Feb 27.1949

Of

Doc.	Def. No.	Pros.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
50	2311		Note Annexed to Prosecution Exhibit No. 31		17357
48	2312		Protocol of Signature in con- nection with Exhibit No. 31		17358
145	2313		Fishery Convention Between Japa and the USSR	an	17360
194	2314		"Treaty for the Renunciation of War" (Publication of the U.S Government Printing Of		
194A	2314-A		Excerpt therefrom		17361
154	2315		Report to the Conference from the Second Commission on Open ing of Hostilities	n- 17372	
154A	2315-A		Excerpt therefrom		17372
471	2316		Treaty of Commerce and Navigation		17386
52	2317		Exchange of Notes of 2 November 1917 re China, known as the Lansing-ISHII Agreement, when the U. S. recognized Japan's special interests in China	rein	17389
152	2318		Exchange of Notes dated 14 April 1923 Between the American Secretary of State and the Jambassador cancelling the after Lansing-ISHII Agreement	apanese	17391

Of

Doc.	Def. No.	Pros.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
200	2319		Book entitled "Conferences on the Limitation of Armamen Washington, 12 November 1921 to 6 February 1922, publishe by the U.S. Government Print ing Office	d	
200A	2319 - A		Excerpt from the Minutes therefrom		17397.
200B	2319-В		Another excerpt from the above Book		17398
			MORNING RECESS		17399
200C	2319-C		Further excerpt from the above		17406
2000	2319-D		ditto		17411
200E	2319 - E		ditto		17417
200F	2319 - F		ditto		17422
200G	2319 - G		ditto		17433
			NOON RECESS		17433
200H	2319 - H		Last excerpt from the above		17439
237	2320		Book entitled "The Washington Conference, Treaties and Resolutions" compiled by the Japanese Government	17448	3
237A	2320-A		Excerpt therefrom		17448

Of

Doc.	Def. No.	Pros.	Description	For Iden	
202D-2	-		Excerpt from John B. Powell' Book "My Twenty-Five Years in China" (pp. 75 and 76) Objection upheld		admitted
202D-3	-		Excerpt from above Book Objection upheld	Not	admitted 17455
40	2321		Declaration upon which France Great Britain, Italy, Japan and Russia Agree not to Con clude a Separate Peace, si 30 November 1915	n n-	17456
150	-		Treaty of Mutual Assistance Between France, the United Kingdom and Turkey, dated 19 October 1939 Objection upheld	Not	admitted
151	_		Agreement of Mutual Assistance Between the United Kingdom and Poland Objection upheld		admitted
184			Joint Declaration by the U. So of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the USSR, China, Australia, Bergium, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Haitz Honduras, India, Luxemburg The Netherlands, New Zealar Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, South Africa and Yugoslavia Objection upheld	l- i,	admitted

Of

Doc. No.	Def. No.	Pros. No.	Description	For Iden	In Evidence
185	-		reaty of Union in the War Against Hitlerite Germany and her Associates in Europe and of Collaboration and Mutual Assistance Thereafter Between the USSR and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland		admitted
		0	bjection upheld		17464
186	-		greement for Joint Action by the Government of the USSR and His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom in the War Against Germany bjection upheld		admitted 17464
187	-		rotocol to the Agreement for Joint Action bjection upheld	Not	admitted
159	2322	A	nglo-American Joint Declara- tion		17465
		A	FTERNOON RECESS		17469

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Citations re The Constitution of Japan - Part I - (Exhibit No. 68) by Mr. ONO	17470
Citations re The Imperial House Law - Chapter I - Succession to the Imperial Throne (Exhibit No. 69) by Mr. 0N6	17477
Citations re Imperial Ordinance on the Organization of the Cabinet (Exhibit No. 70) by Mr. ONO	17477
Citations re Organization of the Board of Planning (Exhibit No. 71) by Mr. ONO	17480
Citations re Organization of the Board of Information (Exhibit No. 72) by Mr. ONO	17481
Citations re Imperial Ordinance Relating to General Rules Concerning the Organization of the Ministries (Exhibit No. 73) by Mr. ONO	17484
Citations re Organization of the War Ministry (Exhibit No. 74) by Mr. ONO	17486
Citations re Imperial Ordinance Relating to the Organization of the Ministry of the Navy (Exhibit No. 75) by Mr. ONO	17499
Citation re Imperial Ordinance Relating to the Organization of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Exhibit No. 76) by Mr. ONO	17503
Citations re Military Ordinance (Exhibit No. 77) by Mr. ONO	17504

1 Thursday, 27 February 1947 2 3 4 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL 5 FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal 6 War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan 7 8 The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, 9 at 0930. 10 11 Appearances: 12 For the Tribunal, same as before with the 13 exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE E. NORTHCROFT, 14 Member from New Zealand, not sitting. 15 For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 16 For the Defense Section, same as before. 17 18 The Accused: 19 All present except OKAWA, Shumei, who is 20 represented by his counsel. 21 22 (English to Japanese and Japanese 23 to English 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.
THE PRESIDENT: Captain Lazarus.

MR. LAZARUS: We next offer in cvidence defense document 50, being a note annexed to prosecution Exhibit 31.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, in our submission this document is inadmissible not only for
the reason mentioned on many occasions that it has
nothing to do with any question before this Tribunal,
which applies with peculiar force in this case, but
also because the only purpose of it is to be needlessly offensive to one of the prosecuting nations. Your
Honor doubtlessly appreciates the point.

MR. LAZARUS: Mr. President, Mr. Comyns Carr has been unduly vicious in ascribing motives like that to the defense against any one member of the prosecution staff or any nation, and we resent it very highly. I personally never lose sight of the fact that you all represent Allias with whom I fought, but still I am going to do my duty here as an attorney, and every bit of evidence that is good for our side we will introduce.

THE PRESIDENT: How is it relevant and material?

What probative value has it? That is the only point. MR. LAZARUS: It is part, Mr. President, of one of the prosecution exhibits which they omitted 3 for reasons best known to themselves, and which we think is material, and we certainly will connect it later, Mr. President. 6 7 GENERAL VASILIEV: May I say a few words 8 about the document, sir? THE PRESIDENT: We cannot hear two counsel 9 on the one side on the same point. The document is 10 11 admitted. We have some doubt about it, but, as we 12 said yesterday, we are reserving these questions of 13 relevancy. 14 MR. LAZARUS: Yes. sir. 15 "Annexed Note. Dated at Peking, January 20, 16 1925." 17 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 50 18 will receive exhibit No. 2311. 19 (Whereupon, the document above re-20 ferred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2311, 21 and was received in evidence.) 2-2 MR. LAZARUS: I am sorry. I will start again, 23 Mr. President. 24 "Annexed Note. Dated at Peking, January 20, 25 1925.

7 8

"In proceeding this day to the signature of the Convention embodying Basic Rules of the Relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Japan, the undersigned Plenipotentiary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has the honour to tender hereby to the Government of Japan an expression of sincere regrets for the Nikolaievsk incident of 1920."

We next offer in evidence defense document 48, being the Protocol of Signature in connection with prosecution exhibit 31.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 48

will receive exhibit No. 2312.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2312, and was received in evidence.)

MR. LAZARUS: I shall read only the next to the last paragraph on page 1.

"The Two Plenipotentiaries further agreed that there should be opposed to the present Protocol the Memorandum, handed by the Japanese Plenipotentiary to the Plenipotentiary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on August 29th, 1924, and embodying a statement on the conditions of oil and coal fields worked by the Japanese in Northern Saghalien."

We next offer in evidence defense document 1 145, being the Fishery Convention between Japan and the U.S.S.R. dated 23 January 1928, concluded in conformity with the provisions of prosecution exhibit 31. I shall not read any of the paragraphs now. 5 GENERAL VASILIEV: May I ask for what purpose 6 this document is being presented? THE PRESIDENT: That is a fair question. 8 MR. LAZAKUS: As I explained on the first day, 9 Mr. President, this is one of a series of documents 10 which we will introduce to bring the Tribunal entirely 11 up to date on a situation existing between Japan and 12 Russia at the time of the alleged aggressive war at 13 Namanhan and Khackhin-Gol in 1938 and 1939, and also 14 Russia's violation of her neutrality pact by declaring 15 16 war on Japan on 8 August 1945. As I stated, Mr. President, I will not read 1.7 18 any paragraphs now. Such paragraphs as are pertinent 19 may be read later. We will show later that this 20 particular treaty was the source of perpetual and

GENERAL VASILIEV: If the Court please, I believe that the document is quite irrelevant to any issue involved in this case. The accused were not

perennial disputes between the two parties over its

21

22

23

24

25

provisions.

charged with the violation of the Fishery Convention, and therefore it means that they should not try to justify themselves. This document is an attempt to accuse the U.S.S.R. and to treat the U.S.S.R. as if the U.S.S.R. were an accused at this trial, and to accuse the U.S.S.R. of violation of this convention. It is inadmissible as your Honor repeatedly stated in this Court.

I must call to the attention of the Tribunal that if this document is admitted we will have to conduct special investigation on the subject and present to the Court a great number of documents in order to elucidate this problem correctly. And I repeat that this document is irrelevant to any issue involved in this case.

THE PRESIDENT: It may prove to be irrelevant.

We said yesterday that if any document turned out to

be irrelevant we would reject it.

MR. LAZARUS: We next offer for identification only the publication of the United States Government Printing Office--"

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 145 will receive exhibit No. 2313.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2313, and was received in evidence.)

4 5

MR. LAZARUS: We next offer for identification only the publication of the United States Government Printing Office entitled "Treaty for the Renunciation of War," and we offer in evidence excerpts therefrom, defense document 194, being notes exchanged between several of the powers who were parties to the Kellogg-Briand Pact, prosecution exhibit 32.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 154

will receive exhibit No. 2314 for identification only;

and the excerpt therefrom, bearing the same document

number, will receive exhibit No. 2314-A.

Correction in the record, please. That is defense document 154 -- defense document 194.

(Whereupon, defense document No. 194 was marked defense exhibit No. 2314 for identification; and the excerpt therefrom was marked defense exhibit No. 2314-A and received in evidence.)

MR. LAZARUS: (Reading) "Note of the Government of the United States to the Governments of Great Britain, Germany, Italy, and Japan. Delivered at the Respective Foreign Offices April 13, 1928.

"As Your Excellency is aware, there has recently been exchanged between the Governments of

France and the United States a series of notes dealing with the question of a possible international renunciation of war. The views of the two Governments have been clearly set forth in the correspondence between them.

"The Government of the United States, as stated in its note of February 27, 1928, desires to see the institution of war abolished and stands ready to conclude with the French, British, German, Italian and Japanese Governments a single multilateral treaty open to subsequent adherence by any and all other fovernments binding the parties thereto not to resort to war with one another.

"The Government of the French Republic, while no less eager to promote the cause of world peace and to cooperate with other nations in any practical movement towards that end, has pointed out certain considerations which in its opinion must be borne in mind by those Powers which are members of the League of Nations, parties to the Treaties of Locarno, or parties to other treaties guaranteeing neutrality. My Government has not conceded that such considerations necessitate any modification of its proposal for a multilateral treaty, and is of the opinion that every nation in the world can, with a proper regard for its own

interests, as well as for the interests of the entire 1 family of nations, join in such a treaty. It believes, moreover, that the execution by France, Great Britain, Germany, Italy, Japan and the United States of a treaty solemnly renouncing war in favor of the pacific settlement of international controversies would have tremendous moral effect and ultimately lead to the 7 adherence of all the other governments of the world.

"The discussions which have taken place between France and the United States have thus reached a point where it seems essential, if ultimate success is to be attained, that the British, German, Italian and Japanese Governments should each have an opportunity formally to decide to what extent, if any, its existing commitments constitute a bar to its participation with the United States in an unqualified renunciation of war.

"In these circumstances the Government of the United States, having reached complete agreement with the Government of the French Republic as to this procedure, has instructed me formally to transmit herewith for the consideration of your Government the text of M. Briand's original proposal of last June, together with copies of the notes subsequently exchanged between France and the United States on the subject of

3

6

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

2

3 4

5

6

7

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

"P. 43 22

(Houghton).

24

23

25

"(London), May 19, 1928.

Affairs (Chamberlain) to the American Ambassador

a multilateral treaty for the renunciation of war.

"I have also been instructed by my Government to transmit herewith for consideration a preliminary draft of a treaty representing in a general way the form of treaty which the Government of the United States is prepared to sign with the French, British, German, Italian and Japanese Governments and any other Governments similarly disposed. It will be observed that the language of Articles I and II of this draft treaty is practically identical with that of the corresponding articles in the treaty which M. Briand proposed to the United States.

"The Government of the United States would be pleased to be informed as promptly as may be convenient whether Your Excellency's Government is in a position to give favorable consideration to the conclusion of a treaty such as that transmitted herewith, and if not, what specific modifications in the text thereof would make it acceptable.

"The British Secretary of State for Foreign

"P. 45

"Your Excellency: Your note of the 13th

April, containing the text of a draft treaty for the
renunciation of war, together with copies of the correspondence between the United States and French Governments on the subject of this treaty, has been
receiving sympathetic consideration at the hands of
His Majesty's Government in Great Britain. A note
has also been received from the French Government,
containing certain suggestions for discussion in
connexion with the proposed treaty, and the German
Government were good enough to send me a copy of the
reply which has been made by them to the proposals of
the United States Government.
"P. 44

"4. After studying the wording of article I of the United States draft, His Majesty's Government do not think that its terms exclude action which a State may be forced to take in self-defence.

Mr. Kellogg has made it clear in the speech to which I have referred above that he regards the right of self-defence as inalienable, and His Majesty's Government are disposed to think that on this question no addition to the text is necessary.

"10. The language of article I, as to the

1 renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy, 2 renders it desirable that I should remind your 3 Excellency that there are certain regions of the world the welfare and integrity of which constitute a special 5 and vital interest for our peace and safety. His 6 Majesty's Government have been at pains to make it clear in the past that interference with these regions 8 cannot be suffered. Their protection against attack is to the British Empire a measure of self-defence. 10 It must be clearly understood that His Majesty's 11 Government in Great Britain accept the new treaty 12 upon the distinct understanding that it does not pre-13 judice their freedom of action in this respect. The 14 Government of the United States have comparable 15 interests any disregard of which by a foreign Power 16 they have declared that they would regard as an un-17 friendly act. His Majesty's Government believe, 18 therefore, that in defining their position they are 19 expressing the intention and meaning of the United 20 States Government. 21 22

"Austen Chamberlain.

23

24

"P. 51

25

"Tokyo, May 26, 1928.

"Monsieur l'Ambassadeur: I have the honour

to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's Note No. 336 of April 13th last, transmitting to me, under instructions from the Government of the United States, the preliminary draft of a proposed multilateral treaty representing in a general way a form of treaty which the Government of the United States is prepared to sign with the French, British, German, Italian and Japanese Governments and any other Governments similarly disposed, with the object of securing the renunciation of war. At the same time Your Excellency enclosed a copy of the correspondence recently exchanged between the Governments of the United States and the French Republic commencing with a proposal put forward by M. Briand in June, 1927; and you intimated that the Government of the United States desired to be informed whether the Japanese Government were in a position to give favourable consideration to the conclusion of such a treaty as that of which you enclosed a draft -and if not, what specific modifications in the text would make it acceptable.

"I beg to inform Your Excellency that the Government of Japan sympathize warmly with the high and beneficent aims of the proposal now made by the United States, which they take to imply the entire abolition of the institution of war, and that they will

1 2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

be glad to render their most cordial cooperation towards the attainment of that end.

