslovakia, invited to revise their tariffs for the sake of a future United States of Europe, will refuse. If it is pointed out to them that they are themselves the sufferers, they are likely to reply that they are willing to pay the price for their separate national existence. On the other hand, Poland or Czechoslovakia will listen more readily to the proposal of an economic conference that is only that. When in the course of years they find themselves enjoying the benefits of European economic unity they may be open to further suggestions.