THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

January 21, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR
THE SECRETARY OF STATE:

FOR PREPARATION OF REPLY
FOR MY SIGNATURE.

F.D.R.

Letter from Hon. Myron Taylor, The Everglades Club, Palm Beach, Florida, 1/19/44, to the President, enclosing letter which he has received from Harold Tittmann, Vatican City, (American Foreign Service), 11/21/43, in re desire of the Vatican to prevent Rome from becoming a battlefield.
My dear Mr. President:

In compliance with your memorandum of January 21, 1944 I have prepared a reply to Mr. Myron Taylor for your signature, if you approve. I have likewise prepared extra copies of Mr. Taylor's letter and Mr. Tittmann's letter for reference to Admiral Leahy, if you consider it appropriate.

Faithfully yours,

[Signature]

Enclosures:

1. From Mr. Taylor.
2. From Mr. Tittmann.
3. To Mr. Taylor.

The President,

The White House.
OK to send out

Copy has been made available to Admiral Leahy.
January 31, 1944

Dear Mr. Taylor:

Thank you for your letter of January 16, 1944 enclosing a letter from Mr. Tittmann at Vatican City outlining the Vatican's interpretation of the "open city" status of Rome. I have made a copy of Mr. Tittmann's letter available to the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff for consideration.

I am glad to see that you are enjoying a well-earned rest.

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd) Franklin D. Roosevelt

The Honorable
Mr. C. Taylor,
The Everglades Club,
Palm Beach, Florida.
THE EVERGLADES CLUB  
Palm Beach, Florida

Jan. 18 01

Mr. President,

In the enclosed letter, Mr. Tilden has summed up the situation regarding making of Rome an "open city." I am confident you already have those considerations in mind.

With kind regards,

Yours truly,

[Signature]

To: The President

[Address: White House]
January 18, 1944

Dear Mr. President:

In the enclosed letter Harold Tittman has summed up the situation regarding making of Rome an "open city"—I am confident you already have these considerations in mind.

With kind regards,

Believe me

Sincerely

Myron Taylor.

To

The President

White House.
Dear Myron:

You will undoubtedly have read the telegrams I have been sending regarding the desire of the Vatican to prevent Rome from becoming a battlefield. I understand that the Apostolic Delegate in Washington has also been instructed to bring the point of view of the Holy See on this matter to the attention of the State Department.

I gather from my conversation with the Cardinal Secretary of State that the Vatican regards the idea of an "open city" as a military question only, and is not interested in any way in the various projects of a political nature that have been advanced recently in the German-controlled Rome press. In the eyes of the Holy See, therefore, "open city" would appear to mean simply this:

1. Provision to avoid combats from taking place in Rome, either through agreement between the belligerent parties or through Allied strategy. This would mean in practice the withdrawal of the Germans from Rome before the arrival of the Allies.

2. Provision by the Allies of police protection for the city during the interval between the withdrawal of the Germans and the arrival of the Allies.

3.

The Honorable

Myron C. Taylor,

Department of State,

Washington.
3. Provision by the Allies of food supplies for the population during this interval and thereafter.

I have on a number of occasions pointed out to the Vatican that it is our desire to prevent destruction in Rome and that if the city is destined to suffer it will be the fault of the Germans only and not ours. I understand that the Germans on their part have officially assured the Holy See that it is also their desire to see Rome spared.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Harald Fittkau
Vatican City, November 24, 1943.

Dear Myron:

You will undoubtedly have read the telegrams I have been sending regarding the desire of the Vatican to prevent Rome from becoming a battle-field. I understand that the Apostolic Delegate in Washington has also been instructed to bring the point of view of the Holy See on this matter to the attention of the State Department.

I gather from my conversation with the Cardinal Secretary of State that the Vatican regards the idea of an "open city" as a military question only, and is not interested in any way in the various projects of a political nature that have been advanced recently in the German-controlled Rome press. In the eyes of the Holy See, therefore, "open city" would appear to mean simply this:

1. Provision to avoid combats from taking place in Rome, either through agreement between the belligerent parties or through Allied strategy. This would mean in practice the withdrawal of the Germans from Rome before the arrival of the Allies.

2. Provision by the Allies of police protection for the city during the interval between the withdrawal of the Germans and the arrival of the Allies.

3. Provision by the Allies of food supplies for the population during this interval and thereafter.

I have on a number of occasions pointed out to the Vatican that it is our desire to prevent destruction in Rome and that if the city is destined to suffer it will be the fault of the Germans only and not ours. I understand that the Germans on their part have officially assured the Holy See that it is also their desire to see Rome spared.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD TITTMANN

The Honorable
Myron C. Taylor,
Department of State,
Washington.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

February 21, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR
THE ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE

I have read the enclosed original from the Pope, dated July 20, 1943. Do you think that this should go to Senator Nye? What in the name of true religion do you suppose the Senator wants this for?

F. D. R.
DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
WASHINGTON  

February 14, 1944  

My dear Mr. President:  

I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I have received from Senator Nye requesting a copy of the reply which the Pope made to your letter of July 10, 1943 at the time of the invasion of Sicily. The Pope's reply is dated July 20, 1943, which you were kind enough to refer to me by memorandum on August 30 for my information and to make copies for the Department's files. I returned the original letter to you on September 6, 1943.  

I should be grateful for an expression of your wishes in replying to Senator Nye.  

Faithfully yours,  

Enclosure:  
From Senator Nye,  
February 4, 1944.  

The President,  
The White House.
Department of State

ENCLOSURE

Letter drafted

ADDRESS TO

The President
February 4, 1944

Honorable Cordell Hull
Department of State
Washington, D.C.

My dear Mr. Secretary:

The New York Times of July 24, 1943 reported the letter of President Roosevelt to the Vatican of July 10, 1943.

Can you afford me a copy or a summary of the response which was afforded to this communication by the Pope?

Sincerely yours,

/s/ GERALD P. NYE
March 1, 1944

My dear Archbishop:

I have your letter of February 17 concerning the recent aerial attacks on Rome, especially in the outlying portions, and transmitting the urgent and personal appeal of His Holiness for their cessation.

The Allied military authorities in Italy are committed to a policy of avoiding damage to religious shrines and historical monuments to the extent humanly possible in modern warfare. This applies to the city of Rome as to other parts of Italy where the forces of the United Nations have been or will be engaged in active fighting.

However, we are fighting a desperate battle against a hard and unscrupulous foe whose ultimate defeat will accomplish the liberation of Italy and the Italian people. When the enemy uses all the facilities which a great center, such as Rome, affords in order to further his military campaign, thus postponing the ultimate liberation of the nation, these facilities must be denied him with all our force. When the enemy assumes a position exposing innocent civilians or uses a religious or historical shrine to his own military advantage, we have no choice but to attack and dislodge him. It is in the nature of a conflict thrust upon the world by evil powers whose strength is based on utter contempt of everything that is beautiful or holy that our military commanders may be obliged to make these painful decisions.

Published in
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Our only reason in attacking any part of Rome is because it is occupied and used by the Germans. If His Holiness will be successful in persuading them to respect the sacred and cultural character of Rome by withdrawing from it without a struggle he could thus assure its preservation.

Please ask His Eminence the Cardinal Secretary of State to assure His Holiness that it remains our ardent desire that religious edifices and other monuments of our common civilization be saved from damage. To the degree that the hard exigencies of the campaign, through German ruthlessness in the use of such monuments, may not require inevitable exceptions, this principle will be applied in the conduct of the war.

Very sincerely yours,

[Signature]

His Excellency
The Most Reverend
Ambrose Giovanni Cioffi,
Archbishop of Landicia di Frigia,
The Apostolic Delegate,
Washington, D. C.
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
WASHINGTON

February 29, 1944

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

In compliance with your memorandum of February 19, 1944, there is attached for your signature, if you approve, a reply to the Apostolic Delegate's letter of February 17 concerning aerial attacks on Rome. The copy of the letter from the Delegate is returned.

Enclosures:

1. Draft letter to the Apostolic Delegate.
2. Copy of letter from Apostolic Delegate, February 17, 1944.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

February 19, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR
THE ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE

FOR PREPARATION OF REPLY
FOR MY SIGNATURE.

F. D. R.
Mr. President:

I have been informed by His Eminence, the Cardinal Secretary of State, that for some days past Allied aeroplanes have undertaken an almost continuous bombardment and machine-gunning of sections of Rome, especially at the outskirts but also within the city proper. Notable damage has been caused to civilian buildings and to some churches. The recently reconstructed Hospice of Santa Galla, which is the property of the Holy See, has also been seriously damaged.

His Eminence notes that since Rome was declared an open city by the Badoglio Government last August it has been left practically without any anti-aircraft defense, and is not equipped with suitable air raid shelters. The population of the peripheral zones of Rome consists largely of working people among whom there already have been many victims.

In view of the foregoing and particularly in consideration of the sacred character of Rome, the center of Catholicism, the Holy Father as Bishop of the Eternal City, in his profound grief for the suffering population which has already been so sorely tried, ardently desires the cessation of these bombardments. His Holiness therefore, through me, addresses his personal and urgent appeal to Your Excellency, as President of the United States, for this purpose.

The President

The White House
In this tragic hour the eyes not only of almost four hundred million Catholics, but of all those who have God in their thoughts and who appreciate the spiritual values of life, are turned with anxiety to the Sovereign Pontiff. Destruction and ruin are being heaped upon Italy in these days. The entire population is subjected to the most extreme hardships of war. Without hope of helping itself the nation is forced to witness the obliteration of so many of its treasures of religion, art and culture which it has fondly safeguarded throughout the centuries not only for itself but for the world. What will be the judgment of centuries to come if now even Rome itself, whose very name is the symbol of our civilization, should be included among the ruins of the present war?

To Your Excellency, who has on many occasions manifested your noble concern for the city of Rome and for the suffering, I address this appeal, at the direction of the Holy Father and in his august name. With a grieving heart and with a cry that springs from the depths of his paternal soul, the Sovereign Pontiff invokes Your Excellency's intervention that Rome may be spared from the horror and destruction of further aerial attacks.

With the assurances of my highest consideration and of my deep personal regard, I have the honor to remain

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]

Archbishop of Laodicea
Apostolic Delegate
The White House
Washington

March 13, 1944.

Memorandum For
The Secretary of State:

For Preparation of Reply
For My Signature.

F.D.R.

Letter from The Most Reverend A. G. Cicognani, Archbishop of Laodicea, Apostolic Delegate, 3/13/44, to the President, in reply to the President's letter of 3/1/44 in re bombardment of Rome. Quotes message from His Eminence, the Cardinal Secretary of State, regarding the matter.
March 31, 1944

MEMORANDUM FOR ADMIRAL LEARY

There is attached a copy of a letter from the Apostolic Delegate in Washington, containing certain observations of the Holy See with respect to the preservation of religious shrines and monuments in Rome and other parts of Italy. Since military considerations are involved, you and the Joint Chiefs of Staff may wish to consider the comments of the Holy See, particularly the proposal to by-pass Rome.

Enclosure:

1. From the Apostolic Delegate, March 15, 1944.
March 31, 1944

My dear Archbishop:

I have your letter of March 12, 1944, submitting certain observations of the Holy See with respect to the preservation of religious shrines and monuments in Rome and other parts of Italy. Please inform His Eminence the Cardinal Secretary of State that I am grateful for his views and will give them careful consideration. I have made them available to my Chief of Staff for consideration by the appropriate Allied military authorities.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

His Excellency
The Most Reverend
Amleto Giovanni Giogiani,
Archbishop of Leonessa di Frigia,
The Apostolic Delegate,
Washington, D.C.
Mr. President:

I beg to acknowledge Your Excellency's valued letter of March 1, 1944, on the subject of the bombardment of Rome. I transmitted its content at once to His Eminence, the Cardinal Secretary of State, who now informs me that the Holy See has taken cognizance of Your Excellency's declaration of your "ardent desire that religious edifices and other monuments of our common civilization be saved from damage".

