

SURV - SWAN

SUSSMAN, H.

CLASS OF SERVICE
This is a full-rate Telegram or Cablegram unless its deferred character is indicated by a suitable symbol above or preceding the address.

WESTERN UNION

1901

4-17-45

A. N. WILLIAMS
PRESIDENT

SYMBOLS	
DC	Day Letter
NL	Night Letter
LC	Deferred Cable
NLT	Cable Night Letter
Ship Radiogram	

The filing time shown in the date line on telegrams and day letters is STANDARD TIME at point of origin. Time of receipt is STANDARD TIME at point of destination.

FA293 NL PD=TDF DALYCITY CALIF 16

MRS ELEANOR ROOSEVELT=

WHITE HOUSE WASHDC=

WE INVITE YOU TO THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE=

MR AND MRS HARRY SUSSMAN, =

THE COMPANY WILL APPRECIATE SUGGESTIONS FROM ITS PATRONS CONCERNING ITS SERVICE

Swan

MITCHELL, CAPRON, MARSH, ANGULO & COONEY

CITY BANK FARMERS TRUST BUILDING

20 EXCHANGE PLACE

NEW YORK 5, N. Y.

CABLE ADDRESS
"MELOPOEIA"

WILLIAM D. MITCHELL
C. ALEXANDER CAPRON
GEORGE S. MITTENDORF
CLINTON C. SWAN
CHARLES ANGULO
JOHN B. MARSH
EDWIN W. COONEY
L. RANDOLPH MASON
GORDON KNOX BELL
JAMES D. OUCHTERLONEY
JOHN STUART DUDLEY
RICHARD J. TURK, JR.
EDWARD H. CAMERON, JR.
EDWARD E. WATTS, JR.
DAVID KELLY
ELMER J. HOARE
EARLE J. STARKEY
HARRY A. LEIGH

June 13, 1945.

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt,
New York World Telegram,
125 Barclay Street,
New York, N. Y.

Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I am enclosing herewith a copy of my letter of today's date to Mr. David Lawrence commenting on his article in last night's Sun entitled "Communitistic Propagandizing Seen a Source of Friction Between Allies". As you probably know, Mr. Lawrence quoted at length from your recent column.

I am also enclosing herewith the copies of the enclosures mentioned in my letter to Mr. Lawrence which are self explanatory.

The basic question is the one outlined in my letter of today's date to Mr. Hugh Fulton. As I said to Mr. Lawrence, I wish that you also could give your best to the solution of that question. Certainly it is a vital one to all Americans, particularly those with boys in the Service. Also, I cannot think of a greater service which you could render than to carry on at this time, and on this general subject, the international work which your distinguished husband led.

With great respect, I am

Sincerely,

Clinton C. Swan

Enclosures

June 13, 1945.

David Lawrence, Esq.,
The New York Sun,
Washington Office,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Lawrence:

I have sent you some memos from time to time hoping that you might be interested in some of the thoughts therein expressed and might be able, if you approved of them, to further their accomplishment because of your large following of enthusiastic readers, among whom I am one. To date my memos do not seem to have impressed you much. Possibly your "Fan Mail" sweeps you completely.

I liked your article in yesterday's New York Sun. It ties in very much with some work which I have been urging very strongly with sources very close to the "highest levels" of our Government. For your information, I am sending herewith copy of my memo of May 3rd on psychological warfare; also a clipping from the New York Herald Tribune of May 6th which shows what the Government did. Although many others may have suggested the same thing, I at least was thinking along the same lines as the policy ultimately decided upon, and I am inclined to think that at least my memo was the working draft of the final statement and broadcast. Whether that is so or not is really unimportant. Also I have been advocating for a long while broad publicity on the food situation and the Government's, at least, getting the advice of Mr. Hoover on that subject. I imagine that many have also advocated that, although until very recently the public generally has not been told the seriousness of the world food situation.

I am enclosing herewith copy of my letter to Mr. Hugh Fulton of yesterday and an amplifying letter to him of today's date. The pamphlet referred to which I sent Mr. Fulton is the pamphlet recently issued by the Japanese People's Emancipation League which I received from the Japanese American Committee for Democracy, 72 West 52nd Street, New York City. If you do not know of that organization, I would be glad to obtain a copy of the pamphlet and send it to you.

The big basic question is the one outlined in my letter to Mr. Fulton of today's date. I certainly wish that you could feel you could give your best to the solution of that problem and help the public, generally, to reach the right answer as to it by an article on that general

David Lawrence, Esq.

-2-

6-12-45

subject.

As, in your article of June 11th, you quoted at length from Mrs. Roosevelt's recent article, I am sending Mrs. Roosevelt a copy of this letter for her information as well.