"The proposal of the United States is understood to contain nothing that would refuse to independent states the right of self-defence, and nothing which is incompatible with the obligations of agreements guaranteeing the public peace, such as are embodied in the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Treaties of Locarno. Accordingly the Imperial Government firmly believe that unanimous agreement on a mutually acceptable text for such a treaty as is contemplated is well capable of realization by discussion between the six Powers referred to, and they would be happy to collaborate with cordial good will in the discussions with the purpose of securing what they are persuaded is the common desire of all the peoples of the world -- namely, the cessation of wars and the definite establishment among the nations of an era of permanent and universal peace.

"P. 72

1

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"The British Secretary of State for Foreign
Affairs (Chamberlain) to the American Charge (Atherton).
"(London), July 18, 1928.

"P. 73

"As regards the passage in my note of the

19th May relating to certain regions of which the welfare and integrity constitute a special and vital interest for our peace and safety, I need only repeat that His Majesty's Government in Great Britain accept the new treaty upon the understanding that it does not prejudice their freedom of action in this respect.

"I am entirely in accord with the views expressed by Mr. Kellogg in his speech of the 28th April that the proposed treaty does not restrict or impair in any way the right of self-defence, as also with his opinion that each State alone is competent to decide when circumstances necessitate recourse to war for that purpose.

"In the light of the foregoing explanations, His Majesty's Government in Great Britain are glad to join with the United States and with all other Governments similarly disposed in signing a definitive treaty for the renunciation of war in the form transmitted in your note of the 23rd June."

I will skip the rest of that.

On the last page, "Address by M. Aristide Briand, French Minister for Foreign Affairs.

"Page 311.

"Gentlemen: I am fully conscious that silence would best befit such a solemn occasion." hat I should like, without any further words, would be to let each of you simply rise to affix his signature, in the name of his own country, to the greatest collective act born of peace. But I should be failing in my duty to my country if I did not tell you how deeply it feels the honor of welcoming the first signatories of the General Pact for the Renunciation of War.

"It may be objected that this pact is not practicable; that it lacks sanctions. But does true practicability consist in excluding from the realm of facts the moral forces, amongst which is that of public opinion? In fact, the state which would risk incurring the reprobation of all its associates in the pact would run the positive risk of seeing a kind of general solidarity, gradually and spontaneously directed against it, with the redoubtable consequences which it would soon feel. And where is the country, signatory to the pact, which its leaders would assume the responsibility of exposing to such

8 9

a danger? The modern law of interdependence between nations makes it incumbant upon every statesman to take for himself these memorable words of President Coolidge: 'An act of war, in any part of the world, is an act that injures the interests of my country.'"

This concludes that group, and we will turn now to the group where we left off yesterday, starting with document No. 104 numerically, document No. 154.

We next offer for identification only the book entitled "Reports to the Hague Conference of 1899 and 1907," edited by James Brown Scott and put out by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, being the official explanatory and interpretative commentary accompanying the draft conventions and declarations submitted to the Conference by several commissions charged with preparing them.

We offer in evidence defense document 154, being an excerpt therefrom from pages 502 to 508 inclusive, containing a report to the Conference from the Second Commission on opening of hostilities in connection with the Hague Convention III of 1907. This report deals with Articles 1 and 2 of the said Convention.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual 1 terms. 2 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 3 154 will receive exhibit No. 2315 for identifica-4 tion only, and the excerpt therefrom, bearing the 5 same document number, will receive exhibit No.2315-A. 6 (Whereupon, document No. 154 was 7 marked defense exhibit No. 2315 for identifica-8 tion, and the excerpt therefrom was marked 9 defense exhibit 2315-A and received in 10 evidence.) 11 MR. LAZARUS: I shall read only certain 12 portions of this article, Mr. President, the first 13 three paragraphs on page 1 to start. 14 (Reading): "It was the duty of the Second 15 Commission to study this part of the programme; the 16 present report, however, deals only with 'the 17 opening of hostilities."" 18 MR. COMYNS CARR: If this document is to 19 be admitted at all, your Honor, I would ask that 20 the actual first paragraph as printed be read, be-21 ginning with "The Russian programme" --22 MR. LAZARUS: I shall read that then. 23 "The Russian programme contains the 24 following topic: 25

"Additions to be made to the provisions of the Convention of 1899 relative to the laws and customs of war on land -- besides others, those concerning: the opening of hostilities and the rights of neutrals on land.

"It was the duty of the Second Commission to study this part of the programme; the present report, however, deals only with 'the opening of hostilities.'

"The question whether there is an obligation upon a Government intending to make war to give notice to its adversary before beginning hostilities has been discussed for years and has given rise not only to lengthy theoretical expositions but also to frequent recriminations between belligerents. It would be a vain task, from the point of view that we must take here, to review the practice in the various wars since the beginning of the last century in an effort to determine whether there is, according to positive international law, any rule on this subject. We have only to ask ourselves whether it is advisable to lay one down, and if so, in what terms.

"As to the first point, there can be no doubt. It is clearly desirable that the uncertainty

seen in various quarters should cease. Everybody is in favour of an affirmative answer to the first question placed before us by the president of the second subcommission, his Excellency Mr. Asser, in his questionnaire."

The questionnaire, incidentally, is on the last two pages, and I shall not read it.

"The subcommission has had before it a proposition of the French delegation, and an amendment thereto offered by the Netherland delegation. The proposition and its amendment were alike in requiring a warning to be given before opening hostilities and also a notification to neutrals. The difference between them lay in the interval between the warning and hostilities, which the Netherland delegation proposed to fix definitely. Some special questions have also been raised regarding the notification to neutrals. We shall give you an explanatory statement on these several points.

"The French proposition was worded as follows:

"ARTICLE 1" --

THE MONITOR: The document was not properly marked, Mr. Lazarus; so will you kindly wait for a minute?

MR. LAZARUS: Yes.

(Reading) "ARTICLE 1.

"The contracting Powers recognize that hostilities between themselves must not commence without a previous and explicit warning, in the form either of a reasoned declaration of war or of an ultimatum with conditional declaration of war.

"ARTICLE 2.

"The existence of a state of war must be notified to the neutral Powers without delay.

which was imprired by a resolution passed by the Institute of International Law at its meeting at Ghent in September, 1906, is easily justified.

Two distinct cases are provided for. When a dispute occurs between two States, it will ordinarily lead to diplomatic negotiations more or less lengthy, in which each party attempts to have its pretensions recognized, or at least to secure partial satisfaction. If an agreement is not reached, one of the Powers may set forth in an ultimatum the conditions which it requires and from which it declares it will not recede. At the same time it fixes an interval within which a reply may be made and

3.

4 5

21 22

declares that, in the absence of a satisfactory answer, it will have recourse to armed force. In this case there is no surprise and no equivocation. The Power to which such an ultimatum is addressed can come to a decision with a full knowledge of the circumstances; it may give satisfaction to its adversary or it may fight.

"Again, a dispute may arise suddenly, and a Power may desire to have recourse to arms without entering upon or prolonging diplomatic negotiations that it considers useless. It ought in that case to give a direct warning of its intention to its adversary, and this warning ought to be explicit.

armed force is stated conditionally in an ultimatum, a reason is expressed, since war is to be the consequence of a refusal to give the satisfaction demanded. This is, however, not necessarily the case when the intention to make war is made manifest directly and without a previous ultimatum. The proposal set out above requires that reasons be assigned in this case also. A government ought not to employ so extreme a measure as a resort to arms without giving reasons. Every one, both in the countries about to become belligerents, and

also in neutral countries, should know what the 1 war is about in order to form a judgment on the 2 conduct of the two adversaries. Of course this 3 does not mean that we are to cherish the illusion 4 that the real reasons for a war will always be 5 given; but the difficulty of definitely stating 6 reasons, and the necessity of advancing reasons 7 8 not well substantiated or out of proportion to the 9 gravity of war itself, will naturally arrest the 10 attention of neutral Powers and enlighten public opinion.

"The warning should be previous in the sense of preceding hostilities. Shall a given length of time elapse between the receipt of the warning and the beginning of hostilities? French proposition specifies no interval, which implies that hostilities may begin as soon as the warning has reached the adversary. The time limitation before war is begun is thus less determinable than in the case of an ultimatum. In the opinion of the French delegation the necessities of modern warfare do not allow of a requirement that the party desiring to take the aggressive should grant further time than what is absolutely indispensable to let its adversary know that force

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

23

24

is to be employed against it.

1 2

"The principle of the French proposal met with no objection and the text was voted almost unanimously by the subcommission, after the delegations of Germany, Great Britain, Japan, and Russia had expressly declared themselves in accord with it.

"The delegation of the Netherlands desired to supplement the principle as follows:

"The contracting Powers recognize that hostilities between themselves must not commence until the lapse of twenty-four hours after an explicit warning, having the form of a reasoned declaration of war, or of an ultimatum with conditional declaration of war, has officially come to the attention of the adversary's government.

"The difference between this and the French proposal lies in requiring a fixed interval between the receipt of the warning and the opening of hostilities. The need for this delay was explained by Colonel Michelson, speaking for the Russian delegation, in these words:

"The problem of such a delay is intimately connected with the relation which exists between the peace and war establishments of every country.

Consequently a result of its adoption would be a more or less considerable reduction of expenditures. The time may not be so far distant after all when we shall be able to distinguish between the troops and other preparations for war which every country in its own sovereign judgment deems requisite in its political situation and those that it is compelled to maintain only through the necessity of being constantly in readiness for fighting. By establishing a certain interval between the rupture of peaceful relations and the beginning of hostilities, an opportunity would be afforded to such countries as may desire it to realize certain economies during times of peace. It is undeniable that these economies would be beneficial in every way, and could not fail to bring about a great relief from the burden of peace armies, a relief all the more acceptable because it would in no way affect the right of each nation to fix its own forces and arman art solely in accordance with its own views and meeds.

1

2

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"There is still another advantage to be derived from the proposed delay. It would leave to friendly and neutral Powers some precious time which they could use in making efforts to bring about a reconciliation, or to persuade the disputants to

submit their causes of difference to the High Court of Arbitration here. But, while speaking of this subject of a delay, we must not lose sight of what is at present possible. The idea of any considerable delay is not yet developed in the consciences of the people of the nations. Consequently it would perhaps not be wise to go too far with out desires, in order that we may not get beyond what is really possible in practice at the present day. So let us content ourselves with accepting the delay of twenty-four hours which has been proposed by the delegation of the Netherlands. Let us leave to the future the work of the future, and merely express our hope that in the future the benefits of a still longer delay will be secured.

undeniable, it did not convince the majority of the subcommission. It did not appear consistent with military exigencies of the present day to fix such an interval; a great advance is gained, however, in securing the admission of the need of a previous warning. Let us hope that in the future we shall make a further advance; but let us not proceed too rapidly. It is noteworthy that the Institute of International Law, in its resolution

1.7

referred to above, considered that it could not go so far as to suggest a definite interval, although in such a matter as this an assembly of jurists might be expected to be less conservative than an assembly of diplomatists and military and naval men. It limited itself to saying: 'Hostilities shall not commence before the expiration of a delay suffucient to make it certain that the rule of previous and explicit notice cannot be considered as evaded.'

An obligation to make a declaration of war include the reasons therefor awakened some scruples as being contrary to provisions in some constitutions. Thus the Cuban delegates made the following statement: 'In view of the fact that paragraph 12 of Article 59 of the constitution of Cuba mentions among the powers of Congress that of declaring war, it is not possible for the delegation to subscribe to any act that does not reserve to our Congress the right to determine the form and conditions of such a declaration. On the other hand, General Porter declared that the French proposal was not inconsistent with the provisions of the American federal constitution, under which Congress has the power to declare war. Indeed, there seems to be some misunderstanding on this point. We should make a distinction between two acts that are often confused because the same expression is used to describe both: namely, the act of deciding on war and the act of communicating this decision to the adversary. According to the constitutions the decision belongs to the sovereign or head of the State, either acting alone or in conjunction with the representatives of the people; but the notification is essentially for the executive. Since the notification closely follows the decision, they are combined under

the understanding where there is externally only one sovereign act. Bearing this in mind, it is easily shown that the French proposition voted by the subcommission is not at all inconsistent with constitutional provisions of the kind indicated. The liberty of a congress to decide on war in whatever way it chooses is not touched. Can it be supposed that war will be determined upon lightly, even though the formal resolution may not indicate the reasons, and is it too much to ask of a Government which, in execution of such a decision, declares war that it give its reasons therefor? We do not think so.

the term 'declaration,' and this is especially

"According to the second article of the French proposal, 'the existence of a state of war must be notified to the neutral Powers without delay.' As a matter of fact, war not only modifies the relations existing between belligerents, but it also seriously affects neutral States and their citizens; it is therefore important that these be given the earliest possible notice. It is hardly to be supposed that, with the present rapid spread of news, much time will elapse before it is everywhere known that a war has broken out, or that a State will be able to invoke its ignorance of the existence of a war in order to

23

1

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

evade all responsibility. But as it is possible, in spite of telegraph and cable lines and radiotelegraphy, that the news might not of itself reach those concerned, precautions must be taken. Accordingly two amendments were offered. The first, from the Belgian delegation, was as follows: 'The existence of a state of war must be notified to the neutral Powers. This notification, which may be given even by telegraph, shall not take effect in regard to them until forty-eight hours after its receipt.' The other, offered by the British delegation, in an article contained in a proposal submitted to the Third Commission and referred to this subcommission, said: 'A neutral State is bound to take measures to preserve its neutrality only when it has received from one of the belligerents a notification of the commencement of the war."

And the last paragraph on that page, beginning with "The view."

"The view which has been adopted is that it is impracticable to fix any delay. The governing idea is a very simple one. A State can be held to duties of neutrality only when it is aware of the existence of the war creating such duties. From the moment when it is informed, no matter by what means (provided there is no doubt of the fact), it must not

25

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

7 8

do anything inconsistent with neutrality. Is it at
the same time obliged to prevent acts contrary to
neutrality that might be committed on its territory?
The obligation to do so presupposes the ability.
What can be required of a neutral Government is that
it take the necessary measures without delay. The
interval within which the measures can be taken will
vary, naturally, according to circumstances, extent
of territory, and facility of communication. The
interval of forty-eight hours, as was proposed,
might be, in a given case, too long or too short.
There is no need of establishing a legal presumption
that the neutral is or is not responsible. It is a
question of fact which can be determined usually
with but little difficulty."

We skip to Annex 1.

"Draft of Regulations Relating to the Opening of Hostilities. Text submitted to the Conference.

"Article 1"--

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, this part has been read and I will omit it. Articles 1 and 2 have been read into the record previously.

We next offer in evidence defense document 471, being the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation

```
between Japan and the United States dated 21 February
 2 1911, which was denounced by the United States on
 3 26 July 1939, prosecution exhibit 53. As will be
 4 later shown, the rights secured to Japan and Japanese
5 nationals upon which her existence so much depended
6 was wiped out by the abrogation and the subsequent
  freezing of Japanese assets in the United States on
  25 July 1941, prosecution exhibit 67.
            I will read only three articles.
            THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
10
            CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 471
11
  will receive exhibit No. 2316.
12
13
                 (Whereupon, the document above
       referred to was marked defense exhibit
14
15
        No. 2316 and received in evidence.)
16
                          (Reading) "Article 1.
            MR. LAZARUS:
1.7
            "The subjects or citizens of each of the High
18
  Contracting Parties shall have liberty to enter,
19
   travel and reside in the territories of the other to
20
  carry on trade, wholesale and retail, to own or lease
21
  and occupy houses, manufactories, warehouses and shops,
  to employ agents of their choice, to lease land for
23
  residential and commercial purposes, and generally to
  do anything incident to or necessary for trade upon
25
  the same germs as native subjects or citizens, submitting
```

themselves to the laws and regulations there established.

"They shall not be compelled, under any pretext whatever, to pay any charges or taxes other or higher than those that are or may be paid by native subjects or citizens.

