

a point at which it passed beyond what should be regarded as a strictly military responsibility. It had become a question for the Governments concerned, including those of the liberated countries. It was pointed out that this view seemed to be shared by the Theatre Commander (see reference in paragraph 2a above to the message from SCAEF). In brief the view of the U.S. War Department (which prevailed, at least for the time being, on the U.S. side) was that the provision of supplies to France must be limited to:

- (a) civil affairs supplies necessary to prevent "disease and unrest",
- (b) raw materials for processing in France into finished war materials for use by the U.S. Army (i.e. supplies for the repair and salvage of army stores, vehicles, etc., and raw materials such as rubber, cotton, wool, and cement for use in French factories producing military materials),
- (c) "spot" or "ad hoc" allocations of supplies and shipping to fill requests of the French Provisional Government on occasions when the military position might warrant, but with no firm advance guarantees to the French on which they could base a production programme of their own.

8. The U.K. objections to these limitations were:

- (a) the quantities permitted by this arrangement would not be appreciable, in fact, and would certainly not permit of any substantial restitution of French industry and employment.
- (b) the quantities would be far less than the 1,000,000 tons of materials which the Germans had provided to French industry each month.
- (c) the flow of such supplies, in addition to being small in volume, would be uncertain and intermittent with the result that production and employment, at even a low level, could not be continuous, and the orderly development of French political institutions might well be seriously affected.
- (d) the realization by the French that their country was regarded merely as an advance base, and that they were not considered as colleagues or partners, would have most unfortunate results on French relations with the U.S. and U.K.

9. From a review of the detailed discussion it is apparent on the U.S. side that the views of the Service Departments clearly dominated. Although there were numerous indications that Mr. Hopkins, and the representatives of the Department of State and the War Shipping Administration were sympathetic with the views of the U.K. Delegation, Mr. Hopkins made it quite clear that in his opinion the view of the War and Navy Departments would govern any immediate decisions which might be taken. A number of reasons have been suggested to explain the dominant position occupied by the Service Departments on the U.S. side in these discussions:

- (a) The coincidence of these discussions with the landings on Luzon and with the new German threat to our military position in Northwestern Europe combined to emphasize the eminence of military requirements in U.S. policy.
- (b) At the first meeting Mr. Hopkins remarked that there had been so far only one general discussion of the subject under consideration at which all the interested U.S. Departments were represented. As a consequence no generally