His Eminence directs me to present to Your Excellency various observations on the subject, and I respectfully transcribe them herewith as they were received.

Up to the present the destruction to sacred buildings and monuments is already enormous and involves losses that rise to many millions of dollars. Quite naturally this destruction is the source of grave concern to the Holy See and it is feared that in many cases adequate means have not been employed to carry out the repeatedly expressed desire of Your Excellency that such monuments and sacred edifices be spared from the devastation of war.

These conditions have been verified also in the most recent lamentable bombardments of Rome in which the large Ostiense station was the military target. Despite the fact that the target area was very extensive and attacked under conditions of clear visibility, two churches and many homes of working people were destroyed. All these latter structures easily could have been distinguished from the objective itself. These raids resulted in the killing of hundreds of innocent persons, - a fact which is the more painful since they belong to a nation already vanquished and which surrendered unconditionally.

The President

The White House
The Holy See on its part begs to assure the Allied governments that every precaution is being used and the greatest vigilance employed lest any of the religious monuments of the Eternal City be used for military purposes. The destruction of the Abbey of Montecassino, falsely described as a German fortress, has been for the Holy See a sad lesson on the dangers of such erroneous statements. (In this regard I have recently consigned a memorandum to Mr. Myron C. Taylor).

His Eminence further states that in the judgment of competent military observers a direct attack on Rome is neither necessary nor desirable. The city is situated on a plain, not far from the sea, and has an extensive network of roads fanning out to both the North and South, thus permitting an advancing military force to by-pass it easily. On the other hand house to house combat in the city would entail tremendous losses to both the attacking and defending forces, and of course principally to the innocent civilian residents.

It would appear therefore that to save Rome from such destruction would be in the interest not only of religion and civilization, but would also offer direct military advantage.

It is obvious that the destruction caused in the Italian campaign, and most particularly in Rome, is being made the instrument of widespread German propaganda against the Allies, with resulting distrust and aversion among those very people who might have been expected to follow the Allied standard.

I can assure Your Excellency, on the statement of His Eminence, that the Holy See will continue to make opportune insistence with the German authorities for the same purpose of saving Rome from further destruction.

With the assurances of my highest consideration and of my deep personal regard, I have the honor to remain

Most respectfully yours,

[Signature]
Archbishop of Laodicea
Apostolic Delegate
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

Subject: Reply to Apostolic Delegate's letter concerning preservation of Rome.

In compliance with your memorandum of March 13, 1944, transmitting a letter from the Apostolic Delegate concerning the preservation of religious shrines and monuments in Rome, there is attached a proposed reply to the Delegate for your signature if you approve.

I have likewise prepared, for your signature, a memorandum to Admiral Leahy furnishing him with a copy of the Delegate's letter for consideration by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Letter from the Delegate to you is returned, a copy having been made for the Department's files.

Enclosures:
1. From the Apostolic Delegate, March 13, 1944.
2. Draft letter to the Apostolic Delegate.
3. Draft memorandum to Admiral Leahy.
March 21, 1944

Dear Byron:

I have your letter of March 13 enclosing a memorandum from the Apostolic Delegate concerning the bombing of Montecassino by Allied aircraft. General Wilson has reported in considerable detail concerning the reasons for military action against the Abbey. His report sounds convincing to me and I suggest that you reply to the Delegate on my behalf saying that the Allied military commanders in the field had indisputable evidence that the Abbey of Montecassino formed a part of the German defensive line in that area. I think it better not to go into further detail.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

The Honorable
Byron G. Taylor,
Caretaker of the Department of State.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

Subject: Reply to Myron Taylor's letter concerning the destruction of Montecassino Abbey

In compliance with your memorandum of March 15 enclosing a letter from Myron Taylor and memorandum from the Apostolic Delegate concerning the destruction of the Abbey of Montecassino, I have prepared a reply to Mr. Taylor for your signature if you approve.

Mr. Taylor's letter and enclosure are returned, copies having been made for the Department's files.

Enclosures:

1. From Mr. Taylor,
   March 13, 1944,
   with enclosure.
2. Draft reply to Mr. Taylor.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

March 15, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR
THE SECRETARY OF STATE:

FOR PREPARATION OF REPLY
FOR MY SIGNATURE.

F.D.R.

Letter from Hon. Myron Taylor, 71 Broadway, NYC, 3/17/44, to the President, enclosing a memorandum which was presented to him the Apostolic Delegate which he, in turn, has received from the Papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Maglione, in re destruction of the Abbey of Montecassino.
March 13 1944

Dear Mr. President,

The Apostolic Delegate has brought to my attention personally a memorandum which he has received from the Papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Maglione, and which I enclose herewith for your information and action.

I have been thinking of a paragraph that sometime might well be used in relation to the whole question of destruction of property and life and might
well be picked up and used generally.

I shall be at the Department of State Thursday - and each week hereafter on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday.

With highest personal regards,
believe me,

Faithfully yours,

[Signature]

To The President,
The White House,
Washington.
MEMORANDUM

The destruction of the Abbey of Montecassino is most saddening and arouses great fears for the future of other such religious centers in Italy and in Rome itself. The Abbot of Montecassino has given formal assurance to the Holy See that there were never gun emplacements, nor German soldiers, nor observation posts within the precincts of the monastery. The integrity of this illustrious Prelate, who remained at his place in the monastery till the last, and the accurate control exercised by him and his monks in order not to prejudice the fate of the monastery leave no doubt regarding his testimony.

In the monastery the only extraneous persons were many poor refugees, mostly women and children, and several hundred of these were killed by bombs. The Abbot does not know whether some military emplacements which were in the vicinity of the monastery, but nonetheless outside it, were eliminated by the bombardments. He observes, however, that where there was only a peaceful monastery, absolutely free from any military elements, there are now enormous piles of ruins which can easily be defended, and whose conquest will reap a vast toll of human lives.

After all this it is understandable how the entire Catholic world is weighed down with grave concern for the Eternal City. All those of good will and competent persons of every profession sincerely hope that not only for reasons of religion and civilization, but also for obvious military considerations, tactics and future strategy be so outlined as not to carry the battle near or within the walls of such a vast and monumental city as Rome.
Dear Mr. President:

I acknowledge your favor of March 21 suggesting a form of reply to the Apostolic Delegate in respect to the bombing of Monte-Cassino by Allied aircraft. I am attaching for your files a copy of my reply based upon your suggestion.

With assurances of my highest esteem,
believe me

Faithfully yours,

Myron C. Taylor

The President,
The White House.
March 22, 1944

Your Excellency:

Referring to your recent communication concerning the bombing of Montecassino by Allied aircraft, the President has authorized me to reply in his behalf that the Allied military commanders in the field had indisputable evidence that the Abbey of Montecassino formed a part of the German defensive line in that area. These are the reasons for military action against the Abbey. Your Excellency has frequently been advised that it has been and is the ardent wish of the President and the Allied military commanders that such compelling situations be not created by the enemy to make military action necessary.

With assurances of my continuing respect and regard, believe me

Very sincerely yours,

Myron C. Taylor

His Excellency
The Most Reverend
Amleto Giovanni Cicognani,
Archbishop of Laodicea di Frigia,
The Apostolic Delegate,
Washington, D. C.
MR. H. L. MILLER:

Please note, and then send back to me.

hms

[Signature: Miller]
April 1, 1944

MEMORANDUM FOR MISS TULLY
THE WHITE HOUSE

The attached communication to the President from Pope Pius XII on July 20, 1943, regarding the status of the Vatican City and Papal domains in Italy is being returned to you for the President's files.

A copy has been made for the Department's files.

Enclosure:

1. From Pope Pius XII,
    July 20, 1943.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

April 4, 1944

Subject: Communication from the Cardinal Secretary of State on the Bombing of Rome.

There is attached a copy of a letter of March 22, 1944 from the Apostolic Delegate in Washington transmitting a communication from the Cardinal Secretary of State regarding allied aerial attacks on Rome.

A copy of this communication has been sent to Admiral Leahy.

Enclosure:

1. From the Cardinal Secretary of State, March 22, 1944.
My dear Mr. Secretary,

I must ask your kind indulgence for resuming so soon the theme of my letter of March 18th, expressing some concern of the Holy See. But the Cardinal Secretary of State has just sent me a further communication, and I think it well at the present time to keep you informed.

In the consciousness of his exalted spiritual mission, the Holy Father is unwilling to assume the responsibility of not having made known the truth, or of having neglected to exhort all belligerents to sentiments of humane consideration for the dangers and difficulties of civilian populations in all war areas. It is for these reasons that His Holiness desires, through this communication, to open his whole mind before his beloved people of America and before the President of the United States.

Cardinal Maglione points out that it is there the prevailing conviction that adequate precautionary measures would make it possible to limit aerial attacks strictly to objectives of military importance. This particular point was stressed in some detail in my letter of March 18th.

His Eminence also emphasizes that the continued bombings of Rome are lowering the prestige of the Allies, embittering a populace otherwise well disposed, and producing the further effect of fomenting Communism which is already rife in the great mass of the people.

The Honorable
Cordell Hull
Secretary of State
Washington, D.C.
He adds that in the bombardment of Rome on March 18th, the homes of numerous civilians were hit, while the large general hospital of Rome, known as the "Policlinico", as well as other smaller hospitals, was seriously damaged. Because of this fact, many persons were killed outright, and the necessary work of providing medical assistance for the wounded and the dying was rendered particularly difficult.

The Cardinal Secretary avails himself of this present communication to remark the fact that Allied aircraft still fly over the territory of the Vatican City State. His Eminence wishes to bring this to the attention of the United States Government, which has given repeated assurances that the neutrality of the Vatican would be duly respected, particularly in view of the danger of crashing planes, or of the accidental or forced release of bombs in an emergency.

With sentiments of high personal regard and with every best wish I remain

Sincerely yours,

Archbishop of Laodicea
Apostolic Delegate
April 6, 1944

Dear Byron:

Please thank Marshal Badoglio, on my behalf and that of the Board, for his message of appreciation regarding the Board for American Relief in Italy, the establishment of which is further evidence of the American people's friendly sentiments and sympathy toward the people of Italy in the struggle against the common enemy.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

The Honorable
Byron G. Taylor,
Caret of Department of State,
Washington, D. C.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

Subject: Reply to Mr. Myron Taylor on messages from Marshal Badoglio concerning the President's Board for American Relief in Italy.

In accordance with your memorandum of March 29, 1944, on the above subject, the attached reply to Mr. Myron Taylor has been prepared for your signature, if you approve.

Enclosure:

1. Draft letter to Mr. Myron Taylor.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

March 29, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR
THE SECRETARY OF STATE:

FOR PREPARATION OF REPLY
FOR MY SIGNATURE.

F.D.R.

Letter to the President, 3-24-44, from Myron C. Taylor, attaching copy of a telegram from Chapin, Algiers, 3-19-44, saying that Badoglio has asked transmission to the Pres. Mr. Taylor and Toscanini, telegrams re gratitude of the formation of the Commission for Italian Relief, and welcoming appt. of Mr. Taylor as President of the Commission.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 7, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR
THE SECRETARY OF STATE:

FOR PREPARATION OF REPLY FOR
MY SIGNATURE.

F.D.R.

2 letter from His Excellency A. G. Cicognani, Archbishop of Laodicea, Apostolic Delegate, 1/1/44, to the President, one of which is a reply to the President's letter of 3/31/44, and the other is a message of good wishes to the effect that the President's health will soon be restored.
Mr. President:

I have the honor to acknowledge Your Excellency's letter of March 31, 1944, regarding a previous communication of His Eminence, the Cardinal Secretary of State, on the subject of the preservation of religious shrines and monuments in Rome and other parts of Italy.

I have already informed His Eminence that Your Excellency has given careful consideration to his comments and has made them available to your Chief of Staff for consideration by the Allied military authorities.

