

EUROPEAN INLAND TRANSPORT CONFERENCE, OCTOBER 10, 1944—SEPTEMBER 27, 1945; FORMATION OF THE EUROPEAN INLAND TRANSPORT ORGANIZATION ¹

840.70/1-2045

Memorandum by Messrs. John N. Plakias and Walter A. Radius of the Office of Transportation and Communications to the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs (Clayton)

[WASHINGTON,] December 28, 1944.

In response to the joint invitations of the U.S. and U.K. Governments,² representatives of twelve countries convened in London on October 10, 1944 to discuss the establishment of a European Inland Transport Organization (EITO). The participating countries are Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Greece, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, the United Kingdom, the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia. The Danish Minister in London,³ SHAEF,⁴ SACMED⁵ and UNRRA⁶ are represented by observers.

Background

The document which is serving as a basis for discussion at the conference is an Anglo-American draft agreement, drafted in London in the summer of 1944 at bipartite discussions between representatives of the U.S. and U.K. Governments.⁷ The Soviet Government was represented by an observer. The draft agreement is based on, and incorporates to a large extent, the proposals emanating from the work done during the preceding two years by the Technical Advisory Committee on Inland Transport (TACIT) of the Allied Requirements Bureau. The Governments participating in the present conference, with the exception of the USSR, are represented on TACIT.

¹ Continued from *Foreign Relations*, 1944, vol. II, pp. 743-831. The Conference was not in continuous session during this period. After several meetings in October and November, 1944, no meetings of the Conference were held until August 24, 1945, although certain delegations, including the United States delegation, continued meetings during the interim.

² Invitations sent by the United Kingdom on September 11 and 12, 1944.

³ Eduard Reventlow.

⁴ Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Force.

⁵ Supreme Allied Commander, Mediterranean Theatre.

⁶ United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. For documentation on the participation of the United States in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, see pp. 958 ff.

⁷ *Foreign Relations*, 1944, vol. II, p. 792.

The Military Interest

The military are keenly interested in the establishment of a European Inland Transport Organization to assume the following functions:

- (1) To give technical advice relating to European transportation problems and equipment requirements;
- (2) To coordinate transportation in areas which the military would wish to turn over to civil authorities;
- (3) To assume responsibility for the allocation and distribution for use of surplus equipment made available by the military;
- (4) To aid in the restitution of allied equipment; and
- (5) To assist in the rehabilitation of allied transport systems.

The War Department was represented at the bipartite discussions of last summer by Major General Frank Ross, Chief of Transportation of the United States Army in the European Theater of Operations. General Ross and Ambassador Winant are the two chief American delegates to the present conference.

Interim Commission

At the bipartite discussions of last summer the representatives of the U.S. and U.K. recommended to their Governments that, since the establishment of the permanent EITO might be subject to delays (which is precisely what has happened), there be established a tripartite Interim Commission composed of representatives of the U.S., U.K. and U.S.S.R. to assist the military and do certain important preparatory work for the permanent organization. The Interim Commission was to cease functioning when EITO came into being.

While the U.S. and U.K. Governments were prepared to establish and participate in the interim organization early in the fall, no response was received from the Soviet Government. As a result, the establishment of the Interim Commission was deferred. With the convocation of the conference the British believed that the permanent organization might be established shortly and no longer favored the Interim Commission. It subsequently developed that the Continental Powers opposed an interim organization which excluded them.

The British position on an interim organization has changed periodically. First they urged it. Then they strongly opposed it. Now they are again advocating the establishment of some interim body.

The position of the U.S. Government has been consistent. The U.S. favored the establishment of the Interim Commission at an early date and prior to the convocation of the conference. However, since it was not established prior to the conference and the opposition of the Continentals became known, we have not considered an interim organization essential unless the military desire it or unless the establishment of the Organization appeared long delayed.

Preliminary Tripartite Discussions

Before the conference, as well as during the early stages of the conference, the U.S., U.K. and U.S.S.R. delegations held a series of informal tripartite discussions in order to receive the Soviet views, attempt to reconcile differences and develop acceptable compromise provisions. It soon developed that the Soviets opposed an organization with centralized authority and strongly advocated that its functions be limited to recommendations and coordination.

The Conference

One of the main difficulties in drawing up an acceptable agreement was to find middle ground between the Soviet position for an organization without authority and the views of the U.S. and U.K. Governments, supported by the Continentals, who desired an organization with considerable administrative authority. The Department has taken the position that while it would prefer an organization with authority, the Continentals are the main parties at interest and that so long as the U.S. interests, particularly the military, are adequately provided for, the U.S. Government would be prepared to go along with an organization acceptable to the Continentals and Soviets.

The principal reasons for this position included the following: first, the U.S. has only a secondary and temporary interest in a regional organization of this character; and second, the success of an international agreement is dependent upon the spirit with which it is accepted by its members. Accordingly an organization with authority might be less effective if the participants accepted it reluctantly, whereas an agreement with milder provisions might be more effective if the participants supported it wholeheartedly.

Poland

Although there was some apprehension in the Department over the attitude of the Soviets toward participation in a conference with the Polish Government in exile, this problem was not raised until after the conference had been meeting for over two weeks. On October 28 the U.S. and U.K. Governments received similar notes from the Soviet Government requesting the unseating of the representatives of the Polish *Émigré* Government and the substitution of the representatives of the Lublin Committee.⁸ The Soviets threatened to withdraw from the conference unless this action was taken.

