


334 - SWNCC COMMITTEE, DATA  
INFORMATION AND GATHERING

SECRET

**“Armorclad”**  
Made in U. S. A. T. M. Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.  
U. S. Patents No. 1,370,424 -- 1,511,268 -- 1,544,818  
British Patent No. 224,787

**Guides and Folders**

  
**Remington Rand Inc.**  
BRANCHES EVERYWHERE

CAT. NO. 52551-P.4



LIST OF PAPERS

FILE UNDER NO. SWNCC 334 - COMMITTEE, DATA INFORMATION AND GATHERING

Serial No.	From	Date	To	Synopsis
1		4/2/45		Memo appointing committee to consider problems presented by SWNCC 64.
2	R.J. Patterson	6/25/45	Mr. R.M. Garr	Letter re. representative on Metals and Minerals Br., Production Div., ASF.



COL. McCARTHY	.....
COMDR. RICHARDSON	.....
MR. R. E. COX	.....
LT. COL. PENNOYER	.....
LT. COMDR. BEILFUSS	.....
MR. H. W. MOSELEY	.....
MR. J. P. BARDINER	.....
LT. COMDR. ROCKEFELLER	.....
LT. COL. V. F. FIELD	.....
MAJOR W. E. GUNTHER	.....
1ST LT. E. SPITTALL	.....
ENS. F. WHITESIDE	.....
FILE	.....

(Written 15 June 1945)

JUN 25 1945

Mr. Robert M. Carr,  
Executive Secretary,  
Executive Committee on Economic Foreign Policy,  
Department of State,  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Carr:

Reference is made to letter of 16 January 1945 from this office which designates Colonel W. A. Amelung, Chief, Metals and Minerals Branch, Production Division, ASF, as the War Department representative on the Technical Committee on Copper. Colonel Amelung is slated for overseas activity and it accordingly will be necessary to designate a new War Department representative on this Committee.

The new representative will be Major H. J. Beardsley, Chief, Copper Section, Metals and Minerals Branch, Production Division, ASF. Major Beardsley's address is room 1728 Tempo "R" Building, Ext. 76103.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) ROBERT P. PATTERSON  
ROBERT P. PATTERSON,  
Under Secretary of War.

cc: Under Secretary of War  
Commanding General, ASF  
Mr. Howard Bruce  
Gen. H. C. Minton  
Col. F. R. Denton  
Col. J. S. Cooke  
~~Col. W. A. Amelung~~  
Col. W. A. Amelung  
Maj. H. J. Beardsley  
Comeback

HCM	5181
FRD	5181
JSC	4935
WAA	<u>WAA</u> 76103

Written by: Col. W. A. Amelung/elb  
SPUPM



319  
CONFIDENTIAL

*J.B.*  
COPY NO. 40

2 April 1945

STATE-WAR-NAVY COORDINATING COMMITTEE

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. Frank W. Fetter, State Department,  
Steering Member (S-2689)  
Major Alfred Ogden, USA (W-6026)  
Lt. Philip Young, USN (N-63111)

Subject: Appointment of Informal Committee.

The State, War and Navy Departments have reached an agreement to set up an informal working group to consider the problems presented by SWNCC 64, and to make pertinent recommendations to SWNCC relating to these matters. The individuals listed above have been designated by their respective Departments to serve on this informal committee.

It is assumed that a representative of F.E.A. will be called in for consultation if required.

\* SWNCC 64 is forwarded herewith, together with an extract of the minutes of the 15th meeting of SWNCC pertaining to this matter.

For the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee:

CHARLES W. McCARTHY  
Secretary

\* Furnished to members of Committee only.



*Terms of reference dated  
2 Apr. 1945, sent  
F.W. Fetter, State Dept.*

ASSISTANT SECRETARY  
A-D  
MAR 26 1945  
MR. DUNN  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
OFFICE OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS  
Division of British Commonwealth Affairs

March 23, 1945

A-D - Mr. Dunn *Mr. C. A.*

At Mr. Gardiner's request I have discussed SWNCC 64 (Obtaining Pricing Information and Supporting Data For the U.K. Reciprocal Aid Account) with Mr. Fetter and Mr. Orchard.

Mr. Fetter points out that the Department's responsibilities in the matter have been exhaustively studied, that the War Department presents no new information or reasons for re-opening the discussion, that representatives of the War Department (including General Edgerton), Navy Department, FEA, and the Embassy discussed the matter exhaustively with the British authorities as recently as December, and that Ambassador Winant and Hawkins had then expressed the opinion that nothing further would be gained by pressing the British further. He also states that Mr. Acheson, with the approval of the Secretary, had advised FEA and Admiral Reeves at the conclusion of the London negotiations that this Department was fully prepared to deal with any allegations by Congress or the War or Navy Departments that we were not sufficiently cooperative in pressing the British for further information.