With the assurances of my highest consideration and of my deep personal regard, I am honored to remain

Most respectfully yours,

A. G. Cicognani
Archbishop of Laodicea
Apostolic Delegate

The President
The White House
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT:

June 3, 1944

On May 29, 1944 you referred to me Mr. Myron Taylor’s letter of resignation as Representative of the United States on the Intergovernmental Committee on Political Refugees. You requested a draft answer. Such a draft is attached. It accepts Mr. Taylor’s resignation, with great regret.

At the same time you referred to me Mr. Taylor’s memorandum which expressed his hope that a permanent Board of Directors would shortly be found for the Italian relief operation, and recommending that the Red Cross be brought in at once as an administrative arm of the UNRRA. Attached, a memorandum in answer to Mr. Taylor’s memorandum.

We are canvassing with UNRRA and the Red Cross the possibilities of Mr. Taylor’s suggestion. We will shortly report on the subject.

Enclosures:

1. Draft letter to Mr. Taylor.
2. Memorandum to Mr. Taylor.
June 5, 1944

My dear Myron:

I have your letter of May 25 and note with especial regret that you ask that it be taken as your resignation as Representative of the United States on the Intergovernmental Committee on Political Refugees from Germany and Austria, and also the resignation of Robert T. Fall as your alternate. In view of your wish, I must release you, though I do so with great reluctance.

I think you have every reason to be gratified with the results which have been achieved, not the least of which was the bringing into existence of an organization of thirty nations for the purpose of dealing with this tragic situation. Many people have testified to the faithfulness of your work in this field and I am very sure that the continued interest which you generously promise will have continuing results.

I know that I shall continue to have the benefit of your help on other matters, and consequently I shall have the opportunity to take your counsel from time to time.

With warm regards, I am

Cordially,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

The Honorable
Myron C. Taylor,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
WASHINGTON

May 25, 1944

Dear Mr. President:

In June of 1938 you asked me to act with you in creating and setting up the Intergovernmental Committee on Political Refugees from Germany and Austria. This Committee was formalized on a permanent basis and an office set up in London, the membership consisting of thirty nations represented by their Ambassadors and Ministers. Its official staff consists of a British chairman, five vice-chairmen, including myself as American Representative and the Ambassadors of four other principal countries; a director, a vice-director, and a modest secretariat.

Subsequently the High Commissioner for Refugees, League of Nations, Sir Herbert Emerson, was persuaded to also become the Director of the Intergovernmental Committee, thus consolidating efforts in the refugee field. Patrick Malin (American) is Vice Director. The scope of the Intergovernmental Committee's activities was last year extended to apply to all refugees, and no longer restricted to German-Austrian refugees.

Some months ago you created the War Refugee Board, upon which initial uncertainties appeared as to the relationship between the Intergovernmental Committee and the War Refugee
suggested that Sir Herbert Emerson, the Director, come to this country to confer with Secretary Morgenthau, Mr. Pehle, and myself. That was done, and complete agreement was reached. The two groups now find themselves in perfect harmony. (Copy of letters from Sir Herbert Emerson and Mr. Pehle are attached.)

It is now intended at a meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee to be held in London in June to further adjust these relationships and to create an Executive Committee. It is also proposed that the Executive Committee shall be composed of representative Ambassadors or Ministers. It has been my practice in the past, regarding the informal meetings which the Vice-Chairmen have held when I was absent from London, to request the American Ambassador in London to represent this country in my stead. This plan has been successful. I think that the field is so adequately covered by the arrangements which have been made and by the modification of the by-laws of the Intergovernmental Committee as proposed, that it is no longer essential for me to continue as the American representative of the Intergovernmental Committee or as a vice-chairman.

You were good enough to appoint Robert T. Pell as my alternate last Fall, when you requested me by letter to continue in this Committee. Some time ago Mr. Pell tendered his resignation, and has been assigned to other duties in London.
I appreciate very much your intention of conferring upon me an honor, entailing a certain amount of effort and responsibility, which I have undertaken to discharge conscientiously. This letter, accompanied by Mr. Pell's memorandum to me, may therefore be considered our resignations.

My interest in this subject has not ceased, and without official connection I shall always be willing to assist in any way I can.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Myron Taylor, Esq.,
16 East 70th St., New York.

My dear Myron,

Your very kind letter of April 24th reached me before I left New York and so I was unable to reply at once. It is good of you to offer your congratulations, but the path to successful discussions was prepared by yourself, and when any difficulties arose you were prompt in removing them.

I am very glad that you took action when you did, for there is no doubt that if things had been allowed to drift, the usefulness and even the existence of the Inter-Governmental Committee would have been jeopardized. As it is, we have been able to reach complete agreement with the War Refugee Board to establish the position and standing of the I.G.C. and I believe greatly to increase the potential and actual usefulness of both bodies. Once the atmosphere of suspicion and misunderstanding was dispelled, it was easy to come to an understanding with the War Refugee Board and I see no reason why our relations should not continue to be cordial. Malin was a great help. In fact, you made an excellent choice when you selected him for the appointment of Vice-Director, and as you will have seen, he and I worked together in the closest terms.

I reached Ottawa yesterday morning and spent the rest of the day in seeing the relevant officials of the Dominion Government and in talking over matters with Senator Cairine Wilson who has taken a keen and profitable interest in refugee matters. I am finishing my talks in Ottawa today and go on to Montreal tomorrow where I shall see some of the leading voluntary workers. I have fallen in love with Canada itself and wish I were forty years younger!

Again, my warmest thanks both for the support and for the help you gave in what would otherwise have been a very difficult situation, and also for your great kindness and hospitality to me personally.

I will let you know of developments in England but I do not anticipate any difficulty there.

With my warmest regards to Mrs. Myron and yourself,

Yours sincerely,

(Sd) H. W. EMERSON.
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
WAR REFUGEE BOARD
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Office of the Executive Director

April 24 1944

Dear Mr. Taylor:

Now that Sir Herbert Emerson has left Washington after a series of discussions dealing with relations between the Inter-Governmental Committee and the War Refugee Board, I want to express my personal thanks to you for originating and implementing the idea that Sir Herbert and I get together on our common problems. As you know, the discussions were most harmonious, complete agreement was reached as to the relations between the two agencies, and definite steps were taken to push forward specific plans.

Thanks for the assistance.

With personal regards,

(Signed) J. W. PEHLE

Executive Director.

Mr. Myron C. Taylor,
American Representative,
Inter-Governmental Committee,
Room 220,
Department of State.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT:

June 3, 1944

On May 29, 1944 you referred to me Mr. Myron Taylor's letter of resignation as Representative of the United States on the Intergovernmental Committee on Political Refugees. You requested a draft answer. Such a draft is attached. It accepts Mr. Taylor's resignation, with great regret.

At the same time you referred to me Mr. Taylor's memorandum which expressed his hope that a permanent Board of Directors would shortly be found for the Italian relief operation, and recommending that the Red Cross be brought in at once as an administrative arm of the UNRRA. Attached, a memorandum in answer to Mr. Taylor's memorandum.

We are canvassing with UNRRA and the Red Cross the possibilities of Mr. Taylor's suggestion. We will shortly report on the subject.

Enclosures:

1. Draft letter to Mr. Taylor.
2. Memorandum to Mr. Taylor.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

May 29, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR

THE SECRETARY OF STATE

FOR PREPARATION OF REPLY

FOR MY SIGNATURE.

F. D. R.

Letter from Hon. Myron C. Taylor, 5/25/44, to the President, tendering his resignation as American representative and as a vice chairman of the Intergovernmental Committee on Political Refugees from Germany and Austria. Encloses various papers in re work of the Committee and refers to a memorandum which he received from Mr. Pell, which is to be considered Mr. Pell's resignation from the Committee. There does not seem to be a memorandum from Mr. Pell.
June 5, 1944

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. MYRON TAYLOR

I have your recent memorandum relating to the five trustees for Italian relief, and note your hope of finding a permanent Board of Directors representative of the Italian community, thus fulfilling the duty of the temporary trustees and permitting their retirement.

Your recommendation as to Italian relief is that the Red Cross should tackle this job at once, as an administrative arm of UNRRA, in view of the fact that UNRRA has no directive to distribute relief in Italy. I am asking the State Department to go into this matter with the Red Cross and the representatives of UNRRA. Based on the result of that inquiry, I will consider your suggestion that a direct instruction be given to the military.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT
MEMORANDUM FOR
THE PRESIDENT
FROM MYRON TAYLOR:

It is generally asserted that relief of the civilian population of Allied-occupied Italy is inadequate, and this has given rise to much disappointment and criticism among the people. As the occupation progresses to Rome and beyond, that condition will probably grow in seriousness and urgency.

In a way, the conduct of the Allies in Italy forms a pattern of the expected in other countries when occupied. Up to this time the only substantial relief that has been afforded has been through and by the armies of invasion. This has been natural and essential—but it may well have been inadequate.

At your reported instance, The President's War Relief Control Board recently persuaded me to act as temporary chairman of a group of five Trustees for Italian relief, Messrs. Arturo Toscanini, Angelo Patri, John M. Hilldring and Don Ameche. Since undertaking the task we have organized it in corporation form, selected a capable Executive Vice President, Judge Juvenal Marchisio of the Domestic Relations Court of New York City, and explored the field with a view to making of it a permanent organization representative of the Italian community.

There are more cross currents of Italian political feeling,
of personal hatreds and narrow prejudices than in any group
I have ever had to deal with. I hope very shortly however to
find a permanent Board of Directors representative of the
Italian community, thus fulfilling the duty of the temporary
Trustees and permitting their retirement.

The Intergovernmental Committee on Political Refugees has
had a representative in Italy who has reported on conditions
there. A copy of that report is hereto attached.

In our investigations of the Italian situation in order to
predicate our action upon realities we discovered that:

1. The Army did not encourage present action by
private organizations.

2. The Army indicated that no shipping space was
available for supplies.

3. The National War Fund Inc. forbade a campaign
for funds, which the Italian community was
urgently proposing.

4. There was some doubt about encouraging a drive
in the communities for used clothing and
other relief materials.

It thus appeared that the scope within which American Re-

lief for Italy Inc. could act was very limited. Subsequent
efforts however have enlarged the field. The National War
Fund Inc. appears to be prepared to release a moderate amount
of funds. We have applied as a first relief budget for about
$1,600,000. The Army has indicated that some shipping space
may be found. The President's War Relief Control Board and
the National War Fund Inc. have now consented that a drive for
used clothing and other materials can be undertaken, and this
is already under way.
The distribution of supplies in Italy will be made under the control of the Army but principally by the War Relief Services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference through its Church organizations in the area in question. Monsignor Carroll (American) has established an office in Naples, to supervise relief activities by the Church. The Quakers also have sought opportunity to participate.

All of these agencies however are inadequately supplied for present and certainly for the future needs of the population, particularly as the area of occupation expands. United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration at present:

a. Have no funds.

b. Have no directive permitting the distribution of relief in Italy as an enemy country, or now as a co-belligerent, or ultimately if it becomes an Ally. UNRRA plan a meeting in June at which it is said the scope of their activities may be increased.

All of the problems of relief, refugees and migration are necessarily so intimately related and interwoven that several agencies acting separately are bound to create conflict, duplication and waste. UNRRA has been chartered on a United Nations basis, to finance and work in the field. I assume that rehabilitation means more the rehabilitation of men, women and children than it does the rebuilding of plants and other properties, which if undertaken would run into vast figures and an unpredictable length of time. UNRRA has no adequate distributing organization, past experience, or staff to conduct the proposed activities on the scale which will result before and
at the termination of the war.

There is however an organization, the Red Cross, national and international, which has all of these facilities in a developed state, and I have always believed it should be a medium for the administration of relief. For example, after the last war, the American Red Cross assisted in building up the Italian Red Cross, and I believe that today it could reconstruct the Italian Red Cross as one of the distributing arms of UNRRA in that Country. It of course would work with the Church, which is vitally important in Italy, and through other organizations having facilities and personnel that would be useful.

