UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
RECEIVED
APR
20
1954
LIBRARY

S1.1:936
Vol.1
C.2

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Foreign Relations of the United States

Diplomatic Papers

1936

(In Five Volumes)

Volume I

General
The British Commonwealth

United States
Government Printing Office
Washington : 1953

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

DEPARTMENT OF STATE PUBLICATION 5395

DIVISION OF PUBLICATIONS

For sale by the

Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office

Washington 25, D.C. - Price $4.25 (Buckram)

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

PREFACE

The documents published in these volumes were selected with a view to presenting a comprehensive record of the diplomatic relations between the United States and Japan in regard to matters related to the causes of conflict between the two countries from the beginning of the Japanese occupation of Manchuria on September 18, 1931, to the Japanese surprise attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and the declaration of war by the United States on December 8, 1941.

The amount of background material here printed has been limited by the necessity of keeping the publication within a reasonable compass. It was obviously impossible to include an absolutely complete selection of even the more important of the pertinent reports coming to the Department from American diplomatic representatives and other observers during the ten years covered. Therefore only reports of special significance have been selected.

While the American Government consulted with other interested powers and at times took parallel action in dealing with crises arising in the Far East during this period, it was not its practice to take joint action. It has therefore been thought advisable to limit the selection to those documents relating directly to American-Japanese relations without entering into the ramifications of discussions with third powers.

The correspondence with the Japanese Government with respect to losses by American nationals due to bombings and other acts of the Japanese armed forces in China is so voluminous that documents in record of representations in many individual cases have been omitted. This printed record therefore includes only the record of representations of a general character and a number of notes on particular incidents which were thought to be typical.

It is contemplated that additional documents relative to some of the developments treated in the present publication and to other phases of the policy of the United States toward the Far East during the years 1931–1941 will be published in the regular annual volumes of *Foreign Relations of the United States.*

SUPT. OF DOCUMENTS
FEB 18 '44
1053362
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

e. To eliminate personal opinions presented in despatches and not acted upon by the Department. To this there is one qualification—in connection with major decisions it is desirable, where possible, to show the alternatives presented to the Department when the decision was made.

No deletions shall be made without clearly indicating the place in the text where the deletion occurs.

045.3 *Clearance*

RE shall obtain the following clearances of material for publication in *Foreign Relations of the United States:*

a. Refer to the appropriate policy officers such papers as would appear to require policy clearance.
b. Refer to the appropriate foreign governments requests for permission to print certain documents originating with them which it is desired to publish as part of the diplomatic correspondence of the United States. Without such permission the documents in question will not be used.

In keeping with the spirit of the above quoted Department regulation, the research staff is guided in compiling the record by the principles of historical objectivity. It is the rule that there shall be no alteration of the text, no deletions without indicating the place in the text where the deletion is made, no omission of facts which were of major importance in reaching a decision, and that nothing should be omitted with a view to concealing or glossing over what might be regarded by some as a defect of policy. In the selection of papers the editors have attempted to give a substantially complete record of American foreign policy as contained in the files of the Department of State together with as much background material as possible, while keeping the volumes within reasonable limits with respect to size and number. In the preparation of *Foreign Relations* for the decade preceding World War II special attention has been given to the inclusion of documents of significance with respect to the origins of that conflict.

The responsibilities of the Historical Division (formerly the Division of Historical Policy Research) for the preparation of the *Foreign Relations* volumes are entrusted, under the general supervision of the Chief of the Division, G. Bernard Noble, to the Chief of the Foreign Relations Branch (Editor of *Foreign Relations*), E. R. Perkins, and the Assistant Chief of the Branch, Gustave A. Nuermberger. The research staff of this Branch is organized with a Special Problems Section and area sections for the British Commonwealth and Europe, the Soviet Union, the Near East and Africa, the Far East, and the American Republics. The 1936 volumes were prepared, under the direction of the Editor of *Foreign Relations*, by Mr. Nuermberger and by Matilda F. Axton, Rogers P. Churchill, N. O. Sappington, John G. Reid,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Francis C. Prescott, and Shirley L. Phillips of the present staff and George Verne Blue, Morrison B. Giffen, Victor J. Farrar, and Henry P. Beers, former staff members.

The Division of Publications is responsible with respect to *Foreign Relations* for the proofreading and editing of copy, the preparation of lists of papers and indexes, and the distribution of printed copies. To expedite publication, indexes for the 1936 volumes have been drafted by a private company under contract. Under the general direction of the Chief of the Division, Robert L. Thompson, the editorial functions mentioned above are performed by the Foreign Relations Editing Branch in charge of Elizabeth A. Vary.

For 1936 the arrangement of volumes is as follows: Volume I, General, The British Commonwealth; Volume II, Europe; Volume III, The Near East and Africa; Volume IV, The Far East; Volume V, The American Republics.