The U.S. and U.K. Governments rejected the Soviet request and pointed out that they thought it inappropriate to inject far reaching political factors into a technical discussion.⁹ The hope was expressed

⁸ For note to the U.S. Government, see *Foreign Relations*, 1944, vol. II, p. 840. For continuation of the controversy regarding the establishment of a government in Poland, see *ibid.*, 1945, vol. V, pp. 110 ff.

⁹ For U.S. note dated November 22, 1944, see *ibid.*, 1944, vol. II, p. 879.

that the Soviets would continue to participate in the technical discussions. The Soviets have not answered the U.K. and U.S. replies, but neither has the Soviet delegation left London. No formal meetings of the conference have been called since this move by the Soviets. All subsequent discussions have been conducted through informal meetings, but without Soviet participation.

The Ronald Formula

Various methods have been considered in order to avoid the Polish political issue and still reach an acceptable agreement. One of the devices considered was a proposal made by Mr. Ronald of the British Foreign Office which has come to be known as the "Ronald Formula". This formula provided that the agreement would only be signed by governments after their territory had been liberated. This would have permitted the Soviets but not the Poles to sign at this time. The Ronald Formula was not discussed with the Soviets. When it was presented informally to the other Continentals they strongly opposed it.

The British have suggested other proposals as gestures to induce the Soviets to participate in this technical organization and circumvent the Polish issue. The Department has taken the position that while Soviet participation is most desirable, an agreement should not be held in abeyance pending Soviet participation if the agreement meets the technical points raised by the Soviets and which might be acceptable to them at a later date. The Department has felt that formulas or gestures would not induce Soviet participation in a technical organization if for political reasons they wish to abstain.

Present Status of Conference

After October 28, in order to proceed with the important work of the conference, it was decided to continue discussions through informal meetings and to redraft the agreement, incorporating insofar as possible the views of the Soviets. The conference has not met in formal session since October 27; however, informal meetings have been held with the Continental delegations and the Soviets have been kept advised. It is proposed that on completion of an agreement acceptable to the Continentals which incorporated the Soviet views, it would be presented to the Soviets. If at that time the Soviets would be prepared to accept the agreement they could come in, otherwise the door would be left open for them to participate at such time as they saw fit.

At the informal meetings in which all the Continentals except the Soviets are participating, considerable progress has been made in reaching an acceptable draft agreement. Certain points on the procedure for establishing EITO and the method of signature remain unsettled and there may be some difficulty over the provisions affect-

ing the inland waterways. The Department has suggested that the conclusion of the main agreement should not be delayed because of divergent points of view on the details of inland waterway transport question. This problem could be dealt with by the countries concerned, after the main agreement was signed.

JOHN N. PLAKIAS
WALTER A. RADIUS

840.70/2-145 : Telegram

The Ambassador in the United Kingdom (Winant) to the Secretary of State

LONDON, February 1, 1945—8 p. m.
[Received 8:12 p. m.]

1130. Department will know from British Embassy of United Kingdom proposal dated January 27¹⁰ advocating the establishment of an interim transport organization including United States, United Kingdom, France, Belgium and Holland to function until solution of the Polish question makes it possible to establish EITO. Ronald states that the Ministerial Committee which adopted the proposal was strongly opposed to signing anything with the London Poles.

With reference to British proposal we submit for the Department's consideration the following summary of the situation and our conclusions:

I. We believe EITO draft agreement in its present revised form except for further minor amendments is technically satisfactory to all EITO conference participants including Soviet Government although latter has not formally replied to this effect.

II. However the three following questions must be resolved before signature of all participants is possible:

1. It is now clear that the establishment of EITO is out of the question until the Polish question is resolved as United Kingdom will sign nothing with London Poles and French have indicated they will not sign the EITO agreement without the USSR; meanwhile the Czechoslovak Government have recognized the "Polish Provisional Government."¹¹

2. Decision by the EAC¹² of the question of a French occupation zone would have to precede French signature of EITO agreement since latter depends on mention of French Republic in Article XIV Paragraph 9 as one of the countries designating or recognizing Commanders in Chief (reEmbs 1039, January 30¹³).

¹⁰ See telegram 427, February 3, 1 p. m., to Paris, p. 1395.

¹¹ January 31, 1945.

¹² European Advisory Commission; for documentation on the participation of the United States in the work of EAC, see vol. III, pp. 1 ff.

¹³ Not printed.

3. The opposing Dutch and French views on the inland waterway annex constitute a third obstacle since the French dislike the annex whereas the Dutch have stated their signature of main EITO agreement depends on signature of annex by principal European inland waterway countries. Although British and Belgians would sign it they as well as the French have indicated view that failure to solve inland waterway question should not hold up main EITO agreement but we do not know measure of French success in persuading Dutch in their conversations (reEmbs 1039, January 30).

III. Both British and French Governments favor setting up some provisional machinery prior to solution of Polish question. ReEmbs 646 of January 17,¹⁴ we do not yet know to what extent French dislike of Western European arrangement and preference for a protocol setting up EITO provisionally including London Poles and the other Eastern European participants in the EITO conference represents final view of French Provisional Government particularly in view of inclusion in British proposal of invitation to USSR to associate itself with the provisional organization and suggestion of some additional arrangement for associating Czech and other governments in some consultative capacity.

IV. On the basis of the above summary we suggest the following conclusion:

Since (a) EITO agreement as such will not be signed unless or until Polish question is resolved, and (b) French suggestion for protocol setting up EITO provisionally including the London Poles would apparently be unacceptable to United Kingdom and presumably to the Czechoslovak Government only two alternatives remain: (1) to wait until the solution of the Polish question makes possible the establishment of EITO; (2) to set up a provisional organization along the lines suggested by the British.