This memorandum is intended to bring to a focus the problem of relief, rehabilitation, refugees and migration. I am sure that private contributions in the United States through the National War Fund Inc. can never be adequate for such needs as now begin to appear, and that what is needed in this as in many other fields is not coordination but consolidation of all relief into a single agency - UNRRA - but using the facilities of the Red Cross and other suitable agencies for actual distribution and local administration.

For the immediate situation I believe an instruction directly from you to the military is the only solution to avoid a dangerous situation and similarly that you should personally direct UNRRA to expand the scope of its authority and in turn assume its rightful responsibility in this field.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

June 7, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR

HON. E. R. STETTINIUS, JR.
ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE:

What do you think of Myron Taylor leaving as soon as possible to go to the Vatican? I think he might be very useful there. I hope he is well enough to do it.

F.D.R.
My dear Miss Tully:

Will you be good enough to place the attached in the hands of the President and greatly oblige.

Yours sincerely,

Myron C. Taylor

Miss Grace Tully,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.
Dear Mr. President:

Attached hereto are the composite maps showing the disputed territorial areas both in Europe and in the Pacific, with brief explanatory memoranda which I am sure you will find of great interest. Dr. Pasvolisky of the State Department can, at your request, at any time provide you with a fuller explanation of any of these matters should you care to call upon him.

Again with best greetings and regards, believe me

Sincerely yours,

Myron C. Taylor

Enclosure:

As stated.

The President,
The White House.
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Division of Political Studies

TERRITORIAL AND BOUNDARY PROBLEMS IN THE FAR EAST

The accompanying map indicates the following problem areas of Far East, numbered correspondingly:

CHINA

Foreign Possessions in China
1. Hongkong (British)
2. Macau (Portuguese)

Foreign Leaseholds in China
1. Kowloon leased territory (British)
2. Kwangchowwan (French)

Foreign Concessions in China
4. Peiping (legation quarter, military rights)
5. Tientsin (British, French, Italian, Japanese)
6. Shanghai (International, French)
7. Amoy (International)
8. Canton (British, French)
9. Hankow (French, Japanese)

Other foreign rights in China
10. Navigation rights on Yangtze
11. French Indochina-Yunnan Railway
Manchuria

Predominantly Chinese population, but with more Mongols than live in Outer Mongolia. The future political status of the Japanese puppet state, and the future transportational orientation of northern Manchuria, are very uncertain.

12. Kwantung Leased Territory - First leased for 25 years to Russia in 1898. Lease taken over by Japan and later extended to 99 years from original date; i.e., to 1997.

13. South Manchuria Railway zone - Special rights now held by Japanese.

14. Jehol - This province is in a critical position between China, Manchuria, and Inner Mongolia. Originally part of Inner Mongolia, but at present incorporated in Japanese "Manchukuo", its future status and relationships constitute a problem.

15. Manchuria-U.S.S.R. Boundary - It is reported that more than 300 border incidents have occurred on this boundary between 1933 and 1937. Although defined by treaties between China and Russia, there are a few doubtful points. The major problem is one of Soviet-Japanese relationships. Three of the "incident" points are shown on the map.


17. Lake Khanka.

18. Islands in the Amur - Two localities in particular, near Khabarovsky at the Ussuri confluence and south of Slagoveschensk.

19. Manchuria-Coter Mongolia boundary - Although it was reported in August 1939, that "positive results" had been attained in the settlement of this boundary, by Japanese "Manchukuo" and the Coter Mongolia "republic", Mongols live on both sides of the frontier, and it is potentially troublesome, especially if China were to regain Manchuria and not Coter Mongolia. Boundary incidents have occurred especially at

20. Wall
20. Wall of Genghis Khan

21. Lake Bur - over water and fishing rights —
Manchukuo claiming all of lake, Outer Mongolia part of it.

22. Nomonhan -

Inner Mongolia

This region, now comprising Ninghsia, Suiyuan and
Chahar (formerly also Jehol), is largely Chinese in
population, with many Mongols adopting the Chinese
language. Mongolian nationalism has been fostered during
Japanese occupation. The future transportational orienta-
tion probably will be towards China. Chahar province con-
tains a moderately-sized deposit of good-grade iron ore,
which can be smelted with North China coking coal.

23. Boundary between Inner and Outer Mongolia — Undelimited, possibly troublesome, boundary complicated by
northward extension of Chinese farming, opposed by nomads
of Outer Mongolia, and by the growth of Mongol nationalism.

Outer Mongolia

A de facto republic under strong Soviet influence.
Chinese suzerainty has never been officially relinquished.
Chinese troops and settlers are not admitted. Boundary
problems with Manchuria and Inner Mongolia. The trans-
portational orientation is now towards the U.S.S.R.

Tannu Tuva

Another de facto republic under strong Soviet in-
fluence. A mountain-girt area of northward-flowing streams,
with a native population of Turki-speaking Mongols. There
is a possibility of claims by China or Outer Mongolia.
Boundaries apparently now stable.

Sinkiang

Strong Soviet influence, though the governor is
Chinese. British influence in extreme south, Mohammedan
region between two Lama Buddhist areas, Outer Mongolia and
Tibet. Caravan routes between northwestern China and the
U.S.S.R., the importance being increased by the Turksib
railroad.

24. Sinkiang-
24. Sinkiang-Tibet boundary - A Sinkiang claim for the Kokoshill Mountains instead of the Kuen Lun Range, which would extend Sinkiang to the south at the expense of Tibet.

25. Sinkiang-India boundary - Claims overlap between the Yarkand River and the Karakoram Range.

Tibet

Practically independent, with strong British influence, but China has never relinquished its claims and these are not denied by outside powers.

26. Tibet's eastern boundaries - Overlapping claims with China in the provinces of Chinghai and Sikang, which have both Chinese and Tibetan populations. The western limit of effective Chinese authority shifts back and forth from year to year.

27. Ladakh - Formerly part of West Tibet, and mainly Tibetan in culture, now joined to Indian Kashmir.

28. Tibet-India boundary, west of Nepal - Disputed areas, chiefly where Tibetans have spilled over the divides into the heads of valleys on the Indian side, seeking pastures and timber. Four such areas are:

29. Spiti -

30. Bashahr -

31. Upper Tehri -

32. Upper Almora -

33. Tibet-Nepal boundary - Much of this boundary is in the high Himalaya and is not important. The principal dispute concerns the Humla area near the western end.

34. Tibet-Bhutan boundary - The boundary is somewhat uncertain, especially along the Chuwai Valley, which is a trade
trade route between Tibet and India.

35. **Tibet-Bhutan-India overlapping claims** - An area of triple overlapping claims, at the eastern end of Bhutan.

36. **Tibet-India to the east of Bhutan** - A long strip of overlapping claims.

37. **Tibet-China-Burma overlapping claims** - Another area of triple overlapping claims.

**Burm**: Burmese nationalism is increasing and Burma may become more aggressive in respect to its boundaries.

38. **Burma-India boundary** -

39. **Arakan coast strip** - A small area of India, administered for convenience from Burma.

40. **Boundary through unadministered hill areas** - Inhabited by animist tribes. Although the boundary is fairly definite friction is possible if either or both governments extend actual administration to this area.

41. **Manipur State** - Anciently under Burmese rule, now in India; a possible Burmese claim, at least for bargaining purposes.

42. **Burma-China boundary** - Triple claims of Tibet, China, and Burma at the north. Specific points on the Burma-China boundary include:

43. **Sedon area** -

44. **Wa tribal area** - The boundary here was not completely delimited in 1937 and apparently was not finally settled before the Japanese invasion. Complicated by mineral discoveries.

45. **Burma-Thailand boundary** - There are considerable number of Thai-speaking people in Burma. Thailand seems
to regard the Burmese as traditional enemies, having lost territory to the kingdom of Burma (before the British came into Burma). There are some specific boundary problems.

46. The Shan States - Thai-speaking, but in Burma.

47. Salween drainage area - In Thailand.


49. Kra Isthmus - A strategic area, with possibilities of a canal which would reduce the importance of Singapore. British territories of Burma and Malaya are separated by the Thai possession of this isthmus.

THAILAND

There are Thai, or related, peoples in all the bordering states except Malaya. A strong irredentist feeling prevails in Thailand, especially against the French.

50. Thailand-Malaya boundary - The Patani district, which is rich in tin and rubber, is largely Malay (called "Thai-Malay" by Thailand).

51. Thailand-Indochina boundary - The former extent of the Thai empire has been reduced since 1867 by French activities. Parts especially desired by Thai (and acquired with Japanese influence in 1941) include

52. Laos - west of the Mekong and

53. Northern Cambodia -

FRENCH INDOCHINA

This comprises five political entities: Tonkin, Annam, Laos, Cambodia and Cochinchina. Possibly more than one "nationalism" will emerge, with Annamese perhaps the most active.

Although the boundary with China has been delimited, it is possible that China might revive claims to the northern part (Tonkin).

MALAY STATES

Tin and rubber center. Tendency to expand northward at
the expense of Thailand.

NETHERLANDS INDIES

Large region, with great resources, and with great variation in culture and population density. Nationalism is strongest in Java and Madura. Portuguese Timor and the British colonies in Borneo may be affected by any change of status or other developments in the Netherlands Indies.

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

54. Davao - Japanese are numerous, especially in southeastern Mindanao.

55. Batan Islands - The 1898 treaty of peace between Spain and the United States defined the northern limit of the Philippines "along or near the 20th parallel ... and through the middle of the navigable channel of Bashi", whereas the Bashi channel is in approximately 21° 30' north latitude. John Bassett Moore wrote in 1899 that the ambiguity was due to the fact that

"The maps of the Philippines hanging in the consultation room of the American Commissioners did not extend far enough north to show the relation of the archipelago to the possessions of Japan, nor did they give the names of any channels north of the Philippines or in the northern part of the archipelago."

The United States admits no question that the boundary is in the Bashi Channel.

ISLANDS IN THE
SOUTH CHINA SEA

There are a number of small islands and reefs in the South China Sea, whose sovereignty is not certain. Chinese, French, British, Japanese, and perhaps American claims exist. The principal groups or islands are:

56. Spratly and other islands - Group of small islands without accepted general name. (Japanese name, Shinnan Gunto, of uncertain application.)

Contested
Contested by France and Japan, with possible Chinese and British claims. Outside of Spanish cession to U. S. but geographically closer to the Philippines than to any other state. Occupied by Japan, 1939.

57. Scarborough Shoal - Shoal just outside the limits of the 1898 cession from Spain, but possibly subject to U. S. or Philippine claims.

58. Paracel Islands (Haisha Islands) - Conflicting claims of China, France, and Japan. Occupied by Japan in 1938.

JAPANESE EMPIRE

59. Chientao District of Manchuria - district which is dominantly Korean. (1937 Japan Year Book shows 474,000 Koreans in a total population of 637,000).

60. Korea (Chosen) - By the Treaty of Portsmouth, 1905, Russia recognized Japan's paramount political, military, and economic interests in Korea, and a similar provision was incorporated in the Anglo-Japanese alliance the same year. Japan acquired control of Korean foreign relations and a Japanese resident-general was appointed. This limited protection received wider powers in 1907 and in 1910 Japan formally annexed Korea.

The area of Korea is 86,226 square miles, and the population, in 1940, was 24,326,327. In 1937 there were 630,000 Japanese in Korea.

61. Southern Sakhalin - The southern portion of the island of Sakhalin is transferred by Russia to Japan in 1905 in lieu of an indemnity following the Russo-Japanese war. The population, which is almost entirely Japanese, was 414,891 in 1940. Southern Sakhalin is a source of coal, timber and fish.