E. R. PERKINS
Editor of Foreign Relations

DECEMBER 1, 1953.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

DIRECTORY

SECRETARIES OF STATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

Stimson, Henry L., March 5, 1929–March 4, 1933
Hull, Cordell, March 4, 1933–

UNITED STATES AMBASSADORS IN JAPAN:

Forbes, William Cameron, June 17, 1930–March 22, 1932
Grew, Joseph Clark, February 19, 1932–December 7, 1941

PRIME MINISTERS OF JAPAN:

Wakatsuki, Baron Reijiro, April 14, 1931–December 11, 1931
Inukai, Ki, December 13, 1931–May 15, 1932
Saito, Admiral Viscount Makoto, May 26, 1932–July 3, 1934
Okada, Admiral Keisuke, July 8, 1934–February 26, 1936
Hirota, Koki, March 9, 1936–January 23, 1937
Hayashi, General Senjuro, February 2, 1937–May 31, 1937
Konoye, Prince Fumimaro, June 4, 1937–January 4, 1939
Hiranuma, Baron Kiichiro, January 5, 1939–August 28, 1939
Abe, General Nobuyuki, August 30, 1939–January 14, 1940
Yonai, Admiral Mitsumasa, January 16, 1940–July 16, 1940
Konoye, Prince Fumimaro, July 22, 1940–October 16, 1941
Tojo, General Hideki, October 18, 1941–

JAPANESE MINISTERS FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS:

Shidehara, Baron Kijuro, July 2, 1929–December 11, 1931
Inukai, Ki, December 13, 1931–January 14, 1932
Yoshizawa, Kenkichi, January 14, 1932–May 16, 1932
Saito, Admiral Viscount Makoto, May 26, 1932–July 6, 1932
Uchida, Count Yasuya, July 6, 1932–September 14, 1933
Hirota, Koki, September 14, 1933–April 2, 1936
Arita, Hachiro, April 2, 1936–January 23, 1937
Sato, Naotake, March 3, 1937–May 31, 1937
Hirota, Koki, June 4, 1937–May 26, 1938
Ugaki, General Kazushige, May 26, 1938–September 30, 1938
Arita, Hachiro, October 29, 1938–August 28, 1939
Nomura, Admiral Kichisaburo, September 25, 1939–January 14, 1940
Arita, Hachiro, January 16, 1940–July 16, 1940
Matsuoka, Yosuke, July 22, 1940–July 16, 1941
Toyoda, Admiral Teijiro, July 18, 1941–October 16, 1941
Togo, Shigenori, October 18, 1941–September 1942

JAPANESE AMBASSADORS IN THE UNITED STATES:

Debuchi, Katsuji, October 24, 1928–February 13, 1934
Saito, Hirosi, February 13, 1934–December 22, 1938
Horinouchi, Kensuke, December 22, 1938–October 20, 1940
Nomura, Admiral Kichisaburo, February 14, 1941–December 7, 1941

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE III

LIST OF PAPERS XI

GENERAL:

The Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, Geneva: 1936 phase 1

London Naval Conference, 1935: Second phase, January 6–March 25, 1936 22

Efforts to relate other powers to the London Naval Treaty of March 25, 1936, by accession or by separate bilateral treaties 102

Rejection by the United States of British proposal for renewal of article 19 of the Washington Naval Treaty, February 6, 1922 122

Retention of naval tonnage by the United States, the United Kingdom, and Japan under articles 17 and 21 of the London Naval Treaty of 1930 132

Signature of procès-verbal, November 6, 1936, relating to part IV (rules of submarine warfare), London Naval Treaty, signed April 22, 1930. 160

Views of the Department of State with respect to neutrality legislation 165

Analyses and reports by American diplomatic missions regarding European political developments affecting the preservation of peace . . 180

The German-Japanese Accord of November 25, 1936, against the Communist International 390

Negotiations for the suppression of liquor smuggling into the United States:

Belgium 407

Canada 424

Cuba 427

France 428

Mexico 436

Netherlands 437

Norway 439

Interest of the United States in the efforts of the League of Nations to promote international economic cooperation 453

Principles underlying the policy of the United States for restoration of international commerce and finance 486

Interest of the United States in liberalizing the policy of the International Rubber Committee with respect to the world supply of rubber 503

Preliminary discussions with respect to an international conference on production and marketing of sugar 521

Tripartite financial stabilization agreement by the United States, France, and the United Kingdom, set forth in simultaneous statements, September 25, 1936 535

Status of intergovernmental debts owed the United States by reason of the First World War 566

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

GENERAL—Continued Page

Position of the Department of State with respect to the treatment of foreign war debts 567
France 579
Italy 590
Rumania 597
Opposition of the Department of State to proposals to increase tariff rates on imports from countries in default on war-debt payments . 599
Views of the Department of State on bill providing for acquisition of essential commodities by crediting purchases as payments on war debts and by other methods 603
Representations by foreign governments against proposed legislation restricting tourist cruises from American ports to American ships . . 605
Representations of certain foreign governments against proposed legislation providing for additional requirements with respect to radio facilities on cargo ships 618
Participation by the United States in the Conference for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs, Geneva, June 8–26, 1936 . 625
Participation by the United States in the international conference for the standardization of the keeping and operation of herdbooks, Rome, October 12–14, 1936 626
Extradition treaties signed between the United States and certain other countries 628

THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS:

UNITED KINGDOM:
Efforts of the Secretary of State to secure the cooperation of the British Government in his international trade program; preliminary discussions respecting a trade agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom 629
Informal discussions regarding proposed restriction of trade between Australia and New Zealand to British shipping 706
Supplementary convention between the United States and the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand respecting the tenure and disposition of real and personal property, signed May 27, 1936 . . 716
Reciprocal arrangements effected by the United States with the United Kingdom, Canada, and the Irish Free State for trans-Atlantic air service 720
Refusal of the British Government to recognize the right of the United States to exercise control outside territorial waters over any vessel flying the British flag, except as provided by treaty 730
Informal representations against proposed preferential tariff rates in certain British West African colonies favoring Empire trade . . 731
Recognition of the United Kingdom by the United States Government as a reciprocal country under the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 736

