Ort 16 Somet

Of

WITNESSES

(none)

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

Pros. Def. No. No.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
759	Extract from the Record of Litvinov's Talk with SHIGEMITSU, Mamoru, dated 31 Aug 1938		7825
760	Article published in 1933 by the Social Education Association in the "Mis- cellaneous People Liter- ature Minao Bunko" No. 516 entitled "Japan's Mission in the Showa Era" by the Accused ARAKI, Sadao	7828	
760-A	Excerpt therefrom		7828
761	Record of the Talk of ITAGAKI, Seishiro, dated 28 Mar 1936, who at that time was Chief of the Kwantung Army Head- quarters, with Ambassador ARITA	7830	
761 - A	Excerpt therefrom		7830

Of

EXHIBITS

Pros. Def. No. No.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
762	Extract from document of the Kwantung Army Command- ing General's "Represen- tation of Opinion on the Establishment of a New China	ì	7839
763	Photostatic Copy of a Map published in China Postal album as far back as 1919 by the Directorate General of Posts in Peking		7841
764	Consists of Two Books of Maps	7841	
764-A	Excerpt therefrom		7842
765	Map of Manchuria published on p. 10 of an official magazine, the "Tokyo Gazette" in July 1939	7844	
765-A	Excerpt therefrom		7845
766	Memo of the Red Army General Staff History Department of 12 March 1946 under the heading "On the Provocative Attack of the Japanese in the Nomongan Area in 1939"		7845
767	Text of Negotiations Between Molotov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs for the USSR and the Japanese Ambassador to the USSR, TOGO, Shigenori, dated 9 June 1940		7849

Of

EXHIBITS

Pros. Def. No. No.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
768	Minutes of Interrogation of Accused HIRANUMA, Kiichiro, dated 24 Apr 1946	7853	
768-A	Excerpt therefrom		7853
769	Record of the Talk between Ribbentrop with OSHIMA, the Japanese Ambassador in Berlin on 23 Feb 1941	\$	7867
770	Telegram from Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army to the Vice-Minister of War dated 17 Jan 1938 (No. 1)		7871
771	Ribbentrop's telegram to the German Ambassador in Tokyo dated 10 July 1941		7874
772	Group of Certificates (attached to the above document and document 2608)		7874
773	Message of Foreign Minister SHIGEMITSU, Mamoru, Broad- cast on 11 Dec 1943 to Berlin on the occasion of the Second Anniversary of the Japanese-German- Italian Agreement	7876	
773-A	Excerpt therefrom		7877

Of

EXHIBITS

Pros. Def. No. No.	Description	For Ident. Ev	In vidence
774	Excerpt from Decision on Japanese Foreign Policy taken at the Four Ministers Con- ference on 7 Aug 1936, as characterized by the Letter of the Defendant SHIRATORI to ARITA dated 4 Nov 1935	7878	
774-A	Excerpt therefrom		7882
775	Excerpt from KIDO's Diary dated 22 Aug 1939		7889
776	Minutes of Interrogation of Defendant OSHIMA dated 22 Apr 1946	7890	
776-A	Excerpt therefrom		7891
777	Text of the Speech made by Foreign Minister MATSUOKA over the Radio on the day of the Conclusion of the Pact (27 Sept 1940)	7899	
777-A	Excerpt therefrom		7899
778	Record of Ribbentrop's Talk with OSHIMA on 24 June 1942	7903	
778-A	Excerpt therefrom		7903
779	Excerpt from the Minutes of the Imperial Conference on 2 July 1941		7904

Of

EXHIBITS'

(cont'd)

Pros. Def. No. No.	<u>Description</u>	For Ident.	In Evidence
780	Telegram sent from Tokyo to Berlin by Ott, German Ambassador to Japan on 23 Mar 1931		7909
781	Excerpt from KIDO's Diary, an entry dated 21 June 1941		7910
782	Letter from the Japanese Embassy to the German Minister for Foreign Affairs dated 26 Aug 1939 re: the Conclusion by Germany of the Non-Aggression Pact with the Soviet Union		7911
783	Excerpt from the Record of Ribbentrop's Talk with MATSUOKA on 27 Mar 1941		7915
784	Excerpt from Ciano's Diary, entry dated 19 Sept 1941		7922
785	Record of Ribbentrop's Talk with Mussolini in the presence of Ciano on 22 Sept 1940	7924	
786	Symposium of Documents of the Japanese Ministry for Foreign Affairs in which there is a Telegram of KURUSU, Japanese Am- bassador in Berlin to MATSUOKA on 28 Sept 1941 (no. 1251)	7929	
786-A	Excerpt therefrom		7929
787	Proceedings of the Privy Council held on 18 Dec 1940 (Text of MATSUOKA's Speech at this meeting)	7930	

Of

EXHIBITS

Pros. Def. No. No.	<u>Description</u>	For Ident.	In Evidence
787-A	Excerpt therefrom		7931
788	Telegram of Ott in Tokyo sent to Berlin on 4 Oct 1941 (no. 1974)	7933	
788-A	Excerpt therefrom		7933

Wednesday, 16 October, 1946 1 2 3 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST 5 Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan 8 The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, 9 at 0930. 10 11 Appearances: 12 For the Tribunal, same as before. 13 For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 14 For the Defense Section, same as before, with 15 the exception of: WILLIAM J. M CORMACK, who has 16 resigned as Counsel for the Accused MINAMI, Jiro; 17 A. W. BROOKS, Counsel for the Accused OKAWA, Shumei and 18 KOISO, Kuniaki, is now also Counsel for the Accused 19 MINAMI, Jiro. 20 21 (English to Japanese, Japanese to 22 English, Russian to English and Japanese to 23 Russian interpretation was made by the 24 Language Section, IMTFE.) 25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

DR. UZAWA: Mr. President, with the Tribunal's permission I should like to report that American Counsel McCormack for the accused MINAMI, Jiro, has resigned and has been succeeded by Captain Brooks.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Tribunal please, yesterday afternoon Mr. Logan objected to the evidence of one of the Russian witnesses and the Tribunal then heard Mr. Golunsky on the objection. Response was being made by Mr. Logan while I was waiting to be heard. For some reason the ruling of the Court went far beyond the mere overruling of the objection or motion and made a far-reaching statement concerning a great scope of the law in the case. This came as a surprise. It was on this general question —

THE PRESIDENT: I am not here to be lectured by you. You choose your language more carefully when you are addressing this Court. I am not in the least concerned with anything that surprises you.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I am sorry, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: You have no right to be at that lectern on such a point.

I have to give whatever reasons are necessary

19

8

10

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

for any decision of this Tribunal, and I shall give those reasons without regard to the opinions of individual counsel for the defense or for the prosecution.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Your Honor, I don't think we are talking about the same thing. I say it was a surprise to me or I would have joined Mr. Logan in his motion if I had anticipated what the Court was going to say, that is all. May I explain a little bit further?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I don't see what there is to explain, really. Your conduct doesn't call for any explanation. You have come with no objection.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I have a specific objection, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it is too late. If
the point arises again you may have an opportunity,
but I can't allow you to reoren a decision of the
Tribunal. I am sure if I did every colleague I have
would resent it, quite rightly.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Vell, due to the extent of the general proposition yesterday, my question to the Court that I had to propose was only that the matter remain open until I would have an opportunity to make an objection to it thoroughly this morning.

THE PRESIDENT: If the occasion arises later

to make an objection you may do so andyou will be fully heard.

General Tadevosyan.

the Tribunal, as evidence, the extract from the record of Litvinov's talk with SHIGEMITSU of August 31, 1938, which will show that the Japanese government had to admit that their demands had no grounds and accepted the Soviet proposal of the re-demarcation of the frontier basing on the Khunchun agreement.

I tender in evidence prosecution document No. 2230.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: If your Honor please, I am not objecting to the admission of this document in evidence except on grounds that I have before, but what I am objecting again is to the comment by the prosecutor, which seems to me unfair comment. The document does not show at all what he says. This has been going on now for two weeks; warnings have been given; it seems to do no good. The defense must make these objections and I confess that I don't like to.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you can trust the Tribunal to ignore any excessive comment, Major Furness. After all, as I have reminded you frequently,

we are not a jury, although discharging the functions of one. When we come to consider our verdict we will pay regard only to the evidence and disregard the 3 comments so far as they are not warranted by the evidence. Then the defense feel provoked to rise again because 6 comments have been made excessively, I hope they will 7 keep in mind what I have just said. It will save a lot of time. 9 GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: I quote from Litvinov's 10 talk with SHIGEMITSU of August 31. 11 I tender in evidence prosecution document 12 No. 2230. 13 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 14 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 15 No. 2230 will be given exhibit No. 759. 16 (Whereupon, the document above referred 17 to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 759 and 18 received in evidence.) 19 GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: I quote from the said 20 record of the talk: 21 "SHIGEMITSU stated that the Japanese party 22 has no objections to setting the treaties concluded 23 by the representatives of China and Russia as prin-24 ciple of the work, but the Japanese party understands 25 that additional documents may be submitted to the

committee, and they will be considered by the committee, to make its work more successful."

1

2

3

4

I skip three paragraphs and quote further: "Here I added that to make it clearer I would make this point more precise. The Hunchun agreement and other documents signed by the representatives of Russia and China should be necessar. ly considered by the committee. The Japanese and Manchurian party cannot say: 'We cannot accept this or that treaty.' As to the other documents submitted by one of the parties, the opposite party may say that she does not accept this or that document. In this lies the difference between the 13 hature of the agreements signed by the representatives 14 of Russia and China and other documents. I think I made 15 myself clear and the Ambassador probably understood me. .

SHIGEMITSU answered that he understood it in 16 17the following way: The treaties and agreements concluded 18between Russia and China are set up as principle of the 19committee work, and other additional documents are taken minto consideration -- this is for the committee to 21decide in what manner to take them into consideration. 20 onsidering all that he stated that we had no differ-23ences."

Thus, as is clear from the report of the Frontier Corps Department of the People's Commissariat

1 for Home Affairs of the U.S.S.R. of Merch 21, 1946, 2 which document has been presented by us to the Tribunal, 3 exhibit No. 573: 4 "The State border in this sector has been 5 guarded and is being guarded by border troops in 6 accordance with the protocol of 1886." MR. FURNESS: Again we request that we be 8 furnished with the entire document from which excerpts 9 in exhibit 759 have been taken. 10 MR. GOLUNSKY: I understood yesterday that 11 we had an agreement with the defense about all the 12 documents of this type, to furnish them complete 13 copies as soon as mechanically possible. 14 GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: Now, if the Tribunal please, 15 I shall pass to presenting documents which will prove that in 1939, in the Nomongan area, Japan, without declaring war, attacked the territory of the Mongolian 18 People's Republic, bound with the Soviet Union by a 19 treaty of alliance. 20 I shall present to the Tribunal a number of 21 documents which will prove that this attack had been 22 planned and prepared long before it was actually launched. 24 If the Tribunal please, I shall first of all 25 tender for identification document No. 2627A, which

is the article, "Japan's Mission in the Showa Era," by the accused ARAKI, Sadao, former War Minister of 2 Japan. The article was published in 1933 by the 3 Social Education Association in the "Miscellaneous People Literature Minao Bunko" No. 516. I offer in evidence an excerpt from this document. 6 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 7 No. 2627 will receive exhibit No. 760 for identification 52 only. 9 (Whereupon, the document above referred 10 to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 760 for 11 identification only.) 12 THE PRESIDENT: The excerpt is admitted on 13 the usual terms. 14 CLERK OF THE COURT: And the excerpts there-15 16 from, marked prosecution document 2627A, will receive 17 exhibit No. 760A. 18 (Whereupon, the document above referred 19 to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 760A 20 and received in evidence.) 21 GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: On pages 28 and 29 ARAKI 22 wrote as follows: 23 "Japan does not want such an ambiguous area 24 as Mongolia to exist next to her sphere of influence. 25 Mongolia, by all means, should be Mongolia of the East,

and she should be given independence, peace and tranquillity. It would be outrageous to leave her to be preyed upon by other countries. The ambiguousness of Mongolia's position will be the source of troubles of the whole East. The problem of Mongolia may become a far greater obstacle to the proclamation of the Imperial Way than the Manchurian problem. Therefore, it will be necessary to make it clear at this point, that we have a resolute determination to crush any country that turns against the Imperial Way."