62. Kurile Islands - Japanese title to these islands, which are of considerable strategic value, was determined in a convention of 1875, in which Russia agreed to withdraw in return for Japanese withdrawal from Southern Sakhalin. The permanent population of 17,500, which is entirely Japanese, is concentrated on the three southernmost islands. Fishing, the only significant industry, draws from 20,000 to 30,000 Japanese to the islands during the summer months.

Fisheries

63. Bonin (Ogasawara) Islands - The Bonin Islands were formally annexed by Japan in 1876. The population, which is entirely Japanese, was 7,361 in 1940. The islands produce sugar and fish. There are a military landing field, and a naval air station, and a naval anchorage at the island of Chichi Jima.

64. Marcus Island - American discovery and claim in 1889. Japanese occupation and claim in 1898. U.S. sovereignty not subsequently asserted. There is a military airfield on the island of Marcus.

65. Japanese Mandated Islands - In 1914, after having declared war on Germany, Japan occupied all German islands in the Pacific north of the equator. The Principal Allied and Associated Powers, including the United States, through their representatives at a meeting on May 7, 1919, voted to confer on Japan a mandate for the "German islands north of the equator". This was a preliminary and conditional commitment, since the Treaty of Versailles had not been signed and the Principal Allied and Associated Powers were not in possession of Germany's "rights and titles". Later, after the treaty had been signed (June 28, 1919) and the United States had refused to ratify it, the Principal Allied Powers, without the consent of the United States, allocated these German islands as a class C mandate to Japan and on December 17, 1920, the Council of the League of Nations approved and confirmed the mandate charter which prescribed the terms and conditions on which Japan should act as Mandatory.

The Mandated Islands number over 600, and are scattered over an area extending 2,500 miles east and west, and 1,200 miles north and south. The population in 1938 was 59,593 natives, 71,847 Japanese, and 124 foreigners. The islands produce sugar, coconuts, fish products and phosphates.

Naval
Naval and military activity is located principally at Saipan, Angaur, Yap, Truk atoll, Ponape, Kusaie, Jaluit, and Wotje. Landing fields and anchorages for seaplanes and surface vessels have been developed at many points throughout the four island groups.

66. Formosa (Taiwan) — Formosa and the Pescadores were ceded by China to Japan at the conclusion of the Sino-Japanese war in 1895. The total area is 13,900 square miles, and the population is (1940) 6,077,478, of which 2.5 percent are aborigines, 6 percent Japanese, and 91.5 percent Formosan Japanese. Formosa produces 80 percent of Japan's sugar requirements, and 7 percent of its rice requirements. A Japanese naval base is located in the Pescadores, and there are numerous military airfields in Formosa. China expects to recover Formosa at the end of the war.

67. Liuchiu (Ryukyu) Islands — Prior to 1879, when Japan formally annexed the Liuchiu Islands, the Liuchiu people maintained a measure of political independence, although the suzerainty of both China and Japan was recognized. China at first protested the Japanese annexation, but finally acquiesced in 1881.

The inhabitants of the Liuchiu Islands, which numbered 750,240 in 1940, speak a language which differs from Japanese about as much as Portuguese does from Spanish. Through education, conscription and a closely supervised system of local government, they have to consider themselves an integral part of the Japanese Empire. The principal occupation is agriculture.

There are a naval base and anchorage, and several airfields in the islands.
APPENDIX I (to PWC-219)

TERRITORIAL DISPUTES IN EUROPE CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO
THE PRESENT POLITICAL STATUS OF THE CONTESTANTS
(SEEN MAP 4, EUROPEAN SERIES)

The disputed territories are listed below according to
the status (Allied or Enemy) of the claimant states. Of
the claimant states, given in brackets, the first named is
in every case the state which held the territory in ques-
tion on January 1, 1938. The numbers given in parentheses
refer to Appendix II and to Map 4, European Series.

I. Territories in Dispute Between Two Allied States

Eastern Poland between the Curzon Line and the Riga
Line (11) [Poland and the Soviet Union]

Teschen (33) [Czechoslovakia and Poland]

II. Enemy Territories Claimed by Allied States

Petsamo (1) [Finland and the Soviet Union]

Salla sector, Karelia, Hanko Peninsula, Gulf of
Finland Islands (2) [Finland and the Soviet Union]

East Prussia (6) [Germany, Poland and possibly the
Soviet Union]

German Territory East of the Oder (9) [Germany and
Poland]

German Upper Silesia (10) [Germany and Poland]

Northern Bukovina (13) [Romania and the Soviet
Union]

Bessarabia (14) [Romania and the Soviet Union]

Dodecanese (20) [Italy, Greece and possibly Turkey]

Sector of Southern Bulgaria Adjacent to Greece (18)
[Bulgaria and Greece]

DECLASSIFIED
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Venezia Giulia, Northeastern Udine, Fiume, Zara and the Italian Islands on the Dalmatian Coast (25)
[Italy and Yugoslavia]
Raab Salient (29) [Hungary and Yugoslavia]

III. Allied Territories Claimed by Enemy States

Polish Territory Annexed by Germany in 1939 (8)
[Poland and Germany]
Subcarpathian Ruthenia (12) [Czechoslovakia, Hungary and possibly the Soviet Union]
Hungarian-Czechoslovak Frontier Zone (30)
[Czechoslovakia and Hungary]
Sudetenland (34) [Czechoslovakia, Germany and possibly Austria]
Yugoslav-Bulgarian Frontier Zone North of Macedonia (17) [Yugoslavia and Bulgaria]
Yugoslav Macedonia (24) [Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and possibly Greece]
Western Thrace and Greek Macedonia (19) [Greece and Bulgaria]
Yugoslav-Hungarian Frontier Zone (28) [Yugoslavia, Hungary and possibly Rumania]
Eupen, Malmédy, and Morenet (35) [Belgium and Germany]
Luxembourg (36) [Luxembourg and Germany]
Alsace Lorraine (37) [France and Germany]

IV. Territories in Dispute Between Two Enemy States

Transylvania (15) [Rumania and Hungary]
Southern Dobruja (16) [Rumania and Bulgaria]
V. Disputes Involving, as One Party, States Without Recognized Governments or Provisional Governing Authorities (Austria, Albania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania)

The Baltic States (3) [Estoria, Latvia, Lithuania and the Soviet Union]

The Kosovo Region (23) [Yugoslavia and Albania]

Northern Epirus (Southern Albania) (21) [Albania and Greece]

Island of Saseno (22) [Italy and Albania]

Czechoslovak-Austrian Frontier Zone (32) [Czechoslovakia and Austria]

Klagenfurt Area (27) [Austria and Yugoslavia]

South Tyrol (26) [Italy and Austria]

Burgenland (31) [Austria and Hungary]

VI. Areas Claimed by More Than Two States, and the Disposition of Which Depends on Larger Territorial Settlements

Vilna District (4) [Poland, Lithuania and the Soviet Union]

Memelland (5) [Lithuania, Germany and possibly the Soviet Union and Poland]

Danzig (7) [Free City of Danzig, Germany and Poland]
The accompanying map (European Series, Map 4) indicates the following disputed areas of Europe, numbered correspondingly.

1. The Petsamo District.--This area, which includes Finland's only Arctic seacoast, was a part of Tsarist Russia until 1917, and was acquired by Finland by the Treaty of Tartu, October 1920. A portion of it, approximately 155 square miles in area, including the western part of the Rybachi Peninsula, was ceded to Soviet Russia by the Treaty of Moscow, March 12, 1940. Recently, in its armistice proposals to Finland, the Soviet Union has claimed "the Petsamo district", but the exact territory claimed is not known.

2. The Salla Sector, Karelia, the Hanko Peninsula, and the Gulf of Finland Islands.--The Salla sector was a part of Finland from 1595 until its cession to the Soviet Union by the Treaty of Moscow in 1940. The Karelian Isthmus boundary and the status of the Gulf Islands were fixed by the Treaty of Tartu, October 14, 1920. In the negotiations of 1939 the Soviet Government proposed changes in the boundary on the Isthmus and a lease of the Gulf Islands and of Hanko Peninsula. The Finnish counterproposals were rejected. By the treaty of Moscow of March 12, 1940 the Isthmus boundary was moved north and west, the Gulf Islands were ceded to the Soviet Union and a 30 year lease of Hanko was granted.

The area in dispute is mainly that ceded to the Soviet Union in 1940, a total of 13,500 square miles, of which 9,549 square miles were in the Karelian Isthmus region. Forty-seven square miles at Hanko were leased to Russia. The population of this area was approximately 450,000 in 1939.
1939. Nearly 95 percent moved into Finland after the Treaty of Moscow, and over 300,000 have moved back into the area since 1941. In the disputed area the population was approximately 97.6 percent Finnish-speaking, 1.3 percent Swedish-speaking, and 0.9 percent Russian-speaking. The ceded and leased areas are chiefly of strategic importance to Finland, and Vilnur is of special sentimental significance to the Finns.

3. Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.--These republics proclaimed their independence of Russia in 1918 and secured it in 1920. By treaties of October 1939 their military and naval bases were occupied by Soviet troops, and by ultimate of June 1940 they were required to institute new governments. Legislatures subsequently elected under complete Soviet occupation established Soviet socialist republics and petitioned for admission to the U.S.S.R., which was granted in August 1940. The Soviet Government claims these three states, occupied by Germany since 1941, as constituent republics of the U.S.S.R.

Estonia: Area, 18,353 square miles; population (est. 1939), 1,134,000; Ethnic composition: Estonians, 87.7%; Russians 8.2%; Germans, 1.7%; Swedes, 0.7%; Jews, 0.4%; others, 1.3%.

Latvia: Area, 25,402 square miles; population, 1,950,502. Ethnic composition: Latvians, 75.5%; Russians, 10.59%; Jews, 4.79%; Germans, 3.19%.

Lithuania: Area, 22,959 square miles; population 2,879,070. Ethnic composition: Lithuanians, 80.14%; Jews, 7.11%; Poles, 3.02%; Russians, 2.34%; Germans, 4.08%.

4. Vilna District.--Vilna was disputed by Poland and Lithuania after the first World War. It was seized by the Poles in 1920. Poland's sovereignty over it was recognized by the principal Allied Powers and by the League of Nations but not by Lithuania. In 1940 the Soviet Union, having occupied the area upon the collapse of Poland, ceded it to Lithuania, but a few months later Lithuania itself was incorporated into the U.S.S.R. The Vilna district is now claimed by the Soviet Union, by Poland, and by representatives of the former Lithuanian government.

5. Memelland
5. Memelland.—The Memelland was renounced by Germany in the Treaty of Versailles, June 28, 1919. It was placed under Lithuanian administration by the convention signed on May 7, 1924 by the Principal Allied Powers and by Lithuania on May 17, 1924. It was ceded by Lithuania to Germany on March 22, 1939. It is claimed by Germany and by representatives of the former Lithuanian government. It may also be claimed by the Soviet Union and by Poland.

Memelland had an area of 943 square miles, and a total population of 182,000. In 1925 the ethnic-linguistic division was 44 percent German, 27 percent Lithuanian, and 25 percent "Memelländer". Memel is the principal Baltic port of Lithuania and is the outlet for the important Niemen waterway system. In 1939 approximately three-fourths of Lithuanian foreign commerce passed through this port.

6. East Prussia.—East Prussia remained under German sovereignty, although physically separated from the rest of Germany, after the "Corridor" was transferred to Poland by the Treaty of Versailles. The western and part of the southern boundaries of East Prussia were fixed by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, August 16, 1920, following a plebiscite in the Marienwerder and Allenstein districts, held in accordance with the Treaty of Versailles. Under the final settlement, Poland received a narrow riparian strip along the east bank of the Vistula, varying in width from a few feet to a half mile.

The area of East Prussia under the 1920 boundaries was 14,283 square miles. According to the census of May 1939 the population was 2,496,017 persons. According to the census of 1925—the most reliable index of linguistic distribution—the Polish population of East Prussia was 40,502, to which might be added the 62,596 Masurians, Slaves who speak a dialect akin to Polish, residing in the district of Allenstein. Polish sources estimate the Polish population of East Prussia at upwards of 400,000. The whole of East Prussia is now claimed by the Polish Government. The Soviet Union apparently favors Polish acquisition of part or all of the province but may claim the eastern sector, including the chief city and part of Königsberg, for itself.