It is recommended that we reply to the War Department along the following lines:

*Pages 1-4  
The State Dept.  
reply of Mar 26*

We are always glad to do anything in our power to help other Departments obtain from other Governments information to which those Departments attach importance. We will accordingly be glad to reconsider the position taken in the Department's letter of December 12, 1944 in the light of such information as the War Department is prepared to furnish as to the inadequacy of the information now being furnished by the British as a result of the November-December negotiations. If the matter is to be reopened with the British so soon, the American negotiators will undoubtedly meet stiff resistance and must be prepared to present convincing arguments as to the inadequacy of the information now being furnished and new reasons why additional information is necessary. This Department's judgment on whether the matter should again be discussed with the British would depend upon the strength of the arguments which the War Department, and possibly the Navy Department and FEA could present. It might be well for representatives of the various agencies concerned to discuss the matter informally on the technical level.

cc: Mr. Orchard, Mr. Fetter, Theodore C. Achilles  
BC:TCA:MEI Mr. Gardiner



C  
O  
P  
YMarch 19, 1945  
2563A-D-SWNC  
Mr. Cox:

As you know, the War Department is under considerable pressure by the Mead Committee of the Senate to furnish information regarding accounting connected with the furnishing of lend-lease supplies and reciprocal aid received, particularly from the British. I am afraid that if we do not at least ask the British for the data the War Department desires, the responsibility will be placed upon us for not cooperating in securing the desired information and we will therefore be subject to criticism in Congress.

I still do not quite understand why we should not press the British further for the data the War Department requires and at least find out what the British reply will be to our approach in order that we may then decide whether we shall press further.

Would you please take steps to have this question very carefully studied from the point of view of the responsibilities of this Department in the matter.

/S/ James Clement Dunn

A-D:JCD:REH



C  
O  
P  
Y

March 17, 1945

A-D  
Mr. Dunn,

Attached is SWNCC 64, a new paper just introduced to the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee by Mr. McCloy. It comprises the War Department's desire that the State Department reconsider its position as evidenced in its letter dated December 12, 1944, to the Secretary of War (Appendix C of SWNCC 64) that it is not in a position to press for more pricing information and supporting data on reciprocal aid furnished the United States than the British Government agreed to furnish.

I asked Fetter (FMA), who drafted the State Department letter of December 12, to prepare you a memorandum on this subject. His memo attached herewith shows that the Department's position in this matter had the approval of FEA, our Embassy in London, Mr. Acheson and Mr. Stettinius. Mr. Fetter questions "whether it is necessary or desirable to reopen the matter".

You might be able to explain to Mr. McCloy personally why the Department does not wish to press the British further; if that does not work, have Fetter, with Gardiner of SWNCC Secretariat assisting, prepare a rebuttal paper to place before SWNCC.

What action do you wish to take on SWNCC 64?

/S/ R. E. Cox

A-D-SWNC:REC:DJF



C  
P  
Y

SWACC

March 16, 1945

TO: SWNCC - Mr. Cox

FROM: FMA - Mr. Fetter

SUBJECT: REQUEST OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT THAT THE STATE DEPARTMENT  
RECONSIDER ITS POSITION ON THE PRICING OF RECIPROCAL  
AID BY THE BRITISH.

Originally no monetary valuation was placed by the British on the reciprocal aid furnished to the United States. As a result of pressure both in Congress and in the War and Navy Departments for obtaining a monetary valuation, negotiations were carried on between the State Department and the British Ambassador and in the spring of 1943 the British started to furnish, by main categories, the monetary valuation of reciprocal aid. This information, however, did not price individual services and materials, and the situation was not considered satisfactory by the War Department or the Navy Department. The principal reason advanced by the British for not furnishing more information was the manpower situation, but in a great many instances this did not appear to Americans familiar with the situation as a convincing argument. On October 4, 1944, the Secretaries of War and Navy wrote to the Secretary of State outlining the situation. Mr. Stettinius, then Acting Secretary, replied on October 23, indicating that Ambassador Winant would associate himself with representatives of the War Department, the Navy Department, and FEA in presenting the problem to the British in London, but Mr. Stettinius did not commit the Department to pressing for all of the information that the Services asked for.

As an outcome of extended discussions in London in November and December the British agreed to make available much more information than they had previously, but were not prepared to furnish everything that the Services wished. The Embassy in London and the FEA representatives felt that it was not desirable to press for more information than the British indicated that they were in a position to furnish. Mr. Acheson, in a 'phone conversation on November 16 with Mr. Denby, who was representing FEA in the discussions in London, tentatively approved the position that the Department would not press the British for more information than they had agreed to furnish in these discussions. The following day, after conferring with Mr. Stettinius, he cabled to Mr. Denby confirming this decision. This was not satisfactory to the Army and Navy, and on November 22, the Secretaries of War and Navy again sent a joint letter to the Department requesting additional information, although in the last paragraph of the letter the statement appeared: "We recognize, however, that there may be reasons of policy which will restrain you from pressing for acceptance on the part of the British of the responsibility for providing the pricing data in the detail we have recommended." On December 12, the Secretary of State in a letter, which was cleared by Mr. Denby of FEA, took the position that we could not press for more information than the British had agreed to furnish in the London negotiations, but indicated in the last paragraph that if the information that the British furnished did not live up to the understandings reached in London the matter could be reopened. Information

available



available to the Department indicates that the various British Ministries are now furnishing the figures which they offered to furnish at the time of the London discussions in November and December, except that some information to be made available by the War Office involved procedures proposed by the War Office that have not been acceptable to the U. S. Army. Hence, if the Department accedes to the request of the War and Navy Departments to review the Department's position in the matter it will mean reviewing a position which had the approval of FEA and of our Embassy in London, and was approved by Mr. Acheson and cleared by him with Mr. Stettinius. In view of this situation I question whether it is necessary or desirable to reopen the matter.

FMA:FWF:EC