I shall further present to the International Military Tribunal for identification, a document which was referred to in the opening statement of Minister Golunsky, Associate Prosecutor for the U.S.S.R. This document is the record of the talk of ITAGAKI, Seishiro, who at that time was Chief of the Kwantung Army Headquarters, with Ambassador ARITA, of March 28, 1936, document No. 1466.

I offer in evidence an extract from this document.

TO

25

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 1466 has been given exhibit No. 761 for identification; and the excerpt therefrom, bearing the same
document No., will be given exhibit No. 761-A.

No. 1466 was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 761 for identification; and the excerpt therefrom was marked prosecution's
exhibit No. 761-A and received in evidence.)

(Whereupon, presecution's document

GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: Three years prior to the events in the Nomongan Area, ITAGAKI expounded the designs of the Japanese Military to seize the Mongolian People's Republic.

I quote three excerpts from the aforesaid document:

"THE PROBLEM OF OUTER MONGOLIA

"Outer Mongolia is a secret zone. The Czarist Regime had already stretched out its evil hand and had made this secret zone a protectorate.

"Since the revolution the Government of Soviet Russia has adopted the same policy and succeeded in winning over this country. As is quite evident if we look at the map of East Asia, Outer Mongolia is of importance from the point of view of Japanese-Manchukuoan influence

today because it is the flank defence of the Siberian Railroad which is a connecting line between Soviet territory in the Far East and in Europe.

"If Outer Mongolia be combined with Japan and Manchukuo, Soviet territory in the Far East will fell into a very dangerous condition, and it is possible that the influence of the Soviet Union in the Far East might be removed almost without fighting.

Therefore, the Army aims to extend Japanese-Manchurian power into Outer Mongolia by all means at hand and as its first step, to establish normal and complete diplomatic relations between Manchukuo and Outer Mongolia regarding the latter as an independent country, without considering Soviet Russian will. They are furthering their work against Western Inner Mongolia, to be explained next, to conciliate the Outer Mongolian race."

14.

"But if Outer Mongolia should set it at naught our moderate intentions as stated above and should invade Manchukuo with Soviet Russia, the Imperial Army is ready to hold fast to each foot and inch of territory with firm resolution in light of the spirit of the protocol between Japan and Manchukuo.

"THE PROBLEM OF INNER MONGOLIA

"Part 3.

"Western Inner Mongolia (Chahar and Suiyuen Province) and the zone to the west of these are of great value for executing the continental policy of Japan.

"Should the said zone be placed in the sphere of Japanese and Manchurian influence, it means that will be a base for pacification of their brothers of the same race in Outer Mongolia, more-over that the influence of Soviet Russia which comes from HSING-KIANG, as well as a land link between Soviet Russia and China, will both be blocked, fundamentally frustrating the plan of the Third International movement against China. In a passive sense the said zone will be the shield against Communication of the establishment of peace and

order in Manchukuo. If the said zone should not be placed in the sphere of Japanese and Manchurian influence, but left to natural tendencies, it is obvious that Bolshovization will immediately close in on the western frontier of Manchukuo through Outer Mongolia and Sinkiang district.

"From the above standpoint the Imperial army has been furthering its work with regard to Western Inner Mongolia for several years. The conditions in the past and at present are described in a separate sheet. The Imperial Army is resolved to further its work overcoming all sorts of obstacles."

The contents of this document show that the blow against the Mongolian People's kepublic was considered by the Kwantung Army also as a blow against the Soviet Far East.

The Japanese had been preparing for this for a long time. The evidence presented by my colleagues, Mr. Hyder and Mr. Parkinson, concerning the Japanese military's aggression in Manchuria and in Mongolia bear witness to the fact that both in Manchuria and in Inner Mongolia, the Japanese extended the sphere of their aggression every year, dreaming of annexing the Mongolian People's Republic to Inner Mongolia.

I refer to exhibit No. 212, page 2705 of the record of the Tribunal, of July 30, 1946; exhibit No. 273, page 3676 of the record of August 9; and exhibit No. 274, page 3688 of the record of August 12.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Tribunal please, I wish to object to the prosecution commenting upon the evidence before the case is terminated, and it seems he is going far afield here.

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, we do this for the sake of the record, so the Members of the Tribunal could have in one place a condensed list of all the evidence relating to this question,

7 8

although it has been submitted to the Tribunal at different times and is scattered all over the record.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is not to the typing in of the material tendered by Messrs. Hyder and Parkinson but to observations that preceded that.

The decision on the objection is the same as that hitherto given, and the objection is upheld to that extent. Only such comment as is warranted by the evidence adduced or to be adduced must be indulged in. We must have a bare minimum of description and explanation of evidence to be adduced. I can only keep on repeating that there is no need for repeated objections.

The excessive and unwarranted comment, if any, is made in Russian before we know it is made. We have to wait for the English. And, in the circumstances, all I can do on behalf of the Tribunal is to assure the defense that we will disregard any excessive and unwarranted comment and will confine ourselves to the evidence; and I trust that will be sufficient for all purposes.

Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, if we abide by a blanket ruling as to all this excessive comment, as we must, of course, if that is the Court's desire,

we will have a record running along for hundreds of pages showing no objection on our part. And, if and when the record comes before the Reviewing Authority, they very well might say, "You were satisfied at the time. You made no objection."

THE PRESIDENT: There is no need for you to object. The Court itself will take the stand that you are inviting us to take. We need no invitation. I have said that repeatedly. I do ask you to remember, we are not a jury; we are eleven judges trained in the law, trained to give decisions, trained to weigh evidence.

As I said before, and you seem to forget, these comments are made in Russian before we know they are made. We do not know until we hear the English what has been said by the Russian prosecutors.

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, could I say something additionally and very briefly?

THE PRESIDENT: I have not stopped you yet.

MR. SMITH: What we are afraid of is the complexion and appearance of this record if it comes before a Reviewing Authority. Now, every trial man in this room knows that in a record as voluminous as this, it is literally impossible for any Review-

1 2

ing Authority to read every word; and the danger is that the man reading this record for the Supreme Commander and digesting the evidence will seize on a catchy expression such as the Russian prosecutors use in introducing these exhibits.

Certainly, your Honor has the power of control of counsel and to strike out these excessive remarks. What the last prosecutor said, about all this evidence that he is trying to tie up shows a long plan dream, I submit is a final summation and has nothing to do with this stage of the case.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If your Honor please, I suggest that the prosecution be directed to give us a copy of what they are going to say, and we will object to it before they say it, if the objection is warrantable.

THE PRESIDENT: I appeal to the prosecution to give no occasion for all these objections that are wasting our time and getting us nowhere.

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, we try to comply with the wishes of the Tribunal and have shortened our comments to the very minimum, and I do not know where the defense counsel have seen the long comments. Today, only one sentence was said by Major General Tadevosyan which might be described

as a comment.

THE PRESIDENT: General Tadevosyan.

GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: Now, if the Tribunal please, I shall refer to witness TANAKA's examination before the Tribunal on July 6, 1946. His testimony corroborated the facts stated in the above mentioned exhibit No. 212. I refer to page 2039 and the pages that follow of the record. My colleague, Colonel Ivanov, has presented prosecution document No. 751, exhibit 719, Manchurian Confidential File, 1938.

I shall submit to the Tribunal, as evidence, part of this document, the Kwantung Army Commanding General's "Representation of Opinion on the Establishment of a New China" (document No. 751-C).

This document discloses that on January 24, 1938, UEDA, Kenkichi, Commanding General of the Kwantung Army, "in accordance to the new situation" submitted to the War Minister SUGIYAMA his opinion "in regard to the establishment of a new China as seen from the standpoint of the Kwantung Army."

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 751-C will be given exhibit No. 762.

(Whereupon, the document above

mentioned was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 762 and received in evidence.) 2 GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: I shall quote a passage 4 from this top secret recommendation under the heading of "Outline of the Policy for the Establishment of a New China." I quote from page 3 of the English text: 7 "Although the establishment of a new China lies 9 ultimately in organizing a central government in North 10 China, we shall respect the wishes and conventions of the 11 native people exclusively and make them contribute to the 12 preparation for the fast approaching war with Soviet Russia. 13 At the same time we shall make them concentrate on post-14 war adjustment made necessary by the Incident. Thus, it 15 is our main purpose to build an ideal self-governing body 16 of the united provinces which will be fit for the present state of affairs and suitable for the demands of national 18 defence, peace and order, and the political situation of 19 various provinces." 20 The evidence I shall further present will show 21 that in order to find a pretext for an attack on the Mongolian People's Republic, the Japanese militarists resorted to a groundless and arbitrary alteration of the

map regarding the frontier line between Manchuria and the

Mongolian People's Pepublic:

I respectfully call the attention of the Tribunal to the photostatic copy of a map which I now present in evidence. It was published in China Postal album as far back as 1919 by the Directorate General of Posts in Peking. (Document No. 1858)

1 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 3 No. 1858 will receive exhibit No. 763. 4 (Whereupon, the document above 5 mentioned was marked prosecution's exhibit 6 No. 763 and received in evidence.) 7 GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: Lake Buir-Nur and the 8 Khalkhin-Gol River are shown in the second and the 9 third sections at the bottom of the map. The fron-10 tier line (thick black line) is shown running through 11 the middle of the lake and east of the Khalkhin-Gol 12 River, crossing the latter at its effluxion and turn-13 ing southeast. 14 Now I tender in evidence two maps of Man-15 churia published in 1934 and 1935 by the Japanese 16 authorities themselves, document No. 1754. 17 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 18 No. 1754, consisting of two books of maps, will be 19 given exhibit No. 764 for identification only. 20 (Whereupon, prosecution's document 21 No. 1754 was marked prosecution's exhibit 22 No. 764 for identification). 23 THE PRESIDENT: The map last tendered is 24 admitted on the usual terms. 25 CLERK OF THE COURT: And the excerpt therefrom, bearing the same prosecution number, 1754, will receive exhibit No. 764-A.

(Whereupon, the document above mentioned was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 764-A and received in evidence.)

GENERAL TADEVOSYAN:

enlarged sections of these maps. It is expressly clear from the first map published in 1934 by the Kwantung Government-General, that the frontier passes east of the Khalkhin-Gol River, i.e., the frontier line on this map runs in the same place as in the Chinese map which I presented just now. Consequently, several years prior to the attack on the MPR the Japanese Authorities themselves recognized that fact. A photostatic copy of the section of the map is being brought to the attention of the Tribunal so that the Court may see for themselves that the above statement is true.

And here is the second map of Manchuria published in 1935, i.e., in the following year by the Eureau of the Kwantung Province to which the Kwantung Government-General was subordinated. I respectfully call the attention of the Tribunal to the photostatic copy of a section of this map. On this map the border-

3 4

line is already shown as running along the Khalkhin-Gol River and in some places even west of the river, the whole of Lake Buir-Nur being included into the Manchoukuo territory.

Now there is one more map which I submit to the Military Tribunal as evidence. This is a map of Manchuria published on page 10 of an official magazine, "the Tokyo Gazette" in July, 1939 (Document No. 1505), i.e., when the battle in the Nomongan area was already raging.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I should like to point out to the Tribunal that on exhibit 764-A the second map purports to have been published in December, 1935, but the certificate describes these as excerpts from a book published in 1934. It, therefore, appears that either a proper certificate should be provided or the second map should be disregarded.

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, this objection is the result of the technical delay of our processing division which processed the first excerpt and did not process in time the second one. The original Japanese certificates are both with the original maps filed with the Tribunal.

I am handing now to the defense the copies of the English translation. Of course, if they insist on their rights, we can wait until tomorrow in producing these maps.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, there is a separate certificate for the December, '35 map, is that so?

Document No. 1505, which has been tendered, is admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 1505 will receive exhibit No. 765 for identification; and the excerpt therefrom, bearing the same

document No., will receive exhibit No. 765-A.

(Whereupon, the "Tokyo Gazette" for July, 1939 was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 765 for identification; and the excerpt therefrom, prosecution document No. 1505, was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 765-A and received in evidence.)

GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: I respectfully call the attention of the Tribunal to the fact that on this map the borderline runs all along the western bank of the Khalkhin-Gol River.