We recommend the second alternative believing that the known urgency of the transport situation in France, Holland and Belgium and the need for a responsible organization with authority to deal with the supply and military agencies outweighs other more indefinite considerations, for example: (1) the estimated length of time until the Polish question is likely to be settled (2) the estimated effect of either course of action on future Soviet participation in EITO (3) the estimated effect of either course of action on the future of EITO in its relation to the other eastern countries.

Could you give us an immediate answer on this problem or let us know if delay is unavoidable.

WINANT

¹⁴ Not printed.

840.70/2-345 : Telegram

*The Acting Secretary of State to the Ambassador in France
(Caffery)*¹⁵

WASHINGTON, February 3, 1945—1 p. m.

427. I. British Embassy on January 31 handed Department an *aide-mémoire* referring to European Inland Transport Conference stating HMG is of opinion that Soviet Government is unlikely to give any formal statement of its position with respect to revised draft of the agreement nor to offer to sign it until settlement of the Polish issue. In view of urgent need for creating appropriate machinery to deal better with problems of European inland transport, HMG favors strongly prompt setting up of some organization, however provisional, limited to area of joint Anglo-American military responsibility, but with an invitation to the Soviet Government to associate itself in whatever way it deems appropriate until it is ready to become a formal member of full organization. It therefore proposes that:

A. Draft agreement be put in final form by further informal meetings with Continental Allies and the results communicated to Soviet delegation in London.

B. Thereupon the U.S., U.K., French, Belgian and Netherlands Governments enter into an informal understanding to apply as between themselves such parts of draft agreement as are physically applicable in the areas under their jurisdiction, inviting Soviet Government to participate in such manner as it deems appropriate.

C. A temporary bureau be formed in London, composed of representatives of the five governments mentioned above and a Soviet observer or liaison officer if possible, to supervise application of agreement and also to assume duty of maintaining informal contact with the European Allies which are not participating in provisional arrangement to make sure that nothing is done which might affect their interests adversely.

The *aide-mémoire* concludes by stating that, in view of HMG, only some such procedure as that proposed above can get around the problem presented by the issue which has been raised as to Polish Government in London; and that, in view of HMG, any procedure which involved the participation of the London Poles would jeopardize the hope of ultimate Soviet participation in the full organization.

II. British Embassy has orally informed Department¹⁶ that a similar *aide-mémoire* was concurrently being handed to the Provi-

¹⁵ Repeated to London as telegram 831 for the EITO delegation; to Moscow as telegram 218 with the following additional sentence: "Any comments from Embassy would be appreciated."

¹⁶ Meeting on January 31, 1945, in the Office of Transport and Communications Policy.

sional French Government in Paris, and that HMG wished to secure the views of the two Governments on following points:

A. Whether proposed procedure would prejudice the position with respect to recognition of the legitimate government of Poland, and

B. Whether it would prejudice the plans for setting up a European Inland Transport Organization of scope originally contemplated, with Soviet participation.

III. For information of Embassy, a meeting was held in London on January 17 of U.K. and U.S. EITO delegations, with Commandant Mathé, an attaché of the French Embassy specializing in transportation matters, who had just returned from consultations in Paris. Mathé stated that the French under no circumstances would sign EITO agreement without Soviets but that they were prepared to enter into an interim arrangement setting up EITO on a provisional basis without Soviets but with participation of all other governments represented at EITO conference, including London Poles. Mathé indicated that French would not, however, be prepared to enter into an interim arrangement confined to area of joint Anglo-American military responsibility.

IV. Department is not prepared at this time to express a definitive opinion on either of the questions referred to in II above.

Department has misgivings as to usefulness at this time of procedure suggested by British, and is inclined to the view that it would be preferable to await the termination of the meetings between the President, Mr. Churchill and Marshal Stalin¹⁷ before making any new move in EITO matter, except to renew informal discussions in order to get revised agreement in final form as promptly as possible.

V. For your confidential information: Nevertheless, if the Provisional Government of France should have changed its position indicated in III above and should now concur in the views of HMG, the U.S. Government would not wish to stand in way of consummation of arrangement proposed. You are, therefore, requested to ascertain as soon as possible French views on British proposal. Repeat your reply to Amembassies London and Moscow.

GREW

840.70/2-1145: Telegram

*The Acting Secretary of State to the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (Winant)*¹⁸

WASHINGTON, February 3, 1945—1 p. m.

830. For EITO Delegation. ReEmbs 1130 of February 1.

I. As indicated by Department's no. 427 of Feb. 3, 1945 to Paris, repeated to London as no. 831 of Feb. 3, 1945, Department would be

¹⁷ The Yalta Conference, February 4-11, 1945.

¹⁸ Repeated to Paris as 426, and to Moscow as 217.

prepared to participate in proposed arrangement as set forth in British *Aide-Mémoire*, provided French favor it. If, however, French have not changed their views as stated by Mathé on January 17, Department would wish to consider the situation thus presented before determining its position.

II. Department is not prepared to commit itself to British proposal as modified by inclusion of SACMED¹⁹ area (reEmbs 1151 of February 2²⁰) even if favored by French, until it is informed precisely as to what countries British include in SACMED area, and how British think that such countries could be integrated into an interim organization. Please advise. Department assumes recommendations in Embassy's 1130 are not modified by change in British proposal.