AUSTRALIA:
Unsatisfactory trade relations between the United States and Australia 742
Informal arrangements between the United States and Australia respecting the importation of American aircraft and aircraft parts into Australia 774

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS—Continued

CANADA: Page
Informal discussions between officials of the United States and Canada with respect to trade relations 783
Convention between the United States and Canada respecting income taxation, signed December 30, 1936 790
Protests of the Canadian Government against certain provisions of the liquor tax bill; settlement of United States claims against Canadian distillers 796
Negotiations respecting the revision of the convention for the preservation of the halibut fishery of the Northern Pacific Ocean and Bering Sea 825
Proposed negotiation of a new treaty to deal with the Great Lakes–St. Lawrence Basin as a whole, including the Niagara Falls . . . 834

IRISH FREE STATE:
Disinclination of the United States to enter into a trade agreement with the Irish Free State 847

NEW ZEALAND:
Representations regarding discrimination against American commerce in the New Zealand Mandate of Western Samoa 852

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA:
Efforts to meet complaints from South Africa that American import regulations unduly restricted South African exports to the United States 855

INDEX 879

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Occupation of Manchuria by Japan and Statement of Policy by the United States—Continued

Date and number	Subject	Page
1931 Oct. 24 (193)	*From the Chargé in Japan (tel.)* Note from the Foreign Minister and accompanying statement (texts printed), setting forth Japan's position with regard to the Treaty for the Renunciation of War and disclaiming any thoughts of recourse to war for the solution of outstanding differences with China.	28
Oct. 24	*Resolution Voted Upon by the Council of the League of Nations* Recommendations for solution of the difficulties between China and Japan.	29
Oct. 26 (259)	*From the Consul at Geneva (tel.)* Summary of the action of the Council of the League in regard to the Sino-Japanese conflict; impasse over Japan's demands that long-standing problems be settled in advance of the withdrawal of Japanese troops.	31
Nov. 3 (217)	*To the Chargé in Japan (tel.)* Memorandum to be presented to the Foreign Minister (text printed) reinforcing the position taken by the League with reference to the Japanese demands.	34
Nov. 5 (219)	*To the Ambassador in Japan (tel.)* Explanation of the Department's policy in reinforcing the position of the League; and information that the suggestion is being made to the President of the Council that the impasse might be resolved by direct negotiations between the two Governments in the presence of neutral observers.	36
Nov. 6 (209)	*From the Ambassador in Japan (tel.)* Statement by the Foreign Minister of the five principles which the Japanese Government considers must be affirmed by both Governments before troops are withdrawn.	38
Undated [Rec'd Nov. 9]	*From the Japanese Embassy* Outline of the Japanese position with respect to the settlement of fundamental problems as a condition precedent to withdrawal.	39
Nov. 10 (326)	*To the Ambassador in Great Britain (tel.)* Instructions to proceed to Paris to be available for conferences with members of the Council, in view of the fact that the discussions of the Manchurian situation will involve American interests; background information and general instructions.	41
Nov. 19	*Memorandum by the Secretary of State* Conversation with the Japanese Ambassador in which the Secretary stated that he could not but regard the occupation of Tsitsihar by Japanese troops as a violation of the Kellogg Pact and the Nine-Power Treaty, and that he must reserve full liberty to publish all U. S.-Japanese correspondence on the Manchurian situation.	44
Nov. 21	*Memorandum by the Secretary of State* Conversation with the Japanese Ambassador in which the Ambassador stated that his Government would withdraw its forces from Tsitsihar as soon as possible and that it intended to adhere to the policy outlined in the Embassy's memorandum handed to the Secretary on November 9, and in which the Ambassador reported that Japan was now willing to consent to a neutral commission.	46

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

LIST OF PAPERS

(Unless otherwise specified, the correspondence is *from* or *to* officials in the Department of State.)

GENERAL

THE CONFERENCE FOR THE REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS, GENEVA: 1936 PHASE

Date and number	Subject	Page
1936 Aug. 17 (1815 Pol.)	*From the Consul at Geneva* Observations on preparatory work in connection with the possible resumption of the Disarmament Conference, as set forth in memoranda (texts printed) by officers of the League of Nations Secretariat.	1
Sept. 9 (1830 Pol.)	*From the Consul at Geneva* Transmittal of draft statement, prepared by the Disarmament Section of the League Secretariat for delivery in case the disarmament matter is raised in the forthcoming Assembly meeting, and of a memorandum dealing with the attitudes of the various governments.	11
Sept. 25 (1067)	*From the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* French desire that the Council consider calling the Bureau of the Disarmament Conference, and hope that the 1935 committees considering traffic in and manufacture of arms, and budgetary publicity, will resume work.	13
Sept. 26 (1069)	*From the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* Speculation as to French position in forthcoming Conference Bureau meeting, and request for instructions if Department wishes energetic support for reopening of disarmament discussions.	13
Sept. 28 (511)	*To the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* Department's position relative to reopening subject of disarmament and desire for further information on present prospects of a positive result; instructions for Minister to attend Bureau session if called.	14
Sept. 29 (1070)	*From the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* Advice of move of Scandinavian and Netherland delegations to have disarmament question taken up by the Assembly Third Committee, and inquiry as to whether the British and French should be approached formally to ascertain their positions on the subject.	15
Sept. 29 (512)	*To the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* Reason for view that formal approach to the British and French would be inadvisable.	16
Oct. 1 (1071)	*From the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* Information that the Third Committee was set up by the Assembly; and that France would support reexamination of budgetary publicity, control of manufacture and traffic in arms, and limitation of air forces.	16