"The subjects or citizens of each of the High Contracting Parties shall receive, in the territories of the other, the most constant protection and security for their persons and property, and shall enjoy in this respect the same rights and privileges as are or may be granted to native subjects or citizens, on their submitting themselves to the conditions imposed upon the native subjects or citizens.

"They shall, however, be exempt in the territories of the other from compulsory military service either on land or sea, in the regular forces, or in the national guard, or in the militia; from all contributions imposed in lieu of personal service, and from all forced loans or military exactions or contributions.

"Article 4.

"There shall be between the territories of the two High Contracting Parties reciprocal freedom of commerce and navigation. The subjects or citizens

1 2

3

4 5

,

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of each of the Contracting Parties, equally with the subjects or citizens of the most favored nation, shall have liberty freely to come with their ships and cargoes to all places, ports and rivers in the territories of the other which are or may be opened to foreign commerce, subject always to the laws of the country to which they thus come."

And lastly the fourteenth article. "Article 14.

"Except as otherwise expressly provided in this Treaty, the High Contracting Parties agree that, in all that concerns commerce and navigation, any privilege, favor or immunity which either Contracting Party has actually granted, or may hereafter grant, to the subjects or citizens of any other State shall be extended to the subjects or citizens of the other Contracting Party gratuitously, if the concession in favor of that other State shall have been gratuitous, and on the same or equivalent conditions, if the concession shall have been conditional."

We next offer in evidence defense document 52 containing the exchange of notes of 2 November 1917 regarding China, known as the Lansing-ISHII Agreement wherein the United States recognized Japan's special interests in China.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 52

will receive exhibit No. 2317.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2317 and received in evidence.)

MR. LAZARUS: (Reading)

"From the Secretary of State to Viscount

"Department of State, Washington
"2 November 1917

"Excellency:

ISHII.

"I have the honor to communicate herein my understanding of the agreement reached by us in our recent conversations touching the questions of mutual interest to our Governments relating to the Republic of China.

"In order to silence mischievous reports that have from time to time been circulated, it is believed by us that a public announcement once more of the desires and intentions shared by our two Governments with regard to China is advisable.

"The Governments of the United States and
Japan recognize that territorial propinquity creates
special relations between countries, and, consequently

- /

Japan has special interests in China, particularly in the part to which her possessions are contiguous.

"The territorial sovereignty of China, nevertheless, remains unimpaired and the Government of the whited States has every confidence in the repeated assurances of the Imperial Japanese Government that while geographical position gives Japan such special interests they have no desire to discriminate against the trade of other nations or to disregard the commercial rights heretofore granted by China in treaties with other Powers.

"The Governments of the United States and Japan deny that they have any purpose to infringe in any way the independence or territorial integrity of China and they declare furthermore that they always adhere to the principle of the so-called 'open door' or equal opportunity for commerce and industry in China.

"Moreover, they mutually declare that they are opposed to the acquisition by any Government of any special rights or privileges that would affect the independence or territorial integrity of China or that would deny to the subjects or citizens of any country the full enjoyment of equal opportunity

in the commerce and industry of China. "I shall be glad" -- and so forth. "From Viscount ISHII to the Secretary of State. "Japanese Embassy, Washington, 6 "November 2, 1917. 7 "Sir:" --THE PRESIDENT: Is that a similar letter? 9 MR. LAZARUS: In effect it confirms the 10 previous letter, Mr. President. I will omit it. 11 We next offer in evidence defense document 12 152, being exchange of notes dated 14 April 1923. 13 between the American Secretary of State and the 14 Japanese Ambassador canceling the aforesaid Lansing-15 ISHII Agreement. 16 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 1.7 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 152 18 will receive exhibit No. 2318. 19 . (Whereupon, the document above 20 referred to was marked defense exhibit 21 No. 2318 and received in evidence.) 22 MR. LAZARUS: I shall read only the second 23 paragraph, if the Tribunal please. 24 (Reading) "The discussions between the two 25 Governments have disclosed an identity of views and,

1.7

in the light of the understandings arrived at by
the Washington Conference on the Limitation of
Armament, the American and Japanese Governments
are agreed to consider the Lansing-ISHII correspondence
of November 2, 1917, as canceled and of no further
effect."

The letter from the Japanese Ambassador to the Secretary of State confirms the statement on the first letter.

We next offer for identification only the book entitled "Conferences on the Limitation of Armament," Washington, November 12, 1921 to February 6, 1922, published by the Government Printing Office at Washington, D.C., and defense document 200-A, an excerpt from the minutes therefrom is tendered in evidence for the purpose of showing the interpretation of the term "administrative integrity" of China, contained in the Nine-Power Treaty, which was prosecution exhibit 28, one of the principal treaties which the prosecution charges was violated by the accused.

THM PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, with regard to this group of documents, extracts from the conference on the limitation of armaments at Washington, it is our submission that there must be some limit

to the extent to which preliminary discussions can be taken as interpreted -- as aids to interpreting an agreement finally signed.

3.

THE PRESIDENT: That is our British view and perhaps the American view, I think it is, but it is not the universal view. I have had occasion to discover that.

MR. CARR: Yes, I appreciate that our British, and probably also American view, cannot be applied in its full strictness in international law. For that reason I have not objected to two documents of that character already tendered and read by the defense. But, when you come, as you do in this series of documents, to argumentative controversy between the parties in the course of negotiations, and then you find that that controversy has been resolved by the signature of an agreement, it then appears to follow, in my submission, that the agreement supersedes the statements made in the course of argument and that those statements cannot be used to interpret it.

The other objection to many of the extracts from this book which are offered is that they raise new controversial issues of ancient history, particularly with regard to the Twenty-One Demands made against China by Japan in 1915. And if we are to go into those, it will very largely, and in our submission unnecessarily, extend the scope of this

inquiry. On both of those grounds we ask the Tribunal to exclude this group of documents.

MR. LAZALUS: Mr. President, you have correctly stated that the rule that a document may not be further explained or elucidated by the debates or addresses surrounding it is not an universal rule. In the United States, whether in State courts or in Federal Courts, when it comes to the question of interpreting even a city ordinance by the Board of Aldermen or the lowest type of legislative authority, the minutes of the meetings, the addresses by the proponents and the opponents of the measure are looked into very thoroughly.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think that applies in any part of the British Empire. However, this discussion is useless.

MR. LAZARUS: We have another basis for the support of the admission of this, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: You see, this is the difficulty: Let in any part of these negotiations and
then you let in the lot of them, extending over
years sometimes. Where do you end? However, to
shorten the matter, we have decided to admit this
with the usual reservations.

MR. LAZARUS: Yes, sir.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, might I just correct? According to information supplied to me by United States colleagues, what my friend has just said about the United States practice, in order that there may be no misunderstanding about it, I am informed that in the United States reference to discussions leading up to legislation is only permitted if it is first shown that there is a patent ambiguity in the legislation itself.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 200 will be given exhibit No. 2319 for identifica-

ment 200-A, will be given exhibit No. 2319-A.

(Whereupon document No. 200 was marked defense exhibit No. 2319 for identification, and the excerpt therefrom, document No. 200-A was marked defense exhibit 2319-A and received in evidence.)

MR. LAZARUS: I shall read, Mr. President, only the last two paragraphs.

"ADMIRAL BARON KATO asked the meaning of the phrase 'administrative integrity' as used in the proposed Resolution. He desired to know if this referred to political independence, and was not intended to touch upon interests or privileges which in the past had been granted to various countries.

"MR, ROOT took the inquiry of Baron KATO
to refer to the meaning of the words 'administrative
integrity' with reference to their effect upon
privileges that had already been granted. He replied
that this phrase certainly did not affect any
privileges accorded by valid or effective grants;
that, on the contrary, respect for the administrative
integrity of a country required respect for the

things that are done in the exercise of its full sovereignty by an independent State."

We next offer in evidence defense document 200-B, another excerpt from the previous defense exhibit.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 200-B will receive exhibit No. 2319-B.

(Whereupon the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2319-B and received in evidence.)

MR LAZARUS: I will read from the middle of the first page:

"Mr. HANIHARA desired on behalf of the apanese delegation to state briefly the position of Japan regarding this matter. He did so by reading a statement as follows:

THE PRESIDENT: Read that after the recess.

We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

1 2 3

4

6

5

8

10

11

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

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

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Lazarus.

MR. LAZARUS: (Reading) "JAPAN'S ATTITUDE IN REGARD TO THE FOREIGN GARRISONS IN CHINA.

"The Japanese Delegation wishes to explain, as succinctly as possible, why and how the Japanese garrisons in various parts of China have come to be stationed there. At the outset, however, I desire to disclaim most emphatically that Japan has ever entertained any aggressive purposes or any desire to encroach illegitimately upon Chinese sovereignty in establishing or maintaining these garrisons in China.

"'(1) Japanese railway guards are actually maintained along the South Manchurian Railway and the Shantung Railway.

"'With regard to the Shantung Railway guards,
Japan believes that she has on more than one occasion
made her position sufficiently clear. She has declared and now reaffirms her intention of withdrawing
such guards as soon as China shall have notified her
that the Chinese Police Force has been duly organized
and is ready to take over the charge of the railway
protection.

"'The maintenance of troops along the South Manchurian Railway stands on a different footing. This is conceded and recognized by China under the Treaty of Peking of 1905. (Additional Agreement, Art. II). It is a measure of absolute necessity under the existing state of affairs in Manchuria -- a region which has been made notorious by the activity of mounted bandits. Even in the presence of Japanese troops, those bandits have made repeated attempts to raid the railway zone. In a large number of cases they have cut telegraph lines and committed other acts of ravage. Their lawless activity on an extended scale has, however, been effectively checked by Japanese railway guards, and general security has been maintained for civilian residents in and around the railway zone. The efficiency of such guards will be made all the more significant by a comparison of the conditions prevailing in the railway zone with those prevailing in the districts remote from the railway. The withdrawal of railway guards from the zone of the South Manchurian Railway will no doubt leave those districts at the mercy of bandits, and the same conditions of unrest will there prevail as in remote corners of Manchuria. In such a situation it is not possible

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

for Japan to forego the right or rather the duty, of maintaining railway guards in Manchuria, whose presence is duly recognized by treaty.

"'(2) Towards the end of 1911 the first Revolution broke out in China, and there was complete disorder in the Hr. peh district which formed the base of the revolutionary operations. As the lives and property of foreigners were exposed to danger, Japan together with Great Britain, Russia, Germany, and other principal Powers, dispatched troops to Hankow for the protection of her people. This is how a small number of troops have come to be stationed at Hankow. The region has since been the scene of frequent disturbances; there was recently a clash between the North and South at Changsha, pillage by troops at Ichang, and a mutiny of soldiers at Hankow. Such conditions of unrest have naturally retarded the withdrawal of Japanese troops from Hankow.

"'It has never been intended that these troops should remain permanently at Hankow, and the Japanese Government have been looking forward to an early opportunity of effecting complete withdrawal of the Hankow garrison. They must be assured, however, that China will immediately take effective measures

-1

for the maintenance of peace and order and for the protection of foreigners, and that she will fully assume the responsibility for the damage that may be or may have been done to foreigners.

"'(3) The stationing of the garrisons of foreign countries in North China is recognized by the Chinese Government under the Protocol relating to the Boxer Revolution of 1900. Provided there is no objection from the other countries concerned, Japan will be ready, acting in unison with them, to withdraw her garrison as soon as the actual conditions warrant it.

"' (4) The Japanese troops scattered along the lines of the Chinese Eastern Railway have been stationed in connection with an Inter-allied Agreement concluded at Vladivostok in 1919. Their duties are to establish communication between the Japanese contingents in Siberia and South Manchuria. It goes without saying, therefore, that these troops will be withdrawn as soon as the evacuation of Siberia by the Japanese troops is effected.'"

This is taken from 6 February 1922.

"Mr. HANIHARA read the following reply:

"'JAPAN'S STATEMENT REGARDING THE MAINTENANCE

OF JAPANESE POLICE IN MANCHURIA AND THE TREATY PORTS

OF CHINA.

2 3

1

4

5

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

"'In considering the question of Japanese Consular police in China, two points must be taken into account.

"'(1) Such police do not interfere with Chinese or other foreign nationals. Their functions are strictly confined to the protection and control of Japanese subjects.

"'(2) The most important duties with which the Japanese police are charged are, first, to prevent the commission of crimes by Japanese, and, second, to find and prosecute Japanese criminals when crimes are committed.

"'In view of the geographical proximity of the two countries, it is natural that certain disorderly elements in Japan should move to China, and, taking advantage of the present conditions in that country, should there undertake unlawful activities. When these lawless persons are caught in the act of crime by the Chinese police, it is not difficult for that police force to deal with the case. The culprits are handed over as early as possible to the Japanese authorities for prosecution and trial. But when the criminals flee from the scene of their acts, it is in many cases hard to discover who

committed the crimes and what were the causes and circumstances that led up to their commission. This is more difficult for the Chinese authorities, as they have no power to make domiciliary visits to the homes of foreigners who enjoy extraterritorial rights, or to obtain judicial testimony in due form from such foreigners.

"'Without the full cooperation of the Japanese police, therefore, the punishment of crime is, in a great many cases, an impossibility, and those who are responsible for lawbreaking escape trial and punishment.

"This tendency is especially evident in Manchuria, in which region hundreds of thousands of Japanese are resident. In places where the Japanese volice are stationed, there are far fewer criminal cases among Japanese than in places without Japanese police. Lawless elements constantly move to districts beyond the reach of Japanese police supervision.

"'Apart from the theoretical side of
the question it will thus be observed that the
stationing of Japanese police in the interior of
China has proved to be of much practical usefulness
in the prevention of crimes among Japanese residents,

without interfering with the daily life or Chinese or of other foreign nationals. The Japanese policing provides a protection for the Chinese communities which at present their own organization fails to provide.

"The Japanese delegation is in possession of knowledge and information as to the actual conditions prevailing in China and especially in Manchuria. However, it is unnecessary to go into details at the present stage."

We next offer in evidence defense document 1 200-C, being a further excerpt from the previous 2 defense exhibit. 3 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 4 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 5 200-C will receive exhibit No. 2319-C. 6 (Whereupon, the document above re-7 ferred to was marked defense exhibit No. 8 2319-C and received in evidence.) 9 MR. LAZARUS: Beginning in the middle of 10 the first page: 11 "MR. HANIHARA, on behalf of the Japanese 12 Delegation, submitted a statement in writing, as follows: 13 "'The leased territories held by Japan at 14 present are Kiaochow and Kwantung Province, namely, 15 Port Arthur and Dairen. It is characteristic of Japan's 16 leased territories that she obtained them, not directly 17 from China, but as successor to other Powers at 18 considerable sacrifice in men and treasure. She succeeded 19 Russia in the leasehold of Kwantung Province with the 20 express consent of China, and she succeeded Germany 21 in the leasehold of Kiaochow under the Treaty of 22 Versailles. 23 "'As to Kiaochow, the Japanese Government have 24 already declared on several occasions that they would

4 5

6

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"In the leased territory of Kwantung Province there reside no less than 65,000 Japanese, and the commercial and industrial interests they have established there are of such importance and magnitude to Japan that they are regarded as an essential part of her economic life.

"'It is believed that this attitude of the Japanese Delegation toward the leased territory of Kwantung is not against the principle of the Resolution adopted on November 21st.'

"MR. HANIHARA for Japan had stated that, as had already been known, the matter of Shantung was being dealt with in the course of conversations outside of the Conference, and that he hoped for a happy result. On the other hand, he had pointed out the difference between the status of Japan's rights in Port Arthur and Dalny and those in Kiaochow, and had stated that Japan had no intention of relinquishing the rights acquired in Port Arthur and Dalny.