III. Every effort should, of course, be made to get EITO document in final form as soon as possible, by means of informal meetings with Continental Allies.

IV. Department will appreciate any information obtainable on Franco-Dutch discussion of waterways annex.

V. Please repeat Embassy's 1151 of February 2 to Paris and Moscow.

GREW

840.70/2-1345: Telegram

The Acting Secretary of State to the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (Winant)

WASHINGTON, February 13, 1945—6 p. m.

1103. In view of Crimean declaration,²¹ Department has informed British Embassy that it will be necessary to delay reply to *Aide-Mémoire* proposing interim European inland transport organization until it is possible to confer with those who attended conference. At Department's request, British Embassy is inquiring of Foreign Office whether its views as to procedure are now modified.

For your confidential information, subject to conferring with Department personnel who attended conference, it is Department's tentative view that EITO conference might be immediately reconvened without either the London or the Lublin Poles but with understanding that new Polish Government, when constituted, would be invited to accede to EITO. This procedure of course would require prior clear-

¹⁹ Supreme Allied Command, Mediterranean Theater.

²⁰ Not printed; it stated that British Foreign Office favored the SACMED and the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force areas being included in proposed interim European organization (840.70/2-245).

²¹ See communiqué issued on February 12, 1945, at the end of the Yalta Conference, *Foreign Relations*, The Conferences at Malta and Yalta, p. 968, particularly the section on Poland, p. 973.

ance with Soviets. Any comments or suggestions would be appreciated.

Sent to London, repeated to Paris and Moscow.²²

GREW

840.70/2-1345 : Telegram

The Acting Secretary of State to the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (Winant)

WASHINGTON, February 23, 1945—1 p. m.

1382. Department is handing British Embassy an *Aide-Mémoire*²³ setting forth the proposal described in last paragraph of Department's no. 1103 of February 13, but suggesting that the Provisional Government of France concert with the U.S. and U.K. in presenting it to Moscow.

GREW

840.70/3-1045 : Telegram

The Ambassador in the Soviet Union (Harriman) to the Secretary of State

Moscow, March 10, 1945—8 p. m.

[Received 8:20 p. m.]

705. ReEmbs 616, March 3, 5 p. m.²⁴ The British and French Ambassadors and I have proposed to the Soviet Government, in letters dated March 9, that the EITO Conference be reconvened immediately without Polish participation.²⁵

Repeated to London as 109 and Paris as 35.

HARRIMAN

840.70/3-2245 : Telegram

The Acting Secretary of State to the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (Winant)

WASHINGTON, March 22, 1945—3 p. m.

2205. For EITO Delegation. In view of Soviet insistence on Polish participation in any revived EITO Conference without waiting for

²² As telegrams 569 and 316, respectively.

²³ Dated February 22, 1945 (not printed), in reply to British *aide-mémoire* of January 31, 1945, not printed but outlined in telegram 427, February 3, 1 p. m., to Paris, p. 1395. An *aide-mémoire* of March 3, 1945, was received from the British Embassy which expressed agreement with the proposals contained in the Department's *aide-mémoire* under reference (840.70/3-345). British agreement to reconvene the EITO Conference without the Poles was also reported by the London Embassy in telegram 2157, March 2, 1945, 7 p. m. (840.70/3-245).

²⁴ Not printed.

²⁵ In a letter to Ambassador Harriman dated March 19, 1945, Mr. Andrey Yanuaryevich Vyshinsky, Soviet First Assistant People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, stated that the Soviet Government was of the opinion that the Provisional Government of Poland should participate (840.70/3-1945).

tripartite agreement on a provisional government for Poland, and unwillingness of Department to permit any Polish participation until such agreement has been reached, Department would consider sympathetically any proposal acceptable to the British, French and the other Continental Allies for securing prompt action. Such a proposal might be the revival of the British scheme for an interim arrangement for western Europe, or a revival of the EITO Conference without the Poles and without the Soviets if they did not care to participate, for the purpose of working out such arrangements as might appear appropriate to the conferees. You are requested informally to communicate to the Foreign Office this view of the Department.²⁶

Department is wiring Paris to the same effect.²⁷

GREW

840.70/3-2745 : Telegram

The Ambassador in France (Caffery) to the Secretary of State

PARIS, March 27, 1945—4 p. m.
[Received March 28—11:53 a. m.]

1456. The subject of EITO and Department's 1119, March 22²⁸ were discussed informally today with Charguereaud of Foreign Office. Lebel²⁹ is ill and was unable to be present. The result of the interview may be summarized as follows:

Charguereaud has not seen the text of the reply to the joint US-UK-French *démarche* in Moscow (reference Embassy's 1147, March 10 and Embassy's 1382, March 23³⁰) but he had been informed of its substance (reference Department's 1165, March 24³¹). He had lately returned from London where he had received the impression—largely from press reports—that the tactics of the Russians were directed at hastening the formation of the new provisional Polish representation at the San Francisco Conference.³² Under the circumstances, Charguereaud was inclined to defer temporarily consideration of the interim arrangement proposed by the British (reference Department's 892, March 6³¹) in the hope that these tactics might succeed and that a solution of the problem was not far off. He observed however that since the French did not participate in the Yalta Conference, they were in no position to form an opinion as to the prospects.

²⁶ In telegram 3152, March 27, 1945, 6 p. m., from London, the Embassy reported that it was discussing with the Foreign Office the practicability of various alternative proposals for proceeding with EITO (840.70/3-2745).