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Date and number	Subject	Page
1936 Oct. 2 (1073)	*From the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* Election of Lange of Norway as President of the Third Committee, and his attitude that its work would be a useful preface for the meeting of the Bureau.	18
Oct. 4 (1074)	*From the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* British attitude toward budgetary publicity, and toward general disarmament discussions at this time.	18
Oct. 5 (1075)	*From the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* Decision of Third Committee to support French move for convocation of the Bureau; reiteration of their positions by the French and British.	19
Oct. 7 (1078)	*From the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* Approval by Third Committee of a report to the Assembly favoring an early meeting of the Bureau.	20
Oct. 10 (1079)	*From the Minister in Switzerland (tel.)* Council's authorization to its President to set date of meeting of Bureau, and its decision to communicate information of actions taken, relative to disarmament, to members of the Bureau, and to states represented at the Conference.	20
Dec. 24 (4735 L. N. No. 3484)	*From the Minister in Switzerland* Communication from Council's President (text printed) stating that he has decided to refer the question of the date of meeting of the Bureau to the Council itself in January.	21

LONDON NAVAL CONFERENCE, 1935: SECOND PHASE, JANUARY 6–MARCH 25, 1936

1936 Jan. 7	*To President Roosevelt* Transmittal of draft telegram for the President's consideration (text *infra*). (Footnote: President's approval of communication.)	22
Jan. 7 (8)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Advisability of securing clear-cut statement as to whether Japan would be willing to reach agreement on other phases of the naval question in the absence of agreement to a "common upper level"; Department's view on continuance of discussions.	22
Jan. 8 (38)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Account of conversations with British Foreign Office officials, who disagreed as to securing an early termination of conversations with the Japanese.	24
Jan. 9 (39)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Agreement of Foreign Secretary Eden with U. S. desire for early determination of Japanese position on the matter of a common upper limit; his doubts as to even a consultative pact with the Japanese.	26
Jan. 9 (10)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Comments relative to conversations reported in No. 38, of January 8.	27
Jan. 10 (41)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Information from Eden regarding Japanese concern when he told them the British were ready to discuss and come to a decision relative to the common upper limit; practical agreement of French and Italians to join in rejecting common upper limit.	28

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

LONDON NAVAL CONFERENCE

Date and number	Subject	Page
1936 Jan. 10 (43)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Request for Department's views as to Japan's continuation in naval negotiations in capacity of observer if she withdraws from active participation in consequence of rejection of common upper limit.	29
Jan. 10 (12)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Department's inability to see any basis for objection to presence of Japanese observer or observers.	30
Jan. 11 (45)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Request that delegation be kept fully informed of conflicting views between Foreign Office and the Navy in Tokyo.	30
Jan. 11 (14)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Advice that U. S. Ambassador in Japan has been informed of request in No. 45 of January 11.	30
Jan. 12 (9)	*From the Ambassador in Japan (tel.)* Advice of reports indicating disagreement on Naval Conference between the Navy and the Foreign Office which desires to avoid blame for complete rupture; belief that disagreement is on methods and tactics and not on objectives.	31
Jan. 13 (11)	*From the Ambassador in Japan (tel.)* Foreign Minister's confirmation that he had won out in contest with Navy over immediate withdrawal of delegation from London.	32
Jan. 14 (46)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Further developments in relation to Japanese participation in the Conference; comment of Nagai, one of the Japanese delegates, that what Japan wants is to leave in most friendly spirit.	32
Jan. 14 (47)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Discussion with British of entire situation, including their unwillingness to accede to Japan's desire that other matters be taken up before the subject of parity; observations relative to British views on qualitative agreement. (Footnote: Citation to text of Japanese withdrawal announcement of January 15.)	33
Jan. 16 (55)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Observations disagreeing with reported statement of Senator Key Pittman to the effect that future efforts to limit naval armament are futile, and that Japan withdrew to institute a naval race.	35
Jan. 16	*Memorandum by the Chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs* Analysis of the effects of Japanese withdrawal, in which issue is taken with observations made in No. 55 of January 16.	36
Jan. 18 (20)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Explanation that Japanese withdrawal has considerably lessened U. S. interest in the Conference, and that initiative in the Conference should be left to European powers. (Footnote: Citation to text of statement of Chairman Davis of January 15.)	38
Jan. 20 (23)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* President Roosevelt's opinion that Department should still seek an agreement, within the tonnage limits in existing treaties, with an escape clause in event Japan exceeds limitations.	38

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

LONDON NAVAL CONFERENCE

Date and number	Subject	Page
1936 Jan. 21 (62)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Importance of agreement among European naval powers to U. S.-British agreement; difficulties connected with quantitative and qualitative disarmament.	39
Jan. 23 (64)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Résumé of conversations indicating the general French attitude toward continuation of the Conference, and French opposition to inviting Germany to participate at this time.	40
Jan. 23 (66)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Development of U. S.-British disagreement as to status of previous informal understanding on gun caliber and tonnage of capital ships; contention of U. S. delegation that understanding was contingent on agreements which were not consummated; desire to avoid evidence of difference of opinion.	42
Jan. 24 (67)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Detailed résumé of conversations with the British relating to gun caliber and tonnage of vessels, and request for Department's views on British compromise proposals.	44
Jan. 26 (72)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Further explanation of British proposals, with indication of escape clauses.	48
Jan. 29 (28)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Inquiry as to whether there was any discussion on question of scrapping.	48
Jan. 29 (29)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Department's position relative to British proposals discussed in telegrams from Chairman Davis. (Footnote: Marginal notation that Department's telegram was read and approved by Admiral Taussig, and one specified part by President Roosevelt.)	49
Jan. 30 (76)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Doubt as to meaning of portion of Department's No. 29 of January 29; further explanation of status of conversations, and opinion as to what should be accepted.	50
Jan. 30 (77)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Hope that the President, the Department, and the Navy will approve delegation's recommendations on cruisers; acknowledgment that qualitative limitation would have definite advantages and would be better than no agreement.	51
Jan. 31 (31)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Memorandum of the Navy General Board suggesting changes in proposals as set forth by the delegation, and requesting further information.	52
Feb. 1 (81)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Information requested by the General Board.	53
Feb. 3 (82)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* British intentions in regard to scrapping.	54
Feb. 3 (83)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Reasons why the British are unable to give any definite assurance as to ultimate tonnage of the light surface category, and observations as to probable future British construction capacity.	55