"Mr. Balfour had illustrated the difference between the British leaseholds at Kowloon and Weihaiwei and, with regard to the latter, had shown a willingness on the part of Great Britain to relinquish her rights under conditions similar to those set forth by France, but had pointed out the importance of retaining Kowloon.

"Continuing, the Chariman observed that in view of the definite statements by Japan with regard to the retention of her rights in Port Arthur and Dalny, and by Great Britain with regard to her inability to relinquish Kowloon, it was necessary to inquire whether the French proposal to return Kwangchowwan and the British offer to relinquish Weihaiwei might be considered without the proviso which required that all other leaseholds be relinquished. He desired to inquire whether consideration of the Shantung matter could be set aside and whether other leases could be treated on a separate tasis, and whether in view of the position taken with regard to the maintenance of Japanese rights in Kwantung Province and British rights in Kowloon, France and Great Britain would make more definite statements.

1

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"Mr. Balfour replied that this was a very specific question which his former statement, had it been clearer, would have answered; that he had never intended to imply that any action Great Britain might take with regard to Weihaiwei would be determined or guided by the disposition of the Manchurian question; that he had not had Balny in mind at all, but had been thinking of the Shantung peninsula, in which Weihaiwei is situated. He then declared that the British

1

4

6

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23 24

25

Government's policy was to make use of the surrender of Weihaiwei to assist in securing a settlement of the question of Shantung and that, if aggreement could be reached on this question, the British Government would not hesitate to do their best to promote a general settlement by restoring Weihaiwei to the central Government of China."

We next offer in evidence defense document 200-D, being a further excerpt from the previous exhibit.

THE PRESIDENT: How many of these have you. Captain?

MR. LAZARUS: Four more, Mr. President. Each one deals with ardifferent subject. This one, for instance, Mr. President, with some troops that Japan maintained in China for self-protaction. In other words, this is not only to explain the Washington Conference. We are not using that only on that basis as Mr. Comyns Carr suggested. This is our affirmative evidence on what Japan had been doing, and what right she had acquired in China and how she was carrying it out; how she was carrying out her obligations that she had assumed under these treaties.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, in view of what

,

my friend has just said, I think I should put my objection on a different ground. If my friend is tendering these documents as evidence of the facts stated therein, then, in my submission, ex parte statements by Japanese representatives at this conference do not afford any proof in favor of these Japanese defendants as to the truth of the statements made. If that is an issue I understand there would be considerable evidence, if it is considered relevant, to the contrary.

MR. LAZARUS: I said, Mr. President, that that was only one of the bases on which we are introducing it and we will definitely tie in all these statements later with evidence. I will read only the beginning of the statement up to Appendix I on exhibit 2319-D -- up to Appendix I.

THE PRESIDENT: We will have to deal with Mr. Carr's objection. These Japanese delegates could only speak from information about these matters. It is hearsay, but it is not inadmissible for that reason. The objection is overruled.

MR. LAZARUS: Thank you, sir.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 200-D will be given exhibit No. 2319-D.

Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No.

"The statement of Mr. HANIHARA was as follows:

cause a certain principle is accepted, it should be applied in all cases immediately and without qualification. In proceeding to its practical application we must not lose sight of particular facts and circumstances that surround each individual case.

While constantly keeping the accepted principle in view, we should go forward step by step toward its complete realization, in such a manner as will maintain due harmony with the actual situation prevailing in each instance.

"I should state in all frankness that the stationing of our troops and police in some parts of China is solely due to our instinct for self-protection. It is admittedly a costly and thankless undertaking to maintain our troops and police in a foreign land. We should only be too glad to be relieved of that responsibility, if the efficient system of protection and control over our nationals resident in China were in operation.

"'In this connection, I can only repeat

the significant fact that there exists a state of affairs in China, which, apart from the question of treaty rights, renders necessary the presence of foreign troops in the very capitol of China.

guards, China has declared her intention to send a suitable force of Chinese police for the protection of the Railway. She has, however, so far failed to send any such police force to whom the Japanese troops can actually hand over the duties.

Manchurian Railway guards, Mr. Sze's observation on the interpretation of the Additional Agreement to the Treaty of 1905 seems to us hardly convincing. The fact pointed out by the Chinese Delegation that hussia has withdrawn her troops from Manchuria apparently refers to the condition of things created by the existing anomalous situation in hussia. It does not prove that hussia has definitely agreed to the withdrawal of her troops as is contemplated in the Sino-Japanese Agreement of 1905.

"That Agreement also provides that when

tranquility shall have been re-established in Manchuria and when China shall have become herself capable of affording full protection to the lives and property of foreigners, Japan will withdraw her railway guards simultaneously with Russia. Referring to that provision, I would like to invite the attention of the Committee to the actual conditions described in the written statement which I shall presently lay before you (See Appendix I.)

"'As for the contention that China should be given an opportunity of proving her ability to maintain peace and order in Manchuria, the reply is obvious: Japanese interests and Japanese security are matters of such importance that she (Japan) can not afford to take obvious risks. By taking such chances as are suggested we should do no good either to China or to ourselves. We should not pander to a sentimental idea at the risk of creating grave international difficulties in a region which has already been the source of a life-and-death struggle on the part of Japan, in a war which did more to preserve the integrity and independence of China than perhaps any other that has ever been

7 8

fought.

ese troops at Hankow, I believe that I have made our position sufficiently Plear at a previous meeting of the Committee, and I shall not attempt to repeat it. I would only add that in many cases of local disturbances in and around Hankow the menace to the security of foreign communities in general assumed so serious a proportion that those various communities organized volunteer corps for their self-protection, and that the Japanese garrison was called upon to extend active assistance and cooperation to the foreign volunteer corps.

"'It may not be out of place to give here a short account of the deplorable condition of disorder and lawlessness in China proper. (See Appendix II.)

ese troops stationed along the Chinese Eastern
Railway, criticisms have been made by the Chinese
Delegation on the continued presence of Japanese
expeditionary forces in Siberia. The Japanese
Delegation desires to reserve the discussion of this

question for a suitable opportunity which will later on be afforded by the Conference. For the present, I shall content myself by pointing out that the stationing of Japanese troops along the Chinese Eastern Railway is due to the Interallied Agreement of 1919, in which China participated, and that those troops will be withdrawn immediately upon the evacuation of the Maritime Province by Japanese forces."

I omit reading the appendices.

We now invite the Tribunal's attention to the totals in that appendices.

We next offer in evidence defense document 200-E, being a further excerpt from the previous exhibit.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 200-E

will be exhibit No. 2319-E.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2319-E and received in evidence.)

Morse & Barton

MR. LAZARUS: (Reading) "BARON SHIDEHARA said there was a question he wished to raise in connection with the matters discussed relating to the open door. He then made the following statement:

"The Japanese Delegation understands that one of the primary objects which the present Conference on Far Eastern questions has in view is to promote the general welfare of the Chinese people and, at the same time, of all nations interested in China. For the realization of that desirable end, nothing is of greater importance than the development and utilization of the unlimited natural resources of China.

"'It is agreed on all sides that China is a country with immense potentialities. She is richly endowed by nature with arable soil, with mines and with raw materials of various kinds. But those natural resources are of little practical value, so long as they remain undeveloped and unutilized. In order to make full use of them, it seems essential that China shall open her own door to foreign capital and to foreign trade and enterprise.

"'Touching on this subject, Mr. Sze, on behalf of the Chinese Delegation, made an immortant statement to the full Committee on November 16th, declaring that "China wishes to make her wast natural

3

5

6

9

11

12

10

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

23

24

25

resources available to all people who need them."

That statement evidently represents the wisdom and foresight of China, and the Japanese Delegation is confident that the principle which it enunciated will be carried out to its full extent.

"'It is to be hoped that, in the application of that principle, China may be disposed to extend to foreigners, as far as possible, the opportunity of cooperation in the development and utilization of China's natural resources. Any spontaneous declaration by Chine of her policy in that direction will be received with much gratification by Japan and also, no doubt, by all other nations interested in China. Resolutions which have hitherto been adopted by this Committee have been uniformly guided by the spirit of self-denial and self-sacrifice on the part of foreign Powers in favor of China. The Japanese Delegation trusts that China, on her part, will not be unwilling to formulate a policy which will prove of considerable benefit no less to China herself than to all nations!"

We next offer in evidence defense document 200-F being a further excerpt from the previous exhibit.

GENERAL VASILIEV: If the Court please,

considering the importance of the issue reised, I would like to make objections. Though the Soviet prosecution in its opening statement mentioned the period of the Japanese intervention in Siberia in 1918-1921, 4 it was mentioned as an historical fact of common 5 knowledge, an historic forerunner of later Japanese 6 ggression. However, in conformity with the principle There accepted, we took into consideration that the 8 event took place in the period not covered by the 9 Indictment and the accused were not charged with it. 10Therefore, there is no need for the defense to try 11to disprove it. If the document is to be admitted 12 sling with some specific aspect of the intervention 13 would mean that the Tribunal decided to deal the the period of 1918-1921 not covered by the Indictment and especially to inquire into issues connected with the Japanese intervention in Soviet Siberia. In such case we shall have to submit considerable evidence which is in our possession dealing with the issue and the innumerable crimes perpetrated by the Japanese during the intervention against the Russian people. Moreover, it must be taken into consideration that Beron SHIDEHARA is not a witness on this issue; neither is he an eye witness, and he does not speak of his own actions or somebody else's actions but deals with the

problem in a general way. As far as we know Baron SHIDFHARA is not an authority on history or on international law and his conclusions as to the aims and nature of the Japanese intervention have no value whatsoever. Therefore, I object to the presentation of this document and respectfully request the Tribunal not to admit it.

1

2

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Lazarus.

MR. LAZARUS: Mr. President, the prosecutor himself has just stated that they referred to this incident as historical background, and they call it the historical forerunner of later Japanese aggression against Russia. Now, as I said in answer to Mr. Comyns Carr yesterday, that is their side of the sotry. Now it is our turn to tell our side. We are giving our side of this historical background and we intend to show and we will show -- we have the evidence to show -- that Japan never aggressed against Russia. On the contrary, it was always the other way around. When we seek to give historical background just as the prosecution did, that doesn't mean that is going to make an issue of the case and extend it back to 1928. We are simply doing what the prosecution did and we respectfully request that we be permitted to but in our historical background. It will

not be necessary on the part of the prosecution to adduce further evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Baron SHIDEHARA was the spokesman of Japan on that occasion and we must take it he had a mandate to say what he did.

MR. LAZARUS: That is correct, sir.

Japan's attitude and the facts upon which that attitude was based. So far as the facts went, his statement was hearsay but the Charter admits that. The only question is whether what he said is relevant to any issue that we have to determine. We have admitted many documents in the last two days with no great certainty as to their relevancy and we have made reservations. It may be that this evidence will justify evidence in rebuttal if it can be given, but even if it cannot be given that does not shut out material evidence for the defense. We have decided to admit the document with the usual reservations.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 200-F will receive exhibit No. 2319F.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2319-F and received in evidence.)

MR. LAZARUS: In the light of what Mr. Comyns

Carr said, Mr. President, I must again state the defense's position to the Tribunal. At no time will we seek or will we even try to embarrass any one of our Allied nations. There is certain evidence that must be adduced and we are doing our duty asattorneys to present it.

THE PRESIDENT: The question is not the defense's motive but whether the evidence has probative value.

MR. LAZARUS: (Reading) "Baron SHIDEHARA said that, if the discussion on the Siberian problem was to be proceeded with, it might be of interest for the Committee to know exactly the intentions and aims of Japan in regard to Siberia, and, with the permission of the Chairman and of the Committee, he would make a concise statement in this respect.

"He then read as follows:

was originally undertaken in common accord and in cooperation with the United States in 1918. It was primarily intended to render assistance to the Czecho-Slovak troops who in their homeward journey across Siberia from European Russia found themselves in grave and pressing danger at the hands of hostile forces under German command. The Japanese and American

expeditionary forces, together with other Allied troops, fought their way from Vladivostok far into the region of the Amur and the Trans-Baikal Provinces to protect the railway lines which afforded the sole means of transportation of the Czecho-Slovak troops from the interior of Siberia to the port of Vladivostok. Difficulties which the Allied forces had to encounter in their operations in the severe cold winter of Siberia were immense.

"'In January, 1920, the United States decided to terminate its military undertaking in Siberia, and ordered the withdrawal of its forces. For some time thereafter, Japanese troops continued alone to carry out the duty of guarding several points along the Trans-Siberian Railway in fulfillment of interallied arrangements, and of affording facilities to the returning Czecho-Slovaks.

"The last column of Checho-Slovak troops safely embarked from Vladivostok in September, 1920.

Ever since then Japan has been looking forward to an early moment for the withdrawal of her troops from Siberia. The maintenance of such troops in a foreign land is for her a costly and thankless undertaking, and she will be only too happy to be relieved of such responsibility. In fact, the evacuation of the

1 2 3

Trans-Baikal and the Amur Provinces was already complated in 1920. The only region which now remains to be evacuated is the southern portion of the Maritime Province around Vladivostock and Nikolsk.

5

4

7.

8

10

11

12

14

1516

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"'It will be appreciated that for Japan the question of the withdrawal of troops from Siberia is not quite as simpl as it was for other Allied Powers. In the first place, there are a considerable number of Japanese residents who had lawfully and under guaranties of treaty established themselves in Siberia long before the Folshevik eruption, and were there entirely welcomed. In 1917, prior to the joint American-Japanese military enterprise, the number of such residents was already no less than 9717. In the actual situation rrevailing there, those Jamanese residents can hardly be expected to look for the protection of their lives and property to any other authorities than Japanese troops. What wer districts those troops have evacuated in the past have fallen into disorder, and practically all Japanese residents have had precipitately to withdraw, to seek for their personal safety. In so withdrawing, they have been obliged to leave behind large portions of their property, abandoned and unprotected, and their homes and places of business have been destroyed. While the hardships and losses

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

thus caused the Japanese in the Trans-Baikel and the Amur Provinces have been serious enough, more extensive damages are likely to follow from the evacuation of Vladivostok in which a larger number of Japanese have always been resident and a greater amount of Japanese capital invested.

"There is another difficulty by which Japan is faced in proceeding to the recall of her trooms from the Maritime Province. Due to geographical propinguity the general situation in the districts ground Vldivostok and Nikolsk is bound to affect the security of the Korean frontier. In particular it is known that these districts have long been the base of Korean conspiracies against Japan. Those hostile Koreans, joining hands with lawless elements in Russia, attempted in 1920 to invade Korea through the Chinese territory of Chientao. They set fire to the Japanese Consulate at Hunchun and committed indiscriminate acts of murder and pillage. At the present time they are under the effective control of Jaranese troops stationed in the Maritime Province, but they will no doubt renew the attempt to penetrate into Korea at the first favorable opportunity that may present itself.

"'Having regard to those considerations, the Japanese Government have felt bound to exercise

precaution in carrying out the contemplated evacuation of the Maritime Province. Should they take hasty action without adequate provision for the future they would be delinquent in their duty of affording protection to a large number of their nationals resident in the districts in question and of maintaining order and security in Korea.

Maritime Province is under Japan's military occupation.

Japanese troops are still stationed in the southern portion of that Province, but they have not set up any civil or military administration to displace local authorities. Their activity is confined to measures of self-protection against the menace to their own safety and to the safety of their country and nationals. They are not in occupation of those districts any more than American or other Allied troops could be said to have been in occupation of the places in which they were formerly stationed.