Sincerely,

(Signed) Clinton C. Swan

Enclosures

CCS:HK

P.S. In other words, as I see it, two of the most important things that could be done at this time in connection with the Jap situation are: (1) to urge upon our Government that they interpret "Unconditional Surrender" as meaning only our minimum necessary military objectives, relying on the new United Nations organization to ultimately obtain the balance of our objectives, and that the Japanese people be told that by the broadest propaganda; and (2) that the Chinese National Government, the Chinese Communists, Russia, and right thinking Japanese, possibly represented by the Japanese Emancipation League, be urged to cooperate as soon as possible so as to present a united front:

I know nothing about the J.P.E.L. or the Japanese American Committee for Democracy other than what I have read in their pamphlet. Possibly there is a stronger Japanese American group to "head up" Japanese cooperation or, of course, it is possible that there is such a radical element in the J.P.E.L. that some would think it advisable to steer clear entirely of that organization.

Even if the J.P.E.L. is a leftist organization (which I suspect, but do not know), its avowed policy, as stated in its pamphlet, is certainly one that even a nonbeliever in Communism could subscribe to. On its Advisory Board are Albert Einstein, Pearl Buck and Bishop Francis J. McConnell; also at least two other clergymen, and Congressman Dr. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., which latter group I know nothing about.

As Prime Minister Churchill declared in a public address when Russia entered the war -- he did not retract one iota anything that he had previously said about Russia and Communism, but that he welcomed Russian cooperation in the war.

* * *

P.P.S. I am also enclosing a copy of my memo of May 31st on the same general subject.

C.C.S.

Sent out May 3rd, 1945.

If I were President, I would write (with or without Mr. Churchill joining in), the following letter, or one somewhat along similar lines, to Hirohito:

I am addressing you as the head of a nation which was a great nation and, I hope, will again be a great nation. Germany is out, completely beaten. It was manifest months ago that Germany was completely beaten but, in spite of the fact that there could be no other result, the cruel and sadistic leaders of Germany forced their people to continue resistance with the result that many thousands of people lost their lives thereafter, many of Germany's cities were reduced to rubble, and millions of people suffered terribly. During that time (the last few weeks) that these German leaders continued this senseless resistance, Germany, as a nation, probably incurred greater ill will and loss of caste in the opinion of the other nations of the world than at any similar period of time (a few weeks) in Germany's history. In a few weeks they have thrown away senselessly what will take years, possibly generations, to recover.

Japan is now faced with an exactly similar position. The result of the war is inevitable. Japan is beaten. If you, as the leader of the Japanese nation, want your subjects killed in useless battle, your cities reduced to rubble, and your entire population to suffer as a result thereof, that apparently is within your power to decree. Such a course is senseless and, with the example before you of what happened to Germany in loss of life, property and caste with the nations of the world, it is hard to understand how any intelligent person or group could make such a decision.

The terms of surrender cannot be changed; they

are still, and will continue to remain, "Unconditional Surrender". On the other hand, unconditional surrender does not mean that the Japanese nation is to be crucified or its productive power reduced to rubble. I, as the President of the United States, and any other right thinking person of the United Nations, look forward to the time when the Japanese nation and people will resume their place among the family of nations in accordance with the traditions of many of the great Japanese people who have already gone on. (One or two of the great leaders of Japan in the past might here be specifically mentioned).

Although the result is inevitable, as a human being I cannot let this opportunity go by without appealing to you personally as the leader of a once great nation to join with me in ending this senseless slaughter and destruction.

Sincerely,

If the above letter could be "doctored up" by someone familiar with the Japanese psychology, with which I appreciate I am not familiar, which would offer some possibility for them to "Save face", without lessening at all the terms of unconditional surrender, it should be so done.

Possibly at the same time that such a letter is being sent to Hirohito through diplomatic channels (Russia and other neutral powers), it could be given to the press and broadcast by leaflets and radio over the home islands of Japan. In any event, it would show whether the Emperor has power or is in the complete control of the military. Although its primary purpose is not to drive a wedge between the Emperor and the military, it might be effective in some way in doing that, if it didn't have a better result.

U.S. Broadcasts Warn Japanese To Give Up Now

10 Transmitters Pour Out Truman's Message; Yield or Face Sure Destruction

By Jack Tait

WASHINGTON, May 8.—At the moment Japan found itself fighting alone against overwhelming military odds today, the American government unleashed a propaganda barrage directed at the Japanese people, assuring them that unconditional surrender does not mean extermination or enslavement.

Eight to ten transmitters on the Pacific Coast and stations at Honolulu and Saipan bombarded the receivers of the average Japanese during the day.