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

LONDON NAVAL CONFERENCE

Date and number	Subject	Page
1936 Feb. 4 (92)	*From the Consul General at Beirut, Temporarily at Paris* Conversation with an official of the Foreign Office relative to German participation in international disarmament discussions.	57
Feb. 6 (33)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Instructions as to basis of discussions; and information relative to President Roosevelt's approval, with the request that implications of agreement on that basis be noted.	57
Feb. 12 (94)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Account of conversations with the French, who are considering probable political consequences of German participation, and wish, before acquiescing therein, to come to an agreement with the British concerning possible future violation of the Rhineland.	58
Feb. 14 (96)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Information from Eden of his conversation with a French delegate who was told that a naval agreement, essential to the British, necessitated German participation. Eden's willingness to assure French that the British would stand by Locarno.	59
Feb. 17 (123)	*From the Ambassador in France (tel.)* Discussion of present situation in naval negotiations with the Minister of Marine, who explained French acquiescence in German participation in a naval treaty upon agreement to later conversations on air and land forces.	60
Feb. 18 (97)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Conversation with French delegate, who conveyed French willingness to initial treaty to go into effect when certain "general political questions" were solved, and was informed by Chairman Davis that the United States could not sign an agreement contingent on a European political settlement.	61
Feb. 19 (99)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Conversation with another French delegate to whom Chairman Davis intimated his displeasure at attempt of French Government to secure U. S. position on capital ships through the French Ambassador in Washington, and reiterated his position as stated in No. 97 of February 18.	63
Feb. 20 (58)	*From the Ambassador in Italy (tel.)* Information indirectly from the Japanese Ambassador that in a Council of State at Tokyo the ranking Admiral advocated Japanese withdrawal from the Conference, but gave assurances that Japan had no intention of building in competition with British or U. S. navies.	64
Feb. 20	*To President Roosevelt* Information of French Ambassador's representations regarding capital ships. Request for approval of indicated method of steering negotiations back to London.	65
Feb. 20 (40)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Account of French Ambassador's representations regarding capital ships, and U. S. reply indicating hope that the French would take up matter at the Conference.	65
Feb. 20 (41)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Observations as to Department's position on tonnage of capital ships and caliber of guns.	66

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

LONDON NAVAL CONFERENCE

Date and number	Subject	Page
1936 Feb. 21 (102)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* British position on the importance of a naval agreement to which Germany would be a party, agreement with U. S. position against acceptance of treaty contingent upon a political agreement, and plan for representations to the French.	68
Feb. 21 (43)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Approval of position Davis has taken relative to avoiding an agreement dependent upon political developments or settlements.	69
Feb. 21 (103)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Observations as to uncertainty of the Italian position regarding a naval agreement and relative to possible influence of the Abyssinian question on that position.	69
Feb. 25 (44)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Department's objection to the anomalous position of having to wait for signing of treaty pending settlement of European political questions; request for advice on suggestion to speed final agreement.	70
Feb. 25 (105)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Account of conversation with officials of the Foreign Office, in which Davis proposed that the naval treaty, as contemplated, be drawn up and initialed by Britain and the United States, and left open for adherence by other powers.	71
Feb. 25 (46)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Counter suggestion of a memorandum indicating type of treaty the United States would be willing to sign before end of year.	72
Feb. 25 (106)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Information from the British as to French proposal for the conclusion of a four-power treaty with a later bilateral British supplementary treaty with Germany, and as to the German and Italian positions.	73
Feb. 25 (107)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Advice of attempt to speed reaching of conclusions, and of Eden's opposition to further dillydallying.	74
Feb. 26 (47)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Nonobjection to French proposal, but instructions to indicate that the United States will take no part in the bilateral agreements with Germany.	74
Feb. 26 (108)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Information that negotiations are still going on, but that delegates have had idea suggested in No. 46, February 25 in mind, in case something more satisfactory cannot be reached.	74
Feb. 26 (109)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Information from Italian Delegate Grandi that Italy would not sign agreement at present, but might adhere in the future.	75
Feb. 27 (110)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Presentation of three alternatives of action contingent on specific developments.	76
Feb. 27 (48)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Comment on alternatives, including statement of willingness to enter an agreement with England and France with appropriate safeguard clauses. (Footnote: Indication of President's approval of telegram.)	77