7. Danzig.—The Danzig area was renounced by Germany in the Treaty of Versailles, June 28, 1919, and proclaimed a Free City with a High Commissioner appointed by the League of Nations.
The total area of the Free City of Danzig was 731 square miles. The population in 1935 numbered 412,000. According to the Danzig census of 1923, the Free City had a total population of 366,730, of whom 12,027 spoke Polish or Kashub.

8. **Polish Territory annexed by Germany in 1939.**--Poland's possession of the so-called "Corridor", the Poznań area, and the major part of the Upper Silesian industrial area, acquired from Germany after the first World War, was a serious source of friction between Poland and Germany from 1919 to 1939. This territory was re-incorporated into Germany after the military defeat of Poland in 1939, together with additional territory which had not been a part of pre-1914 Germany. This area, comprising the richest agricultural and industrial parts of pre-war Poland, had a population in 1939 of some ten million, of whom only 680,000 were Germans. Many Germans, perhaps as many as one million, have been settled there in accordance with the Nazi plan to "Germanize" the annexed territories.

9. **German Territory East of the Oder River.**--Polish claims to German territory in Pomerania and Lower Silesia have not been precisely defined. Some suggestions include all territory up to the Oder River. At the very least Poland is likely to claim a line running from the northwestern corner of the Polish province of Poznań to Kolberg on the Baltic Sea, and seems assured of British and Soviet support for this claim. The smaller territory in question has an approximate area of 7,770 square miles and a population, almost entirely German-speaking, of 750,000. The larger area, up to the Oder River, has an area of 18,300 square miles and a solidly German population of about two and one-half millions.

10. **German Upper Silesia.**--The area in question is the pre-war German Regierungsbezirk of Oppeln, which included the territory awarded to Germany by the Conference of

Ambassadors
Ambassadors, October 19, 1921, following a plebiscite held in accordance with the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, plus several local districts to the west of the plebiscite area. It is now claimed for Poland both by the Polish Government-in-Exile and by spokesmen of Polish groups sponsored by the Soviet Union.

This territory has an area of 3,750 square miles and had a population of 1,483,000 in 1933. The industrial district in the extreme east had one-tenth the area and one-third the population of the territory in question. In 1925 the exclusively German-speaking element made up 57 percent of the total population in the territory which formed part of the plebiscite zone, 72 percent of the population in the industrial district. The western districts outside of the plebiscite zone, with a total population of about 323,000, are almost solidly German-speaking.

11. Eastern Poland between the Riga Line and Curzon Line.--This area includes pre-1914 Austro-Hungarian and Russian territory. Eastern Galicia was renounced by Austria-Hungary in the treaty of St. Germain, September 10, 1919, and was awarded to Poland on March 15, 1923 by the Principal Allied Powers acting under Article 87 of the Versailles Treaty. The former Russian territory was acquired by Poland by the treaty of Riga, October 12, 1921. A somewhat larger area was occupied from September 1939 to June 22, 1941 by Russia under agreement with Germany. In January 1944 the Soviet Government proposed the Curzon Line as the future Polish-Soviet frontier.

This part of former Poland has an area of 70,049 square miles. Its total population, according to the Polish census of 1931, was 10,574,763, of whom 3,841,908 were Polish-speaking, 3,925,108 were Ukrainian-speaking, 910,492 were White Russian-speaking, 10,737 were Russian-speaking, 707,086 were listed as "local" inhabitants of the Province of Polesie, 689,225 were Yiddish-speaking, 79,385 were German-speaking, and 75,917 were Lithuanian-speaking.

12. Subcarpathian Ruthenia.--Formerly a part of the Kingdom of Hungary, this area was renounced in the treaty of Trianon, June 4, 1920, and awarded to Czechoslovakia as an autonomous province by the treaty of Sèvres, August 10, 1920. Subcarpathian Ruthenia lost 612 square miles to Hungary on November
November 2, 1938, and on March 15, 1939, it was incorporated by force into Hungary.

The area of Subcarpathian Ruthenia is 4,871 square miles. The population in 1930 was 725,337, of whom 450,925 (62.17 percent) were Ruthenian (Ukrainian); 34,511 (4.75 percent) Czechoslovak; 13,804 (1.90 percent), German; 115,805 (15.96 percent), Magyar; and 95,008 (13.10 percent), Jewish. A mountainous and agricultural region, the region had strategic significance for Czechoslovakia in that it separated Poland from Hungary and provided a connecting link with Rumania. If Eastern Galicia is acquired by Russia, Czechoslovakia's retention of Ruthenia would give it a common frontier with Russia on the Carpathians. There is some possibility that the Soviet Union itself might absorb Ruthenia, in view of the preponderantly Ukrainian-speaking population of that province.

13. Northern Bukovina to the line of Russian Occupation.--Formerly belonging to Austria-Hungary, Bukovina was renounced in the treaty of St. Germain, September 10, 1919, and awarded to Rumania by the treaty of Sèvres, August 10, 1920. The northern part of it was occupied by Russian troops on June 26, 1940, and formally incorporated into the Ukrainian S.S.R. on August 2, 1940. It was occupied by Rumania from 1941 to 1944, and has since been re-occupied by the Soviet Union.

The area of Northern Bukovina is approximately 2,240 square miles. Its total population, according to the Rumanian census of 1930, was 529,462, of whom 267,908 were Russians and Ukrainians by mother-tongue and 137,073 were Rumanians.

14. Bessarabia.--Bessarabia was a province of pre-1917 Russia. An assembly representing the majority Rumanian element in the population proclaimed its independence on December 17, 1917, and, during Rumanian military occupation, voted its union with Rumania on April 8 and November 27, 1918. Rumania's sovereignty was recognized in the treaty of Paris, October 28, 1920, by Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan. The U.S.S.R. reoccupied Bessarabia on July 25, 1940 and on August 2 united the northern and southern portions with the Ukrainian S.S.R. and formed the Moldavian S.S.R. of the remainder, together with parts of the former Moldavian S.S.R. It was occupied by Rumania from July
July 1941, to 1944. By May 1944 it had been partially reconquered by Soviet forces.

The area of Bessarabia is 17,143 square miles. Its total population, according to the Rumanian census of 1930, was 2,864,402, of whom 1,398,573 were Rumanian-speaking, 370,112 were Russian-speaking, 331,183 were Ukrainian-speaking, 201,276 were Yiddish-speaking, 164,551 were Bulgarian-speaking, and 101,356 were Turkish-speaking.

15. Transylvania.--This area includes the former Grand Principality of Transylvania, Maramuresh, Criehana, and the Rumanian Banat. Its cession by Hungary to Rumania was implicit in the Treaty of Trianon, June 4, 1920, which fixed the common boundary between the two states. The division of the Banat between Rumania and Yugoslavia was determined by the Allied Supreme Council and accepted by the two states in August 1919, and confirmed with slight modifications by a protocol signed at Belgrade on November 24, 1923, and an additional protocol signed in Bucharest, June 4, 1927. By the Vienna Award of August 30, 1940, all of Maramuresh, most of Criehana, and over half of Transylvania proper was ceded to Hungary.

The total area in dispute is 39,686 square miles. Its total population, according to the Rumanian census of 1930 was 5,546,363, of whom 3,207,860 were Rumanians by declared nationality, 1,353,276 were Hungarians, 543,852 were Germans, and 43,342 were Yugoslavs. The northern part of Transylvania, which Hungary regained in 1940, is 16,000 square miles in area; it contains some 1,149,000 Rumanians and 909,000 Hungarians.

16. Southern Dobruja.--Southern Dobruja was ceded by Bulgaria to Rumania in the Treaty of Bucharest, August 10, 1913, following the second Balkan war. It was retroceded in September 1940.

The area of Southern Dobruja is 2,983 square miles. Its total population, according to the Rumanian census of 1930, was 378,344, of whom 144,659 were Turkish-speaking, 142,403 were Bulgarian-speaking, and 79,739 were Rumanian-speaking. Since that census virtually all the Rumanian inhabitants have been repatriated to Rumania, under an agreement, and many of the Turks have migrated to Turkey.

17. Yugoslav-Bulgarian
17. **Yugoslav-Bulgarian Frontier Zone North of Macedonia.**—This area was occupied and annexed by Bulgaria in 1941. A part of it (districts of Tsaribrod and Bosilegrad) had been ceded by Bulgaria to Yugoslavia in 1919. At that time Yugoslavia also acquired a small sector in the Timok valley near Vidin, which Bulgaria did not reoccupy in 1941.

The area of this zone is approximately 2,564 square miles. The total population is about 195,200, of whom roughly 45,000 are Bulgarians and the remainder Serbs. In Tsaribrod is located the strategically important Dragoman Pass, which commands the Sofia-Belgrade trunk railway.

18. **Sector of Southern Bulgaria adjacent to Greece.**—The Greek claim to Bulgarian territory has not been precisely defined. It may extend as far north as the Arda River and the Kresna defile, embracing an approximate area of 4,500 square miles. The population of 390,000 is about two-thirds Bulgarian and the remainder Turkish. The Greek claim is based on strategic considerations.

19. **Greek Eastern Macedonia and Western Thrace.**—This area was occupied and annexed by Bulgaria in 1941. Greek Eastern Macedonia, in which some Bulgarian troops have been stationed, but which Bulgaria has not annexed, may also be claimed by Bulgaria. Some 80,000 Macedonian Slavs resident there provide the basis for a possible Bulgarian claim. Western Thrace was acquired by Bulgaria in 1913, and was occupied by the Allied Powers from 1918 to 1923, when it was ceded to Greece. Greek Macedonia was acquired by Greece from Turkey in 1913.

The disputed territory has an area of approximately 5,464 square miles and has approximately 645,700 inhabitants. The immigration of a large number of refugees from Anatolia and the exchange of minority populations between Greece and Bulgaria made the area predominantly Greek. Approximately 85,000 Turks remained. Some 80,000 Bulgarians are reported to have settled in the area since 1941, and about the same number of Greeks have been evacuated. The area is strategically important since it offers the possibility of a direct territorial outlet for Bulgaria on the Aegean.

20. **The Dodecanese Islands.**—The Dodecanese Islands include the following: Rhodes, Kos, Patmos, Lioce, Kalymnos, Leros, Nissyros, Tilos, Khalki, Symi, Astypalai, Karpathos, Kasos and Kaseloriz. Italy came into "temporary" possession of the islands as a result of the Turco-Italian War of 1911-1912.
1911-1912 (Treaty of Lausanne, October 18, 1912). The secret treaty of London, April 26, 1915, promised Italy full sovereignty over the islands. Italian sovereignty was recognized in the treaty of Sèvres, August 10, 1920 (Article 122) and in the treaty of Lausanne, July 24, 1923 (Article 15).

The total area of the Dodecanese Islands is 1,035 square miles. The total population (1936) is 140,848, eighty to eighty-five percent of which is Greek. Without great economic significance, the islands are of strategic importance as stepping stones to the Asiatic mainland, particularly Rhodes and Leros. For this reason their disposition is a matter of interest to Turkey. Greece claims the entire group on ethnic grounds.

21. Northern Epirus (Southern Albania).—This area was claimed by Greece at the peace conference in 1919. The Conference of Ambassadors, however, decided on November 9, 1921 to confirm the Albanian boundaries as fixed by the Conference of Ambassadors of the six European powers in London in 1913, subject to certain specified modifications to be carried out by a Boundary Commission. The boundary was definitely fixed by the Conference of Ambassadors in Paris on July 30, 1926. This area, together with the rest of Albania, was annexed to the Crown of Italy from April 1939 to September 1943, when it was occupied by Germany, which proclaimed the restoration of Albanian independence.