²⁷ Telegram 1119, March 22, 1 p. m.; Moscow informed of this action in telegram 668, March 22, 1 p. m.

²⁸ See footnote 27, above.

²⁹ Claude Lebel of the French Foreign Office.

³⁰ Neither printed.

³¹ Not printed.

³² United Nations Conference on International Organization, April 25–June 26, 1945. For documentation, see vol. I, pp. 1 ff.

The French Government has already indicated its willingness to participate in the interim arrangement should this be considered necessary with the qualifications noted in Embassy's 642, February 11,³³ namely, (a) that the arrangement be informal, (b) that they could withdraw on 30 days notice. Charguereaud added that he would expect Soviet participation in this arrangement at least in the capacity of observer. The French could not however agree to participate in a revival of the EITO Conference without Soviet participation for the reasons given in numbered paragraph 2 of Embassy's 642, February 11.

Sent to the Department, repeated to London as No. 187 and to Moscow as 37 of March 27.

CAFFERY

840.70/3-3045: Telegram

*The Secretary of State to the Ambassador in the United Kingdom
(Winant)*

WASHINGTON, March 30, 1945—1 p. m.

2454. For EITO Delegation. British Embassy has proposed revival of interim arrangement for European inland transport advanced last January,³⁴ with following modifications:

1. Draft Agreement should be put in final form by U.S., U.K., French, Netherlands, Belgian and Luxembourg Delegations and an understanding should be reached to apply it, without prejudice to subsequent amendments if and when other governments participate, on informal and experimental basis in areas where they have responsibility.

2. Temporary Executive Board would be set up composed of representatives of U.S., U.K., France and Belgium, and Hondelink would be appointed Chief Officer, but not a member of the Board.

3. U.S., U.K. and French Ambassadors in Moscow would then inform Soviet Government they could not agree to representation by the Lublin Poles at the EITO Conference and that, if Soviet Government was unwilling to eliminate all Polish representation pending settlement of the Polish Government question, the three governments would be obliged to put into effect the interim arrangement as above indicated. Soviet Government would be invited to participate in whatever way they considered appropriate, but the setting up of the interim organization would not be in any way delayed by their failure to do so.

4. Interim arrangement would be considered as extending to the SACMED area but, in view of possible complications with Soviets

³³ Not printed; it reported that the French were vitally interested in the recovery of their displaced transport equipment, much of which was in the areas occupied by the Russians and that they were afraid this question would not receive uniform treatment in the various zones of occupation should the Soviet Union not participate in revival of the Conference (840.70/2-1145).

³⁴ See telegram 427, February 3, 1 p. m., to Paris, p. 1395.

arising from Yugoslav participation, none of the national governments in that area would be invited to participate. Insofar as possible the Agreement would be made operative in the area by means of EITO representation at Allied Force Headquarters and closest possible working arrangements with UNRRA.

Department has expressed its approval³⁵ of this proposal and you are therefore authorized to take all steps appropriate to bring it into effect as soon as possible.

Repeated to Paris and Moscow.³⁶

STETTINIUS

840.70/4-1145 : Telegram

The Ambassador in the United Kingdom (Winant) to the Secretary of State

LONDON, April 11, 1945—7 p. m.

[Received 7:45 p. m.]

3689. ReDept's 2454, March 30. Immediately following telegram³⁷ contains text of draft agreement for proposed provisional European Transport Organization.

At the meeting of United States, United Kingdom and French EITO delegations held on April 11, it was agreed that Secretariat of Conference in the names of the three delegations should address an invitation to the Belgian, Netherlands, Norwegian and Luxembourg delegations to attend a meeting on Tuesday, April 17 to discuss proposed provisional agreement. Department's comments on the text³⁸ would, therefore, be appreciated as soon as possible as it is hoped to circulate in advance of the meeting a text agreed by the United States, United Kingdom and French delegations.

Department will notice the inclusion of the Norwegian Delegation in the invitation. This seemed desirable as Norway is part of the SHAEF area.

It was agreed to draft a joint communication to the Soviet Government for presentation by the representatives of the United States, United Kingdom and France in Moscow when agreement on the provisional organization has been reached by the governments concerned in the matter, informing Soviet Government of the steps taken. Text will be forwarded to Department for approval.³⁹

³⁵ Letter from Mr. Walter Radius of the Office of Transportation and Communications to the Second Secretary of the British Embassy (Maclean), March 30, 1945, not printed.

³⁶ As telegrams 1246 and 740, respectively.

³⁷ Not printed.

³⁸ Except for two very minor amendments, the Department in its telegram 2899, April 13, 1945, to London, gave approval to the draft agreement (840.70/4-1145).

³⁹ See telegram 4542, May 5, noon, from London, *infra*.

French were informally assured of support of Levy for chairmanship by United States and United Kingdom members in provisional executive. (ReDept's 2788, April 10.)⁴⁰

French were informed of United States and United Kingdom approval of inclusion of France in article XIV, paragraph 9 of EIT/26. (ReDept's 2698, April 6.)⁴⁰

WINANT

840.70/5-545 : Telegram

The Ambassador in the United Kingdom (Winant) to the Secretary of State

LONDON, May 5, 1945—noon.

[Received 1:18 p. m.]

4542. I. We have discussed with British and French the question of informing (1) the Soviet Government (2) the delegations participating in the ECITO⁴¹ Conference and (3) the press concerning signing of provisional agreement and have agreed to recommend following procedure:

1. Communication to Soviets. Immediately upon signature, United States, British and French Embassies in Moscow would be instructed to make a concerted approach to the Soviet Government in accordance with the draft telegram below. In London immediately after signature the chairman of the Conference would call a meeting of the United States, United Kingdom, French and Soviet delegations at which the Soviet delegation would be informed of the step taken.