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

LONDON NAVAL CONFERENCE

Date and number	Subject	Page
1936 Feb. 28 (112)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Explanation by Italian delegates that they wished to remain in the Conference although for political reasons they would not sign a treaty at the present time; that they would, however, indicate it was for technical reasons; and that Italy hoped to adhere later.	77
Feb. 28 (50)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Information from Italian Ambassador that Italy is unable at this time to enter into a naval treaty, with reasons therefor.	78
Feb. 28 (51)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Suggestion for consideration of a gentleman's agreement between Great Britain, France, Italy, and the United States, and, through England with Germany, for notification of every decision to lay down vessels of over 100 tons. (Footnote: Information that this instruction embodied substance of a memorandum from the President.)	78
Feb. 28 (113)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* For the President and the Secretary: Detailed analysis of situations which are making agreement difficult, and suggestion of two possible lines of procedure which might prevent the termination of the Conference without concrete results.	79
Feb. 29 (114)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* For the President and the Secretary: Suggestion as to action in case none of the other powers, except Britain and the United States, are prepared to sign.	81
Feb. 29 (54)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Comments on analysis and suggestions of the delegation.	82
Mar. 3 (119)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Understanding of condition under which the United States can agree to reduce the gun caliber of capital ships to 14 inches; recommendation that delegation not insist upon condition.	83
Mar. 4 (120)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Advice of French formula pertaining to capital ships, and modification suggested by the delegation for Department's approval.	84
Mar. 5 (58)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Approval of modifications of French formula. Position that further discussions relative to reduction in tonnage or gun caliber of capital ships might better take place in 1941, with arrangement to take effect as from January 1, 1942. (Footnote: Approval of telegram by Navy officials.)	86
Mar. 9 (64)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Request for opinion as to possibility of expediting discussion of any pending technical questions, and as to early return of the delegation, in view of entirely new turn of events brought about by German action in the Rhineland.	86
Mar. 9 (129)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Information that treaty completion will take ten days longer, and question as to Senate ratification in time for treaty to come into force January 1, 1937; importance of having it effective on that day.	87

885223—54—VOL. I——2

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

LONDON NAVAL CONFERENCE

Date and number	Subject	Page
1936 Mar. 10 (132)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Hope of concluding treaty with France and England in ten days; probable effects of German Rhineland matter on negotiations.	88
Mar. 11 (68)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Discussion of ratification of treaty, and conclusion it would be best for Davis to initial draft of treaty at this time and appoint some later time for signature in order not to jeopardize Senate acceptance of treaty.	89
Mar. 13 (137)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* For the President and the Secretary: Request for definite information as to whether it is proposed to obtain ratification before the end of the year and reasons for request, with a general résumé of the situation as seen from London.	89
Mar. 14 (138)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* For the President and the Secretary: Further information relative to ratification, and suggestion of signing and withholding treaty from Senate pending clarification of international situation.	91
Mar. 14 (72)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Further views on ratification, and advice of President's views on submission of the treaty to the Senate ;instructions as to further steps in connection with initialing or signing.	92
Mar. 16 (141)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Conversation with an official of the Foreign Office, who indicated the British decision to go ahead with the naval treaties, while Davis explained the U. S. position on ratification.	94
Mar. 19 (146)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Suggestion that, since the new treaty does not provide for quantitative agreement, a statement including idea of parity be agreed to; British sympathy with idea.	95
Mar. 19 (147)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Explanation of safeguarding clauses found in articles 24 and 25 of the draft treaty.	96
Mar. 21	*Memorandum by President Roosevelt to the Under Secretary of State* Desire for clarification in treaty relative to building vessels during interim period before treaty becomes effective.	96
Mar. 23 (80)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Confirmation of telephone conversation conveying President's thought that the affirmation of the parity principle be incorporated in an exchange of private notes with Eden which need not be made public.	97
Mar. 23 (83)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Expression of thanks for work of delegation leading to the conclusion of the treaty.	98
Mar. 23 (84)	*To the Chairman of the American Delegation (tel.)* Suggestion of oral exchange relative to the parity principle, with an exchange of memorandums of the conversation instead of letters.	98

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

LONDON NAVAL CONFERENCE

Date and number	Subject	Page
1936 Mar. 28	*To the Secretary of the Navy* Information of the notes exchanged (text printed) between Davis and Foreign Secretary Eden regarding the maintenance of parity between the navies of the United States and the British Commonwealth.	98
Mar. 30	*To President Roosevelt* Advice that interests of the United States relative to building in the interim period before the treaty becomes effective are fully protected.	100
	(Note: Citation to text of Treaty for the Limitation of Naval Armament, signed March 25, and of Protocol of June 30, 1938. List of signatories and dates of deposit at London of instruments of ratification of the Treaty.)	100

EFFORTS TO RELATE OTHER POWERS TO THE LONDON NAVAL TREATY OF MARCH 25, 1936, BY ACCESSION OR BY SEPARATE BILATERAL TREATIES