Now I shall submit to the Military Tribunal as evidence a memo of the Red Army General Staff
History Department of March 12, 1946, under the
following heading: "On the Provocative Attack of
the Japanese in the Nomongan Area in 1939." (Document No. 2231)

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 2231 will receive exhibit No. 766.

(Whereupon, the document above mentioned was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 766 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: I quote a few excerpts

from section two on page 1 of the English text:

"The Japanese carried out all-round and thorough preparation for the attack, using their customary method of provocations. Since January 1939 the Japanese armed detachments began to systematically violate the state frontier of the MPR.

"There were about thirty violations of that kind. Simultaneously a large group of regular troops of the 23 infantry division and Bargut cavalry regiments was concentrated on the sector of the frontier in this area, which from the Mongolian side was guarded only by a small frontier outpost, stationed west of the Khalhin-Gol river (see Appendix N 3 and N 4)."

Now I skip five paragraphs on page 2 and quote further:

"On May 14 at 6 hours the mounted Japanese and Barguts 300 men strong violated the MPR frontier in the district of the 7th outpost, seized Dungur-Obo and came onto the eastern bank of the Khalhin-Gol river. During this day the Japanese constantly appeared over the MPR territory.

"On May 15, at 12 hours 45 minutes five
Japanese light bombers made a raid on the 7th outpost.
They dropped 52 bombs from the height of 800 metres

and fired from machine guns during low flight. result 2 tsiriks were killed and 19 wounded. Prior to the raid three planes conducted air reconnaissance. The frontier guards saw that 700 cavalry men and 3 trucks with infantry soldiers were concentrated on the eastern bank of the Khalhin-Gol river. beginning from May 11, 1939 the Japanese actually started hostilities using regular Japanese and Bargut units to this purpose.

"All these provocative actions showed clearly that the Japanese were preparing the largescale operations and were striving to seize the territory of the MPR."

Now I pass to the top of page 4 and read the first full paragraph:

"During the battles which took place in May, the Japanese could not attain their aims and, having suffered great losses, strengthened their preparation for a still larger operation, striving to seize territory and wipe out the Soviet and Mongolian forces. By the end of June 1939, the Japanese concentrated all the units of the 23rd Infantry Division, part of the 7th Infantry Division, two tank regiments and Bargut cavalry regiments in the battle area. All these units were reinforced by artillery taken from other

12 13

11

14 15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

units of the Kwantung Army. Not fewer than 150 airplanes of the Japanese Air Forces were also concentrated in this area.

"The enemy planned to smash our defense suddenly and quickly and to break with its main forces through to our rear lines of communication."

I quote another small excerpt on page 4 of 1 the English text, last paragraph: 2 "Our troops, launching an offensive in 3 August 1939, routed the Japanese invaders, cleared 4 the MPR territory of the enemy and took on the 5 defensive along the frontier line." 6 If the Tribunal please, I stop quoting 7 8 from this document to return to it later on. 9 Finally, after protracted negotiations be-10 tween Molotov, People's Commissar for Foreign Af-11 fairs for the USSR, and the Japanese Ambassador to 12 the USSR, the accused TOGO, Shigenori, the latter 13 signed an agreement on June 9, 1940 which text with 14 a map attached is now submitted to the Military Tri-15 bunal as evidence, prosecution document No. 2147. 16 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual 17 terms. 18 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 19 No. 2147 will receive exhibit No. 767. 20 (Whereupon, the document above 21 mentioned was marked prosecution's exhibit 22 No. 767 and received in evidence.) 23 THE PRESIDENT: We will recess now for 24

fifteen minutes.

25

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal For the Far East is now resumed.

GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: I quote from the text of the agreement between Molotov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. and the Japanese Ambassador TOGO of June 9, 1940.

"The frontier line between the Mongolian People's Republic and Manchoukuo in the above mentioned area runs as it is shown on the map published by the Red Army General Staff in 1935, scale 1:200,000, which is attached to the present agreement."

The evidence tendered hereinafter corroborates the aggressive aims of the Japanese Military, who initiated undeclared wars against the U.S.S.R. in 1938 and 1939.

We have submitted in evidence the affidavit of former Ataman Semyonov, G.M., interrogated on April 11, 1946 (Exhibit No. 668). I quote an excerpt from page 14 of the English text:

"In 1938 the Japanese General Staff decided to reconnoitre the power of the Red Army in the Far East by battle, and opened hostilities in the Lake Hassan district. Major YAMAOKA, a General Staff Officer, came to Dairen from Tokyo to see me, with a special task to inform and have me prepared

8

1

9

11 12

10

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25

for the events which were taking place. YAMAOKA warned me that I with the whiteguard emigrant units had to be ready to participate in the operations as, provided the operations in the Lake Hassan district progressed successfully, large forces of the Japanese Army would be thrown into the Soviet Primorye, and the whiteguard emigrants units would be used for the consolidation of the occupied territory.

"Then the Red Army liquidated the Japanese break-through into the Soviet territory in no time. and peace negotiations were started, the Japanese Command initiated the preparation for a new diversion in the direction of the M.P.R. and the Soviet Zabaikalve.

"I was to take part in this operation, and, in case of a successful break-through, I, with the whiteguard emigrants units, had to begin an advance in Inner Mongolia through the Mongolian People's Republic into the Soviet Union. The Japanese pointed out that the main strategic direction of the Japanese blow was the Zabaikalye which in the opinion of the Japanese was the narrow outlet through which went the supplies for the Soviet Primorye.

"Major-General ANDO in his talk with me said that the Japanese reckoned that in case they succeeded

4 5

in intercepting the Red Army communications at Lake Baikal, the Soviet Far East would be annexed from the Soviet Union."

We shall now present in evidence a document which will show that fighting against Mongolian People's Republic, the U.S.S.R., the Kwantung Army and its Commanding General acted not without the knowledge of the Japanese Government.

I submit to the Tribunal for identification the minutes of interrogation of accused HIRANUMA, Kiichiro of April 24, 1946(Prosecution document No. 4122). I tender in evidence a short excerpt from this document in order to prove that the defendant HIRANUMA, who at that time was Japan's Prime Minister and though aware of the military operations of the Japanese Army against the Mongolian People's Republic and the U.S.S.R., did not take any measures to stop the hostilities."

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 4122 will receive exhibit No. 768 for identification

and the excerpt therefrom bearing prosecution No.

4122-A will receive exhibit No. 768-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 768

for identification; the excerpt therefrom 1 being marked prosecution's exhibit No. 2 768-A and was received in evidence.) 3 GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: During the interrogation 4 held on April 24, 1946, HIRANUMA testified as 5 follows: 6 What aim did the Japanese Government 7 pursue giving its approval of the Attack of the 8 Japanese troops against the Mongolian People's 9 Republic territory in the Nomongan area? 10 "A. The attack took place not during my 11 premiership. Therefore I know nothing about it. 12 13 110. You were Prime-minister from January 14 1939 till August 1939, weren't you? 15 "A. Yes. 16 "hen did the Nomongan Area incident take no. 17 place? 18 " A. I don't remember. 19 110. I remind you that the attack of the 20 Japanese troops against Mongolian People's Republic 21 in the Nomongan area took place in May 1939, i.e., 22 when you were Prime-minister of Japan and GEDA. 23 Kenkiti was Commanding General of the Kwantung Army. 24 "A. It might be so, but, as I have already 25 said, the military acted independently, without

reporting their actions to the government and, therefore, I knew nothing. 2 "Q. Then when was it that you learned about 3 the said attack? "A. After the opening of the hostilities. 5 110. Only then? 6 Yes, only after the opening of hostilities. 7 8 Tell us, who reported the events to 9 you, what were the contents of the report, and why 10 for 3 months did you not take measures to check the 11 actions of the Japanese troops attacking the Mongolian 12 People's Republic? 13 "A. I received information about the outbreak 14 of the incident from War Minister ITAGAKI, Seishiro. 15 I spoke about the cessation of hostilities many times. 16 but the Military circles were of different opinion. 17 "Q. Did you as Prime-minister of Japan give 18 anybody orders that hostilities be ceased? Whom and 19 when did you give such orders? 20 "A. As the Supreme Command of the army 21 was not controlled by the government I could not 22 give such orders, but I expressed, my views on the 23 necessity of ceasing hostilities to War Minister 24 ITAGAKI orally. 25

"C. Did you suggest that, because you thought

the Japanese attack on Mongolian People's Republic 1 was wrong? 2 "A. My opinion was that all disputes had 3 to be settled by means of negotiations, and not by 4 way of military operations. 5 "C. In other words you considered those 6 actions wrong? 7 Yes, I considered those actions wrong. 8 During the Nomongan incident, did you 9 as Prime-minister submit to the Emperor your suggestion 10 11 that hostilities be ceased? 12 "A. No, I did not submit my suggestion to 13 the Emperor. 14 "O. "hat was ITAGAKI's reply to your suggestion 15 of the cessation of hostilities? 16 "A. Since ITAGAKI's view was at variance 17 with mine, he considered that hostilities should 18 continue." 19 MR. USAMI: My name is USAMI. I appear for 20 the accused HIRANUMA. 21 THE PRESIDENT: Counsellor USAMI. 22 MR. USAMI: If your Honor please, I draw your 23 attention to the document just tendered and read by 24 the prosecution. This is a statement of HIRANUMA 25 taken by the Russian interrogator. The actual statement

was made in the Japanese language. The record was taken in the Russian language through an interpreter.

My client had considerable difficulty in understanding what the interpreter said to him and a greater difficulty in making himself understood by the interpreter. I understand no Japanese shorthand notes were taken.

The notes have never been read to him before. Now my client claims that there are numerous misinterpretations existing which make the meaning of his statement quite different from what he wished to convey and there is one rather serious omission. If the Tribunal thinks fit I shall point out these errors and omissions; if not, I shall not.

THE PRESIDENT: Counsellor USAMI, you will be able to point out, or the accused whom you represent will be able to point out when he is giving evidence, what you regard as defects in the taking of this interrogation and in the recording of it. We can hardly have that question decided now. I know there are some questions of fact that are determined on these matters but this is not one. No question of admissibility is fairly raised by anything you have said. If you had alleged the confession was not voluntary we would have to determine it as a preliminary question.

MR. USAMI: It is not my intention to enter any objection and I do not say there has been any compulsion or coercion. The statement was made quite voluntarily.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not understand the counsellor USAMI to have taken any objection. If he has it is overruled.

GENERAL TADEVOSYAN: I have submitted to the Tribunal a Memo of Military History Department of the General Staff of the Red Army (Prosecution document No. 2231, exhibit No. 766). Appendix No. 12 to the Memo discloses the aggressive aims which were set forth at that time before the Japanese Military Command in the war against the Mongolian People's Republic and the U.S.S.R.

On September 5; 1939, the Commander of the 6th Japanese Army issued a proclamation. I shall now quote from page 6 of exhibit No. 766, the "Proclamation of the Commanding General of the 6th Army" of September 5, 1939:

"Although the order to reform the 6th Army was issued before, I must now state with sorrow that the realization of the glorious task of defense of the northwest area failed because the order was not carried out. The Army was cast into a whirlpool of irregular

8

9

10

11

12

13

21

23

24

25

war on the frontier between Manchuria and Mongolia.

Such control of actions on the front continued for more than ten days into the present. Due to the brave and resolute actions of all the units under Lieutenant-General Kamatsubara chaos in the course of battles was diminished. Now the Army is preparing in the Dzindzin Sume area for a new offensive.

"The Commanding General of the Kwantung Army decided this autumn to help us by sending the welltrained troops stationed in Manchuria, he transfers them to the place of the future battle, places them under my command and plans urgent measures to be taken to settle the conflict. The circumstances are now such that it is clear that the matter is beyond the limits of a mere frontier conflict. We are now waging a sacred war in China and any changes in the conflict under the circumstances of the complicated inner and outer situation acquire great state importance. army has only one way to carry out its actions, that is, to make the army unanimous and consolidated and immediately strike a crushing blow at the enemy to annihilate its growing insolence. At present the preparation of the army is being successfully carried on. The army will meet the coming autumn by finishing with one blow this mouse-stirring and will proudly show to the world

the might of the selected Imperial troops. The officers and soldiers have a deep understanding of the present circumstances. All men of the army from privates to high level are full of brave and decisive spirit and are sure of victory. The army is always ready to crush and destroy the enemy anywhere having a deep faith in its first marshal, the Emperor."