"The Japanese Government are anxious to see an orderly and stable authority speedily reestablished in the Far Eastern rossessions of Russia. It was in this spirit that they manifested a keen interest in the patriotic but ill-fated struggle of Admiral Kolchak. They have shown readiness to lend

1 2

7 8

their good offices for prompting the reconciliation of various political groups in Eastern Siberia. But they have carefully refrained from supporting one faction against another. It will be recalled, for instance, that they withheld all assistance from General Rozanow against the revolutionary movements which led to his overthrow in January, 1920. They maintained an attitude of strict neutrality and refused to interfere in those movements, which it would have been quite easy for them to suppress if they had so desired.

tion, it may be useful to refer briefly to the past relations between the Japanese authorities and Ataman Semenoff, which seem to have been a source of popular misgiving and speculation. It will be remembered that the growing rapprochement between the Germans and the Bolshevik Government in Russia in the early part of 1918 naturally gave rise to apprehensions in the Allied countries that a considerable quantity of munitions supplied by those countries and stored in Vladivostok might be removed by the Bolsheviks to European Russia for the use of the Germans. Ataman Semenoff was then in Siberia and was organizing a movement to check such Bolshevik activities and to preserve order and stability

in that region. It was in this situation that Japan, as well as some of the Allies, began to give support to the Cossack chief. After a few months, such support by the other Powers was discontinued, but the Japanese were reluctant to abandon their friend, whose afforts in the Allied cause they had originally encouraged, and they maintained for some time their connection with Ataman Semenoff. They had, however, no intention whatever of interfering in the domestic affairs of Russia, and when it was found that the assistance rendered to the Ataman was likely to complicate the internal situation in Siberia, they terminated all relations with him and no support of any kind has since been extended to him by the Japanese authorities.

considering plans which would justify them in carrying out their decision of the complete withdrawal of Japanese troops from the Maritime Province with reasonable precaution for the security of Japanese residents and of the Korean frontier regions. It is for this purpose that negotiations were opened some time ago at Darien between the Japanese representatives and the agents of the Chita Government.

"'Those negotiations at Dairen are in no way intended to secure for Japan any right or adventage of an exclusive nature. They have been solely

actuated by a desire to adjust some of the more 1 pressing questions with which Janan is confronted in relation to Siberia. They have essentially in view 3 the conclusion of provisional commercial arrangements, the removal of the existing menace to the security 5 of Japan and to the lives and property of Japanese 6 residents in Eastern Siberia, the provision of guaranties for the freedom of lawful undertakings in that region, and the prohibition of Bolshevik propaganda 9 over the Siberian border. Should adequate provisions be arranged on the line indicated, the Javanese Government will at once proceed to the complete withdrawal of Japanese troops from the Maritime Province.

"'The occupation of cortain points in the Russian Province of Sakhalin is wholly different both in nature and in origin, from the stationing of troops in the Maritime Province. History affords few instances similar to the incident of 1920 at Nikolaievsk, where more than seven hundred Japanese, including women and children, as well as the duly recognized Japanese Consul and his family and his official staff, were cruelly tortured and massacred. No nation worthy of respect will possibly remain forbearing under such a strain of provocation. Nor was it possible for the Japanese Government to disregard

2

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

1 2 3

the just popular indignation arounsed in Japan by the incident. Under the actual condition of things, Japan found no alternative but to occupy, as a measure of reprisal, certain points in the Russian Province of Sakhalin in which the outrage was committed, pending the establishment in Russia of a responsible authority with whom she can communicate in order to obtain due satisfaction.

Japanese Government than to take advantage of the present helpless condition of Russia for prosecuting selfish designs. Japan recalls with deep gratitude and appreciation the brilliant role which Russia played in the interest of civilization during the earlier stage of the Great War. The Japanese people have shown and will continue to show every sympathetic interest in the efforts of patriotic Russians aspiring to the unity and rehabilitation of their country. The military occupation of the Russian Province of Sakhalin is only a temporary measure, and will naturally come to an end as soon as a satisfactory settlement of the question shall have been arranged with an orderly Russian Government.

"'In conclusion, the Japanese Delegation is authorized to declare that it is the fixed and settled

of Russia and to observe the principle of nonintervention in the internal affairs of that country, as well as the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations in every part of the Russian possessions.'"

We next offer in evidence defense document 200-G, being a further excerpt from the previous defense exhibit.

of the document concerning the so-called treaty of 1915 between China and Japan on the grounds of immateriality and irrelevancy. The treaty itself is not valid. This treaty has never received legislative concurrance which is required to give validity to treaties according to Article 35 of the Provisional Constitution of China then in force. This was one of the reasons why China consistently refused to recognize the validity of this treaty at the Paris Peace Conference and also at the Washington Conference on the limitation of armaments.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, our decision on General Vasiliev's objection covers this. It is admitted on the same terms and with the same reservations.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 200-G 1 will receive exhibit No. 2319-G. 2 (Whoreupon, the document above 3 referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2319-G and received in evidence.) 5 THE PRESIDENT: If you come to any expressions 6 offensive to any country you may omit them because 7 they don't help us and we shall disregard them. 8 MR. LAZARUS: I most certainly shall, your Honor. 10 THE PRESIDENT: We will disregard any offensive 11 expressions by Baron SHIDEHARA or anybody else so far 12 as they are just offensive and nothing more. 13 We will adjourn until half past one. 14 (Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was 15 taken.) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

7.

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.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Lazarus.

MR. LAZARUS: Reading from document 200-G, Mr. President, which is defense exhibit 2319-G:

"The Chairman then said that he understood that the next subject to be brought up was the matter which had been generally called the 'Twenty-one Demands,' and he believed an opportunity had been reserved for the Japanese Delegation to speak upon that subject.

"Baron SHIDEHARA read the following statement:

the Chinese Delegation presented a statement urging that the Sino-Japanese Treaties and Notes of 1915 be reconsidered and cancelled. The Japanese Delegation, while appreciating the difficult position of the Chinese Delegation, does not feel at liberty to concur in the procedure now resorted to by China with a view to cancellation of international engagements which she entered into as a free sovereign nation.

"'It is presumed that the Chinese Delegation

has no intention of calling in question the legal validity of the compacts of 1915, which were formally signed and scaled by the duly authorized representatives of the two Governments, and for which the exchange of ratifications was effected in conformity with established international usages. The insistence by China on the cancellation of those instruments would in italial indicate that she shares the view that the compacts actually remain in force and will continue to be effective, unless and until they are cancelled.

ready consent to cessions of its territorial or other rights of importance. If it should once be recognized that rights solemnly granted by treaty may be revoked at any time on the ground that they were conceded against the spontaneous will of the grantor, an exceedingly dangerous precedent will be established, with far-reaching consequences upon the stability of the existing international relations in Asia, in Europe and everywhere.

"The statement of the Chinese Delegation

nder review declares that China accepted the Japanese
demands in 1915, hoping that a day would come when she
the statement of the Chinese Delegation

accepted the Japanese
belogation that a day would come when she
the statement of the Chinese Delegation

accepted the Japanese
belogation

The statement of the Chinese Delegation

accepted the Japanese
belogation

The statement of the Chinese Delegation

accepted the Japanese
belogation

The statement of the Chinese Delegation

accepted the Japanese
belogation

The statement of the Chinese Delegation

accepted the Japanese

4 5

difficult to understand the meaning of this assertion.

It cannot be the intention of the Chinese Delegation to intimate that China may conclude a treaty, with any thought in mind of breaking it at the first opportunity.

Treaties and Notes in question are derogatory to the principles adopted by the Conference with regard to China's sovereignty and independence. It has, however, been held by the Conference on more than one occasion that concessions made by China ex contractu, in the exercise of her own sovereign rights, cannot be regarded as inconsistent with her sovereignty and independence.

"Twenty-One demands," often used to denote the Treaties and Notes of 1915, is inaccurate and grossly misleading.

that the whole original proposals of Japan had been pressed by Japan and accepted in toto by China. As a matter of fact, not only "Group V" but also several other matters contained in Japan's first proposals were eliminated entirely or modified considerably, in deference to the wishes of the Chinese Government, when the final formula was presented to China for acceptance.

Official records published by the two Governments

 relating to those negotiations will further show that the most important terms of the Treaties and Notes, as signed, had already been virtually agreed to by the Chinese negotiators before the delivery of the ultimatum, which then seemed to the Japanese Government the only way of bringing the protracted negotiations to a speedy close.

"The Japanese Delegation cannot bring itself to the conclusion that any useful purpose will be served by research and re-examination at this Conference of old grievances which one of the nations represented here may have against another. It will be more in line with the high aim of the Conference to look forward to the future with hope and with confidence.

"Having in view, however, the changes which have taken place in the situation since the conclusion of the Sino-Japanese Treaties and Notes of 1915, the Japanese Delegation is happy to avail itself of the present occasion to make the following declaration:

"'1. Japan is ready to throw open to the joint activity of the International Financial Consortium recently organized, the right of option granted exclusively in favor of Japanese capital, with regard, first, to loans for the construction of railways in South Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia, and, second, to

loans to be secured on taxes in that region; it being understood that nothing in the present declaration shall be held to imply any modification or annulment of the 3 understanding recorded in the officially announced notes and memoranda which were exchanged among the Governments of the countries represented in the Consortium and also among the national financial groups composing the Consortium, in relation to the scope of the joint activity of that organization. Japan has no intention of insisting on 10 her preferential right under the Sino-Japanese arrange-11 ments in question concerning the engagement by China 12 of Japanese advisers or instructors on political, finan-13 cial, military or police matters in South Manchuria. 14 Japan is further ready to withdraw the 15 reservation which she made, in proceeding to the signature of the Sino-Japanese Treaties and Notes of 1915, 1.7 to the effect that Group V of the original proposals 18 of the Japanese Government would be postponed for 19 future negotiations. "'It would be needless to add that all matters 21 relating to Shantung contained in those Treaties and

"'In coming to this decision, which I have had

Notes have now been definitely adjusted and disposed

24

25

of.

the honor to announce, Japan has been guided by a spirit of fairness and moderation, having always in view China's sovereign rights and the principle of equal opportunity."

And now the last excerpt from this book, we offer defense document 200-H.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 200-H

will receive exhibit No. 2319-H.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2319-H, and was received in evidence.)

MR. LAZARUS: The second paragraph on the first page.

"THE CHAIRMAN: At the last Plenary Session of the Conference I had the pleasure of stating that the Chinese and Japanese Delegates had informed me that they had agreed upon a settlement of the controversy relating to Shantung. I now have the pleasure of stating that I am informed by the Chinese and Japanese representatives that the proposed Treaty on the question of Shantung has been agreed upon, the form of text approved, and the Treaty is ready for signature.

"I am directed by the Committee on Pacific

7.

and Far Eastern Questions to read, for the purpose of having the statements formally placed upon the records of the Conference, the following declarations with respect to the so-called Twenty-One Demands or the Sino-Japanese Treaties and Notes of 1915."

Skipping to page 5, at the bottom of the page:

"Thereupon, on behalf of the American Government, I stated to the Committee the position of the
Government of the United States:

"The important statement made by Baron SHIDEHARA on behalf of the Japanese Government makes it appropriate that I should refer to the position of the Government of the United States as it was set forth in identical notes addressed by that Government to the Chinese Government and to the Japanese Government on May 13, 1915.

"'The note to the Chinese Government was as follows:

"In view of the circumstances of the negotiations which have taken place and which are now pending between the Government of China and the Government of Japan and of the Agreements which have been reached as a result thereof, the Government of the United States has the honor to notify the Government of the Chinese Republic that it cannot recognize any

agreement or undertaking which has been entered into or which may be entered into between the Governments of China and Japan impairing the treaty rights of the United States and its citizens in China, the political or territorial integrity of the Republic of China, or the international policy relative to China commonly known as the open door policy.

"'An identical Note has been transmitted to the Imperial Japanese Government.'

"'That statement was in accord with the historic policy of the United States in its relation to China, and its position as thus stated has been, and still is, consistently maintained.

matters concerning Shantung, which formed the substance of Group I of the original demands, and were the subject of the Treaty and Exchange of Notes with respect to the Province of Shantung, have been settled to the mutual satisfaction of the two parties by negotiations conducted collaterally with this Conference, as reported to the Plenary Session of February 1st.

"'It is also gratifying to be advised by the statement made by Baron SHIDEHARA, on behalf of the Japanese Government, that Japan is now ready to withdraw the reservation which she made, in proceeding to

the signature of the Treaties and Notes of 1915, to the effect that Group V of the Original proposals of the Japanese Government--namely, those concerning the employment of influential Japanese as political, financial and military advisers; land for schools and hospitals; certain railways in South China; the supply of arms, and the right of preaching--would be postponed for future negotiations. This definite withdrawal of the outstanding questions under Group V removes what has been an occasion for considerable apprehension on the part alike of China and of foreign nations, which felt that the renewal of these demands could not but prejudice the principles of the integrity of China and of the open door.

"With respect to the Treaty and the Notes concerning South Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia, Baron SHIDEHARA has made the reassuring statement that Japan has no intention of insisting on a preferential right concerning the engagement by China of Japanese advisers or instructors on political, financial, military or police matters in South Manchuria.

"'Baron SHIDEHARA has likewise indicated the readiness of Japan not to insist upon the right of option granted exclusively in favor of Japanese capital with regard, first, to loans for the construction of

railways in South Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia; and, second, with regard to loans secured on the taxes of those regions; but that Japan will throw them open to the joint activity of the International Financial Consortium recently organized.

"'As to this, I may say that it is doubtless the fact that any enterprise of the character contemplated, which may be undertaken in these regions by foreign capital, would in all probability be undertaken by the Consortium. But it should be observed that existing treaties would leave the opportunity for such enterprises open on terms of equality to the citizens of all nations. It can scarcely be assumed that this general right of the treaty Powers in China can be effectively restricted to the nationals of those countries which are participants in the work of the Consortium, or that any of the Governments which have taken part in the organization of the Consortium would feel themselves to be in a position to deny all rights in the matter to any save the members of their respective national groups in that organization. I therefore trust that it is in this sense that we may properly interpret the Japanese Government's declaration of willingness to relinquish its claim under the 1915 Treaties to any exclusive position with respect to

2

1

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

3

4 5

7

8

6

9

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

23 24

25

railway construction and to financial operations secured upon local revenues, in South Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia.

"It is further to be pointed out that by Articles II, III and IV of the Treaty of May 25, 1915, with respect to South Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia, the Chinese Government granted to Japanese subjects the right to lease land for building purposes, for trade and manufacture, and for agricultural purposes in South Manchuria, to reside and travel in South Manchuria, and to engage in any kind of business and manufacture there, and to enter into joint undertakings with Chinese citizens in agriculture and similar industries in Eastern Inner Mongolia.

"With respect to this grant, the Government of the United States will, of course, regard it as not intended to be exclusive, and, as in the past, will claim from the Chinese Government for American citizens the benefits accruing to them by virtue of the most favored nation clauses in the treaties between the United States and China.

"'I may pause here to remark that the question of the validity of treaties as between Japan and China is distinct from the question of the treaty rights of the United States under its treaties with China; those

7 8

rights have been emphasized and consistently asserted by the United States.

ing the general right of its citizens to engage in commercial and industrial enterprises in China, it has been the traditional policy of the American Government to insist upon the doctrine of equality for the nationals of all countries, and this policy, together with the other policies mentioned in the Note of May 13, 1915, which I have quoted, are consistently maintained by this Government. I may say that it is with especial pleasure that the Government of the United States finds itself now engaged in the act of reaffirming and defining, and I hope that I may add, revitalising, by the proposed Nine Power Treaty, these policies with respect to China.