1936 May 28 (287)	*From the Chargé in the United Kingdom (tel.)* Advice of British bilateral conversations relative to adherence to 1936 Naval treaty with the Poles, who seek explanation of the situation, and with the Soviets, who desire to make reservations before signing. Scandinavian inclination toward general treaty.	102
July 2 (333)	*From the Chargé in the United Kingdom (tel.)* Deposit of instruments of ratification of Treaty of March 25; readiness of Russians to accept treaty with reservations; continuance of British conversations with Germans and French.	102
July 9 (A 5678/ 4/45)	*From the British Assistant Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to the First Secretary of the American Embassy in the United Kingdom* Advice of Japanese communication, in reply to British advances, indicating that Japan has no intention of adhering to the London Treaty under present conditions.	104
July 25 (280)	*To the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (tel.)* Instructions to ascertain British view as to present status of 14-inch gun provision of treaty, which was made contingent on its acceptance not later than April 1, 1937, by Washington Treaty powers.	104
July 31 (385)	*From the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (tel.)* British view that Japanese cannot be presumed to have refused to accept 14-inch limit unless they make declaration to that effect before April 1, 1937; British intention to seek views of their Ambassador in Japan.	105
Aug. 1 (101)	*To the Ambassador in Japan (tel.)* Explanation of situation with respect to 14-inch guns.	106
Aug. 27 (172)	*From the Ambassador in Japan (tel.)* Agreement with British colleague that inquiry as to Japan's position on the 14-inch question should be put point-blank eventually, and comments as to Japan's probable stand on question.	106
Sept. 29 (392)	*From the Ambassador in Italy (tel.)* Reasons for Italy's refusal to sign the London Treaty, and her readiness to work with the Locarno powers.	107

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

LONDON NAVAL TREATY

Date and number	Subject	Page
1936 Oct. 2 (128)	*From the Minister in Switzerland* Memorandum (text printed) of a conversation with British Admiral Bellairs, who recounted British conversations aimed to secure adherence of continental powers to the London Treaty.	108
Oct. 9 (408)	*From the Ambassador in Italy (tel.)* Belief of British Ambassador that Italy's real objection to signing was unwillingness to cooperate in naval matters until a more definite program of European cooperation was agreed to.	110
Nov. 16 (1141)	*To the Chargé in Japan* Instructions to consider the advisability of making formal inquiry as to Japan's position on the 14-inch gun matter, with a detailed presentation of background material on the matter.	111
Dec. 2 (151)	*To the Ambassador in Japan (tel.)* Further instructions as to urgency of action upon receipt of instruction No. 1141 of November 16.	113
Dec. 3 (249)	*From the Ambassador in Japan (tel.)* Suggestion of possibility of handling gun matter through the Naval Attaché in Tokyo, in line with a suggestion made to the British by Ambassador Yoshida at London.	113
Dec. 3	*To the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (circ. tel.)* Information that President ratified London Naval Treaty, drafted to come into effect on January 1, 1937, on May 28; request for information as to intentions of Government to which Ambassador is accredited. (Footnote: Sent also to Embassies in France and Italy.)	114
Dec. 3 (434)	*To the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (tel.)* Review of background of attempt to secure Japanese view on question of 14-inch guns, and instructions to ascertain present status of question as between the British and Japanese.	114
Dec. 7 (599)	*From the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (tel.)* Reluctance of the Foreign Office to proceed on matter of 14-inch guns until negotiations with Soviets and Germans relative to signature of Treaty have been concluded.	116
Dec. 10 (157)	*To the Ambassador in Japan (tel.)* Advice that conversations are now going on between the British Foreign Office and the Japanese Ambassador at London relative to gun calibers, and that Department will not broach matter before end of December.	117
Dec. 12 (447)	*To the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (tel.)* Information as to probable early ratification of the London Treaty by France and Italy, and instructions for representations indicating Department would deem it unfortunate if a lapse in naval limitation were to occur.	117
Dec. 14 (609)	*From the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (tel.)* Position of France, Great Britain, and Italy on ratification.	118
Dec. 18 (262)	*From the Ambassador in Japan (tel.)* Detailed report on Japan's position on naval disarmament, and on the precarious situation of the Government.	118
Dec. 22 (340)	*From the Minister in Norway* Information from Bureau Chief of the Foreign Office of a recent meeting leading to an agreement in principle between Norwegian, Swedish, Danish, and Finnish officials to accept British invitation to participate in London Naval Treaty.	120

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

LONDON NAVAL TREATY

Date and number	Subject	Page
1936 Dec. 30 (1304)	*From the Ambassador in France (tel.)* Desire of French to put off ratification of Naval Treaty until conclusion of present discussions with Germany; plan to ratify some time in January.	121

REJECTION BY THE UNITED STATES OF BRITISH PROPOSAL FOR RENEWAL OF ARTICLE 19 OF THE WASHINGTON NAVAL TREATY, FEBRUARY 6, 1922

1936 Sept. 11	*Memorandum by the Acting Chief of the Division of Western European Affairs* British Chargé's proposal to renew article 19 of the Washington Naval Treaty, providing for nonfortification of certain insular possessions in the Pacific, with change permitting modernization and extension of existing fortifications.	122
Sept. 16	*Memorandum of Conversation, by Mr. Robert T. Pell of the Division of Western European Affairs* Analysis by representatives of the State, Navy, and War Departments of the British proposal to renew article 19 of the Washington Treaty, and decision not to discuss renewal with the British.	124
Sept. 25 (347)	*To the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (tel.)* Oral reply made to the British Chargé (text printed) indicating U. S. reasons for not joining Great Britain and Japan in the renewal of article 19.	130
Oct. 14	*Memorandum by the Chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs* Explanation of what appeared to be an inconsistency in British position relative to Hong Kong fortifications by indication of radical change in British attitude toward rearmament.	131

RETENTION OF NAVAL TONNAGE BY THE UNITED STATES, THE UNITED KINGDOM, AND JAPAN UNDER ARTICLES 17 AND 21 OF THE LONDON NAVAL TREATY OF 1930