It is a well-known fact that the Japanese aggression failed to accomplish that, and their designs upon the territory of the Mongolian People's Republic as well as their further plans to invade the U.S.S.R. territory proved a complete failure.

I call it to the Tribunal's attention that the Commanding General of the Kwantung Army lost his position and resigned due to the failure of the Nomongan operation as is clear from exhibit No. 723, prosecution document No. 2238, which was tendered by my colleague, Colonel Ivanov.

My colleague, Major General Vasiliev, will present further evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, Mr. Tavenner and his colleagues have already presented to the Tribunal evidence showing that Japan entered into a criminal conspiracy with Hitlerite

3 4

Germany and Fascist Italy against democratic states and participated in that conspiracy from 1936 to 1945.

I shall present evidence showing that one of the chief aims of the conspiracy was aggression against the Soviet Union and that Japan, in carrying out the obligations imposed on her by her participation in the conspiracy, prepared and as far as was possible for her, carried into effect plans of aggression against the Soviet Union, and in general provoked aggressive hostile acts against the U.S.S.R.

I shall begin to present evidence showing that the Anti-Comintern Pact was the first stage of Japan's conspiracy with Hitlerite Germany and Fascist Italy, and was essentially a military-political alliance of these aggressors directed against the democratic countries including the U.S.S.R. The text of the Anti-Comintern Pact with the protocol and the secret agreement appended to it have been presented to the Tribunal, exhibit No. 36.

To prove that the Anti-Comintern Pact enabled Germany and Japan to prepare for wars of aggression and then to achieve definite success in German aggression in Europe and Japan's aggression in Asia, and that the Anti-Comintern Pact is directly connected with the Tripartite Pact as links of one chain of conspiracy

8

9

10

11

12

against democratic states, I shall present in evidence excerpts from the record of the talk of Ribbentrop,

Germany's Foreign Minister, with OSHIMA, Japanese

Ambassador in Berlin, on February 23, 1941, prosecution document No. 531. It will be noted that other excerpts from the same document, prosecution document No. 531-A, were presented in the course of the previous phase of the trial and received exhibit No. 632-A.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Tribunal pleaseTHE PRESIDENT: You will be heard in good
time always. I would like him to finish his sentence
before I hear objections.

Yes.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Court please, I have listened here for a long time to the second opening statement by the Russian prosecution as to what they are going to prove in another German-Japanese coalition. It seems as though they are still carrying the matter too far, going back into another phase of the case, and it certainly is time that the defense make more strenuous objection and that the prosecution be admonished.

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, all these days I have been listening patiently to all those repeated objections of the defense on what they

13 14

15

1718192021

2324

22

call "comments of the prosecution." They have been continued in spite of several remarks by the President of this Court that everything exceeding the evidence presented would be disregarded. The honorable President of this Tribunal has several times pointed out that this is an international Tribunal which cannot be bound by the procedural rules of one of the countries represented at this Tribunal.

In the Soviet Union the prosecution as well as the defense is entitled when presenting evidence to tell to the Court how they understand the evidence they are presenting and what they expect will be proved by this evidence. Of course, it is for the Court to judge whether the assertions are well founded. We are not using this rule to the full extent as we would have used it in Russia.

As I have already stated before the recess we have gone already a long way to limit our remarks to the very bare minimum. Now I request that the Tribunal inspect the record of what General Vasiliev said in order to deline whether there is anything except the explanation to the Tribunal, what part of our case he is going to present and on what question the evidence which he is going to submit to the Tribunal will bear. It is half a page long and hardly can be described as

(

--

a second opening statement. In my opinion everything he has said is not only admissible but necessary for the clear understanding of the evidence he is going to present. That is why I request that the Tribunal consider the record of this part of the speech of Major General Vasiliev and tell us whether in the opinion of the Tribunal there is anything inadmissible.

(

-

~?

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal's concern is to observe the Charter. We are not influenced by the procedure in the courts of any of the countries represented here where the procedure of those countries differs from that stated in the Charter. Charter says there shall be a concise opening statement, and we insist that opening statements shall be concise: and, further, that they shall be opening statements, that is to say, a statement of the evidence about to be adduced, and nothing beyond that except a brief explanation of the point of the evidence or the purpose of adducing it. We will carry out our duty as indicated by the Charter. I can say nothing more. That observation is made to both sides on this. I ask for the cooperation of the prosecution and of the defense in carrying out our duty. propose to make some observations on what has occurred in Germany in this matter, but we are not slavishly bound by what took place there. We are not justified in looking at what happened in Germany when our own Charter is so clear.

21

General Vasiliev.

23

24

MR. SHIMANOUCHI: Counsel SHIMANOUCHI, for the accused, OSHIMA.

25

I object to the tendering of prosecution

document No. 531. I have three reasons for my objection. My first reason, the certificate of source with respect to this document is insufficient. There is a certificate attached issued by the United States prosecution, but this is nothing more than one certifying his own document. Even if the United States prosecution may be correct on the matter, it is very doubtful whether the photographic copy, No. 2929, is the same and identical as the document 531. My third reason, it is unclear who and under what status made the record of this conversation. These are my reasons for the objection.

THE PRESIDENT: Minister Golunsky.

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, the document has already been admitted by the Tribunal, and excerpts from it have been tendered in evidence by Mr. Tavenner, exhibit 632-A. General Vasilier was about to quote a part which was not quoted by Mr. Tavenner.

MR. SHIMANOUCHI: It has just been said that document 531 has been admitted, but in my understanding this document has not been admitted. I think that some German telegram with respect to German Foreign Minister Von Ribbentrop and OSHIMA was accepted, but not a record of the talk between them.

THE PRESIDENT: The document, the excerpt is 1 admitted on the usual terms. 2 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 3 No. 531 will receive exhibit No. 769. (Whereupon, the above-mentioned 5 document was marked prosecution's exhibit 6 No. 769 and received in evidence.) THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief Prosecutor. MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, I respectfully 9 request the Court's permission to make an inquiry as 10 to its ruling because it pertains to another phase of 11 the case, and I might state what we consider to be the 12 culminating and most important phase of this entire 13 prosecution. If I understood the President correctly, 14 he stated that the opening statement should be strictly 15 16 confined to a recitation of the facts that were in-17 tended to be tendered in evidence, or the evidence it-18 self with that strict limitation. I am aware --19 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Keenan, before you go 20 further, you misapprehend what I said. I will not 21 repeat it; I will ask the shorthand writer to read what 22 I said. 23 MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, if I might be 24 permitted --

THE PRESIDENT: I do not want you to

3

4 5

6

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

misrepresent me. I want to correct immediately any misrepresentation of what I said.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President --

THE PRESIDENT: You go on and address me and the Court on the assumption that I omitted to say something which I said. I ask the shorthand writer to read out what I said.

(Whereupon, the official court reporter read the President's statement as follows:)

"The Tribunal's concern is to observe the Charter. We are not influenced by the procedure in the courts of any of the countries represented here where the procedure of those countries differs from that stated in the Charter. The Charter says there shall be a concise opening statement, and we insist that opening statements shall be concise; and, further, that they shall be opening statements, that is to say, a statement of the evidence about to be adduced, and nothing beyond that except a brief explanation of the point of the evidence or the purpose of adducing it. We will carry out our duty as indicated by the Charter. I can say nothing more."

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: Shall I continue? THE PRESIDENT: No, that is all I want read.

MR. KEENAN: May I proceed?

THE PRESIDENT: You may.

MR. KEENAN: I am asking the Court, in the light of the statement which I have heard in toto and thoroughly understand, if we may not in this extensive trial, when we reach what we believe to be the culminating point, refer to what we believe to be the issue raised, briefly to present that to the Court, and explain briefly the relation of the facts which we intend to offer in evidence to the issues as they exist and in accordance with the prosecution's theory?

In other words, Mr. President, the prosecution believes that it would be helpful to the Court at a given stage to succinctly bring before the Court its theory of prosecution as it believes the issues to be in existence at that time, and attempt briefly to state how the facts it intends to produce, or the evidence it intends to produce, fits into that theory and to refrain from argument but merely to relate it. We wish to know whether we have that permission, or if that would be in violation of the Court's instruction.

THE PRESIDENT: I said you could add an explanation of the purpose of introducing the evidence.

I cannot limit the right more accurately than that, and that is what I understand to be the meaning of an opening statement.

General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I shall quote in evidence an excerpt from this talk in which the following words of Ribbentrop were recorded, numbered 1 on the English copies of the document distributed to the Court:

"Japan's friendship which enabled Germany
to arm after the anti-commutern pact was concluded.
On the other hand, Japan was able to penetrate deeply
into the English sphere of interest in China. Germany's
victory on the continent does now, after the conclusion
of the three-power pact, bring great advantage for
Japan."

I shall read another excerpt later on in connection with some other problem in order to preserve logical sequence. I respectfully call to the Tribunal's attention that the telegram sent from Tokyo to Berlin on May 4, 1939 and offered in evidence (prosecution document No. 4043, exhibit No. 503) contains the following statement of the defendant HIRA-NUMA which he, as the then Prime Minister, addressed to Hitler in connection with the negotiations concerning the conclusion of the Tripartite Pact:

"....In this splendid hour it is a confirmed joy to me to see how effective the Anti-Comintern agreement between our two countries proves itself in the execution of the tasks placed before them."

I present in evidence the telegram from Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army to the Vice-Minister of War dated January 17, 1938 (No. 1) which proves that after the conclusion of the Anti-Comintern Pact a special air route was established between Germany and Japan which was kept strictly secret.

The entire document No. 751 along with other materials containing the same telegram has been presented for identification by Colonel Ivanov (exhibit No. 719).

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 751-D will receive exhibit No. 770.

(Whereupon, the above mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 779 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I shall read an excerpt from this telegram:

"Regarding air-line connections between

Japan and Germany general prohibition cannot be fully

expected, because the publication of newspaper accounts

is prohibited only as regards the negotiation itself in spite of agreement that the absolute secret should be strictly kept from other countries."

Now I shall pass over to showing that the Anti-Comintern Pact was first of all directed against the U.S.S.R.

The Anti-Comintern Pact has a secret agreement appended to it which is directly aimed against the U. S. S. R. The text of the agreement has been presented to the Tribunal (exhibit No. 480).

I call it to the attention of the Tribunal that the secret agreement provides that if one of the parties is the object of an unprovoked attack or an unprovoked threat of attack by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the other High Contracting State obligates itself.

Quote: "...not to carry out any measures which would in their effect, be apt to relieve the position of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." (Article 1 of the Secret Agreement).

And in that case,

Quote: "....The High Contracting States will immediately consult which measures they will use to preserve their common interests." (Article 1 of the Secret Agreement).

)

The secret agreement provides for an unprovoked attack on voked attack and threat of an unprovoked attack on the part of the U. S. S. R. But I shall presently submit to the Tribunal the documents showing how the signatories of the Anti-Comintern Pact interpreted the terms "aggressor" and "aggression."

In evidence thereof I present Ribbentrop's telegram to the German Ambassador in Tokyo dated July 10, 1941, presecution document 707 -- sorry, a mistake -- presecution document 571. I ask the permission of the Court to present group certificates attached to this document and other document (document No. 2608).

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, I make the same objection as to source. This comes from the prosecution. We understand that if it is admitted it is admitted conditionally on the production of a proper certificate. In this case the source is the prosecution's office here in this building, and it is, therefore, even more objectionable than in the cases in the prior part of this phase. I am sorry, sir. I did not mean to misrepresent it, sir. It apparently comes from the Chief of Counsel of the prosecution in Germany, Nuernberg.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document No. 571 will receive exhibit No. 771, and the certificate relative to a number of documents will receive exhibit No. 772. (Whereupon, the above-mentioned documents were marked prosecution's exhibits Nos. 771 and 772, respectively, and received in evidence.) THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn now until half past one. (Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

D

u

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

MR. SHIMANOUCHI: I am Counsel SHIMANOUCHI.

I have a point on which I must apologize to the Court.