2. Communication to delegations participating in Conference. On May 10, the provisional agreement with annexed draft ECITO agreement would be circulated as a Conference document with a covering note the proposed text of which is in immediately following telegram.⁴⁰

3. Press release. See Embassy's 4544 of May 5⁴⁰ for text which it is proposed to release on May 11,⁴² thus allowing time for Soviet Government and other delegations to have received the information in advance of publication.

4. Publication of text of agreement. In making public the information that a provisional agreement had been signed it seemed to the three delegations that it would be necessary in order to avert suspicions of the nature of the agreement to publish as soon as possible the text of the provisional agreement with the annexed draft agree-

⁴⁰ Not printed.

⁴¹ European Central Inland Transport Organization.

⁴² See Department of State *Bulletin*, May 13, 1945, p. 910.

ment and inland waterway protocol. British Government is prepared to publish text as a white paper.

Does Department approve the procedure outlined above and the texts of the proposed communications?

II. Following is text of telegram which it is proposed be sent to the United States, United Kingdom, and French Embassies in Moscow immediately upon signature of provisional agreement:

1. My immediately following telegram contains text of an agreement concerning a provisional organization for European inland transport which was signed here today (May 8) by the representatives of the Governments of the United Kingdom, United States, Belgium, Luxembourg, Netherlands and Norway and of the French Provisional Government. You will observe that the signatory governments have agreed to bring the draft agreement concerning the establishment of an European central inland transport organization provisionally into force between them in respect of the territories in continental Europe under their authority.

2. I shall therefore be glad if in concert with your British and French colleagues you will inform the Soviet Governments that the United States, United Kingdom, and French Provisional Governments are unable to agree that a delegation appointed by the Lublin Government could properly represent Poland at the ECITO Conference and that since Soviet Government were unwilling to dispense with all Polish representation until the matter could be settled the three governments and the other signatory governments have been reluctantly obliged to proceed having regard to military developments in Europe (or having regard to the cessation of hostilities in Europe as the case may be) with the limited plan of establishing a provisional organization. You should invite the Soviet Government to associate themselves with the provisional organization in whatever way they consider most appropriate. In so doing you should make the following points:

(a) We do not regard European inland transport conference as having been dissolved;

(b) We very much hope that Soviet Government will cooperate, as soon as circumstances allow, in the completion of the draft agreement.

3. In any case we believe that all the signatory governments would welcome arrangements for keeping the Soviet Government informed of the work of the provisional organization, e.g. by having a Soviet representative present as observer at meetings of the provisional council and for maintaining liaison with provisional executive.

4. Statement regarding signature of the provisional organization agreement will be issued to the press for publication on morning of May 11. Soviet delegation to ECITO Conference are being informed today.

WINANT

840.70/5-545 : Telegram

The Acting Secretary of State to the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (Winant)

WASHINGTON, May 7, 1945—1 p. m.

3566. ReEmbs 4542, May 5.

I. Department approves procedure outlined in Section I, paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 (see Dept's 3556, May 5⁴³). Please transmit to Department by air pouch certified copy of signed agreement. When is text to be released as white paper?

II. Proposed communication to Embassies in Moscow satisfactory, and will be transmitted by Department as soon as word received that agreement signed.⁴⁴

GREW

840.70/5-745 : Telegram

The Acting Secretary of State to the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (Winant)

WASHINGTON, May 7, 1945.

3592. This supersedes previous instructions.⁴⁵ You are hereby authorized to sign agreement without amendment to Article XIV, paragraph 9. You are, however, to make it clear to other signatories that this Government interprets the term "Allied Commanders in Chief" to include not only commanders designated by a combination of the powers named but also commanders designated by any one of the powers. You may make this position a matter of record by inserting the amended Article in the minutes of the Council meeting.

GREW

[The agreement for the Provisional European Inland Transport Organization was signed at London on May 8, 1945. For text, see Department of State Executive Agreement Series No. 458, or 59 Stat. (pt. 2) 1359. For a press statement released on May 11, 1945, see Department of State *Bulletin*, May 13, 1945, page 910.]

⁴³ Not printed.

⁴⁴ Communication outlined in telegram 4542, May 5, from London, *supra*, was transmitted in telegram 1040, May 9, 1945, 5 p. m., to Moscow; note transmitted to Soviet Foreign Office on May 11, 1945.

⁴⁵ Telegram 3563, May 7, 1945, 11 a. m., to London, had authorized signature of the Agreement subject to an amendment to article XIV, paragraph 9 (840.70/4-3045).

840.70/6-645 : Telegram

The Ambassador in the Soviet Union (Harriman) to the Secretary of State

Moscow, June 6, 1945—2 p. m.

[Received 3:25 p. m.]

1923. ReDeptel 1040, May 9, midnight.⁴⁶ Reply to Brit note dated May 11 similar in content to our note of same date informing Soviet Govt of decision to proceed with establishment of Provisional Organization for European Inland Transport and expressing desire of signatory govts to keep Soviet Govt informed of work of provisional organization. Vyshinski in note dated May 30 expressed on behalf of Soviet Govt regret that European Inland Transport Conference did not yield positive results and lead to general agreement on creation of European Central Transport Organization. Soviet Govt made their participation in such organization conditional on invitation to Provisional Polish Govt to participate which was refused. Soviet Govt is therefore obliged to state that it sees no possibility of participating in European Inland Transport Organization.

