

1 May 1945

Box 21  
Folder 4  
Item 2  
Page 1

Memorandum of Meeting on Trusteeship - 30 April 1945 in the afternoon.

A meeting of the U. S. delegation determined that Commander Stassen should be in charge of the trusteeship matter for the U. S. delegation throughout the Conference. A special committee, consisting of Commander Stassen, Mr. McCloy (Assistant Secretary of War), Mr. Gates (Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air), Mr. Fortas (Under Secretary of the Interior) and Mr. Gerig (Department of State) was named to present the U. S. trusteeship paper to the other sponsoring powers.

The presentation to the sponsoring powers took place on the evening of April 30th. The other four powers were represented by the following:

England: George Tomlinson, Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Labor  
The Viscount Cranborne, Secretary of State  
A. H. Poynton, Colonial Office  
Major General E. I. G. Jacob  
E. D. K. Owen, Foreign Office

France: Mr. Paul Maggier, Ambassador  
Mr. de laRoche

Russia: Arkadi Aleksandrovich Sobolev

China: V. K. Wellington Koo, Ambassador to Great Britain  
Wang Chung-Hui, Sec. General of Supreme Nat'l. Defense Council  
Lin Chieh, Minister, Chinese Embassy, Washington, D. C.

DECLASSIFIED  
E.O. 11652, Sec. 3(E) and 5(D) or (E)  
By ERC NARS, Date 7-5-74  
NND 740062

The Yalta Agreement was read (the French and Chinese representatives indicating that they were not very familiar with it) and, after a pause in which none of the powers offered to present a document, Commander Stassen produced the U. S. paper and asked whether the other four powers desired to receive it. Lord Cranborne said that the American document should be received and studied, although the British Government would probably present its own paper later; and it was so agreed.

Commander Stassen in presenting and explaining the paper emphasized the separate treatment that had been given to strategic areas. This evoked no adverse comment.

Commander Stassen emphasized the fact that the paper was intended to deal only with machinery and that there was no intention to deal with particular territories at this Conference. He also laid stress on the fact that this meeting was a preliminary one, and not properly part of the Conference.

1 May 1945

Box 21  
Folder 4  
Item 2  
Page 2

Representatives of the other powers asked questions as to what is meant by "states directly concerned" in Paragraph 4. Commander Stassen explained that this language was intended to be all-inclusive to cover a number of different kinds of interest; that there is no machinery in the organization to determine what states are directly concerned and that that is a matter for determination by the countries asserting an interest.

A question was also raised as to the meaning of the phrase "there may be designated in the trustee arrangement a strategic area or areas" (paragraph 6). The representatives asked who would do the designating. Commander Stassen explained that this would be done in the first instance by the states directly concerned, but in the last analysis by the Security Council, by whom the trusteeship arrangements must be approved.

The British and Russian representatives asked the intention with regard to the application of trustee arrangements to European territory taken from the enemy, pointing out that the inhabitants of European territories are not dependent peoples. Mr. McCloy stated that the trusteeship paper was drafted in such a way as to include all areas detached from the enemy, but that there was no specific intention to include European areas. He mentioned the Ruhr, Pantalaria and Lampedusa as areas to which trusteeship might theoretically be applicable.

The French stated at this point, as they did on a number of occasions, that they found it difficult to talk about machinery without knowing the specific territories for which it was intended.

Commander Stassen urged that the trusteeship proposal be given speedy consideration as the proposal must be presented to the Conference not later than Friday, May 4. Mr. Sobolev said that it might take more time than this since this was not a Dumbarton Oaks proposal, but something new. He stated that the rule that proposals must be made by May 4 should not apply to the trusteeship matter, since this was not included in the original four-party proposal. Lord Cranborne and the French representatives agreed with this proposal. It was agreed that a further meeting should be held on the evening of May 3rd, which Lord Cranborne said was the shortest time in which he could expect to have word from London. At that time the group will consider whether the trusteeship paper can be presented as a proposal of the sponsoring powers, whether it should be presented to the Conference as a U. S. Proposal or whether some other procedure should be followed.

(The above summary has been prepared from Mr. McCloy's notes of the meeting).

- 3 -

In a subsequent discussion between Mr. McCloy, Mr. Gates and Mr. Fortas on May 1, Mr. Fortas stated that he had gathered the distinct impression from the meeting that the Russians would insist upon being a party to all trusteeship arrangements in the Pacific. Mr. Sobolev had made some statements implying that three-party consultations between the U. K., the U.S.S.R. and the U. S. would continue even within the Security Council. Mr. Fortas said that he anticipated a strong interest on the part of the U.S.S.R. in all trusteeship arrangements and pointed to the need for a U. S. position on the matter.

Mr. Fortas also mentioned a remark by Lord Cranborne to the effect that presumably some enemy territories will be allocated by the Peace Treaty on the condition that they be placed under trusteeship arrangements.

Mr. Fortas suggested that the U. S. delegation should consider the desirability of agreeing now to a modification of the trusteeship paper to eliminate any possibility of its applying to European peoples. He said that no such application was intended by the draftsmen and that a disclaimer of any such intention might make the paper more acceptable to the sponsoring powers. Mr. McCloy stated that he thought it preferable, for the time being, to keep our position as a trading point.

Mr. Fortas suggested that if any modification of the trusteeship paper should be proposed by other powers, one point should be reconsidered by the U. S. delegation. He said that he believes it is wrong to give the Security Council complete power over civilian affairs in strategic areas. He says that this will make the trusteeship proposals unacceptable to a number of countries and will tend to discredit our interest in the proposal. He referred to a statement by Commander Stassen to the effect that this aspect will tend to cause pressure to confine strategic areas as much as possible, and may result in such areas being too narrowly defined. He would prefer a provision to the effect that the General Assembly has rights of inspection and of receiving information on civilian affairs in strategic areas as well as other areas, subject only to such restrictions on those rights as may be imposed by reservations in the trusteeship arrangements.

At a further meeting on the morning of May 1st, at which only the U. S. Military representatives were present, Mr. McCloy referred to the forthcoming visit of a senatorial group which is coming to San Francisco for the primary purpose of observing the progress of the trusteeship matter. Mr. Stettinius has expressed some concern about this visit. It was thought by the military representatives that the

DECLASSIFIED

E.O. 11652, Sec. (E) and (D)

NND 740062

By ERC NARS, Date 7-5-74

Senators could be given adequate assurance that the U. S. position is fully protected under the proposals which have been submitted to the four sponsoring powers.

At the same meeting Mr. McCloy raised the question as to whether the State Department should be asked to enter into discussions outside of the Conference, but while the chief foreign representatives were here, as to specific bases. He said that the British and French are now sympathetic to the U. S. position and from that point of view these discussions might be timely. The consensus of opinion among the military representatives was that no such discussions should be opened by U. S. representatives for fear that that might lead to a general discussion of specific territories to be placed under trusteeship. However, it was the general view that the U. S. should listen sympathetically to any comments along those lines that might be advanced by other powers.