Nov 22, 1946 Index Wit a Ex.

## INDEX

Of

## WITNESSES

Prosecution's	Witnesses	Page
Ballantine	, Joseph W. (resumed)	11063
Cross	by Mr. Smith (continued) " Mr. Brannon " Mr. Brooks " Mr. Logan " Mr. S. OKAMOTO	11063 11092 11094 11115 11127

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(none)

1 Friday, 22 November, 1946 2 3 4 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building 6 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 the HONORABLE R. B. PAL, Member from 14 India, not sitting. 15 For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 16 For the Defense Section, same as before. 17 The Accused: 18 All present except OKAWA, Shumei, who is 19 represented by his counsel. 20 21 (English to Japanese and Japanese 22 to English interpretation was made by the 23 24 Language Section, IMTFE.) 25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International M 1 0 Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session. r 2 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Smith. е 3 & 4 JOSEPH W. BALLANTINE, called as a 5 A witness on behalf of the prosecution, resumed the stand and testified as follows: 7 CROSS-EXAMINATION 8 BY MR. SMITH (Continued): 9 Mr. Ballantine, irrespective of whether the 10 Amau Statement of April 17, 1934, was authorized or 11 not, are you aware that it had the approval in the 12 English Parliament of Sir John Simon, who was Foreign 13 Minister of State at that time? 14 15 THE PRESIDENT: Sir John Simon's opinion 16 does not appear to me to be relevant, Mr. Smith. 17 MR. SMITH: I assume your Honor automatically 18 allows me an exception to the ruling. 19 THE PRESIDENT: You haven't even bothered to 20 tell me why you think it is relevant. 21 MR. SMITH: I didn't mean to take that at-22 titude, your Honor. This Amau Statement was played 23 up in the American press as a so-called Japanese 24 Monroe Doctrine.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, its quality isn't a

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22 23

24

25

matter to be determined by the opinion of Sir John Simon, so you may have your exception.

Q In April, 1934, are you aware of the fact that there several hundred thousand people of Japanese descent living in China proper, that is, excluding

A I don't know the approximate number of Japanese residents in China in 1936.

Q You lived in China for some time. What years were they?

A I lived in China from 1930 to 1936.

Q And do you mean to say you can't even give us a rough idea as to how many people of Japanese descent were living in China, excluding Manchuria?

THE PRESIDENT: That appears to be beyond the scope of his affidavit.

MR. SMITH: If your Honor please, it is impossible to read this Amau Statement, even assuming it was an authorized statement, which it isn't, as we will show in our own case, without knowing the background and the situation in the Government, the disunity and lack of stability everywhere in China.

THE PRESIDENT: You may prove those things if you can when you are giving evidence, but we don't think that you should be allowed to question this

witness along those lines.

4 5

MR. SMITH: Well, your Honor, there is more to it than what I have said. It involves the question of the protection and safety of Japanese nationals living in China and their property interests.

THE PRESIDENT: This man is not here to be examined on the history, political institutions and geography of China, so far as those matters are beyond the scope of his affidavit, and these matters you mention are.

attention the fact that in the paragraph dealing with the hostilities which commenced after July 7, 1937, the witness has described it as an invasion and wholly unjustified. What I am inquiring about is relevant on this point and also relevant to the larger issue.

THE PRESIDENT: Those matters are far too remote. You must accept our decision, Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: If your Honor please, I had a long series of questions along that line, and in deference to your Honor's ruling, why of course, I won't put the questions. I assume your Honor, has chopped off that whole line of questions.

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal has done so, if the questions to follow are of the same nature

as those just disallowed.

Q In 1911 Japan and the United States made a Treaty of Commerce and Navigation, is that correct?

A That is correct.

Q And that treaty was simply a renewal and extension of a treaty which had been in force for some forty or fifty years prior to 1911, is that correct?

A It was a revision -- it was a replacement for the previous commercial treaty, which I believe was 1899, but I am not sure. It was somewhere in the 1890's.

Q That treaty, in short, provided for the right of citizens of both countries to reside and travel in each other's territory and to lease houses, commercial buildings, manufacturing establishments, and so forth. Is that a short summary of that treaty?

THE PRESIDENT: Neither the validity nor
the effect of that treaty is in issue here, is it?

MR. SMITH: I didn't put it in issue, your
Honor. The prosecution did, in the last paragraph of page 3 of this man's affidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: What does it say?

MR. SMITH: That paragraph says:

"On July 26, 1939, the Government of the United

States notified the Japanese Government of its intention to terminate the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation of 1911. It was felt that this treaty was not affording adequate protection to American commerce either in Japan or in Japanese occupied portions of China, while at the same time the operation of the most-favored-nation clause of the treaty was a bar to the adoption of retaliatory measures against Japanese commerce.

THE MONITOR: Will you give me the page number, Mr. Defense Counsel?

MR. SMITH: Page 3, last paragraph, page 3.

THE PRESIDENT: These delays in interpreting are imposing a great strain on the Court, and on all of us, I think, so do your best to prevent them.

Speak in short sentences and speak clearly. It so happens the Japanese we are listening to now is not a part of the proceedings at all, but a broadcast to the public of what we are saying, but yet we have all these delays, but counsel must cooperate with us to prevent them.

MR. SMITH: If your Honor's statement is directed to me, I am cooperating, and what I was just saying was merely reading the affidavit. I understand the translators have a Japanese copy of

Mr. Ballantine's affidavit and when I referred to the last paragraph on page 3, all they had to do was refer to that.