Sent to Dept as 1926 [1923]; repeated to London as 249.

HARRIMAN

840.70/7-1445 : Telegram

The Acting Secretary of State to the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (Winant)

WASHINGTON, July 14, 1945.

5808. For Moats⁴⁷ and Allison⁴⁸ from Radius and Taft.⁴⁹ Dept has received from BritEmb an *aide-mémoire*⁵⁰ in which it is proposed that EIT Conference be reconvened. BritGovt further proposes that they inform SovGovt of the desire to resume the Conference and that they are disposed to invite Provisional Polish Govt to appoint a delegation⁵¹ but before doing so BritGovt would welcome an assurance that SovDeleg would participate in work of Conference.

⁴⁶ Not printed, but see footnote 44, p. 1404.

⁴⁷ Helen M. Moats, United States Specialist on Inland Transport.

⁴⁸ John Allison, Second Secretary and Consul at London.

⁴⁹ Charles P. Taft, Director of the Office of Transport and Communications Policy.

⁵⁰ Dated July 11, 1945; for text, see *Foreign Relations*, The Conference of Berlin (The Potsdam Conference), vol. I, p. 332.

⁵¹ Recognition by the United States was accorded to the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity on July 5, 1945; for documentation relating to the recognition of the new Polish Government, see *ibid.*, pp. 714-789.

BritGovt also suggested that Danish and Turkish Govts be invited to reconvened Conference and requested U.S. views on this question. Dept has answered ⁵² Brit *aide-mémoire* as follows:

"The Department of State agrees with the proposals of His Majesty's Government as contained in the British Embassy's *Aide-Mémoire* of July 11, 1945 that the Soviet Government be informed of the desire of our Governments to reconvene the European Inland Transport Conference as soon as possible. Such communication to the Soviet Government would go on to say that our two Governments are disposed at once to invite the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity to appoint a delegation to the Conference but that before doing so we would welcome assurance that the Soviet Government would participate in the work of the reconvened Conference.

"The Department of State suggests that since the original invitations to the Conference were issued jointly by our two Governments the proposal to the Soviet Government and the invitations reconvening the Conference likewise be joint communications.

"The Department of State does not believe that the Danish and Turkish Governments should be invited to send delegates to the reconvened Conference as this might entail further delay or raise additional questions concerning the participation of other governments. This question should be left for consideration either by the Conference after it is reconvened or by the Council of the Organization after the final agreement has been signed.

"This Government agrees that the Provisional Organization for European Inland Transport should continue its activities until the European Central Inland Transport Organization proper comes into being."

Please keep in touch with Fonoff on this question and work out with them text of communication to SovGovt and invitations to reconvene Conference.⁵³ Final texts should be cleared with Dept. [Radius and Taft.]

GREW

840.70/8-1345

The British Embassy to the Department of State

AIDE-MÉMOIRE

During the Berlin Conference the United States and United Kingdom Delegations discussed with the Soviet Delegation the expediency

⁵² July 14, 1945.

⁵³ The Embassy reported that the Foreign Office suggested that the matter could be more advantageously taken up at the Berlin Conference and that the Foreign Office had instructed its delegation at Berlin to consult with the United States delegation, and if agreeable, to discuss with the Soviet Government the question of reconvening the EIT Conference as part of a larger discussion of Russian co-operation in European economic organizations; see telegram 7236, July 18, 1945, 1 p. m., from London, *Conference of Berlin (Potsdam)*, vol. II, p. 1158. Subsequently, the Department sent telegram 5808 and the foregoing information to Assistant Secretary of State Clayton at the Potsdam Conference as telegram 61, July 19, 1945, with its approval of the British proposal to discuss with the Soviet authorities the question of reconvening the EIT Conference. See *ibid.*, p. 1159.

of an early resumption of the work of the Lancaster House Conference on Inland Transport which met last October but had to suspend its meetings at the end of November owing to difficulties over the representation of Poland. The three Delegations at Berlin agreed that the new Polish Government should at once be invited to send a Delegation to participate in the Conference which should resume its work as soon as that Delegation could reach London and endeavour as quickly as possible to complete the work on the Draft Convention which had not been finished last November.

2. His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom approached the Polish Provisional Government accordingly on August 3rd, urging them to arrange for their Delegation to reach London by August 22nd.⁵⁴

3. The Polish Provisional Government has now accepted this invitation and we are given reason to hope that their delegation will reach London by August 22nd.

4. It will be recalled that in accordance with an agreement reached before the Conference met last October the Soviet Government arranged then for the attendance of an observer on behalf of Roumania and the United States Government and His Majesty's Government arranged for the attendance of one on behalf of Italy.⁵⁵ It seems to His Majesty's Government undesirable to make a similar arrangement when the conference resumes. In the case of Italy there is no longer an Allied Control Commission to represent Italy, the Allied Control Commission having been replaced by the Allied Commission. Roumania is no longer the only satellite state concerned and the Tripartite or Quadripartite character of Control Commissions in general, which has now become more of a reality, presents in any case the following difficulty. There must be serious doubt whether a Control Commission can be regarded as being a sufficiently corporate entity to permit of its representation as such. It can be held that if a Control Commission is to be represented it must be through representatives of each of the Governments which established it. Three or four representatives or observers for Germany and for each satellite state would be absurd.