1936 Apr. 30 (1223)	*To the Ambassador in the United Kingdom* Request for information on British and Japanese plans on scrapping tonnage in excess of amounts indicated in article 16 of the London Treaty of 1930, or on possible invocation of article 21, the escalator clause.	132
May 15	*To the Secretary of the Navy* Reply to inquiries relating to British and Japanese position in the matter of excess tonnage.	133
June 4 (191)	*To the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (tel.)* Notification of forwarding of copy of memorandum acknowledging receipt of British memoranda relative to destroyer excess tonnage.	134
July 15 (348)	*From the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (tel.)* British invocation of article 21 of the London Naval Treaty of 1930 with view to retaining 40,000 tons of overage destroyer tonnage in excess of allowance in article 16.	135

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

NAVAL TONNAGE

Date and number	Subject	Page
1936 Aug. 14 (105)	*To the Ambassador in Japan (tel.)* Memorandum for presentation to Japan (text printed) indicating British action, and containing an announcement of U. S. intention to exercise right under article 21 in view of British action. (Footnote: Transmittal to Embassy in the United Kingdom of a memorandum similar in substance for communication to British Government.)	135
Sept. 3	*Memorandum by the Secretary of State* Receipt of memorandum from Japanese Ambassador indicating Japan's intentions in view of the British action on destroyers.	136
Sept. 7 (421)	*From the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (tel.)* Advice from Foreign Office of receipt of Japanese note of August 31 inoicating decision to retain excess tonnage in destroyers and submarines; British alarm at retention of submarine tonnage.	136
Sept. 10 (114)	*To the Ambassador in Japan (tel.)* U. S. position that there is no legal warrant for Japanese retention of submarine tonnage, in lieu of adequate destroyer tonnage, without recourse to article 21.	137
Sept. 25 (445)	*From the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (tel.)* Conversation with Craigie, Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, who gave an outline (text printed) of the British position on Japanese retention of excess submarine tonnage and indicated British desire to retain five "C" class destroyers.	138
Sept. 29 (1442)	*To the Ambassador in the United Kingdom* Tentative decisions, in meeting of officials of the State and Navy Departments with the Counselor of the Embassy in the United Kingdom, pertaining to problems connected with certain categories of vessels, and with the Anglo-Soviet Bilateral Naval Agreement.	140
Oct. 27	*Memorandum by the Counselor of Embassy in the United Kingdom to the Ambassador* Résumé of long conversation with Craigie on various naval problems, including those on which tentative conclusions had been reached in the Washington meeting.	145
Oct. 28 (385)	*To the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (tel.)* U. S. attitude toward British retention of cruisers beyond tonnage allowed by Treaty of 1930; instructions to inform Craigie that the United States is obliged to insist on strict application of article 21.	149
Nov. 5 (139)	*To the Ambassador in Japan (tel.)* Instructions to present to the Japanese Government a memorandum stating that U. S. Government has decided to retain 19,000 tons of destroyers under article 17.	151
Nov. 21 (413)	*To the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (tel.)* Instructions to hand to Craigie a memorandum (text printed) relative to U. S. position on the application of article 21 to the British retention of excess cruiser tonnage.	151
Dec. 15 (448)	*To the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (tel.)* Request for information as to status of British and Japanese projected action under article 21, in view of scrapping complications.	153

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

NAVAL TONNAGE

Date and number	Subject	Page
1936 Dec. 16 (618)	*From the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (tel.)* Advice that Japan is giving favorable attention to British proposals relative to "C" class cruisers, and to application of escalator clause to retain submarines.	153
Dec. 17	*Memorandum by Messrs. William T. Turner and Eugene H. Dooman, of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs* Conversation with an official of the Japanese Embassy who desired approval of two points in connection with formal notification of invocation of article 21 in connection with submarines; informal statement (text printed) on the two points.	154
Dec. 17 (450)	*To the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (tel.)* Information relative to Japanese invocation of article 21, in order to retain submarine tonnage.	155
Dec. 24 (624)	*From the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (tel.)* British notification of invocation of article 21 relative to retention of cruiser tonnage.	156
Dec. 28 (284)	*From the Japanese Ambassador* Notification of retention of 15,598 tons of submarines in excess of tonnage permitted under article 18, and of invocation of article 21.	156
Dec. 29 (458)	*To the Ambassador in the United Kingdom (tel.)* Instructions to present note (text printed) acknowledging receipt of British notification of invocation of article 21 and indicating U. S. intention to increase by proportionate amount its cruiser tonnage.	157
Dec. 29 (291)	*From the Japanese Ambassador* Notification that, in response to British invocation of article 21, Japan has decided to retain the subcategory cruiser *Tsushima*.	157
Dec. 30 (166)	*To the Ambassador in Japan (tel.)* Information of Japanese note and Department's reply (*infra*) indicating U. S. intention to retain proportionate amount of submarine tonnage. (Footnote: The same to the Ambassador in the United Kingdom.)	158
Dec. 30	*To the Japanese Ambassador* Acknowledgment of Japanese note and statement of U. S. intention to retain proportionate amount of submarine tonnage.	158
Dec. 30	*Memorandum by the Chief of the Division of Western European Affairs* Reiteration to Counselor of the British Embassy of U. S. position in favor of a reduction of armaments, and regret that it has been found necessary to increase naval armament by invocation of article 21.	158

SIGNATURE OF PROCÈS-VERBAL, NOVEMBER 6, 1936, RELATING TO PART IV (RULES OF SUBMARINE WARFARE), LONDON NAVAL TREATY, SIGNED APRIL 22, 1930

1936 Mar. 10 (130)	*From the Chairman of the American Delegation to the London Naval Conference (tel.)* British plan for reconfirming commitment to part IV of the London Treaty of 1930 pertaining to submarines.	160

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA