

Jan. 22, 1946

Mr. Charles G. Ross,  
Secretary to the President,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Charlie:

# The President's remarks at his last press conference on the trustaeship question with reference to proposed American bases in the Pacific have, as you know, stirred considerable discussion in and out of Congress.

Some further questions have arisen in the course of this discussion, and efforts by me to obtain clarification at the State Department were unsuccessful since Dean Acheson, the Acting Secretary of State, felt they were issues which had to be discussed on a level "higher" than his own.

x36-A The President obviously is the only "level" higher than the Secretary of State, and I would like, therefore, to give "notice" of certain questions asked of Mr. Acheson which I would appreciate if you would pass along to The President in the hope that he may be able to answer them at his next press conference. I'm submitting them in advance because some of them are sufficiently technical that he might not wish to answer them extemporaneously. x20

The questions are enclosed.

Sincerely,

  
W.H. Lawrence

x

1. Is it the intention of the United States government to submit to the UNO in the near future specific proposals for trusteeship arrangements affecting former Japanese-mandated islands which were conquered by the United States in the Pacific?

Will similar arrangements affecting former Japanese-owned islands (such as the Ryukyus or the Volcanics) be made at the same time or subsequently?

Does the department know whether the Soviet Union intends similarly to place the Kurile islands group under a trusteeship arrangement?

2. The President has said that exclusive U.S. trusteeships would be sought for islands considered essential to our own future security. Can the department tell now which islands are to be held by the United States exclusively? If unable to tell which islands, would it be possible to estimate the number?

3. Does the department feel that the veto right of the permanent members of the UNO security council is an important issue in the Pacific base question?

4. If the islands are submitted to trusteeship, how will this question come before the Congress for approval?

Will the disposition of the mandated and Japanese-owned islands be the subject of a separate treaty dealing with trusteeships? Or will the final disposition of the islands be a part of a general pact relating to UNO, or will it be part of the over-all peace treaty with Japan?