A frank bid by President Truman to the Japanese people to throw off the grip of their military leaders and lay down their arms in unconditional surrender was the big weapon of the new psychological warfare campaign opened today by the Office of War Information. The President's statement, handed out at his press conference this morning, was embodied in a special O. W. I. broadcast to Japan at 1:25 p. m. Pacific Coast war time, and read by a Japanese linguist, Captain E. M. Zacharias, U. S. N., recently recalled from a fighting command in the Pacific, and former acting Naval attache in Tokyo. The broadcast was repeated over and over again.

The President's declaration that the end of the war "means provision for the return of soldiers and sailors to their families, seeks farms, their jobs" in Japan kept the new campaign, which seeks to counteract assertions by Japan's leaders that defeat means death or brutal and everlasting enslavement for the Japanese people.

Balancing Mr. Truman's appeal and the friendly message by Captain Zacharias, who addressed himself personally to many prominent Japanese he had known in Tokyo, Joseph C. Grew, Acting Secretary of State, grimly warned in a nation-wide radio address that Japan has been preparing for this day of European victory and is "capable of finding a mad sense of glory in fighting on alone."

Captain Zacharias told the Japanese that he was in a position to guarantee with authority that the "desperate phrase, 'Victory or Extermination,' is a deliberate misrepresentation of fact." Then he said: "Now listen carefully, for I am going to read the official message which I have to convey to you. 'Statement by the President of the United States.'" Then he read Mr. Truman's statement, which follows:

"Nazi Germany has been defeated.

"The Japanese people have felt the weight of our land, air and naval attacks. So long as their leaders and the armed forces continue the war the striking power and intensity of our blows will steadily increase and will bring utter destruction to Japan's industrial war production, to its shipping, and to everything that supports its military activity.

"The longer the war lasts, the greater will be the suffering and hardships which the people of Japan will undergo—all in vain. Our blows will not cease until the Japanese military and naval forces lay down their arms in unconditional surrender.

"Just what does the unconditional surrender of the armed forces mean for the Japanese people?

"It means the end of the war. "It means the termination of the influence of the military leaders who have brought Japan to the present brink of disaster.

"It means provision for the return of soldiers and sailors to the families, their farms, their jobs.

present agony and suffering of the Japanese in a vain hope of victory.

"Unconditional surrender does not mean the extermination or enslavement of the Japanese people."

When he finished reading the Presidential statement, Captain Zacharias said: "You can understand from this forthright statement that your true alternatives are as follows:

"Either cessation of hostilities with unconditional surrender, and this is the only way left for the preservation of your families, your homes, your economy and your country.

"Or a futile prolongation or resistance which will inevitably result in the needless decimation of your country and destruction surpassing in scale even that in Germany."

His final words were: "Your future lies in your own hands. You can choose between a wasteful, unclean death for many of your forces, or a peace with honor."

Captain Zacharias, who has commanded the heavy cruiser Salt Lake City and the battleship New Mexico in the Pacific during the war, told the Japanese that "there is not the slightest doubt that Japan will be defeated definitely and decisively." In one part of his message he addressed himself directly to Japanese notables to prove his assertion that he had always acted as a friend of the Japanese people and had done everything he could to prevent the war.

"Admiral Yonai will recall our many conversations after his re-

turn from Russia as a language officer," he said.

"Admiral Nomura Kichisaburo will remember my frank discussions, both in Japan when Admiral Nagano often attended, and on his way to Washington to his last official assignment.

"Mr. Kurusu will know my regret in the loss of his son, whom as a young boy I often patted on the head.

"Generals Matsumoto, Washizu, Teramoto and Hirota will remember my frequent advice.

"Likewise Mr. Debuschi, Mr. Wakatsugi, Mr. Horiuchi and the staff of the late Ambassador Gaito.

"Your Premier, Admiral Baron Suzuki, may remember our meetings when he was chief of the naval general staff. My impression of him was fully confirmed by his recent sympathetic statement regarding our loss in the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

"And, finally, their Imperial Highnesses Prince and Princess Takamatsu will recall, when, as their side de camp, I accompanied them during their tour of two months in the United States in 1931."

Mr. Grew, whose address was not beamed to Japan, made no attempt to placate the enemy. He said:

"Our offensive is relentless and inexorable—we are determined to destroy Japan's war-making power once and for all . . . there is a fatalism which does not count the odds or cost in human lives. The decision, however, rests with us, not with them."

hindering the relief program, he offered a four-point solution to these problems.

His first recommendation for shifting relief authority to the War Department, he emphasized, "is no reflection on Governor (Herbert H.) Lehman," who is director of U. N. R. A., and who, he claimed, "has been hampered by power politics."