"After these statements it was proposed and decided in the Committee that the statements thus made should be reported to the Conference to be spread upon its record. In the course of the vote Mr. Koo stated in the Committee that his colleagues and he himself desired to indorse the Chairman's suggestion that all of the statements on this very important question should be spread upon the records of the Conference, it being understood of course that the Chinese Delegation

reserved their right to seek a solution on all future appropriate occasions concerning those portions of the Treaties and Notes of 1915 which did not appear to have been expressly relinquished by the Japanese Government. The Chairman stated: "'Of course it is understood that the rights of all Powers are reserved with respect to the matters mentioned by Mr. Koo. ""

•

3

2

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, may I point out that my friend did not read the statement of the Chinese case in answer to the statement of the Japanese case, which he did read, which is to be found on pages 3, 4 and 5 of this document. I do not propose to ask that they should be read now; but if the Tribunal should ultimately decide to pay any attention to this document it will be necessary to read the Chinese side as well as the Japanese side.

MR. LAZARUS: The Tribunal will note that I also omitted the Japanese statement that is contained here. They were both omitted in order to save time because they have been referred to previously, or similar matters have been referred to previously.

MR. COMYNS CARR: My friend is mistaken. did read the Japanese side in the previous document, which is repeated here. The Chinese side has never been read.

MR. LAZARUS: As the prosecution did for the last eight months, we read only those parts that we want to read; and, as they told us then, you can read what you want when your turn comes.

We next offer for identification only the book entitled "The Washington Conference, Treaties

and Resolutions," compiled and edited by the Japanese Government; and the excerpt therefrom, defense document 237. is offered in evidence as a defense exhibit. I 3 shall read only Resolution 9 on page 2.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 237 is marked exhibit No. 2320 for identification only, and the excerpt therefrom, bearing the same document number, will receive exhibit No. 2320-A.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

(Whereupon, defense document No. 237 was marked defense exhibit No, 2320 for identification; and the excerpt therefrom was marked defense exhibit No. 2320-A and received in evidence.)

MR. LAZARUS: (Reading) "No. 9. Resolution Regarding the Reduction of Chinese Military Forces.

"Whereas the Powers attending this Conference have been deeply impressed with the severe drain on the public revenue of China through the maintenance in various parts of the country, of military forces, excessive in number and controlled by the military chiefs of the provinces without coordination,

"And whereas the continued maintenance of these forces appears to be mainly responsible for China's present unsettled political conditions,

4

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

"And whereas it is felt that large and prompt reductions of these forces will not only advance the cause of China's political unity and economic development but will hasten her financial rehabilitation;

"Therefore, without any intention to interfere in the internal problems of China, but animated by the sincere desire to see China develop and maintain for herself an effective and stable government alike in her own interest and in the general interest of trade;

"And being inspired by the spirit of this Conference whose aim is to reduce, through the limitation of armament, the enormous disbursements which manifestly constitute the greater part of the encumbrance upon enterprise and national prosperity;

"It is resolved: That this Conference express to China the earnest hope that immediate and effective steps may be taken by the Chinese Government to reduce the aforesaid military forces and expenditures.

"Adopted by the Conference on the Limitation of Armament at the Fifth Plenary Session, February 1st, 1922."

In connection with the Washington Conference and other matters contained therein, we now offer in evidence defense document 202-L-2, which is an excerpt from defense exhibit which was offered for identification

only, No. 2290.

22 23

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Lefense document 202-
BRIGADIER NOLAN: Excuse me, please.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Pardon me.

point out that the document which is now being offered, No. 202-D-2, is in no better position than the document which was rejected by the Court yesterday, which was No. 202-D-1. It is, again, an excerpt from the book of Mr. John B. Powell, and is objected to on the same grounds and for the same reasons which were urged in respect of document 202-D-1.

MR. LAZARUS: Mr. President, yesterday the Tribunal rejected the excerpt on the grounds that it contained, as pointed out by the prosecution, opinions of the author.

THE PRESIDENT: Opinions gathered by the author, I think.

MR. LAZARUS: Yes, sir, Mr. President.

This excerpt, I respectfully point out to the Tribunal, does not contain opinions, either his own or gathered by him, but contains facts. It contains facts, for instance, on the abrogation of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance: not his opinions as to why, but the facts

on how it came about.

THE PRESIDENT: What authority is he? He is not a historian.

MR. LAZARUS: No, Mr. President, but he certainly is anything that the prosecution introduced him to this Court as being, a reporter who has been a student of Chinese affairs for this many years; and here he is doing no more than he did on the stand, reporting the facts that he knew.

When Mr. Powell was on the stand on behalf of the prosecution, he even reported things that he had heard as rumors.

THE PRESIDENT: As a witness, he spoke of what he observed in China. Here he is writing a book about politics.

MR. LAZARUS: But he reports the facts that

THE PRESIDENT: This is not standard history.

It is just a journalist's account.

MR. LAZARUS: Prosecution also brought in Mr. Goette, as well as Mr. Powell, who told what they had known and what they had observed in their careers as reporters. This man is a reporter, and he observes here and reports what he knows about China and how the Washington Conference settled matters about China.

Mr. President, we must accept it in the same light we did before.

THE PRESIDENT: The fact that he was a witness does not improve your claim to have his book received.

MR. LAZARUS: That is true, Mr. President, but if he were here he would be able to testify to these facts the same as he testified to others, Mr. President. We are asking no more than that, sir. Mr. President, may I point out that there was permitted to be introduced an article written by Mr. Powell that had appeared in the Chicago Tribune, that was introduced several months after Mr. Powell had left the stand.

THE PRESIDENT: If I recall correctly, that was about some atrocities committed in China.

MR. LAZARUS: That is right. He had referred to it while he was on the stand.

THE PRESIDENT: You are asking us to accept his political survey.

MR. LAZARUS: No, Mr. President. These are facts, Mr. President, that he gathered while being a reporter and are the identical types of facts that he referred to while he was on the stand. This is no more and no less, Mr. President, than

d 0 n 80

> 11 12

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

13

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

further testimony by this same witness the same as 1 if he had been on the stand at this time and we were asking the questions. 3 THE PRESIDENT: If he had said these things 4 in the witness box we would have stopped him imme-5 diately. 6 The objection is allowed. 7 MR. LAZARUS: Mr. President, then may we 8 have a subpoena for Mr. Powell? 9 10 THE PRESIDENT: If you apply in Chambers for a subpoena for Mr. Powell to give this testi-11 12 mony, I will reject your application. 13 LR. LAZARUS: May I point out, Mr. Presi-14 dent, that your Honor --15 THE PRESIDENT: I have given the decision. 16 MR. LAZARUS: Yes, sir. 17 MR. SMITH: Will your Eonor hear ne 18 briefly because a number of excerpts out of 19 Mr. Powell's book --20 THE PRESIDENT: I cannot hear you Mr. Smith. 21 I have no power to revoke the decision of 22 the Tribunal. I have given it and it stands, Mr. 23 Smith. If you have excerpts to tender later we will 24 have to consider them on their nerits, whatever they 25 may be.

MR. SMITH: Well, your Honor, I thought probably you were making a general ruling, and I simply wanted to point out that many of the excerpts deal with matters which personally happened to Mr. Powell in China and things which he personally witnessed.

THE PRESIDENT: They may be in a different category. This is a political survey and has been rejected as such.

MR. LAZARUS: We next offer in evidence another excerpt from this document, defense document 202-D-3, Mr. President.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: Whatever might -THE PRESIDENT: I know nothing about it,
Brigadier Nolan. You are talking over our heads
until we look at it. Yes, now we know, Brigadier
Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: Whatever might be said in support of document 202-D-2, there is nothing that could be said in support of 202-D-3, which is merely a political plum that this gentleman has put in his book which adds nothing to this case or the evidence.

MR. LAZARUS: The Washington Conference is a very important document in this case.

The manner in which those terms were carried out by various countries, including Japan, is of vital importance in this case. Here we have factual evidence that one of the countries did not carry out its terms of this conference. The significance of this and how other countries interpreted and worked under the Washington Conference will be pointed out later. This is one of the evidences of factual carrying-out of this conference. And may I point out in the third line, after the word "Canton," I have stricken out the next seven words, in conformity with the President's request this morning that certain types of words should be stricken.

THE PRESIDENT: The decision on defense document 202-D-2 applies. The objection is upheld.

MR. LAZARUS: That concludes my number of documents, Mr. President. Mr. Yamaoka will conclude for the prosecution on this phase -- for the defense rather. Sorry.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: May it please the Tribunal, we next offer in evidence defense document 40, being the declaration of France, Great Britain, Italy, Japan and Russia not to conclude a separate peace, signed November 30, 1915, for the purpose of showing that prosecution exhibit 51 containing a similar agreement between Germany, Italy, and Japan is nothing unusual between allies engaged in war and that it is not necessarily evidence of conspiracy as charged by the prosecution.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 40

will receive exhibit No. 2321.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2321 and received in evidence.)

MR. YAMAOKA: With the Tribunal's permission I shall read defense exhibit 2321.

(Reading) "Declaration upon which France,
Great Britain, Italy, Japan and Russia Agree not to
Conclude a Separate Peace. Signed in London in French,
30 November 1915 (4th year of Taisho)."

I shall skip the next prefatory three lines. "The Italian Government having decided to

8 9

adhere to the Declaration made in London on the 5th of September 1914 by the French, British and Russian Governments, a declaration to which the Japanese Government equally adhered dated the 19th of October 1915, the undersigned duly authorized by their respective governments, made the following declaration:

"The French, British, Italian, Japanese and Russian Governments mutually agree not to conclude a separate peace during the course of the present war. The five Governments agree that when the occasion arises to discuss peace terms none of the allied powers will be able to lay down peace conditions without previous accord with each one of the other allies. The undersigned in this faith have signed the present declaration and have placed their seals on it."

THE PRESIDENT: What point are you making there, Mr. Yamaoka?

MR. YAMAOKA: As I alluded in my prefatory remarks, Mr. President, we intend to tie this in later to meet the charge of the prosecution that the conclusion of the military alliance between Germany, Italy and Japan, as well as the secret protocols or agreements annexed thereto and the no separate peace pact, all of which have been introduced into evidence

8 9

in the case, ostensibly in support of the conspiracy counts, is not necessarily evidence of such conspiracy and that it is not an uncommon practice among nations of the world to engage in such agreements as between allies.

THE PRESIDENT: An agreement is a conspiracy only if it involves something unlawful in the end or the means. What is there unlawful in this pact you have just read?

MR. YAMAOKA: We submit, your Honor, that there is nothing unlawful in this agreement and neither in the agreements alluded to.

THE PRESIDENT: The 1915 pact against separate peace was lawful, therefore all subsequent pacts are lawful. However, it is in there as evidence.

MR. YAMAOKA: For similar purposes and particularly in order to meet the contentions of the prosecution and the implication drawn from prosecution's exhibits 49 and 51, we shall introduce various treaties signed between the allied powers subsequent to the outbreak of World War II for the purpose of showing analogous if not identical acts undertaken by them.

We now offer in evidence defense document 150, being the treaty of mutual assistance between

France, the United Kingdom and Turkey, dated October 19, 1939.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal, I did not object to the last document because I understood that the Tribunal did not wish me to object to these documents merely on the ground of irrelevance. This one is subject to exactly the comment which your Honor made on the last one. The prosecution has never suggested that the making of a no separate peace pact is in itself unlawful. Cur point with regard to the no separate peace pact between Germany, Japan and Italy in 1941 is that it was negotiated secretly for some weeks before it was signed at the same time that Japan was pretending to be carrying on negotiations for a peaceful settlement with the United States. This document is wholly irrelevant in itself and the no separate peace clause in it is irrelevant, in my submission, for the reasons stated.

THE PRESIDENT: This document and the last document are entirely different from those that we have admitted with some doubt as to their relevancy.

MR. YAMAOKA: With regard to this point, if the Tribunal please, I should desire to add that this forms the foundation for later evidence to follow to

2

1

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

counteract the charge of conspiracy by the accused. 1 The objection is upheld. 2 MR. YAMAOKA: In the light of the Tribunal's 3 ruling on the previous document, I should like at 4 5 this time to make an offer of proof that the following documents which I had intended to introduce --6 THE PRESIDENT: Do you concede that the 8 decision covers these documents you are about to 9 mention? 10 MR. YAMAOKA: A few of the following documents, 11 your Honor, but I should like the record to show the 12 offer of proof made by the defense. 13 THE PRESIDENT: We cannot say whether our 14 decision covers documents we have never seen or know 15 nothing about. 16 MR. YAMAOKA: Then, if the Tribunal please, 17 may I respectfully request that the last document be 18 marked for identification, being defense document 150. 19 THE PRESIDENT: The document has been wholly 20 rejected. 21 MR. YAMAOKA: I trust that I made myself 22 clear, your Honor, that I should like to have it merely 23 marked for identification in order to show our offer 24 of proof only.

THE PRESIDENT: Documents have been marked

here for identification for a special reason. They are parent documents from which excerpts have been taken and we want the control of the parent document. That is why they were marked.

MR. YAMAOKA: According to practice to which I am accustomed, if the Tribunal please, in instances where documents are rejected we still have the privilege of offering them for identification and having it--

2.2

2

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

THE PRESIDENT: There is no need for it, Mr. Yamaoka, there is no need for it really. There is a full record kept of all you have said and all we have done; and the document is clearly enough identified. It is a treaty of which judicial notice would have to be taken practically. We will do nothing here without a good reason.

MR. YAMAOKA: Yes, your Honor. In accordance with the Tribunal's ruling I should like to have the record show that the defense offers for identification only -- I believe this is in accordance with what your Honor's ruling has been --

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal's.

MR. YAMAOKA: -- defense document 151, being the agreement of mutual assistance between the United Kingdom and Poland signed at London, August 25, 1939. In accordance with the desires of my associates, Mr. President, I should like to amend the statement I just made, and I should like to tender this document in evidence.

MR. CARR: We object for the same reasons as the last time.

THE PRESIDENT: You rely on the same grounds for its submission, I suppose?

(Whereupon, Mr. Yamaoka nodded head.)

21

22

2324

24

at London, May 26, 1942, in force from July 4, 1942. 1 MR. CARR: Same objection, your Honor. 2 THE PRESIDENT: Objection upheld. 3 MR. YAMACKA: For similar purposes we next 4 introduce in evidence defense document 186, being 5 the Agreement for Joint Action by the Government of 6 the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and His 7 Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom in the 8 War Against Germany, signed at Moscow, July 12, 1941, 9 in force from July 12, 1941. 10 MR. CARR: The same objection, your Honor. 11 THE PRESIDENT: Objection upheld. 12 13 MR. YAMAOKA: For the same purpose we next 14 offer in evidence defense document 187, being the 15 Protocol to the Agreement for Joint Action, to the 16 previous document. 17 MR. CARR: The same objection, your Honor. 18 THE PRESIDENT: Objection upheld. 19 20 21 22 23 24

MR. YAMAOKA: We next offer in evidence defense document No. 159, being the Joint Anglo-American Declaration of August 1941.

THE PRESIDENT: No objection apparently.

MR. COMYNS CARR: No, your Honor, we have no objection to this.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLEAK OF THE COUAT: Defense document No.

159 will receive exhibit No. 2322.

(Whereupon the document above referred to was marked defense arhibit No. 2322 and received in evidence.)

MA. YAMAOKA: With the Tribunal's permission I shall read defense exhibit 2322.

"ANGLO-AMERICAN JOINT DECLARATION.

"Signed somewhere on the Atlantic, on a certain day of August, 1941. Announced on August 14, 1941.

"The President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the

national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

- "1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.
- "2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.
- "3. They respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.
- "4. They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access on equal terms to the trade and raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.
- "5. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all improved labour standards, economic advancement and social

security.

"6. After the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries and which will afford assurance that all men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

"7. Such peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

"8. They believe that all nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force.

Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten or may threaten aggression outside their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

"Signed: Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"Signed: Winston Churchill."

1 2

7.

THE PRESIDENT: Have you finished with the pacts, the No-Separate Peace Pacts? MR. YAMAOKA: The Tribunal will recall --Yes, your Honor. I am sorry. THE PRESIDENT: Some of the Members of the Court think it may be necessary to remind you that the Court does not take the view that these No-Separate Peace Pacts are in themselves criminal. To render them criminal you require a criminal motive

or purpose, or something like that.

