

SECRET

Allied Joint Declaration
6245/25/41

I attach a redraft of the "Joint Declaration" communicated by the State Department on the afternoon of December 30th. London have been informed of the text of this redraft and have made the following comments on it.

(a) The title. London attach "the highest importance" to the Dominions following immediately after the United Kingdom. On the other hand they are quite content, in order to meet the President's wishes and Soviet susceptibilities that the United Kingdom and the Dominions should come 4th in the list after the Soviet and China. But Canada objects strongly to the Dominions being grouped after the United Kingdom and prefers that they appear in alphabetical order as in the American draft.

(b) Sub-paragraph (2). London greatly prefer the original draft which ran as follows:-

"Each Government pledges itself to cooperate with the other Governments signatory hereto; and to continue war against, and not to make a separate armistice or peace with the common enemies or any of them."

The/

The reason for this is that the redraft (which was done at Soviet instigation) may be represented as binding His Majesty's Government and the United States not to make a peace with Japan without Soviet consent, while not pledging the Soviet Government to treat Japan as an enemy.

(c) Last paragraph. London greatly prefer original wording which ran "render material assistance and contributions towards the defeat of members or adherents of the Tripartite Pact". They regard the use of the term "Hitlerism" as inappropriate in a document which covers Governments fighting Japan as well as the Axis.

(d) London wish the term "high contracting parties" used instead of "Governments" throughout. They are very anxious to use this term because this means that royal full powers can be issued to the signatories. Otherwise, if ordinary full powers only signed by the Foreign Secretary are issued, the position of the Indian native States for whom only The King can speak will be complicated. Canada, however, objects to the use of "high contracting parties".

(e) London are very anxious that the words "social security" which we inserted in our version in paragraph 2 after the word "justice", which had been cut out by

the Soviets, should be reinstated. London think that the omission would be badly received at home.

(f) London are very upset that the Free French cannot participate in the Declaration as an original signatory. They are obviously anxious that a further effort be made on this point. If the Free French cannot sign, then the last paragraph should be amended so as to make it clear that the Free French can accede - i.e. some word like "or authorities" must be inserted after "nations".

1/23

I have already put all the above points to the State Department and they in turn have referred them to the President. I understand the latter means to talk to you on the subject. It is clear from London's latest telegram, of which I attach a copy, together with copy of the relevant earlier messages, that they attach considerable importance to the different questions. On the other hand, we have been warned by the State Department that if we persist in our attitude Litvinov may be obliged to refer back to Moscow and that they in turn may make difficulties.

Finally, there is one point outstanding between us and London, and that is whether Burma, which was separately/

separately represented at the St. James's Palace
Conference, should be a party to the Declaration.

December 31st, 1941.