The War Department, Mr. Hoover pointed out by way of contrast, already controls transportation agencies in this country, docks and wharves here, overseas transportation, docks and interior transportation in Europe "and they have the personnel."

"If they start a great stream of food flowing within two weeks," he continued, "they can do the job in time. It is now 11:59 on the clock of starvation."

His remaining recommendations were for the American relief authority to co-operate with the women of liberated countries in setting up canteens in industrial areas for the rehabilitation of under-nourished children, as was done under his direction following World War I, for all costs to be paid by U. N. R. A.'s interna-

tional funds or by nations receiving aid; and for the agency to ship supplies for independent relief committees such as "Save the Children Federation, Inc." which sponsored last night's rally.

Mr. Hoover said that Europe today presented two major and separate relief problems. One was feeding the working classes and the poor in large industrial centers, and the other was caring for the children.

The United States, he asserted, has enough food supplies to sustain both groups without endangering American health standards. The United States can export 450,000,000 bushels of wheat without reducing its own bread consumption, he said. This would supply adult workers with all the bread they can eat and would enable them to survive the forthcoming crisis.

Since this country has a shortage of animal products, Mr. Hoover would limit distribution of these foods to undernourished children. He expressed the belief that "we could squeeze out of our resources the amount these children need without harm to our own health."

Memo for Mother's Day

Real Calf
Imagine a bag with three in calf bag... lined in it... inside zipper compartments black, brown, navy. Mail orders filled



DAVID'S
Fifth Avenue
Also One



Summer's Wonderful White

wear our summer shortie over smart coat in Stroock's Cloud Drift. Also 16,

or white, cool and lovely in Macken dark tones or light gay prints. Size

white Farnsworth tweed belted and rassy dark town fashions. Also in gab 18,

Also

also at our East City



June 12, 1945.

ORIGINAL RETIRED FOR P1

Hugh Fulton, Esq.,
30 Rockefeller Plaza,
New York, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Fulton:

I have just received this morning, and send you herewith, a pamphlet of the Japanese People's Emancipation League. I am also sending the original letter from the Japanese American Committee for Democracy dated May 31st which came to a friend of mine in the National City Bank, who sent it to me; also a copy of my letter dated June 7th to the Committee which explains how I got the pamphlet. I would appreciate your returning the letter from the Committee dated May 31st as it is my only copy, and it is important to me as it shows the list of officers and sponsors.

Although the pamphlet looks very bulky, it is very easy reading, and I found I could go through it quite fully in less than a half hour. I have marked some of the more important passages, in case you just want to read those. The article by Ken (Takeshi) Nori, which appears on page 7 through page 10 of the pamphlet seemed to me particularly interesting.

I tried to check a little the officers and those of the sponsors whom I did not know about but, as yet, have had no really reliable reaction about those individuals. I think it is clear that there is a definite Communist flavor to the movement and, as I do not believe in Communism in any way, shape or form, that part of it does not interest me. On the other hand, as the article above mentioned by Nori points out, they are asking for a minimum program in hopes of getting the support of all right thinking people in Japan. Therefore, from what I know to date, outside of reserving the right to oppose Communism, I believe I could support 100% the program they are advocating, with the exception that I believe our minimum demands should include not only demilitarization of Japan, but demobilization of any war industries and, at least, control and supervision of the Japanese nation for a period of years until we know there is no danger of a future flare-up.

The more I study the whole problem, the more I am convinced that there is a definite conflict between the extreme militarists in our own country who want to crush Japan completely and, among those, I include former Ambassador Grew and Admiral Halsey, both of which men I admire very much. The opposing group, in which I believe, would seek to end the war

as soon as our minimum military objectives are obtained, but would interpret unconditional surrender to mean complete demilitarization of Japan, punishment of their war criminals, complete withdrawal from all occupied territory, including Manchuria, Formosa and Korea; complete demobilization of their war making machine, the policing of Japan until a safe government was elected by the people, and resident representatives of the United Nations in Japan constantly inspecting to make sure that such industrial plants as they are allowed to have are not being made available for use subversively for any future war material. I believe that in addition to the above we must certainly trust the new United Nations organization to be able to accomplish a great deal in the future. Therefore, I would like to see the war terminated as soon as those minimum objectives can be obtained, and I would like to see the Japanese leaders told that promptly by our Government.

and people
You may keep the pamphlet as long as you wish, but whenever you are through with it, rather than have you throw it away, I would appreciate your returning it to me.

Sincerely,

(Signed) Clinton C. Swan

Enclosures

CCS:HK

June 13, 1945.