Northern Epirus has an area of approximately 2,800 square miles and has a population of approximately 300,000 persons, predominantly Albanian. Since there is an Albanian minority in some of the districts situated on the Greek side of the 1926 frontier, possible adjustments in Albania's favor might be considered at the same time that the disposition of Northern Epirus is considered.

22. Island of Saseno.—Saseno is a small and virtually uninhabited rocky island situated at the entrance to the Bay of Valona. It was assigned to Albania by the European Powers in 1913, and ceded by Albania to Italy in 1920. Its primary importance is strategic; it served Italy as a naval strong point on the eastern side of the entrance to the Adriatic Sea.

23. Region of Kosovo.—Certain Yugoslav territories were awarded to Albania (under Italian sovereignty) after
the defeat of Yugoslavia in May 1941. They included a small area in the vicinity of Lake Scutari and a larger area along the former eastern boundary of Albania. The approximate population of this annexed territory is 680,000 of whom about two-thirds are Albanians.

24. Yugoslav Macedonia.--This territory was lost by Turkey in the First Balkan War of 1912-1913 (Treaty of London, May 30, 1913). In spite of the Serbo-Bulgarian Treaty of March 13, 1912, all but the Strumitsa salient was claimed by Serbia and yielded to her by Bulgaria after the Second Balkan War in the Treaty of Bucharest, August 10, 1913. The Strumitsa salient was ceded by Bulgaria to Yugoslavia in the Treaty of Neuilly in November 27, 1919. After the defeat of Yugoslavia in 1941, together with other Yugoslav territories to the north, the whole of Yugoslav Macedonia was occupied and annexed by Bulgaria.

The district has an area of approximately 8,366 square miles and has a population of approximately 680,000 persons, of whom approximately two-thirds are Macedonian Slavs, claimed as Serbs by Yugoslavia and as Bulgars by Bulgaria.

25. Venezia Giulia, Northeastern Udine, Fiume, Zara and the Italian Islands on the Dalmatian Coast.--Venezia Giulia, Zara and the Dalmatian Islands were ceded by Austria to Italy in the Treaty of St. Germain, September 10, 1919. The boundary between Yugoslavia and Italy was confirmed by the Treaty of Rapallo, November 12, 1920. Fiume was renounced by Hungary in the Treaty of Trianon (June 4, 1920), was established as a Free City by the Treaty of Rapallo, and was incorporated in Italy by the Treaty of Rome, January 27, 1924. Yugoslavia now claims this area, and in addition the northeastern part of the district of Udine, which has been a part of Italy since 1866.

The territory has an area of 5,400 square miles. Its total population, according to the census of 1921 (the last census in which the inhabitants were listed according to language) was 946,000, of whom 507,591 were Italian-speaking; 50,389 were Ladin-speaking, 235,944 were Slovene-speaking, and 103,613 were Serbo-Croat speaking.

26. South Tyrol.--This area was ceded by Austria to Italy in the Treaty of St. Germain, September 10, 1919.

The territory
The territory in question, which coincides with the
Italian province of Bolzano, has an area of 2,735 square miles
and a total population (1936) of 278,000. In the census of
1921 (the last census in which the inhabitants were listed
according to language), out of a total population of 244,000
there were 189,000 Germans and 34,000 Italian or Ladin-speaking
inhabitants. Many Germans, apparently about 100,000, were
moved to Germany after an Italian-German agreement and
plebiscite in 1939. Since the surrender of Italy, however,
German administration has been established in this territory,
which is probably still predominantly German in population.

27. **Klagenfurt Area.**—Yugoslavia claims the Klagenfurt
basin, roughly to the boundary of Styria and including the
cities of Villach, Völkermarkt, and Klagenfurt. This area
remained under Austrian sovereignty in 1920 after a plebiscite
in the southern portion resulted favorably for Austria.

The territory involved has an area of about 1,000 square
miles and a total population of some 250,000, of whom only
27,000, according to the Austrian census of 1934, are Slovenes.

28. **Yugoslav-Hungarian Borderlands, including**
Prekomurje, Medjumurje, Baranja, Bačka and the Yugoslav
Banat. These areas were ceded to Yugoslavia by Hungary in
the Treaty of Trianon, June 4, 1920. Since the defeat of
Yugoslavia in 1941 all but the Banat have been occupied by
Hungarian forces. The Banat is now a part of the puppet
state of Serbia and is administered by the local German
minority.

These districts have an area of 7,987 square miles and
a total population of approximately 1,535,000 persons.
According to the census of 1921, there were 670,000 Serbo-
Croats, 303,000 Magyars, 321,000 Germans and 68,000 Romanians
in this territory.

29. **Raab Salient.**—Yugoslavia has claimed on ethnic
grounds a small area of about 50 square miles on the upper
Raab River where Hungarian territory forms a salient between
Yugoslavia and Austria. The population is not more than a
few thousand.

30. **Hungarian-Czecho Slovak Frontier Zone.**—This area
was ceded by Hungary to Czechoslovakia in the Treaty of
Trianon, June 4, 1920. Some of the parts indicated were
re-occupied.
re-occupied by Hungary under the Vienna Award of November 2, 1938; a further zone was ceded to Hungary under the agreement of April 3, 1939.

The area annexed involved about 4,500 square miles. According to the 1930 census the total population was 992,496, of whom 288,803 were Czechoslovak, 587,692 Magyars and 51,000 Jews. The territory is important agriculturally. It borders the Danube River.

31. Burgenland.--The Burgenland was part of Hungary in 1921, when it was ceded to Austria. The city of Sopron, after a plebiscite, was retained by Hungary. Hungary may claim restoration of the whole province or a rectification of the frontier in the Sopron area.

The area of the Burgenland is 1,532 square miles. Its population was about 300,000 (1934), of which 80 percent was German-speaking, 14 percent Croat-speaking, and 4 percent Magyar-speaking. The project of a "Slavic Corridor" connecting Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia through the Burgenland was proposed in 1919 and might be revived.

32. Austria-Czechoslovak Frontier Zone.--Austria, when restored to independence, may make a claim to a rectification of its frontier with Czechoslovakia. There has been no indication that such a claim would extend to all Czechoslovak territory adjacent to the Austrian frontier annexed by Germany in September 1938. More probably it would involve only small areas in the vicinity of Gmünd and Feldberg. This territory is about 70 square miles in area and its population is overwhelmingly German-speaking.

3. Teschen.--The Duchy of Teschen was renounced by Austria in the Treaty of St. Germain, September 10, 1919. It was divided between Czechoslovakia and Poland by the Conference of Ambassadors, on July 28, 1920. Part of the area awarded to Czechoslovakia was ceded to Poland in 1938 and is now in dispute between these two states.

The disputed territory totals 334 square miles in area. According to the census of 1930, the total population of the district was 231,784. The Poles numbered 76,267 (33 percent); the Czechoslovaks, 124,579 (54 percent); and the Germans, 17,198 (7 percent). The area is especially important as an industrial region for steel manufacture.

34. Sudeten
34. Sudeten Area.—As part of the lands of the Crown of Bohemia, these areas were ceded to Czechoslovakia by Austria in the Treaty of St. Germain, September 10, 1919. They were incorporated into Germany as a consequence of the Munich agreement of September 30, 1938. This agreement was subsequently denounced by Great Britain and France, and was never recognized by the United States and the Soviet Union.

The area ceded to Germany in 1938 was 11,236 square miles in area. According to the 1930 census, the total population was 3,756,719, of whom 2,822,699 were German and 736,002 Czechoslovak. The Sudetenland is not a continuous territory, but extends around the western frontier of Czechoslovakia. Cession of the territory destroyed the defenses, the communications system, and the economy of Czechoslovakia.

35. Eupen, Malmédy, and Moresnet.—These three districts extend along the entire Belgian-German frontier. Eupen and Malmédy, formerly part of Germany, were transferred to Belgium in 1920 by the Conference of Ambassadors, following an expression of public opinion held in accordance with the terms of the Treaty of Versailles; and Moresnet, formerly neutral territory, was awarded to Belgium by the same Treaty. These territories were claimed by Germany, and on May 19, 1940, were re-incorporated into the Reich by Hitler.

The districts cover an area of 366.59 square miles and have a total population, according to the census of 1930, of 65,618, of whom 12,166 are French-speaking and 51,383 are German-speaking.

36. Luxembourg.—The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg is an independent state bordering on France, Belgium and Germany and associated with Belgium in an economic union. Its approximate area is 1,000 square miles and its population 297,000 (1935). It was occupied by Germany in 1940 and declared annexed to Germany in 1942.

37. Alsace-Lorraine.—This territory was lost by France in 1871 when it was ceded to Germany under the Treaty of Frankfort May 10, 1871. It was returned to France according to the Peace Treaty with Germany (June 28, 1919), as from the date of the armistice, November 11, 1918. In 1940 this region was annexed by Germany.

The territory
The territory covers an area of approximately 5,605 square miles, with a total population of 1,915,627 according to the census of 1936.
EUROPE: BOUNDARY PROBLEMS

- Territories in dispute between two Allied States
- Enemy Territories claimed by Allied States
- Allied Territories claimed by Enemy States
- Territories in dispute between two Enemy States
- Disputes involving states without recognized governments or provisional governing authorities
- Areas claimed by more than two states, and the disposition of which depends on larger territorial settlements
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Naples
Dated June 22, 1944
Rec'd 7:50 p.m.

Secretary of State,
Washington.

258, June 22, 3 p.m.

TO THE PRESIDENT, THE SECRETARY OF STATE, WAR, NAVY AND BISHOP SHERILL FROM MYRON TAYLOR:

"Cooperating with General Johnson, American Military Governor of Rome, have arranged to have Episcopal chaplain temporarily detached from Army to open American church and community house in Rome at once for services and social privileges of armed forces and others. Temporary arrangement to be concluded upon arrival clergyman selected by American church authorities with your approval.

Visited American Academy Rome, all in good order and to be used by Monuments and Fine Arts sub-Commission in Italy."

BRANDT

WMB RR
my dear Mr. Jelley:

Please forward address sheet and ask you to send this enclosed

under the President's signature.

With thanks and kind regards,

to you.

Sincerely,

Andrew Jelley

Date: 23rd

16 2/703rd

New Felipe
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

June 24, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR
THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

Will you please try to get a seat on a plane for Mrs. Myron Taylor about the tenth of July or shortly thereafter?

F. D. R.
Dear the President:

You have told me —

of your great kindness

in granting permission

to your line in Rome

to become available

and to do so and to

thank you —

I recall several

your reports when he saw

do this there — here you

helped me — he would

have been impossible

to secure plane seats.
in Teheran, but for your
word and O.K.
We listened to your
address in the Dome
occupation, we listened
to the beautiful prayer in
the masjid and were
merited and found of the
President.
His assistant to your
personal representative to
the Vatican will manage
things, hope to remain
here sincerely yours

Austral tele
June 22nd
The President of the United States
Vatican City

June 27, 1944.

Dear Mr. President:

In our last interview you suggested that it would be interesting to learn the occasion of Badoglio's retirement. I am enclosing a statement from an official American source who was present in Italy throughout the invasion and associated with the Allied Advisory Council for Italy, which gives a review of the events leading up to the General's retirement. I shall have in a few days a written statement from an Italian source, who was close to the Royal Family throughout the same period, and will transmit it in due course.

I am very grateful for a telegram from the Secretary announcing that at your instance Anabel would be directed to join me shortly and I have about completed suitable quarters, having had offered the villa

To the President,

White House.

Enclosure:
Statement.
villa of Miss Marion Kemp in Rome before I left home. I think
Anabel should come around some time after the middle of July.

With kindest regards and best wishes, believe me

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
MEMORANDUM ON POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN ROME

June 14, 1944.