MR. YAMAOKA: That has been our view, Mr. President, and we thank the Tribunal for its observation.

The Tribunal will recall that prosecution exhibits 68 to 90 listed on the defense revised list, dated 23 February 1947, bearing serial numbers 55 to 83, were deferred for the consideration of the Tribunal until a more appropriate opportunity.

We should now desire to have that opportunity, and Doctor Seichi ONO, Japanese counsel for the accused OKA, will continue for the defense.

THE PRESIDENT: 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: Dr. ONC.

MR. ONO: We now read exhibit No. 68 which was presented by the prosecution, which is the Japanese Constitution, to show the constitutional set-up of Japan as well as the guarantee of individual liberty by the constitutional law. Concerning the governmental organization of Japan further evidence will be presented later on.

"Article I: The Empire of Japan shall be reigned over and governed by a line of Emperors unbroken for ages eternal.

"Article II: The Imperial Throne shall be succeeded to by Imperial male descendants, according to the provisions of the Imperial House Law.

"Article III: The Emperor is sacred and inviolable.

"Article IV: The Emperor is the head of the Empire, combining in Himself the rights of sovereignty, and exercises them, according to the provisions of the present Constitution.

Article V: The Emperor exercises the legislative power with the consent of the Imperial Diet.

"Article VI: The Emperor gives sanction to

laws and orders them to be promulgated and executed.

"Article VII: The Emperor convokes the Imperial Diet, opens and closes and proresure it and dissolves the House of Representatives.

"Article VIII: The Emperor, on consequence of an urgent necessity to maintain public safety or to avert public calamities, issues, when the Imperial Diet is not sitting, Imperial Ordinances in the place of law.

"Such Imperial Ordinances are to be laid before the Imperial Diet at its next session, and when
the Diet does not approve the said Ordinances, the
Government shall declare them to be invalid for the
future.

"Article IX: The Emperor issues or causes to be issued, the Ordinances necessary for the carrying out of the laws, or for the maintenance of the public peace and order, and for the promotion of the welfare of the subjects. But no Ordinance shall in any way alter any of the existing laws.

"Article X: The Emperor determines the organization of the different branches of the administration, and salaries of all civil and military officers, and appoints and dismisses the same. Exceptions expecially provided for in the present Constitution or in other laws, shall be in accordance with the respective pro-

visions (bearing thereon). 1 "Article XI: The Emperor has the supreme com-2 mand of the Army and Navy. 3 "Article XII: The Emperor determines the or-4 ganization and peace standing of the Army and Navy. 5 "Article XIII: The Emperor declares war, makes 6 peace, and concludes treaties. 7 "Article XIV: The Emperor declares a state 8 of seige. 9 "The conditions and effects of a state of 10 seige shall be determined by law. 11 "Article XV: The Emperor confers titles of 12 nobility, rank, orders and other marks of honour. 13 "Article XVI: The Emperor orders amnesty, 14 pardon, commutation of punishments and rehabilitation. 15 16 "Article XVII: A Regency shall be instituted in conformity with the provisions of the Imperial 17 House Law. 18 19 "Article XIX: The Japanese subjects may, ac-20 cording to qualifications determined in laws or ordi-21 nances, be appointed to civil or military or any other public offices equally." 23 THE PRESIDENT: Why are you reading all this? 24 MR. ONO: I shall not read the entire Consti-25 tution. I shall only read such articles as I believe

relevant to this case.

2

THE PRESIDENT: The relevancy of many of them you have read, Dr. ONO, is not apparent to me at all

4

3

6

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

the limits of law.

"Article XXIII: No Japanese subject shall be

"Article XXII: The Japanese subjects shall

have the liberty of abode and of changing the same within

events.

The defendants in the dock all held MR. ONO: important positions with the Japanese Government previously and they are being charged for crimes by virtue of these official positions which they held at one time. Therefore, I believe that many articles in the former Constitution which established the fundamental organization of the Japanese Government will be of value in determining the responsibility of the accused.

THE PRESIDENT: They are being charged for what they said or did or failed to do or to say.

MR. CNO: The articles which I intend to quote further are the articles which deal with the guarantee of personal liberties, and I believe these articles will have some bearing on the question of restrictions placed on such liberties in war time. I am not intending to read all of the articles. I shall skip around here and there.

arrested, detained, tried or punished, unless according 1 to law. 2 "Article XXIV: No Japanese subject shall be 3 deprived of his right of being tried by the judges determined by law. 5 "Article XXV: Except in the cases provided 6 for in the law, the house of no Japanese subject shall be entered or searched without his consent. 8 "Article XXVI: Except in the cases mentioned 9 in the law, the secrecy of the letters of every Japanese 10 subject shall remain inviolate. 11 "Article XXVII: The right of property of 12 every Japanese subject shall remain inviolate. 13 "Measures necessary to be taken for the public 14 benefit shall be provided for by law. "Article XXVIII: Japanese subjects shall, 16 within limits not prejudicial to peace and order, and 18 not antagonistic to their duties as subjects, enjoy 19 freedom of religious belief. 20 "Article XXIX: Japanese subjects shall, 21 within the limits of law, enjoy the liberty of speach, 22 writing, publication, public meetings and associations." 23 THE PRESIDENT: I don't know why we should give 24 you the liberty of referring to a lot of irrelevant 25 matters when we deny it to others. Most of the things

4

3

6

5

7 8

9

10

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

25

you have read in this Constitution are irrelevant. I invite you to exercise a little better judgment, Dr. ONO.

MR. ONO: May I not read a few articles pertaining to the Imperial Diet in order to assist the Tribunal in gaining a better understanding as to the political structure of the Japanese Government?

THE PRESIDENT: We will listen to anything that is relevant or is likely to prove so, but such things as religious liberties of the Japanese is wholly irrelevant.

MR. CNO: Your Honor, the prosecution has charged that the Japanese Government in war time interfered with the religious liberties of the Japanese people.

May I read four articles more?
THE PRESIDENT: Read them.

MR. ONO: (Reading).

"Article XXXVII: Every law requires the consent of the Imposial Diet.

"Article LV: The respective Ministers of State shall give their advice to the Emperor, and be responsible for it.

"All laws, Imperial Ordinances and Imperial Rescripts of whatever kind, that relate to the affairs of the State, require the counter-signature of a Min-

ister of State.

7.

"Article LVI: The Privy Councillors shall, in accordance with the provisions for the organization of the privy council, deliberate upon important matters of State, when they have been consulted by the Emperor.

"Article LXX: When the Imperial Diet cannet be convoked, owing to the external or internal condition of the country, in case of urgent need for the maintenance of public safety, the Government may take all necessary financial measures, by means of an Imperial Ordinance.

"In the case mentioned in the preceding clause, the matter shall be submitted to the Imperial Diet at its next session, and its apprebation shall be obtained thereto."

22 23

7.

We now read exhibit No. 69 presented by the prosecution which is the Imperial House Law to show the provisions on the succession of the Imperial Throne, and other matters of the Imperial House.

"Article I. - The Imperial Throne of Japan shall be succeeded to by male descendants in the male line of Imperial Ancestors." --

THE PRESIDENT: Please do not read any more of that. It is not necessary.

MR. ONO: We now read exhibit No. 70 presented by the prosecution which is the Imperial Ordinance on the Organization of the Cabinet. This is to show the set-up of the Cabinet and duties and competence of Premier and other State Ministers. This ordinance is relevant to the Article 55 of the Japanese Constitution which I have just read.

"Imperial Ordinance on the Organization of the Cabinet

Marticle I. The Cabinet is composed of various Ministers of State.

"Article II. The Prime Minister stands at the head of the Ministers of State, reports affairs of State to the Sovereign, and in compliance with Imperial instructions, maintains the co-ordination of the various branches of the Administration.

"Article III. The Prime Minister, should an occasion seem sufficiently important to demand such a course, has competence to suspend dispositions made or orders issued by the Administration, pending Imperial sanction.

"Article IV. The Prime Minister can issue Cabinet Ordinances on the authority of his own or specially delegated upon him.

"Article IV-2. The Prime Minister directs and supervises the Superintendent General of Metropolitan Police, Governor of Hokkaido and Prefectural Governors in respect of the affairs in his charge. When their orders or dispositions are contrary to provisions enacted, harmful to the public interest or regarded as violating their competence, he can suspend or repeal such orders or dispositions.

"Article V. The following matters shall be submitted for deliberation by the Cabinet Council:-

- "l. Drafts of laws, financial estimates, and settled accounts.
- "2. Treaties with foreign countries and all international questions of importance.
- "3. Imperial Ordinances relating to the organization of Government offices and the enforcement of regulations and laws.

114. Disputes between Ministries on their 1 respective competence. Petitions from the people, handed down 3 from the Emperor or submitted by the Imperial Diet. "6. Expenditure outside of the budget. 5 117. Appointment of chokunin officials and of 6 local Governors, as well as their promotions and removals. "In addition to the above, any important matters 9 connected with the affairs in charge of various Ministries 10 and having relation to the higher administration, shall 11 also be submitted for deliberation by the Cabinet 12 Council. 13 "Article VI. The Minister in charge can demand, 14 15 according to his own opinion, the consideration of the Cabinet Council upon any matter whatsoever through the 16 Prime Minister. 17 "Article VII. Such matters as concern military 18 secrets and military orders and are reported to the 19 Emperor, unless referred to the Cabinet by the Emperor, shall be reported to the Prime Minister by the Minister 21 of War and the Minister of the Navy. 22 23 "Article IX. Should any Minister of State be 24

prevented from discharging his functions, another

4 5

Minister of State shall concurrently hold his office temporarily or ordered to take charge of his affairs.

"Article X. In addition to the Ministers of various Ministries, a person or persons may be caused by Imperial command to sit in the Cabinet as a Minister or Ministers of State."

We now read exhibit No. 71 presented by the prosecution which is the Organization of the Board of Planning to show the duties and competence of the Board of Planning.

"Article 1

"The Board of Planning shall be under the jurisdiction of the Prime Minister and take charge of the following affairs:

- "1. Drafting of plans concerning the expansion and employment of the total national resources in times of peace and war and reporting of such plans, together with reasons therefor, to the Prime Minister.
- "2, Investigation of the gists of proposals which are submitted by the Ministers to the Cabinet Council and which have an important bearing upon the expansion and employment of the total national resources in times of peace and war and reporting, together with its opinion, to the Cabinet through the Prime Minister.
 - "3. Reporting, together with its opinion, to

1the Cabinet through the Prime Minister with reference 2to the control of budget for important matters related 3to the expansion and employment of the total national 4resources in times of peace and war." 5 6 "5. Matters concerning the making of a plan 7 for the utilization of the territory and matters concern-8 ing the control of affairs of various Government offices 9 as needed by the plan for the utilization of the 10 territory. 11 "The Board of Planning may, if necessary 12 for the execution of the affairs specified in the preceding Paragraph, request the other Government offices concerned to furnish it with reference material or 15 explanations." 16 17 "Article 6 18 "The President shall superintend the affairs of the Board, direct and supervise the personnel under him and decide independently upon the appointment, 21 promotion, demotion and dismissal of officials of 22 'Hannin' rank." 23 We now read exhibit No. 72 presented by the 24 prosecution which is the Organization of the Board 25 of Information to show the duties and competence of

the Board of Information.

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

"Article 1

"The Board of Information shall be under the jurisdiction of the Prime Minister and take charge of affairs concerning the following matters:

- Collection of information, reporting, enlightenment and publicity concerning matters which are the fundamentals of the prosecution of national policies.
- "2. Dispositions in respect of newspapers and other publications as provided for in Article 20 of the National Mobilization Law.
- "3. Guidance and control in respect of broadcasting by telephone.
- "4. Such guidance and control of motionpictures, phonograph records, plays and shows as are necessary for the enlightenment and publicity concerning matters which are fundamentals of the prosecution of national policies.

"The Board of Information may, if necessary for the execution of the affairs mentioned in the preceding 22 Paragraph, request the Government offices concerned 23 to extend their cooperation in connection with the coll-24 ection of information, reporting, enlightenment and 25 publicity."

* * * *

1 2

"Article 6

"The President shall superintend the affairs
of the Board, direct and supervise the personnel under
him and decide independently upon the appointment,
promotion, demotion and dismissal of Clerks (Zoku)."

Greenbers & Mor

S

We now read exhibit No. 73 presented by the prosecution, which is the Imperial Ordinance relating to General Rules concerning the organization of the Ministries. This is to show the duties and competence of Ministers, Vice-Ministers, Chiefs of Bureaus, etc., common to all ministries of the Japanese Government. (Reading)

"Article 1.

"The present rule* shall be applicable to the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, of Home Affairs, of Finance, of War, of the Navy, of Justice, of Education, of Agriculture and Forestry, of Commerce and Industry, of Communications, of the Railways, of Overseas Affairs, and of Welfare.

"Article 2.

"Each Minister shall be responsible for the affairs of which the principal competency belongs to him.

"When there are affairs of which it is not clear where the principal competency belongs and which concern two Ministries or over, it shall be decided where the principal competency belongs by submitting the said affairs to the Cabinet Council.

"Article 3.

"Each Minister shall, when it is necessary

4 5

to enact, repeal or amend a law or an Imperial Ordinance in regard to the affairs of which the principal competency belongs to him, submit the said affairs to the Cabinet Council, together with a draft for such enactment, repeal or amendment.

"Article 4:

"Each Minister may, by virtue of his official authority or by virtue of a special authorization, issue a Ministerial Ordinance in regard to the affairs of which the principal competency belongs to him.

"Article 5.

"Each Minister may, in regard to the affairs of which the principal competency belongs to him, issue directions of instructions to the Superintendent-General of Metropolitan Police, the Governor-General of Hokkaido and the Prefectural Governors:

"Article 12.

"There shall be instituted Bureaus in each Ministry to take charge of the Ministry's affairs assigned to them respectively. The affairs to be so assigned shall be defined by the Imperial Ordinance relating to the Organization of the Ministry concerned:

"Article 14.

"There shall be instituted in each Ministry the following personnel:

"Parliamentary Vice-Minister

"Vice-Minister

"Parliamentary Counselor.

"Directors of Bureaus.

"Private Secretary.

"Secretaries.

"Clerks.

"Article 15.

"There shall be one Vice-Minister in each Ministry, and he shall be of 'Chokunin' rank.

"Article 16.

"The Vice-Minister shall assist the Minister, co-ordinate the affairs of the Ministry, and supervise the affairs of the Bureaus and Divisions.

"Article 18.

"There shall be one Director in each Bureau, and he shall be of 'Chokunin' rank. He shall, under the instructions of the Minister, take charge of the affairs of which the principal competency belongs to him, and direct nd supervise the affairs of the Sections of his Bureau."

We now read exhibit No. 74, presented by the

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

prosecution, which is the Organization of War Ministry to show the duties and competence of the Minister of War, Vice-Minister of War and Chiefs of Bureaus of the War Ministry. (Reading)

"Article 1.

"The War Minister supervises the military administration of the Army, leads and controls officers and civilians in the military service, and superintends various departments under his charge.

"Article III.

"A ministerial Aide-de-Camp is posted in the War Ministry.

"The Ministerial Aide-de-Camp administers the affairs of the minister's Secretariate upon the order of the minister.

"Article V.