With respect to prosectuion document 531, exhibit

No. 732, the Russian prosecutor said that it had already been admitted by this Tribunal. As against this statement I said that I believed that it had not yet been admitted. During the noon recess I made a study of the court record of October 3 and I have found that my recollections were mistaken. Therefore, I beg to apologize to this Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt from a telegram No. 707 numbered 1 in the copies of the document, page 3 of the English text:

"I do not doubt for one moment that in the case of an outbreak of hostilities between America and Germany Japan will stand by her obligations resulting from the Tri-Partite Pact. Even today it can be regarded as absolutely certain that America is the sole

aggressor."

Other excerpts from this telegram bearing upon other issues will be read later on for the sake of preserving logical sequence.

I shall present as evidence of a peculiar distorted understanding of the term "aggression" a statement made over the radio on December 11, 1943, by the defendant SHIGEMITSU when he was Minister for Foreign Affairs on the occasion of the second anniversary of the Japanese-German-Italian military agreement. This statement was published in a symposium of Offical Announcements Concerning Foreign Relations, eighteenth year of Showa, 1943, which I simultaneously present for identification, document No. 1217.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document
No. 1217 will receive exhibit No. 773.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 773 for identification only.)

THE PRESIDENT: The excerpt is admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: And the excerpt therefrom, bearing the same prosecution documentary number, will receive exhibit No. 773A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred

to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 773 A and received in evidence.)

2

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote the following excerpt from this statement on page 5 of the English text:

)

7

8

10

11

"America and Britain, in their resolve not to
permit Japan to exist as a great power, resorted politically to their traditional policy of divide and rule and
economically straight to economic war by using as weapons
their monopoly of resources and their organized strength.
This War had been started by them long before Pearl
Harbor.

12

14

15

16

17

"During the past two years of the War, the forces of aggression, thanks to the irresistible might of our army and navy, have been driven out for the most part from the region of East Asia, although the task still remains of sweeping them off clean from the entire Asia."

18 19

20

21

Not long before the conclusion of the Anti-Comintern Pact, namely, on August 7, 1936, was held a conference of four ministers, Brime Minister, Foreign Minister, War and Navy Ministers.

22

I shall present in evidence an excerpt from the decision on Japanese foreign policy taken at this conference, as evidence of the Anti-Comintern Pact

23

24

having been directed against the U.S.S.R. which was determined by general attitude of Japan toward the U.S.S.R. at that time. The entire document, No. 1857, has already been presented for identification by Colonel Ivanov, exhibit No. 704. Therefore, if your Honor please, I confine myself to quoting this excerpt which should not receive a separate exhibit number.

I quote item 4, last paragraph on page 4:

"The developments in the European political situation have a great influence on the East Asia, and so Japan must exert every effort in bringing European powers to its advantage, especially in restraining the Soviet Union."

General policy of Japan in that period as regards the Soviet Union may be well characterized by the letter of the defendant SHIRATORI to ARITA dated November 4, 1935. The entire letter, together with another letter dated November 12, 1935, is presented for identification and the excerpts therefrom are offered in evidence, document No. 2419A.

No. 2419A will receive exhibit No. 774 for identification.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 774 for identification only.)

MR. NARITOMI: I have been standing at this "
lectern while the Soviet prosecutor was presenting
document 2419A to which I wish to raisean objection.
I should like to look at the original of this document.

THE PRESIDENT: It hasn't been tendered except for identification but an excerpt is tendered but not yet accepted.

MR. NARITOMI: I should now like to present my objection, sir. I have three grounds for my objection.

The first ground of my objection is that
the original document submitted to this Court has no
relation whatsoever to the real document and is not
in SHIRATORI's own handwriting. The original document tendered before this Tribunal is written on paper
bearing the marks of the National Policy Investigation
Association. According to witness YATSUGI, Kazuo,
who appeared at this Tribunal on the ninth of October,
the National Policy Investigation Association, according to this witness, was established in 1937. This
Information is to be found on page 6359 of the English
record of the proceedings of this Tribunal. But the
year in which it is to be found in this document is
November of the tenth year of Showa, 1935. Hence,
there is an inconsistency that this letter was written

Association two years before the establishment of the association. Therefore, it is clear from the document itself that this is not in SHIRATORI's handwriting. Therefore, there is no certificate certifying to the effect that the handwriting on this document and the handwriting on the document bearing the inscription or the imprint of the National Policy Association tendered in evidence is consistent. Therefore, the first ground for my objection is that there is no relevancy to the point that the original is written in SHIRATORI's own handwriting.

According to the attached certificate, it is said that the document was obtained from the Japanese Government. That is my second ground. If it is the case that the prosecution has misunderstood the National Policy Investigation Association is identical with the Japanese Government, then I would refer to the stenographic record of this trial on the date of 9 October giving the testimony of YATSUGI, Kazuo, who declared before this Tribunal that the National Policy Investigation Association was a private research organization, and his testimony is to be found on page 7374.

My third ground is as follows: that the addressee in the Japanese is written ARITA, Taikei,

2 1

which is rendered in English as just Mr. ARITA. Japanese the term "Taikei" is used only in case of an intimate relationship between the addressor and the addressee of letters and should be considered as meaning "brother" or some such friendly term. If exhibit ' No. 125, Personnel Records, are referred to, it is clear that SHIRATORI was Minister to Sweden in 1935 and at that time ARITA was Ambassador to Belgium. letter in question, having been exchanged between friends, it is difficult to understand how such a 10 letter could be found in the possession of the Japanese 11 Government and, therefore, it is difficult to under-12 stand why it can be said that this was obtained from 13 the Japanese government.

The three grounds which I have already given are my reasons for objecting to the tendering of the document unless the original handwriting or a photostatic copy thereof is tendered as evidence, or, if a copy of the original document, then a certificate authenticating the relevancy of this particular handwriting.

14

15

17

21

22

THE PRESIDENT: The learned counsel has not 23 disclosed a single ground for the rejection of the 24 document, although he has discussed it at great length. 25 The matters which he has mentioned may well be given

in evidence by the defense and may lead the Court, if they are established, to reject the document. The objection is overruled. Counsel must express their objections in much briefer terms. The document is admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 2419A will receive exhibit No. 774A. (Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 774A and received in evidence.)

DR. KIYOSE: May I further explain the point raised by counsel NARITOMI just before me?

The certificate attached to this document says that it was obtained from the Japanese Government, and the fact that the National Policy Research Association has been identified with the Japanese Government is a gross mistake.

THE PRESIDENT: There is no need, I cannot allow you, to attempt to reopen the decision. That would not be a ground for rejection of the document.

DR. KIYOSE: This is not an objection,
Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: There is no need to explain anything upon which we have already given a decision. You are out of order; I won't hear you further.

General Vasiliev, proceed.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Before reading the excerpts I call it to the Tribunal's attention that Mr. Tavenner has presented a number of documents proving that in those days the Japanese army circles were aggressive toward the U.S.S.R. The letter of SHIRATORI to ARITA presented by me proves that aggressive aspirations of the same kind existed among high officials of the Japanese Foreign Ministry as well.

I shall quote a few excerpts from this letter

on page 6 of the English text.

"What is most desirous for Soviet Russia at present, is to have peaceful and amicable relationships with the foreign powers. Therefore, countries which border Soviet Russia and who have any pending affairs that need be settled sooner or later with her, should never idle away this opportune time of today. At present there is no country on this earth except Russia that can become a real menace to Japan."

I omit a few lines.

"Fate have that the Slavs and the Yame to race must eventually fight each other for supremacy on the Asiatic continent. The question is not of the temporary change to be made in the state of affairs or the form of government in Soviet Russia. Thus taking a far-sighted view, I believe that adoption of a policy for an instantaneous removal of future calamity at this stage when they are comparatively impotent is a fact which should never be neglected by those who bear concern for the welfare of the people and nation. I am not saying that we should unreasonably force a war against Soviet Russia now. I am only saying that we should start negotiations with her with resolutions, not refusing war if it is inevitable, to shut her out completely from advancing into East Asia.

1 2

20

21

22

23

24

25

"Firstly, Russia should give up entirely her activities of Bolshevization in East Asia: abolish military armaments in VLADIVOSTOCK, etc.; complete withdrawal of her troops from OUTER MONGOLIA and HSINCHIANG, not stationing a single soldier in the area of LAKE BAIKAL; -- these shall be our minimum demands, and others, not to speak of the problems relative to fishing and the rights and interests regarding forestry. Problems regarding transfer of the northern half of SAGHALIEN at moderate prices are also included. In the future, purchase of the MARITIME PROVINCE OF SIBERIA must also be considered. These demands should be made with firm determination. There would be no possibility of success if we negotiate with such a generous attitude as was done at the negotiation on the purchase of the North Manchuria Railway.

"Now that we have already made up our determination of not refusing war if inevitable, diplomatic measures relative to this should be treated as early as possible. Since the relationship of Germany and Poland with Russia are in a same position as ours, there is no need for us to try and specifically weave understanding with them. Once the war breaks out they will surely rise on our side. The only trouble is England."

I continue to quote on page 10.

23

24

25

1

2

"(In short, at this time I keenly feel the necessity of the cabinet decision regarding the great object of the empire's diplomacy. I believe This object to be a drastic liquidation of relations with SOVIET RUSSIA. All diplomatic activities should be concentrated on this object. I believe that the CHINA problem and the disarmament problem are secondary considerations compared to this great object. The reformation of various internal affairs should also be limited within this phase and in line with Item 1. With this great problem in mind, internal and foreign relations should be adjusted for the time being and the trend of public opinion can be settled and the uneasiness can be swept away. Moreover, it is necessary that the liquidation of relations with SOVIET RUSSIA be thoroughgoing in order to sweep away the uneasiness not only for the present but to be rid of the fears and worries from the northwest forever. Therefore, it is natural that war may be unavoidable. It is needless to say that a diplomat should not talk rashly about such matters but I believe that if we miss this opportunity today, we will never have another opportunity to oust the Slav peril forever.) If we execute this today, I firmly believe that we can accomplish it thoroughly with minimum sacrifice and with least fear of

interference by third parties.

"First, if SOVIET RUSSIA advances at the present pace, it will not take ten years before she will become a very powerful country which we will not be able to touch."

I continue to quote on page 11.

"(Second, her weakness is said to lie in the manpower requisites, but Russians before the revolution have gradually died out and have been replaced by those) blind (Russians who have been inspired with communism from the kindergartens and do not know the existence of any other civilization. As time goes by, she will become so powerful in manpower also that we will not be able to overtake her.

"Third, in order to eliminate the menace of RUSSIA forever, it is necessary to make her a powerless capitalistic republic and to rigidly control her natural resources. However, when the foundation of the Communist Government becomes firm, the anti-revolution movement will not easily succeed even if she should be defeated in a war with a foreign country. At present, the chances are good.)"

MR. NARITOMI: Among the excerpts just read by the Russian prosecution, there is on page 7 of the English text, page 11 of the Japanese text, a

passage saying, "The only trouble is England." I think it proper that this should be rendered, "The only issue is England."

In addition to that, there are other passages which are similar to the one I referred to, for instance, the use of the word "ARITA Taikei," which is rendered into "Mr. ARITA" instead of "Brother ARITA," other passages which are improperly translated. I should like to take this matter up with the Language Arbitration Board later.

THE PRESIDENT: You are at liberty to do that without approaching the lectern. We will refer the matters to the Language Section.

General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILEV: For the sake of preserving logical sequence, I must call it to the Tribunal's attention that as is shown in the telegram of Ott, German Ambassador to Japan, dated August 25, 1939, No. 363, prosecution document No. 1381, exhibit No. 486M, which has already been presented by Mr. Tavenner, the Japanese Government headed by the defendant HIRANUMA filed a protest with Germany for her having concluded the Pact of Non-Aggression with the U.S.S.R. and broke off the negotiations that were being conducted concerning the conclusion of a military

alliance between Japan and Germany, giving as its reason that the Pact of Non-Aggression between Germany and the U.S.S.R. violated the secret agreement appended to the Anti-Comintern Pact.

The evidence presented by me will later on show that Germany's actions of concluding the Non-Aggression Pact with the U.S.S.R. were quite misunderstood by Japan. At present in order to emphasize that by this protest the Japanese Government admitted that the Anti-Comintern Pact was directed against the U.S.S.R., I shall present an excerpt from the entry of the defendant KIDO's Diary, dated August 22, 1939, document No. 1632-BB(1).