Upon arrival in Rome it immediately developed from very early consultation with the leaders of the Liberation and resistance fronts that there were two possible courses of action open to the Allied representatives:

1) To require as representatives of the occupying forces that Badoglio continue as Prime Minister and that Roman leaders enter his Ministry;

2) To bring together the members of the Italian Government and the national leaders of the Parties of Liberation, who were assembled in Rome, and to insist that they form the most representative Government possible which would at the same time agree to leave open the institutional question until after the war and accept the obligations Badoglio had assumed towards the Allies both under the Armistice and under subsequent agreements.

If the first course had been selected it would have meant driving a considerable majority of anti-Fascist elements, north of Naples, into opposition and the creation of a weak Government heavily over-balanced to the Right. Regardless of all that Badoglio had done to keep Italy going and of the spontaneity of his reception by the Romans, it was clear that the people of German-occupied Italy had not forgotten he had left them on Sept. 8 without directives to govern their conduct when the Germans descended upon them. There was also the very strong conviction on the part of many of the leaders with whom we talked that no resurgence of Italy was possible unless a clean break was made with their Fascist past. Badoglio did not represent this factor and any Government formed under his leadership would have been weak both politically
politically and administratively. Also it was possible to secure agreement to leave the institutional compromise solution of the Lieutenancy untouched if the Parties both in and out of the Government had their own choice of Premier.

Consequently the second course was indicated, particularly as it represented compliance with our basic instructions and the announced Moscow policy.

By urging the formation of a Government at the earliest possible moment along these lines and by abstaining from direct intervention in the choice of a Premier, Anglo-American authority at least in Rome has regained the initiative which in the South it had earlier abandoned, permitting Russian-Communist leadership to dominate.

It is true that the Government as at present constituted is not too strong and is composed of elderly politicians under a formerly weak Prime Minister. Nevertheless it is absolutely free from Fascist tinge and does comprise both members of the April Government and those who under the German oppression and in danger of their lives kept alive the anti-Fascist spirit of resistance and the organization of the Parties. As a coalition Govt it does embrace most shades of public opinion and party sentiment. Therefore administratively, which from the point of view of the Allied war effort must have high priority, it gives more guarantee of solidarity and effectiveness than would the co-existence of an outspoken opposition with a weak Badoglio Government.

One of the principal supporters of the latter, Togliati, was the member who at the meeting told Badoglio frankly that under the circumstances it would be impossible to form a Government under him.

The Luogotenenza solution has not made it possible to bring in all elements, but these would have been still fewer under Badoglio.

Bonomi who deserves great credit for his activities as President of the
the Rome Committee of National Liberation under the period of German tyranny at the daily risk of his life held the organization together. He is not devoid of political experience and judgment and apparently realizes fully the importance and vital necessity of subordinating Italian political theories to the unification of Italy in the war effort and of faithful and loyal compliance with the undertakings his predecessor gave the Allies.

Since the departure of the Government for Salerno Rome is quiet politically and is awaiting their return.
To the President,
The White House.

Personal for the President.
June 28, 1944

My dear Mr. President:

In further response to your question regarding the retirement of Don Badoglio I am now able to send you a statement from an Italian source which is dependable. This source is an intimate friend of the Crown Princess. This friend, an astonishing influence in higher quarters here, is considered by the Pope and others in high places as an exceedingly close person. Now so is Jack Cavaliere, Crown Prince, who is now in Switzerland and for the moment unable to travel. From letters that have influence in the change of the Mussolini regime and beginning to move against the Germans it was considered. The situation
The King of Belgium is in captivity in Germany. The Belgian ambassador has says they know nothing of his whereabouts.

With assurances of salutations and best regards,

Incirgin

Regretfully

P.S. I dined one night with "Krug" Peter of Yugo-Slavia who visited us at Locust Valley. Suppose he is still "King" ink who knows is these days of change?
THE PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
TO HIS HOLINESS THE POPE

Friday, June 30. 44.

My dear Mr. President:

Enclosing my letter of last week describing my first audience with His Holiness, the Pope, that a scene and
mastry audience yesterday, the first referred
to his great modesty in receiving the armed
forces at the Vatican. He is giving daily audience
to thousands of officers and men. He is
greatly exhilarated by these contacts as any one
would be. He recently received several hundred
members of the Press in the throne room, shaking
hands and shaking hands personally with each.
The Press tells me they were profoundly
moved by this reception. The Germans
received no such attention, had they four
members visiting the Vatican, compared with
their great numbers. This too is in consequence
the Germans criticizing and change probably.

My return to the subject of peace
as the Pope instance. He advocates the same
general reason supporting the principle of
 lilamilies surrounded connected in
my previous report—urging the leader
present circumstances nothing else nor logical or desirable either in the interest of the action or by the message to the future as well as the present considered. That there existed no German Government that could be recognized. That Hitler and his cohorts must be disestablished, the Nazi party destroyed and a competent military command established by the United Nations during the period of occupation and until a dependable Government comes to take up. That only Germany has demonstrated the intention to prevent the peace they promised. To make some sort of inspection to prevent rearmament and the development of war potential. Routed upon disarmament, demobilization, rehabilitation, reoccupation. The hope for an orderly rehabilitation of economic life and the ultimate hope that Germany would fit herself to become a member of a world organization which is in tune with the hope of the world of the future.

The condemned are three points again. and expressed no criticism of them. The Pope concerns that it was only
A matter of time when Germany

name to defeat - yet delayed the end

of life necessary to its accomplishment.

He asked me for a memorandum of

the point, discussed in our first and

Brum audience. I replied that time

carrying on a very personal conference

on the basis of secrecy, both in general terms

in my own language and would not feel

justified without your assurance in both

military any memorandum of it. He assured me

it must be strictly personal and secret

but I replied I must know that give such

a memorandum and none feel bound

personally because of it. He indicates

 informs that he will give me a copy

by the first memorandum used in our

previous audience in a few days. It is

being copies and I assume revised.

Returning to the subject of peace, Mr.

Holmes then enquired if I thought I should

make a further declaration. I said No.

That his last statement was interpreted

in America as that it was due elsewhere

as me, as you German. That I thought nothing

more to done that would raise Jules Tate

in Germany or elsewhere. As it were

prolonging the conflict, increase the late

death of
life and among the neutral nations it is
meant to be misunderstood and resisted.
(The Propaganda claims that American
Catholics favor a negotiated peace. I refer
to this in my first report.)

The Pope had apparently modified his
state of mind since our first audience,
and my journey following our conversation,
with a view of informing himself of our
policies for dealing with Germany.

The point I emphasized was my feeling for
America's role in a readjustment of Europe
cuts across my views of peace. I believe he realizes
it quite as fully as I do. I doubt how
I expected he would feel. The fragments together to
make a pattern. Before this time. But unless
as many less fortunate, far, thoughts were
again made to come in, the conference with
our European to negotiate an arrangement.
I disposed that idea without qualification.

His Holiness was most friendly and expressed
his confidence and appreciation in my presence
before he left.

With assurances of continuing

Hostile and regard I remain wth

Faithfully

Washington Jr.

Add an addendum on Italian Affairs.
THE PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
TO HIS HOLINESS THE POPE

June 30, 1844

Addressed to the President,

In Italy, with an established Government—
in which many of the political solons, are—
forming, vocal and critical. That is—
particularly a quality of the Roman—
not the body politic—but the upper—
classes. They concern with the worse—
on one thing—that it is essential the—
american forces remain here for a—
long time to come. In their generally—
from the intrigue of the politician—
and the general instability of Italian—
character.

For example, I met Signor Orlando—
at an old Spanish friend house on—
Friday. These are his observations—
reduced to a few sentences—though it—
dequires two hours, much translating—
much particularism to accomplish it—
I. Commission to the greatest danger. Prohibition of conscription in the United States encourages it (Shore, taken this up with Sec. Johnson, Military forces).

II. British domination of Italian policy, ministry, and civil life. Americans, representative of the political or policy making field, kept in the minor brackets of Committee Composition.

III. Italy not permitted to form an army to fight as an ally. No pride is wounded. Black men from Africa and America permitted to fight for Italian freedom. Italians not. (He admits upon questioning by me that the Allies have permitted 177,100, Italian troops to...
Fight at the front (an Italian officer friend of mine says there are 26000 Italians in the front line).

In the Crimea after the battle for Ouranopolis, and achieved victory, they will advance on the Parisians. To surrender their arms to the French, to be replaced on arrival at Ouranopolis. The arms were not replaced.

He says the treatment of Holy is the British received him of the practice in 1840 of drawing blood by leeches from a man, preliminary to an amputation.

He feels the British are preparing for an amputation. I did not question him on this. In obvious reasons - 25, Libya, and other African and Adriatic territory. James Lin replied that...
Accumulation has taken place already but did not.
The British are less favorable than 
Expect the War. American Credit 
Is Light.

All in all, Mauvois and the group 
with him are dissatisfied - the mood 
like to the old regime. Only while we 
are basically considering disarmament - would like to lead the 
Cabinet if he cores choose all the 
Members. The British offers 
The Premiership - he says he refused 
Because they would not consent to 
His nomination of all members. 
This led to another solution.

Myron E.

P.S. There is dynamite in the 
Situation if not handled carefully 
and given.
Personal and Confidential

From Myron Taylor, Rome.

The President,
The White House,
Washington.
MEMORANDUM FOR MISS TULLY:

I am transmitting herewith a sealed communication addressed to the President by the Honorable Myron C. Taylor, Special Representative of the President at the Vatican.

Stanley Woodward
Chief, Division of Protocol

Enclosure:

Sealed communication.
July 26, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR MISS TULLY:

I am transmitting herewith a sealed communication addressed to the President by the Honorable Myron C. Taylor, Special Representative of the President at the Vatican.

Stanley Woodward
Chief, Division of Protocol

Enclosure:

Sealed communication.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

June 30, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR

THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Here is a personal and confidential letter from Myron Taylor. Please read and return to my office for me to answer with any comment you care to make.

F. D. R.
Dear Miss Fally,

The enclosed letter is for the President only. Will you see that he receives it intact.

I would appreciate his acknowledgment of it.

With best regards and thanks.

[Signature]

M. Taylor fuller
My dear Mr. President:

Secretary Stimson arrived in Rome in good form on the 14th or 15th July. That the pleasure of dining with him, and to arrange an audience with the Holy Father for the next morning. As it was uncertain what might transpire in the audience I met the Secretary an hour in advance and reviewed with him in a general way the lines that had been taken with the Pope.

The Pope strictly observed protocol. Received the Secretary for a brief greeting before I joined them. Nothing was said by either regarding the man or the political questions that raised. Gratitude for the liberation of Rome in practically undamaged condition was expressed.
The audience lasted about an hour.

We next visited the Cardinal Secretary of State, Mazzini, who arose from his sick bed to receive the Secretary. The audience was brief, formal and did not raise any serious questions.

Secretary Simon left Rome today for Naples.

With renewed regards and respect believe me,

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mr. President

White House
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

Subject: Letter from Myron C. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor's confidential letter to you of June 23 has been read with much interest and appreciation and is returned herewith together with a tentative draft of reply for your consideration.

In view of the preliminary nature of the conversations of Mr. Taylor with the Pope and the Cardinal Secretary, there would not appear to be any particular question which the Department would like you to mention to Mr. Taylor at this time, except a reference to the Vatican's efforts to assist victims of religious and racial persecutions as mentioned in the enclosed draft, if you approve.

Enclosures:
Mr. Taylor's letter, June 23, 1944;
Draft of reply.
Your further address with particular reference
your further address with particular reference
your further address with particular reference
your further address with particular reference
your further address with particular reference

Exemplifying

Aptitude

for unpretentious supplies and particular
some with much force and clarity and
understanding, to correct false impressions
for our own inaccuracy in the course of your
when you should have been
when you should have been
the event of your own
the event of your own
the event of your own
the event of your own

My dear friend,
render assistance to the victims of racial and religious persecutions.

With every good wish and my best to you always,

Very sincerely yours,

The Honorable
Myron C. Taylor,
Vatican City