

MINUTE SHEET.

Reference 1302/1/39 ^B
END

H. E.

Something may have been said to the Foreign Office via the United States Embassy in London about the State Department's decision to abrogate the Japanese Treaty, but if not then their failure to give us any warning of their intentions is rather odd. You may remember that on January 25th last we gave the State Department a long Aide Mémoire discussing the possibilities of economic pressure in Japan (see 15/17/39). In the course of this memorandum the possibility of denouncing our commercial treaties with Japan was raised and we said that His Majesty's Government would welcome the views of the United States Government on this particular point as well as ^{on} the more general issue. We were informed on January 23th that our communication was being studied in the State Department (see 15/23/39) and on February 3rd that the State Department were busy formulating a reply to our enquiry (see 15/23/39). On February 3rd we were also told that while the State Department generally felt that a policy of assisting China would be better than one of retaliation against Japan, they would, if there seemed any good reason in the future to change this opinion, "immediately discuss the matter further with His Majesty's Government". Since then we have as far as I know ~~heard no remark~~ ^{heard to that} from the State Department on the subject of economic pressure on Japan, nor have they ever sent any reply to our Aide Mémoire of January ^{25th} 24th although we have given them on our side a great deal of information about our views towards the situation in the Far East, and Craigie has, we know, been keeping in close touch with the United States Embassy in Tokyo. It all seems rather peculiar and if, in fact, nothing was said beforehand in London, I am not sure that the State Department have not broken their promise "immediately to discuss the matter further with H.M.G."

see below

INDEX

FRHM:MS

012 375/250
2000/00 4/34 JCS/Ltd
Co. 644/229
(REGIMENT)

in the above file

Allen
July 27th 1939.

OVER.

Wells' remarks quoted in
15/28/39 were intended as
the reply to our aide-memoire
of Jan 25th. But it is
rather odd of them to have
behaved in this way, and I
think it was probably one
of the President's sudden hunches.

The French amb. was
told only 3 days ago at the
S. Dept. that they did not
intend to do what they have
now done - at least that
is what I understand from
Mr. Truelle on the telephone.

However the general result
is good, and we can't be
accused of having led the V.S. down
the garden path.

Varian

2/7/39