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 1632-BB(1) will receive exhibit No. 775.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 775, and was received in evidence.)

20

21

22

23

24

25

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt:

"9:00 a.m. - Had interview with the ViceMinister, the Chief of the Metropolitan Police, and
the Director of the Police Bureau. There was a report
that a Non-Aggression Pact has been concluded between
Germany and Soviet Russia. Was astonished at this
extremely treacherous act considering the existence
of the Anti-Comintern Pact and Secret Pact."

I present for identification the minutes of interrogation of the defendant OSHIMA, dated April 22, 1946, document No. 4121.

I offer in evidence a few excerpts from the minutes of interrogation.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 4121 will receive exhibit No. 776 for identification.

(Whereupon, the document above mentioned was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 776 for identification.)

THE PRESIDENT: The excerpts are admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: And the excerpt therefrom, bearing the same prosecution documentary number, will receive exhibit No. 766-A.

(Whereupon, the document above

mentioned was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 766-A and received in evidence.)
GENERAL VASILIEV:

I quote one of the excerpts dealing with the purpose of the conclusion of the Anti-Comintern Pact. This excerpt is numbered 1 in the copies submitted to the Tribunal:

"Q What was the basic aim of Germany and Japan when they concluded the anti-Comintern Pact?

"A The Basic aim of Germany and Japan when they concluded the anti-Comintern Pact was to arrest the growth of communism.

"Q Specifically against what countries was this Pact directed?

"A When this pact was concluded Russia was meant in the first place. Moreover the Pact provided for the prevention of the spread of communist influence in other countries as well.

"Q Usually such Pacts are concluded not against ideas, but against a definite country. Are we correct if we say that the anti-Comintern Pact was directed against the Soviet Union?

"A The anti-Comintern Pact as a whole was not directed specifically against Russia. It was directed against communism in general. However it followed

from the Pact that in case of Russo-German war

Japan should not aid Russia, and also that Germany

should not aid Russia in case of a Russo-Japanese

war."

The other excerpts from the minutes of interrogation of OSHIMA, for the sake of preserving logical sequence, will be read later on in connection with other issues.

If the Tribunal please, in conclusion to this part of my statement I shall mention some of the most important generally known events which took place when the Anti-Comintern Pact was in action prior to the conclusion of the Tripartite Pact. The mention of these events in my statement is necessary as they characterize the growth of prerequisites for aggression and the first steps of real aggression against the USSR on the part of Germany and Japan as participants of the Anti-Comintern Pact. Following the example of my American colleagues I shall use the book "Events Leading up to World War II," chronological history, 1937-1944, official publication of the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, 1945 (Dec. No. 223):

I call these facts to the attention of the 1 2 Tribunal. Correction: I ask the Tribunal to take 3 judicial notice of these facts. July 1937: The beginning of the Japanese 4 large-scale aggression in China. (p. 124, entries of 7, 8 July and subsequent days of July) 6 7 December 1937: The Japanese attacks on the 8 British and American ships on the Yangtze River. (p. 9 139, entry of December 12, 1937) 10 February 1938: The recognition of Manchukuo 11 by Hitlerite Germany and Hitler's congratulations to 12 Japan on her victory in Manchuria. (p. 145, entry of 13 February 20) 14 March 1938: The seizure of Austria by Germany. 15 (p. 147, entry of March 13 and subsequent days) 16 October 1938: German occupation of the Sude-17 tan region in Czechoslovakia. (p. 167, entry of 18 October 10) 19 March 1939: The seizure of Czechoslovakia by 20 Germany. (p. 180, entry of March 16 and subsequent days) 21 September 1939: German attack on Poland. . 22 (p. 210, entry of September 1 and subsequent days) 23 Besides these I shall mention two more signi-24 ficant dates of this period on which evidence has al-25 ready been presented by my colleague General Tadevasyan:

July 1938: The Japanese aggression against the USSR on the Lake Hassan.

May-September 1939: The Japanese aggression against the Mongolian People's Republic and the USSR on the Khalkin-Gol river.

7 8

MR. FURNESS: May I ask what the prosecutor is quoting from?

THE PRESIDENT: He is asking us to take judicial notice of certain events. It is immaterial what he cuotes from.

MR. FURNESS: He is giving page numbers, and we would like to know what book it is. We would also like to have notice of motions of this type so that we could be prepared for them. I object specifically to any taking of judicial notice of Japanese aggression in the region of Lake Khasan which is one of the issues before this Court.

THE FRESIDENT: Is that the only one you object to, Major Furness?

MR. FURNESS: No. I object to them all.

THE PRESIDENT: Some of them cannot be objected to, such as the seizure of Austria, the war against Poland. Those things cannot be objected to reasonably; but others, of course, are debatable.

These matters were, up until now, satisfactorily arranged in Chambers before me. If my memory serves me rightly, there was an agreement on a large number of these matters in Chambers, and an Order was made.

MR. FURNESS: You asked me which we object

to. A series goes in. I cannot, offhand, first notice of this, remember exactly which those events are, and which I object to. Also, they are not just events; they are characterized as they are stated.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, I do not believe this phase of the case asked or made any motion in Chambers with respect to the Court taking judicial notice of any matters. It was the preceding phase that did that. But, you see, here the prosecution were afraid to go a little further in asking the Court to take judicial notice of matters -- for example, the first one they quoted here, they said something about a wholesale invasion by Japan of China. Now, that is characterization which does not come under judicial notice.

THE PRESIDENT: I said some were debatable, but others were not.

MR. LOGAN: The last two that the prosecution mentioned, about the two incidents --

(Whereupon, a discussion was had off the record.)

MR. GOLUNSKY: I just want to make clear to the Tribunal that the prosecution did not ask the Tribunal to take judicial notice of the events near

Lake Khasan and Khalkhin-Gol River.

MR. LOGAN: As a practical suggestion, your Honor, maybe we can take the record and agree on it and submit a revised list tomorrow.

MR. GOLUNSKY: All right.

THE PRESIDENT: Pending your agreement, if you can reach one, we will not take judicial notice of any of those matters. If you fail to agree, we will decide.

General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Now I shall present evidence showing that the Tripartite Pact which finally embodied the conspiracy of Japan, Germany and Italy as a military-political alliance of these aggressors against democratic countries was also directed against the Soviet Union.

I shall offer in evidence a few documents proving that the participants of the Tripartite Pact even in their public speeches made no secret of the fact that the conclusion of that Pact divided the world into two camps between which war would inevitably be waged.

