Reproduced from the Unclassified / Declassified Holdings of the National Archives

		DECLASSIFIED	
	- 1 .1	Authority 2012	
		DEPARTMENT OF STATE THE LEGAL ADVISES	
		Jame 15, 1959	
MEMORANDES	(
20	. 1	ODA - Mr. Pold	
TROM		L/8 - Mr. Metager	
SIBJET	1	Har Damage Claims in the Trust Perritory of the	

The legal questions in relation to the war damage claims in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, together with the position of the United States with respect to negotiations regarding this subject, have been discussed in some detail in two messages to Asembasay TATTO which very sont in 1954. These messages are: A-303 of October 19, 1954 and A-903 of June 4, 1954. Attached to A-903 of June'4 was a boyy of a legal memorandum dated May 21, 1954 from this office to RA which analyzed the relevant articles of the Japanese Peace Treaty is relation to the war damage claims. The upshot of the legal manarendum was that: the U.S. is under no chligation to compensate Japan for the value of its property and that of its nationals located in the Trust Territory, since Japan agreed in the Treaty that the U.S. could seize, retain, or otherwise dispose of such property, Japan may offset the value of such property is the "special arrangement" called for is Article 4(a) of the Treaty: theoretically. therefore, if the value of Japanese property which was select exceeds the value of the claims by Trust Territory inhabitants against Japan, there could be a zero settlement. In no circumstances could Japan acture compensation from the U.S. beyond a sero offset.

Pasifis Islands

We are not aware of any legal problems which were not disposed of in the aforementioned messages. At that time it was contemplated that there would be negotiations for a special) arrangement as contemplated by Article 4(a) of the Peace Treaty. Presumably, this is still the desirable course of action. Should such a special errangement not be effectuated, or should it result in very little or no realization of money for the Trust Territory inhabitants, the U.S. would then be faced with the problem of either a) doing nothing or b) securing an express inhabitants. There would be no legal obligation involved is either event, but purely a policy determination.

OFFICIAL DEE CALT

L:L/E:SIMetager/alm