4. [*sic*] In the circumstances it appears that the only practical method of ensuring that considerations relating to transportation in enemy countries are taken into account is for representatives of the controlling powers at the Conference to make it their duty to act in this matter on behalf of their national elements in each Control Com-

⁵⁴ See document No. 1163, *Conference of Berlin (Potsdam)*, vol. II, p. 1162.

⁵⁵ See penultimate paragraph of telegram 8366, October 5, 1944, 6 p. m., from London, *Foreign Relations*, 1944, vol. II, p. 810; for statement of United States position that the Control Commissions for Rumania and Italy, SHAEF and other groups should participate only as observers, see telegram 8188, October 6, 1944, midnight, to London, *ibid.*, p. 811.

mission. It would thus be for each controlling power to decide for itself whether to include in its delegation an expert to advise it on transportation matters in any given enemy country in the control of which it is participating. "

5. It will, of course, be appreciated that a point of principle is involved in the above which does not apply only in the case of the Inland Transport Conference.

6. His Majesty's Embassy is instructed to inquire whether the United States Government concur with the foregoing.

7. A similar communication is being addressed to the French Provisional Government and to the Soviet Government.

WASHINGTON, August 13, 1945.

840.70/8-845

*The Department of State to the British Embassy*⁵⁶

The proposal contained in the British Embassy's *Aide-Mémoire* of August 13, 1945 has been carefully considered. In view of the fact that Rumania and Italy were represented by observers at the Lancaster House Conference last October, it is felt that it would be undesirable to deny them a similar privilege when the conference reconvenes.

It does not seem to this Government necessary that the Allied Control Commissions for Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary, and the Allied Commission for Italy should be represented through representatives of each of the Governments which have established them. It would seem to this Government that it would be preferable if each of the Commissions were represented by one official designated by the Commission who should be a transport expert and who might be accompanied by a national observer.

WASHINGTON, August 18, 1945.

840.70/8-2245 : Telegram

The Ambassador in the Soviet Union (Harriman) to the Secretary of State

Moscow, August 22, 1945—6 p. m.

[Received August 22—1:55 p. m.]

3006. Emtel 1923, June 6. FonOff replied under date August 18 to British notes dated August 5 and 13 regarding Soviet participation in August 22 Conference on European Inland Transport to effect that

⁵⁶ A summary of this note was transmitted to London in telegram 6970, August 17, 1945.

as promised at Berlin Conference USSR intends to take part⁵⁷ but considers that since Soviet delegates did not participate in discussion of text of agreement signed May 8 text should be reexamined by present Conference with a view to working out text of an agreement on the central organization for inland European transport. USSR also regards British proposal of associating ex-enemy states in work of Conference as complicated and not practically expedient believing that simultaneous representation on American, Soviet and British delegations of expert consultants of this or that ex-enemy country may seriously complicate work of Conference. USSR considers it expedient to maintain arrangements hitherto in force.

To Dept as 3006, rptd London as 419.

HARRIMAN

840.70/8-2445 : Telegram

The Ambassador in the United Kingdom (Winant) to the Secretary of State

LONDON, August 24, 1945—5 p. m.
[Received August 24—4:45 p. m.]

8636. From ECITO Delegation. European Inland Transport Conference reconvened this morning Aug 24 with Soviet and Polish delegations absent. Soviets had arrived evening of 22nd and were informed 24 hours in advance of time of meeting. They gave no indication of not intending to be present. About one-half hour before meeting this morning they informed Foreign Office of inability to be present because of not having received instructions. Gousev⁵⁸ confirmed this when telephoned by Noel-Baker⁵⁹ who with Ronald⁶⁰ regards this as "blackmail on account of Rumania".⁶¹

Poles sent word that their principal delegates had not arrived and others were delayed by an aviation meeting.⁶²

Czechs stated they were present only as observers pending arrival of delegate.

Yugos stated were present only as observers.

After short speech by Noel-Baker and brief discussion conference recessed until Tuesday afternoon August 28 with understanding that

⁵⁷ See Report by the Subcommittee on Cooperation in Solving Immediate European Economic Problems, July 25, 1945, submitted to the Ninth Meeting of the Foreign Ministers, July 27, *Conference of Berlin (Potsdam)*, vol. II, p. 1161; see also chapter XIX, Protocol of Proceedings, *ibid.*, p. 1497.

⁵⁸ Fedor Tarasovich Gousev (Gusev), Soviet Ambassador in the United Kingdom.

⁵⁹ Philip J. Noel-Baker, British Minister of State.

⁶⁰ Nigel Bruce Ronald, British Acting Assistant Under-Secretary of State.

⁶¹ Possibly reference is to the United States and United Kingdom insistence that Rumania continue to be represented by an observer.

⁶² At the third meeting of the Conference on August 28 the Soviet and Polish delegates were present.

draft agreement as attached to provisional agreement should be basis of discussion and that various suggestions for modifications might be submitted at that time.

Before meeting (reEmtel 8456 Aug 21 and 8555, Aug 23 ⁶³) Noel-Baker agreed to refrain until next meeting from proposing admission of press to all sessions. He did propose all work of conference be done in full conference session and not in committee. No objection was made. Conference Secretariat preparing press release stating Conference being reconvened without any detail as to delegations present. Noel-Baker's opening remarks being included.

WINANT

[The Agreement Concerning the Establishment of a European Central Inland Transport Organization and the Annex, Protocol Relating to Traffic on Inland Waterways, were signed at London on September 27, 1945. For texts, see Department of State Executive Agreement Series No. 494, or 59 Stat. (pt. 2) 1740.]

⁶³ Neither printed.