To prove this I shall present in evidence the text of the speech made by Foreign Minister MATSUOKA over the radio on the very day of the conclusion of the Pact (September 27, 1940). Doc. No.823.

```
This speech can be found in the symposium of official
1
   announcements of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs,
2
3
   1940, which I simultaneously present for identifi-
4
   cation.
5
6
7
3
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 1 No. 823 will receive exhibit No. 777 for identification. (Whereupon, the document above mentioned was marked prosecution's exhibit 5 No. 777 for identification.) 6 THE PRESIDENT: Document No. 823 is admitted 7 on the usual terms. 8 CLERK OF THE COURT: The excerpt therefrom 9 will receive exhibit No. 777-A. 10 (Whereupon, the document above 11 mentioned was marked prosecution's exhibit 12 No. 777-A and received in evidence.) 13 GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt from 14 the speech on page 2 of the English text: 15 "With the conclusion of this treaty, Japan's 16 responsibilities as leader of the new order in Greater 17 East Asia becomes even greater than before. Although 18 it is the intention of the Japanese Government to 19 fulfill these responsibilities always by peaceful 20 means, there is no telling whether there might not 21 arise occasions and circumstances calling for a momen-22 tous decision on the part of our nation. Our future 23 is beset with countless obstacles and difficulties, 24

which, it must be fully realized, no ordinary effort

will be sufficient to surmount."

7 8

To further prove, I shall present in evidence the text of the statement of the defendant TOJO, the then Prime Minister, on the occasion of the declaration of war by Germany and Italy on the U.S.A. and of the conclusion by Japan of the military agreement with Germany and Italy. This statement was published in the newspaper Asahi on December 12, 1941, document No. 2462.

(Whereupon, Mr. Blewett approached the lectern and began to speak.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: (Continuing) I have presented to the Tribunal in evidence Ribbentrop's telegram to the German Ambassador in Tokyo, dated July 10, 1941.

THE PRESIDENT: Now, wait a minute, Mr.

Blewett. I want to hear all that is said. I cannot listen to two people at once. I have to hear
every word that is said. I cannot listen to two
people at once. I will give you an indication when
you may talk. You are always in time. I will see
to that.

Mr. Blewett.

MR. BLEWETT: If your Honor please, I object to the introduction of the last document. It seems to be an excerpt from a newspaper. A search of the record does not reveal that the prosecution has asked the Tribunal in accordance with the rules of procedure for the introduction of this document, this apparently being an excerpt from a newspaper or other publication.

THE FRESIDENT: Minister Golunsky.

MR. GOLUNSKY: I cannot tell now precisely whether this document was included in our application about the rule 6b(1). But I call the attention of the Tribunal to the fact that the whole text of TOJO's statement has been translated and processed, and the newspaper from which it has been translated is in evidence with the Clerk of the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, until we are satisfied that rule 6b(1) has been complied with, we cannot receive the document. The document is not admitted. The excerpt is not admitted.

GENERal VASILIEV: I pass over to the next document.

I have presented to the Tribunal in evidence Ribbentrop's telegram to the German Ambassador in Tokyo, dated July 10, 1941, prosecution document No. 571,

2 4

3

4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this record.

No. 1372-A will received exhibit No. 778.

(Whereupon, the document above

I shall quote an excerpt from this telegram showing how the participants of the Tri-Partite Pact considered its wide international application as an instrument of aggression. (This excerpt is numbered 2 in the copies of the document on page 3 of the English text).

I quote: "With the collapse of Russia. the position of the Tri-Partite powers in the world will be so gigantic that the question of the collapse of England, that is, the absolute annihilation of the British Isles, will be only a question of time. The occupation of those of the remaining positions of the British Empire important to the Tri-Partite Powers will then be faced by an America completely cut off from all the rest of the world ."

Concerning the character of the Tri-Partite Pact as an instrument of aggression, I shall present for identification a record of Ribbentrop's talk with OSHIMA on June 24, 1942, document No. 1372-A.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

I shall present in evidence excerpts from

mentioned was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 778 for identification.) THE PRESIDENT: This is admitted on the 3 usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: And the excerpt therefrom will receive exhibit No. 778-A. 6 (Whereupon, the document above mentioned was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 778-A and received in evidence.) GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote Ribbentrop's 10 11 words. (This excerpt is numbered 1 in the copies of the document.) 12 13 "It was the strength of the Tri-partite 14 powers that they had proceeded on the offensive from 15 the outset, never waging a defensive war as England 16 has done thus far. 17 "Ambassador OSHIMA stated that he agreed to 18 what the German Foreign Minister had said in every 19 respect and asked him to be convinced that neither 20 he nor his government believed in conducting the war 21 defensively but that victory could only be secured 22 through further attacks." 23 For the sake of preserving logical sequence,

the second excerpt will be read later on in connect-

ion with some other issue.

25

U

I present a document showing that the aggressors, to justify their actions if they did not arise out of the contents of the Tri-partite Pact, referred to the "spirit" of the Fact while realizing their plans.

This document is an excerpt from the minutes of the Imperial Conference on July 2, 1941 (document No. 1652). It will be noted that the excerpts from the minutes were presented by Mr. Tavenner and received (exhibit No. 588).

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 1652 will receive exhibit No. 779.

(Whereupon, the document above mentioned was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 779 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt from the minutes (item "c," Section II on page 2 of the English text):

"c. Though the spirit of the Tri-partite Axis will form the keynote of our attitude toward the German-Seviet War, we shall not intervene for a while, but take voluntary measures by secretly preparing arms against the Soviet Union."

2

3

5

6

8

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

For the sake of preserving logical sequence, another part of this excerpt will be read later on.

I shall pass over to presenting evidence proving that the Tri-partite Pact was also directed against the USSR.

In order to make it more convenient for the Tribunal to follow the documents presented by me in ? dealing with that issue, I shall divide the presentation of documents in accordance with two periods of the negotiations concerning the conclusion of the Tri-partite Pact. The first period -- prior to the conclusion of the Non-aggression Fact between the USSR and Germany (August 1939), when, as I am going to show by presenting documentary evidence, the Japanese Government made no secret of the fact that the Tri-partite Fact must first of all be directed against the USSR. The second period, up to the time of the actual conclusion of the Pact (September 1940), when, as I am going to show by presenting documentary evidence, the Pact as a matter of fact, continued in full measure to be directed against the USSR as well as against other democratic countries but that was camouflaged due to the considerations of the moment.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

(To the Russian interpreter) Finish what the

prosecutor said before I addressed Mr. Cunningham.

(No response).

Mr. Cunningham.

RUSSIAN INTERPRETER: To show that in the first of these periods, according to the opinion of the Japanese Government, the forthcoming Tri-partite Pact must be directed against the USSR, I shall present in evidence a telegram sent from Tokyo to Berlin by Ott, German Ambassador to Japan, on March 23, 1939, No. 121 (document No. 4043-E).

THE PRESIDENT: You are ahead of him. The Russian prosecutor did not make that last observation, if I recollect.

RUSSIAN INTERPRETER: Correction, please:
The Russian prosecutor did not make that last statement.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Tribunal please, I would like to object to any further evidence on the part of the Russian phase of the prosecution on the question of the Tri-pertite Fact except as it relates particularly and peculiarly to the Russian phase of the case, first. Second, many of these documents and much of the comment of the prosecution is cumulative, is repetitious, and is cluttering

up the record. Third, the one phase of the case has already been devoted to that particular subject, and that matter is closed, and it seems as though the record on that subject should be closed.

.20

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, there was a special agreement between the Soviet section of the prosecution and Mr. Tavenner's section that Mr. Tavenner, in his presentation, would avoid presenting the evidence specifically relating to the relations between the Soviet Union and the Axis Fowers. And the Soviet Union being one of the principal victims of the conspiracy, we certainly claim our right to present evidence to this Tribunal on the subject of this conspiracy.

As to the evidence being cumulative, that is for the Tribunal to judge when the evidence becomes cumulative.

THE PRESIDENT: The Court is not bound, of course, by agreements between different sections of the prosecution. In fact, we will ignore such agreements except in so far as they are consistent with the proper presentation of the prosecution's case. We cannot say the agreement is inconsistent with the proper presentation of the prosecution's case.

The objections are overruled. We will recess now for fifteen minutes. (Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: To show that in the first of these periods, according to the opinion of the Japanese Covernment, the forthcoming Tripartite Pact must be directed against the U.S.S.R., I shall present in evidence a telegram sent from Tokyo to Berlin by Ott, German Ambassador to Japan, on March 23, 1931, No. 121, document No. 4043-E.

THE PRESIDENT: 1939, is it not? Yes, 1939. Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 4043-E will receive exhibit No. 780.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 780 and was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt from the telegram:

"I hear from well informed Japanese press source that the Japanese conference of the five ministers under the presidency of the Prime Minister had decided at two o'clock tonight after a discussion lasting several hours, to take up diplomatic negotiations with Germany for the purpose of

8 9

also against third powers. The same was demanded by
the Italian Government. The Navy had recommended
limitation on Russia."

There is the following entry concerning

concluding a military treaty directed against Russia.

Parts of the Army advocated a further military treaty

the question that interests us in Ciano's diary dated March 8, 1939, that has already been presented in evidence in another phase of the trial, prosecution document No. 1418, exhibit No. 499. I respectfully remind the Tribunal that this entry runs as follows:

"I see the Japanese Ambassador. He confirms what Attolico wrote concerning the Japanese reply on the Tripartite Alliance. Many reservations and the intention of regarding the Pact as exclusively anti-Russian."

I shall present as evidence characterizing the policy conducted by the then Prime Minister HIRANUMA toward the U.S.S.R. an excerpt from KIDO's Diary, an entry dated June 21, 1941, concerning the circumstances in which HIRANUMA resigned the post of the Prime Minister, document No. 1632-W-54.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 1632-W-54 will receive exhibit No. 781.

4 5

No. 781 and was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt:

"In the case of the HIRANUMA Cabinet, the er who had emphasized to the Emperor the neces

referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit

(Whereupon, the document above

Premier, who had emphasized to the Emperor the necessity of a national policy to look upon the Soviet Russia as our hypothetical enemy, could not help keenly feeling the responsibility because this hypothetical enemy, Soviet Russia, had concluded a treaty with Germany."

I shall present in evidence a letter from the Japanese embassy in Berlin to the German Minister of Foreign Affairs dated August 26, 1939, containing a protest against the conclusion by Germany of the Non-aggression Pact with the Soviet Union, document No. 4050-B.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 4050-B will receive exhibit No. 782.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 782 and was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I shall read the document:
"The Japanese Embassy has the honor to inform

the Foreign Office, by order of the Japanese government, of the views of the latter in regard to the
recently concluded pact of non-aggression and consultation between the German government and the
government of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics,
as follows:

of non-aggression and consultation recently concluded between the German Government and the Government of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics as running counter to the secret appended agreement to the Agreement against the Communist International.'"

To show that in that stage of the realization by Germany of her aggressive plans in Europe it was advantageous for her to conclude the Pact of Non-aggression with the U.S.S.R., which she could immediately put aside as soon as according to the opinion of the Hitlerite clique the pact would hinder the next stage of aggression, and that Japan was well aware of that, we have two documents. The first document -- Proceedings of the Privy Council, July 3, 1941, in which is recorded MATSUOKA's statement concerning the ratification of the Franco-Japanese Protocol, document No. 1077. This protocol was presented to the Tribunal in the course of the previous

3 4

5

7

9

8

10

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

25

phase and received exhibit No. 637. Therefore, if your Honor please, I confine myself to quoting this excerpt which should not receive its separate exhibit number.

I quote MATSUOKA's statement, page 3 of the English text, second paragraph from the end:

"Two years ago Germany, facing the imminent crisis of a war with Britain, concluded a treaty with the Soviet Union as a temporary expedient lest the latter should be won over to Britain's side. At that time Germany explicated to Japan that this was an unavoidable disposition, and explained that her real intention was to detest and suppress, when opportunity presented itself, not only the Soviet Union's aggressive principle, but also the ideology embraced by the country. It seemed that the Soviet Union also knew the circumstance very well and planned to strike Germany after waiting for a favorable time. The reasons for starting the war have been published by both governments, but, after all, the Non-Aggression Treaty between Germany and the Soviet Union was but a temporary expedient to both of them."

The second document dealing with the same issue is an excerpt from the record of Ribbentrop's talk with MATSUCKA on March 27, 1941, document No. 4005-B.

It will be noted that the other excerpts from the same document were presented to the Tribunal in the other phase of the trial and received exhibit No. 578.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Tribunal please,
I do not remember the Court ruling on the last objection I made concerning the repetitious evidence on this Tripartite Pact in German-Japanese relations.

THE PRESIDENT: I said the objections were overruled.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I want to further object for the reason that this last document did not have one reference to the relations of Japan and Russia but only those of Japan and Germany and this was all covered in the collaboration between Japan and Germany phase of the case. Most of these documents are the same documents that we looked at in that phase of the case and the prosecution is repeating itself here.

of allowing the case of the prosecution to be presented in phases. To present each phase, and in a manner intelligible to the Tribunal, it is necessary to repeat some of the evidence; rather, I should say, to recall the Court's attention to some of the evidence. The objection is overruled.

Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 5005 -- correction, No. 4005-B will receive exhibit No. 783.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 783 and was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I duote a passage numbered 1 from the excernt presented by me in evidence, page 2 of the English text:

"Germany has concluded her well-known treaties with Russia. Ambassador OSHIMA knows how these treaties were made. Germany had at that time the desire to conclude a pact with Japan. Due to the situation in Japan it had not been possible to carry out this desire. On the other hand, the storm clouds of the war appeared more and more threatening in Europe and since the pact,

Italy-Japan-Germany was unfortunately not possible at that time for the signing of which the Reich Foreign Minister had been, as Ambassador OSHIMA knows ready for six months on order of the Fuehrer, Germany had to decide upon the pact with Russia in view of the approaching war."

Another excerpt will be read by me in connection with some other issue.

I shall present in evidence the following excerpt from the minutes of interrogation of the defendant OSHIMA dated April 22, 1946, concerning the Tripartite Pact and its having been directed against the U.S.S.R., prosecution document No. 4121, exhibit No. 776-A. The excerpt is numbered 2 on pages 2-3 of the English text:

"Question: Describe the history of negotiations carried on in 1938-1939 concerning the conclusion of a military alliance between Japan, Germany and Italy.

"Answer: Approximately in June 1938 I received from the Japanese General Staff the documents which set before me a task of probing in Germany the possibility of concluding a military alliance with Japan in virtue of which Germany would be under obligation to enter into the war with the Soviet Union in case the latter attacked Japan and vice versa that Japan would be

_ 1