ORIGINAL RETIRED FOR PRES

Hugh Fulton, Esq.,
20 Rockefeller Plaza,
New York, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Fulton:

In thinking over my letter to you of yesterday I feel that I expressed, not too well, the most important part of that letter. I therefore would like you to substitute the following for the next to the last paragraph of my letter:

The more I study the whole problem, the more I am convinced that there is a definite division of opinion, not only in Government circles, but also among the people generally, as to just what this country's policy should be and is, so far as Japan is concerned, and also just what "Unconditional Surrender" means. Most of our "career" soldiers, and many other important people in our country, seem to want to go the limit and to totally crush Japan. Many of them point to 1918 and regretfully say that we should have gone to Berlin at that time. That is not a sound argument as, of course, the failure after 1918 was not due to the military situation but due to the failure of the League and of this country to support the League, and subsequent failures by France and Great Britain — all of them failures which I hope this country and the United Nations will not make again. Another argument of this group is summed up in the phrase which I think Admiral Halsey coined to the general effect that it might be better for our own children if we made a quick peace but it would be worse for our grandchildren. There, again, I don't think that statement is sound, as even if we made a quick peace now certainly I am not in any way advocating a peace which doesn't insure all our minimum military objectives with a very good chance that subsequent work of the United Nations organization, and the right thinking Japanese people themselves, will accomplish the rest of our objectives for us. I think that "career" militarists are very apt to think of war as the most certain way, particularly after a nation has been forced into it, to obtain the objectives. I can understand trained militarists feeling that way, but don't agree with them. Likewise, I am inclined to think that former Ambassador Grew may have had such a bitter experience, by reason of the Japanese situation, that he has a tendency to feel that only the harshest military treatment will accomplish our objectives. Therefore, although I admire both Admiral Halsey and former Ambassador Grew very much, nevertheless I feel that they are not entirely "disinterested witnesses". The opposing group, in which I believe, would seek to end the war as soon as our minimum military objectives are obtained, but would interpret unconditional surrender to mean only complete demilitarization of Japan, punishment of their war criminals, complete withdrawal from all occupied territory, including Manchuria,

Formosa and Korea; complete demobilization of their war making machine, the policing of Japan until a safe government was elected by the people, and resident representatives of the United Nations in Japan constantly inspecting to make sure that such industrial plants as they are allowed to have are not being made available for use subversively for any future war material. I believe that in addition to the above we must certainly trust the new United Nations organization to be able to accomplish a great deal in the future. Therefore, I would like to see the war terminated as soon as those minimum objectives can be obtained, and I would like to see the Japanese leaders and people told that promptly by our Government.

Even as to the punishment of their war criminals I would modify that somewhat as a minimum military objective by isolating or exiling the top 200 or 300 of them and accept the assurance of such a new government as is formed in Japan along democratic lines (which would have to be satisfactory to our Government and Great Britain before military supervision of Japan was relaxed at all) would themselves prosecute and punish their own war criminals.

In other words, I think there is a conflict as to this basic policy of our Government. Whether it has been decided by our Government or not, I do not know. Certainly, so far as I know, the public has not been told. I think the public, and the enemy, should be told the minimum terms we will accept, and the sooner that is done, the better, in my opinion. It looks as if this involves the whole question of Communism and Russia. From the pamphlet of the J.P.E.L. it is quite clear that that particular group of Japanese Americans, who claim to have done so much, have been working primarily with the Chinese Communists. Have we not had the same problem to face from the beginning of our association with Russia in this war? David Lawrence in *The Sun* of yesterday (June 12th) quotes at length from an article by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and then David Lawrence goes on to conclude his article, as follows:

"The whole subject was treated by Prime Minister Churchill in a public address when Russia entered the war against Germany. He declared that he did not retract one iota of what he had previously said and felt about Communism but that he nevertheless welcomed Russian cooperation in the war. The same thing can be said now about the peace. Communism is not regarded by the vast majority of the American people as a desirable form of government for us or for our neighbors but this has nothing to do with the right of the Russian Government to maintain communistic forms in governing the Russian people.

The big question mark is, as to the propagandizing of countries near Russia by the communists. With America demonstrating that it is possible for a democratic country to be on friendly terms with a communist country, it would seem that the example could be followed in Europe. Another way of stating the American concept is to declare that the United States does not think it is necessary for the security of Russia for her to impose Communism upon any of her neighbors and subject them to

Hugh Fulton, Esq.

-3-

6-13-45

Moscow influence and that in the long run peace will be better constructed if each nation figures out for itself what form of government and what social or economic philosophy it cares to utilize in its own domain."

Sincerely,