"The following affairs are administered in the minister's Secretariate:

- "1. matters requiring secrecy.
- "2. matters connected with the taking charge of the official seals of the minister and of the ministry.
- "3. matters concerned with taking charge of the original books of military orders.
 - "4. matters concerning the compilation and

translation of records. 1 "5. matters connected with the inspection, 2 reception, despatch, compilation and keeping of the 3 official documents and documents of concrete plan. "6. matters connected with keeping books 5 in Charge. 6 "7. matters concerning management of the 7 8 military library. 9 "8. matters connected with the colours and 10 the Yasukuni' Shrine. 11 "9. matters concerning reports and statis-12 ties. 13 "10. matters concerning personnel affairs 14 of the junior officials of the ministry. 15 "11. matters concerning the reception of 16 foreign military officers. 17 "12. matters concerning discipline in the 18 ministry. 19 "13. matters concerning printing. 20 "14. matters not to be managed according to 21 the established regulations and not concerned with 22 any bureau. 23 "Article VI. 24 "The War Ministry had the following seven 25 Bureaus:

"Personnel Affairs Bureau. 1 "Military Affairs Bureau. 2 "Military Service Bureau. 3 "Equipment Bureau. 4 "Intendance Bureau. 5 "Medical Bureau. 6 "Judicial Affairs Bureau. 7 "Article X. 8 "The following business is transacted in 9 the Military Administration Section: 10 Matters concerning the fundamental 11 12 principles of national defense. "2. Matters concerning the armament of the 13 14 Army and other general military administration of 15 the army. 16 "3. Matters concerning the establishment, 17 peacetime organization and ecuipment of the Army. 18 "4. Matters concerning the principles of 19 guarding against danger, defense, air defense, mobi-20 lization of the army and of man-power. 21 "5. Matters concerning the general control 22 of the military estimates. 23 "6. Matters concerning fundamental munition-24 al administration. 25 "7. Matters concerning the control of the

duties of the air service and others connected with 1 aviation. 2 118. Matters concerning maneouvres and in-3 spection. 4 "9. Matters concerning allotment of units 5 and corps. 6 "10. Matters concerning various regulations at wartime. 8 "11. Matters concorning resident-officers 9 in foreign countries, officers studying abroad, and 10 students of the Whole-nation Combat Research Insti-11 12 tute. 13 "12. Matters concerning Army Munition Re-14 search Committee. 15 "Article XII. 16 "The following business affairs are managed 17 in Military Affairs Section: 18 "1. Matters concerning general affairs of 19 national defense policy. 20 "2. Matters concerning international regu-21 lations. 22 "3. Matters concerning foreign officers 23 attached to army units. "4. Matters concerning general affairs of 25 national demobilization.

1	"5. Matters concerning army affairs of
2	Manchuria and China and other concerned with them.
3	"6. Matters concerning army affairs of
4	foreign countries except Manchuria and China.
5	"7. Matters concerning connection affairs
6	with Imperial Diet.
7	"8. Matters concerning papularization of
8	national defense spirit and counterOplan for nations
9	thoughts.
10	"9. Matters concerning controlling of di-
11	rection of parties researching for military affairs.
12	"Article XIII.
13	"Military Service Bureau consists of Mili-
14	tary Service Section, Complement Section, Defense
15	Section, Horse Administration Section, and Veterinary
17	Affairs Section.
18	"Article XIV.
19	"The following business affairs are managed
20	in Military Service Section:
21	"1. Matters concerning the respective
22	private's mission (except military police and avia-
23	tion privates.)
24	"2. Matters concerning duty and instruction
25	of Military Musical Division.
	"3. Matters concerning military discipline,

morale and disciplinary laws. 1 "4. Matters concerning manuals for training (except those regarding aviation privates). 3 "5. Matters concerning interior duty. 4 "6. Matters concerning ceremonies, formal-5 ities, and insignias. 6 "7. Matters concerning parade grounds, 7 8 ranges, bridging sites, practice grounds and other army facilities (except those under control of 10 Defense Section and regarding aviation affairs). 11 "8. Matters concerning military drilling 12 in civil schools and that of young generation. 13 "Article XV. 14 "The following business affairs are managed 15 in Complement Section: 16 "1. Matters concerning military service. 17 Matters concerning replacement of 112. 18 officers and men. 19 113. Matters concerning army demobilization. 20 "4. Matters concerning levy. 21 "5. Matters concerning personnel demobili-22 zation. 23 "6. Matters concerning requisitions. 24 "7. Matters concerning Reservist Associa-25 tion.

"Article XVI. 1 "The following business affairs are 2 managed in Defense Section: 3 "1. Matters concerning M.P.'s mission. 4 "2. Matters concerning military police 5 6 (except that in charge of Judicial Bureau) and protection of military secret. 8 "3. Matters concerning spy protection. "4. Matters concerning air defense. 10 "5. Matters concerning guarding and safety 11 precautions. 12 "6. Matters concerning garrison duty. 13 "7. Matters concerning construction and 14 complement of fortifications and lands used for 15 national defense. 16 "8. Matters concerning laws applied to 17 fortified zone, military management laws applied to 18 army transport port areas, and etc. 19 "9. Matters concerning domain-and-city 20 planning. 21 "Article XXIV. 22 "Intendance Bureau consists of Accounting 23 Section, Audit Section, Clothing and Provisions Sec-24 25 tion and Building Section. "Article XXV.

"Accounting Section transacts the following businesses: "1. Matters concerning duty and education 3 in Intendance Division. "2. Matters concerning estimate and settle-5 ment. "3. Matters concerning research and consideration of the using of military funds. "4. Matters concerning the estimate of 9 demobilization. 10 "5. Matters concerning the expenditure of 11 reserve funds, the carrying forward of fixed amount, 12 expenditure of passed fiscal years drawbacks of the 13 fixed amount and the expenditure before the opening of the fiscal year. 15 "6. Matters concerning the wartime regula-16 tions in Intendance Division. 17 "7. Matters concerning salaries, wages 18 and other minor pays and travelling expenses. 19 "8. Matters concerning the pecuniary intend-20 ance and accounting officials. 21 "9. Matters concerning various allowances 22 and purchases in this department. 24 "Article XXVIIII. 25 "Building Section transacts the following

businesses: 1 Matters concerning military land and various buildings (excluding the ones under the con-3 trol of Defense Section, Army Ordnance Head Office and Air Service Head Office). 5 "2. Matters concerning military land 6 and the controlling of standard of various building. 7 "3. Matters concerning state-owned proper-8 ties. 9 "4. Matters concerning investigation, re-10 search and inspection of buildings. 11 "5. Matters concerning completion, supply 12 and inspection of munitions -- field service goods, 13 canteen goods, building material and the other 14 goods, (excluding ones under the control of other 15 Sections). 16 "6. Matters concerning investigation, re-17 search, and inspection of munitions, (excluding ones 18 under the control of other sections.) 19 "7. Matters concerning manufacturing and 20 storing equipment of munitions. 21 22 "8. Matters concerning guidance, assistance 23 and inspection of the manufacturing of munitions. 24 "9. Matters concerning stores accounts and 25 stores accountants.

"Article XXIX. 1 "Medical Affairs Bureau consists of Sanitary Section and Medical Service Section. 3 "Article XXX. 4 "Sanitary Section transacts the following 5 businesses: 6 7 "l. Matters concerning duty and education of Sanitary Division. 8 "2. Matters concerning sanitation, unit 9 sanitation and labour sanitation. 10 "3. Matters concerning the sanitation of 11 clothing and provisions, buildings, water supply 12 and drainage. 13 "4. Matters concerning the prevention of 14 15 epidemics. 16 "5. Matters concerning investigation, re-17 search and statistics of military sanitation. 18 "6. Matters concerning various wartime 19 regulations of Sanitary Division. 20 "Article XXXI. 21 "Medical Service Section transacts the follow-22 ings businesses: 23 "1. Matters concerning medical treatment 24 and medical care. 25 "2. Matters concerning hospitals, dispensary

	and sanatorium.
1	"3. Matters concerning completion, supply
2	and inspection of medical stores.
3	"4. Matters concerning investigation, re-
4	search and inspection of medical stores.
5	"5. Matters concerning production and
6	storage equipment of medical stores, (excluding es-
7	tablishment and management).
8	"6. Matters concerning guidance, assist-
9	ance and inspection of medical stores industry,
10	(excluding the ones under the control of Audit
11	Section.)
12	
13	"7. Matters concerning physical examina-
14	tion.
15	"8. Matters concerning pension diagnosis
16	and discharge from service by disease and wound.
17	"9. Matters concerning Japanese Red Cross
18	Society and relief service organizations of the sick
19	and wounded.
20	"Article XXXII.
21	"Judicial Affairs Bureau transacts the
22	following businesses:
23	"1. Matters concerning duty and education
24	of Judicial Division.
25	"2. Matters concerning the administration

of justice of the military affairs. "3. Matters concerning a prison. "4. Matters concerning amnesty, provisional release, and the executions of criminals. "5. Matters concerning wartime various regulations of the Judicial Department."

1 We now read Exhibit No. 75 presented by the aprosecution which is the Imperial Ordinance relating 4to the organization of the Minstry of Navy to show 5 the duties and competence of the Minister of the Navy, 6 the Vice-Minister of the Navy and the Chiefs of bureaus 7 of the Navy Ministry: "Article 1. The Minister of the Navy shall 9 control naval administration, shall superintend Naval 10 Servicemen and Naval Civilians, and shall supervise 11 the agencies under his jurisdiction. 12 "Article 3. There shall be instituted 13 Adjutants in the Minstry of the Navy. They shall, 14 under the instructions of the Minister of the Navy, 15 take charge of the affairs of the Secretariat of the 16 said Minister. "Article 6. There shall be instituted in the 17 18 Ministry of the Navy the following eight Bureaus: 19 Naval Affairs Bureau, Armaments Bureau, Personnel 20 Bureau, Educational Bureau, Munitions Bureau, Medical 21 Affairs Bureau, Accounting Bureau, Judicial Affairs 22 Buresu. "Article 7. There shall be instituted in 23 24 the Ministry of the Navy the First Section, the 25 Second Section, the Third Section and the Fourth

1 Section. "Article 8. The First Section of the Naval 3 Affairs Bureau shall take charge of the following 4 affairs: 5 "1. Matters concerning naval armaments and 6 other matters concerning naval administration in general. "2. Matters concerning the construction or 8 organization of, and service aboard or at, warships, 9 units, offices and schools. 10 "3. Matters concerning the organization and 11 service of warships and units. 12 "4. Matters concerning naval discipline 13 and morale. 14 "5. Matters concerning naval maneuvers. 15 116. Matters concerning naval reviews. 16 "7. Matters concerning ceremonies, etiquette, 17 uniforms and flags. 18 "8. Matters concerning warships and weapons 19 of war and other munitions in general. 20 "9. Matters concerning guarding and defense. 21 "Article 9. The Second Section of the Naval 22 Affairs Bureau shall take charge of the following 23 matters: 24 "1. Matters concerning national defense 25 policy.

1 "2. Matters concerning international conven-2 tions and personnel dispatched abroad. 3 "Article 9 (Second) The Third Section of 4 the Naval Affairs Bureau shall take charge of the 5 following matters: 6 "1. Matters concerning the use of engines. 7 "2. Matters concerning constructions aboard 8 warships. 9 "3. Matters concerning the maintenance and 10 preservation of warships. 11 "Article 9 (Third) The Fourth Section of the 12 Naval Affairs Bureau shall take charge of the follow-13 ing matters: 14 "1. Matters concerning the dissemination of 15 consciousness relating to national defense. 16 "2. Matters concerning the guidance of 17 organizations connected with naval affairs. 18 "Article 9 (Fourth) There shall be instituted 19 in the Armaments Bureau the First Section, the Second 20 Section and the Third Section. 21 "Article 9 (Fifth) The First Section of the 22 Armaments Bureau shall take charge of the following 23 matters: 24

"1. Matters concerning preparations for the

mobilization of naval forces.

25

1 "2. Matters concerning National General 2 Mobilization in general. 3 "3. Matters concerning the preservation of 4 weapons of war and other munitions. 5 "4. Matters concerning requisition. 6 "5. Matters concerning equipments on land 7 and sea." THE PRESIDENT: Dr. ONO, some of these matters 9 are material, but most of them are not. It is very 10 obvious you will never have occasion again to refer 11 to most of these things. They are not giving us any 12 help; they are wasting our time. 13 MR. CNU: Since some of the defendants were 14 Ministers of War or of the Navy or were chiefs of 15 bureaus in those ministries -- vice-ministers or chiefs of bureaus in thoseministries -- I wished to make clear 17 the basis of the laws concerning these organizations 18 with a view of clarifying their individual responsi-19 bility. 20 THE PRESIDENT: We fully appreciate that. 21 We should know exactly under what ordinances or statutes 22 the different ministers or vice-ministers have operated, 23 but it isn't necessary to go into so much detail. 24 25 MR. ONO: With this I shall conclude my read-

ing of this document.

We now read exhibit No. 76 presented by the prosecution which is the Imperial Ordinance relating to the organization of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs:

"Article 1. The Minister of Foreign Affairs shall control affairs relating to the conduct of political affairs concerning foreign countries, to the protection of Japanese commercial affairs in foreign countries and to Japanese subjects residing in foreign countries, and direct and supervise Japanese Diplomatic and Consular Officers.

"The Minister of Foreign Affairs shall direct and supervise the Japanese Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Manchoukuo in regard to those affairs of the Kwantung Bureau which pertain to external matters.

"Article 4. There shall be instituted in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs the following six Bureaus:

"East Asiatic Bureau, Furopean and Asiatic Bureau, American Bureau, South Seas Bureau, Commercial Bureau, Bureau of Treaties and Conventions.

"Article 5. The Fast Asiatic Bureau shall take charge of diplomatic affairs concerning Manchoukuo, China, Hongkong and Amoy.

"Article 6 (Third) The South Seas Bureau shall take charge of diplomatic affairs concerning

1 2

Thailand, the Philippine Islands, Indo-China, Burma, Malaya, North Borneo, the East Indies, Australia, New Zealand, the other Oceanic islands, and the Antarctic region.

"Article 7. The Commercial Bureau shall take charge of affairs concerning commerce and navigation.

"Article 8. The Bureau of Treaties and Conventions shall take charge of affairs relating to treaties and conventions and to matters concerning external laws and regulations."

THE INTERPRETER: The English translations of part 1 and part 2 of Article 6 were missing and I shall read them now:

"Article 6. The Furopean and American Affairs
Bureau shall take charge of such diplomatic affairs
as are not handled by the Asiatic Bureau, the American
Bureau and the South Seas Bureau.

"No. 2, Article 6. The American Bureau shall handle matters concerning immigration and the granting of visas as well as diplomatic affairs relating to the countries of America, including Canada, and its dependencies excluding the Philippine Islands."

MR.ONO: We now read exhibit No. 77 presented by the prosecution which is the Military Ordinance No. 1 concerning Military Ordinance. This will show that

```
1 the Military Ordinance concerning the command of Army
  and Navy is of different nature from other Imperial
3
  Ordinances.
4
           "Article 1. The regulation concerning the
5
  command of Army, Navy which has gone through Imperial
6
  approval is said Military Ordinance.
7
           "Article 2. The Ordinance which necessitate
8
  to put to publicity, is signed by the Emperor with
  His Instruction and Army or Navy Minister concerned
10
  countersigns and writes down the date.
11
           "Article 3. The Ordinance is issued on the
12
  Official Gazette.."
13
           THE PRESIDENT: That seems to be a very
14
  poor translation from the Japanese into English.
15
  em referring to exhibit 77.
16
           MR. ONO: This exhibit is an exhibit presented
17
  by the prosecution and I have read from the exhibit as
18
  presented by the prosecution with translation attached.
19
  I hope that any translation matters will be referred
20
  to the Language Board.
21
           THE PRESIDENT: We appreciate what you say.
22
  The Language Section might attempt a better translation.
23
           We will adjourn now until half past nine
24
  tomorrow morning.
25
                 (Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment
```

1	was taken until Friday, 28 February 1947,
2	at 0930.)
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	