under obligation to enter into the war with the Soviet Union if the latter attacked Germany. In that time I was a military attache. At the beginning of July 1938 I visited Ribbentrop for the purpose of probing in a private manner whether Germany had any such intentions. I told Ribbentrop that I had an idea of concluding a consultative Pact between Japan and Germany, i.e., a Pact in virtue of which in case of conflict with Russia, the party which became subject to attack should consult the other party concerning the forms of aid the latter party should render to the party which became subject to attack. Just at that time Ribbentrop was leaving as he had his summer vacation. He told me that if a military alliance was to be concluded it should be a complete but not a halfway alliance. The obligation to hold consultations is a halfway obligation and Hitler was against such halfway Pacts and therefore, we could talk only about a complete defensive alliance in virtue of which the contracting parties should without reservations enter into the war with the adversary which attacked one of the contracting parties. Secondly, Ribbentrop told me that Germany would like to have a military alliance directed not only against Russia but also against the other countries which might attack Germany and Japan,

namely America, France, England, etc. I told him that the extension of that Pact to other countries, besides Russia, would depend on the degree of readiness of our army and navy for the war against those states. I told him that such an extension of the Pact would be very difficult for Japan. To this Ribbentrop replied that Gemany would not ask us to do the impossible, and that all the particulars of the behavior of the contracting parties in case of such. a conflict could be discussed after the conclusion of the Pact. I received a telegram confirming that Major General KASAHARA forwarded my message to the leading military officers. All of them concurred in the idea of concluding such a Pact and reported to the council of five ministers which consised them of Prime Minister KONOYE, Foreign Minister UGAKI, War Minister ITAGAKI, Minister of the Navy, YONAI and Minister of Finance IKEDA. The council of five ministers also approved of the idea of concluding such a Pact, and I received a telegram from the General Staff offering me to continue the negotiations concerning the conclusion of the Pact, but bearing in mind that, that the military alliance should be mainly directed against Russia and all other countries which Germany had in view should be mentioned in the Pact as

minor objectives.

1 2

21 22

objective mentioned in the treaty, all other countries should be minor objectives, and the entry of Japan into the war against other countries could take place only if those countries were infected with communism.... The divergency of views between Japan and Germany led to further negotiations marking time, and practically the Pact was not concluded in 1939. This continued till the conclusion by Germany of a Pact of non-aggression with the Soviet Union on August 23, 1939, as a result of which further negotiations concerning the conclusion of a military alliance between Germany, Japan and Italy were discontinued."

"Through ITO we received an instruction

from our government. The basic idea of that instruc-

tion was as follows: 'Russia should be the main

I shall present in evidence the following documents connected with the second period of negotiations concerning the conclusion of the Tripartite Pact and showing that the forthcoming Pact actually continued to be directed against the U.S.S.R.

First of all, I respectfully call it to the Tribunal's attention that Mr. Tavenner presented in evidence document which received exhibit No. 541, decisions made by the conference of the Prime Minister

and the Ministers of War, the Navy and the Foreign
Affairs on 4 September 1940 and by the liaison conference on 19 September 1940 on the strengthening of
Japan-Germany-Italy Axis. In these decisions item 3 of conditions of political understanding is formulated
in the following way:

"Item 3. Japan and the two countries of Germany and Italy will cooperate in maintaining peace with the Soviet Union and inducing the Soviet Union to bring her policy into line with the common ground of the two contracting parties. In addition, an understanding will also be reached with respect to consultation as to the action to be taken in the event of a danger of either Japan or Germany and Italy entering upon a state of war with the Soviet Union, if, in the course of negotiations with Germany and Italy, it turns out that such desire is entertained by the two countries."

I shall offer in evidence an excerpt from Ciano's Diary, entry dated September 19, 1940, document No. 1418-A. The entire Ciano Diary received exhibit No. 499 for identification only.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, we object to this excerpt on the ground that it is entirely

1 2 3

22 23

 immaterial and irrelevant to any issues in this case and in effect that it purports to set forth the conversation between Ribbentrop and Count Ciano regarding the effect of the guaranties which Germany made to Rumania which, I submit, are not binding on these accused.

THE PRESIDENT: Minister Golunsky.

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, since we are trying to prove a conspiracy between Japan, Germany and Italy, it is our contention that whatever any of the participants of this conspiracy said at the moment when the conspiracy was concluded is ... relevant to the issue.

MR. LOGAN: May I answer that, if your Honor please. As I understand the Indictment, the conspiracy is between these accused, not between any countries.

extends to the accused and other individuals. Ribbentrop, I suppose, will be claimed to be a co-conspirator.
This excerpt is a statement attributed to Ribbentrop.
It is offered as evidence of the conspiracy. There is a part here relating to Rumania but it has not been read. The document is admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 1418-A will receive exhibit No. 784.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 784 and was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt from the diary: "Arrival of Ribbentrop." I omit three lines.

"In the car he immediately speaks of the surprise he has in his portfolio; this is the Japanese military alliance which is to be signed in a few days in Berlin. He believes that this stroke will have a double edge. Against Russia and against America."

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, I think by omitting that line the prosecution has created a misconception of what the sentence last read means.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, and I think that probably there will be a misconception if that appears in the transcript as it stands now. I think you should read more of this. The whole of the first part might be read, except, of course, the second sentence.

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, the interpreters have not got the full text. If it is agreeable to the Tribunal, we will read the whole paragraph after tomorrow morning.

THE PRESIDENT: I could read it actually, and it will go into English and Japanese, and that is all we are concerned with.

Omitting the second sentence, the first paragraph of the entry reads:

"Arrival of Ribbentrop.

"In the car he immediately speaks of the surprise he has in his portfolio; this is the Japanese military alliance which is to be signed in a few days in Berlin."

I omit the next sentence. Well, I will read it. I think some of my colleagues want it read.

"The Russian dream vanished forever in the

22

23

24

halls of the Bolvedere at Vienna after the guarantees to Rumania were made. He believes that this stroke will have a double edge. Against Russia and against America. The threat of the Japanese fleet will keep the latter from making any move. I express a different opinion: The anti-Russian guarantees are all right; the anti-American note which will induce Washington to increase her commitments to Britain is not so good." The end of the paragraph. 0 General Vasiliev. 10 GENERAL VASILIEV: I present for identifi-11 cation the record of Ribbentrop's talk with Mussolini 12 in the presence of Ciano on September 22, 1940, docu-13 ment No. 4011, on the Tri-Partite Pactbeing directed 14 against the U.S.S.R. 15 16 I present in evidence an excerpt from this 17 record. 18 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 19 No. 4011 will receive exhibit No. 785 for identification 20 only. 21 (Whereupon, the above-mentioned document 22 was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 785 for 23 identification only.) 24 MR. LOGAN: With respect to 4011, your Honor --

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

-0

MR. LOGAN: With respect to this 4011, we object to it on the grounds it is immaterial and irrelevant to any of the issues in this case as it refers to a report of conversation between Mussolini, Count Ciano, and von Mackensen, with respect to whether or not a Spanish delegate should be invited to be present at the ratification of the treaty.

We submit that it is not only immaterial and irrelevant, but it is also cluttering the record with minor details which might very well be omitted.

THE PRESIDENT: Minister Golunsky.

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, we are presenting these documents into evidence in order to prove that the participants of the tri-partite pact, notwithstanding what they were stating publicly, at the moment the pact was concluded very well understood that it was directed against the Soviet Union.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is upheld. The document is rejected.

General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I pass on to the next document. Mr. Tavenner has already presented in evidence the outline of MATSUOKA's speech at the meeting of the committee of the Privy Council held on September 26, 1940 (Prosecution Document No. 1202, exhibit No. 550).

4 5

In connection with the question I am dealing with, I call the Tribunal's attention to the following passage in this outline, page 2 of the English text, line 4 from the top.

"....But even if Germany and Italy could subjugate British Isles now, the war for the destruction of the whole British empire would be no easy matter, moreover, they will have to cope with two great influences -- what may be called Anglo-Saxon Kingdom or Bloc, consisting of America and surviving parts of the British empire, and Soviet Russia strengthened still further by the present war"

Article 5 of the Tripartite Pact (Exhibit No. 43) reads as follows:

"Japan, Germany and Italy affirm that the aforesaid terms do not in any way affect the political status which exists between each of the three contracting parties and Soviet Russia."

As a proof of the understanding of the Japanese Government of this article of the Pact and as a proof of real intentions toward the U. S. S. R., I shall read an excerpt from the minutes of the conference of the Privy Council Investigation Committee held on September 26, 1940 on the subject of conclusion of the Tripartite Pact between Japan, Germany and Italy.

(Document No. 1461) This document was presented to the Tribunal in the other phase of the trial and received exhibit No. 552. Therefore, if your Honor please, I confine myself to quoting this excerpt which should not receive its separate exhibit number. I shall read an excerpt from the speech of MATSUOKA, the then Minister for Foreign Affairs.

To the question asked by FUTAGANI, member of the Privy Council, (page 7 of the English text):

"(4) There exists a non-aggression treaty
bet een Germany and the Soviet Union. Hence, does
Article 5 mean that Germany will not attack the
Soviet Union even when the latter assaults Japan?
Further, is Japan bound to fight against the Soviet
Union if a Soviet-German hostility breaks out? If
this were the case, would not such an arrangement be
unilateral? Does the word 'existing' mean the date
of signing?"

MATSUOKA replied: -- I quote from the bottom of page 7.

"(4) Although there exists a non-aggression treaty, Japan will aid Germany in the event of a Soviet-German war, and Germany will assist Japan in the event of a Russo-Japanese war.

"With regard to the word 'existing', if you

mean to ask if the present status of the Soviet Union cannot be modified, I say no; I mean that it will not be modified by the treaty under consideration. It will be well to readjust Japan's relation with the Soviet Union hereafter."

I omit seven lines and continue to quote MATSUOKA's words:

"(2) We do not anticipate a war with Russia.

Even though the Russo-Japanese relation may be readjusted it will hardly last for three years. After two
years, it will be necessary to reconsider the relations
among Japan, Germany, and Russia."

I shall present for identification a symposium of documents of the Japanese Ministry for Foreign Affairs in which there is a telegram of KURUSU, Japanese Ambassador in Berlin to MATSUOKA sent from Berlin to Tokyo on September 26, 1940, No. 1251, (Document No. 1298).

I present in evidence an excerpt from this telegram from which the Tribunal will see that at the very moment of signing the Tripartite Pact the Japanese Government was already informed that Germany began military preparations for war against the U.S.S.R.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 1298 will receive exhibit No. 786 for identification only.

THE PRESIDENT: The telegram is admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: And the excerpt therefrom bearing prosecution's document No. 1298 will receive exhibit No. 786-A.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned documents were respectively marked prosecution's exhibits Nos. 786 and 786-A, No. 786 being for identification only and No. 786-A being received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote:

"Ambassador Schulenberg is on his way back to Germany to confer on German relations with Soviet Russia in the event of the Japan-Germany-Italy Treaty being concluded.

"The German Government plans to guide the German press to lay particular emphasis on the fact that the treaty does not mean anticipation of war with Russia. But on the other hand, Germany is concentrating troops in the Eastern regions as a check on Russia."

I present for identification the proceedings of the Privy Council held on December 18, 1940, (Document

No. 1285), to prove how the Japanese Government interpreted the common term "adjustment of Soviet-Japanese relations" as well as to substantiate the contention that the Japanese Government based its relations with the Soviet Union on the methods of forcing her to make concessions even up to resorting to threats of military attack. I shall present in evidence the text of MATSUOKA's speech at this meeting of the Privy Council when the joining of Hungary, Slovakia and Roumania to the Tripartite Pact was discussed.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 1285 will receive exhibit No. 787 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 787 for identification only.)

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: I understand that the excerpt here, 1285, is being offered in evidence, and on that page 1 Councilor MINAMI is mentioned, item No. 27.

I want to direct the Court's attention that the MINAMI spoken about on that page is MINAMI, Hiroshi, and not the accused, MINAMI, Jiro, as pointed out and as may be found in exhibit 102, page 19 and page 20: page 19 of exhibit 102 showing that MINAMI, Hiroshi, became

Councilor on the 24th of December, 1936; on page 20 of exhibit 102 showing that MINAMI, Jiro, the accused, did not become Councilor until the 29th of May, 1942. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham. MR. CUNNINGHAM: I would like to mention that the Councilor OSHIMA is not the Ambassador OSHIMA. THE PRESIDENT: The excerpt is admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: The excerpt from prosecution document No. 1285, bearing the same documentary 10 number, will receive exhibit No. 787-A. 11 (Whereupon, the above-mentioned 12 13 document was marked prosecution's exhibit 14 No. 787-A and received in evidence.) 15 GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt from 16 this page, from this speech, page 8: 17 "I deem it a good policy to aggrandize the 18 German menance to Soviet Russia availing ourselves of 19 the situation to regulate our relations with Soviet 20 Russia, seeing that Soviet Russia does not find any 21 menace in Japan and is inclined to reject the adjust-22 ment of Russo-Japanese relations. From this point of 23 view the Government has agreed to the proposal in 24 question from a conviction that it will be favorable 25

to our diplomacy."

Finally, one more proof of the Tripartite 1 Pact having been directed against the U.S.S.R. 2 may be found in the telegram of Ott, German Ambassa-3 dor in Japan sent from Tokyo to Berlin on October 4, 1941, No. 1974. I present this telegram (doe's ent No. 4065-A) for identification. I shall present in evidence two excerpts 7 from this telegram. CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document --9 RUSSIAN MONITOR: Correction: "Document is 10 presented in evidence." 11 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 12 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosection's document 13 No. 4065-A will receive exhibit No. 788. 14 RUSSIAN MONITOR: There is a slight correc-15 tion. So we will repeat General Vasiliev's words 16 again: 17 "I present this telegram, document No. 4065-A, 18 for identification. I shall present in evidence 19 excerpts from this telegram." 20 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 21 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 22 No. 4065-A will receive exhibit No. 788 for identi-23

fication only, and the excerpts therefrom, bearing the

same documentary number, will receive exhibit No. 788-4.

25

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned documents were respectively marked prosecution's exhibits Nos. 788 and 788-A, No. 788 being for identification only, and No. 788-A being received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I shall read one of these excerpts concerning the question under consideration.

"As a result of a careful sounding out of the Army leaders (Minister for War, Chief of General Staff, Head of the Political Section and of the Section for Foreign Armies) the following picture of their ways of thinking is arrived at:"

I quote again:

"The inherent aim of the Tripartite Pact is to bring about a new distribution of power in Europe and the Far East by overpowering the British Empire. Keeping America at bay and eliminating the Soviet Union could only be mere means to this end"

The second excerpt from this telegram will be read later on in connection with some other questions.

I shall pass over to presenting evidence showing that being in conspiracy with Hitlerite Germany and Fascist Italy the Japanese Government during the aggressive war of Germany and Italy against the USSR was actively carrying into effect the aims of the

conspiracy as regards the Soviet Union.

I shall present a group of documents proving that when in the Spring of 1941 the then Minister of Foreign Affairs the defendant MATSUOKA was sent by the Japanese Government to Europe, in particular to Italy and Germany, he during his stay in Berlin in March and April, 1941, was informed by Ribbentrop and Hitler about the attack against the U. S. S. R. and took that circumstance into consideration while concluding shortly after that the Neutrality Pact with the Soviet Union --

THE PRESIDENT: We will receive no more documents today.

We will adjourn until half-past nine tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Thursday, 17 October 1946, at 0930.)