THE PRESIDENT: The questions that you were putting to the witness do not appear to me to be directed to elucidating anything he has said in his affidavit.

Q When the United States terminated the treaty, which took effect on January 26, 1940, the Japanese Government took no action by way of retaliation against the United States. Is that statement true?

A I don't know what retaliation is in that situation; what would be the nature of retaliation for the lapse of a treaty.

Q I mean the Japanese Government took no action by law or regulation to exclude citizens of the United States from Japan and occupied territory or to deprive them of the right to live in homes and own places of business. That is what I mean.

A In our note to the Japanese Government of October 6, 1938, which I believe is in evidence here, there was a long recital of the manners in which the Japanese Government had discriminated against and had violated the rights of Americans in occupied areas in China. The record is published.

	1
	l
1	١
	1
	į
2	١
	١
	1
3	1
	1
,	
4	ı
	ı
	ı
5	ı
	ı
	ı
6	ı
	ı
	ı
7	i
	ı
-	ı
8	į
	۱
9	-
	ì
	Ì
10	ı
	1
	ł
11	ı
	i
10	i
12	ı
	ı
12	ı
13	1
	1
14	1
14	1
	1
15	1
1)	1
	1
16	1
10	1
	1
17	1
1/	1
	1
18	1
10	1
	1
19	1
-/	1
	1
20	1
	1
	1
21	1
	1
-	-
22	1
	1
	1
23	1
	1
01	1
24	1
	1

Q Well, treat my question as repeated and please give me an answer to it.

A I was simply trying to state that this question of Japanese violation of American rights was continuous even before and during and after the lapse of that treaty.

Q I will repeat my question for the third time and ask you to please give me an answer to the question.

A I must not have understood your question correctly, then. I would like to have the question repeated.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. heporter, will you repeat it?

(Whereupon, the official court reporter read the question, as follows: "Q I mean the Japanese Government took no action by law or regulation to exclude citizens of the United States from Japan and occupied territory, or to deprive them of the right to live in homes and own places of business. That is what I mean."

THE PRESIDENT: That is a statement, not a question. He need not reply to a statement.

MR. SMITH: If your Honor please, the question preceded what the reporter just read, and

3

5

7 8

9

10

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

21

23

24

besides that, it was asked in the form of an interrogation and in the form of a rising voice. It was asked in a question form. Does your Honor want me to repeat that question?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't want you to repeat your statement. Put a question. The inflections of your voice are not noted in the transcript, nor are they appreciated by me.

Q I am asking you a question, and answer whether it is correct or not: When the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation of 1911 between Japan and the United States was terminated on January 26, 1940, whether the Japanese Government thereafter took any action by law or regulation to deprive American citizens of the right to travel and reside in Japan and occupied territories and to live in houses and own places of business?

A I don't know of any laws or ordinances that were passed by the Japanese following the lapse of the treaty affecting the rights and residence of Americans in Japan or occupied territories.

Q At the time this treaty was terminated, is it true that there were 110,000 persons of Japanese descent living in the United States, 99 per cent of whom lived in the Pacific Coast States of California,

Oregon and Washington?

3

3 4

5

7

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

A I believe that there were somewhat over a hundred thousand people of Japanese descent living in the United States at that time. As to what proportion lived in the three Pacific States I don't know exactly.

Q Well, you are familiar with the fact that the great bulk, the great preponderance of those people, lived in the three states I have mentioned, is that true?

A That is correct.

Q And of those persons of Japanese descent about 65 per cent were native born, and, therefore, citizens of the United States, is that correct?

A I don't know exactly what percentage, but I think your statement is probably correct.

Q And is it true that still left some 40,000 persons of Japanese descent living in the three Pacific Coast states I have mentioned, who had been made ineligible to United States citizenship since 1924, is that correct?

A There probably were about 40,000 people who were ineligible to citizenship.

Q Are you familiar with the fact that the States of California, Oregon and Washington passed

9

10

12

1314

1516

17

18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

alien land laws, going back to 1913, and those laws were progressively strengthened up to 1923 against alien Japanese owning any land, leasing land, share-cropping, or anything of that sort?

A I know there were such land laws in force.

Then you also knew that while the Treaty of 1911 was in force, it being the supreme law of the land, it limited that state legislation as it applied to alien Japanese, is that correct?

A I understand that was the case.

Q So that after the Treaty of 1911 was denounced those state laws were vigorously applied to alien Japanese in the United States, is that correct?

A I am not sure about that. I don't know what the effect was on that -- state laws.

een

W	
AA	
1000	
0	
U	
1	
- 1	
4	
-	
f	
1	
D.	
28	
~	
D	
1.1	
1	
u	
u	
-	
~	
d	
~	
-	
a	

Q Are you familiar with the fact that there has b
a whole series of litigation in California in recent
years which have deprived alien Japanese of leases,
property and that sort of thing since this treaty was
denounced?

I am not very well versed in that subject. A

When was it -- When did the State Department 0 direct the Panama Canal Commission to close the Panama Canal to Japanese shipping?

I don't know that the Panama Canal was closed to Japanese shipping. If I recall correctly, in July 1941 there was some delay in shipping because precedence was given to clearing the Canal for ships carrying strategic commodities that we needed for our selfdefense. Some representation was made by the Japanese Embassy to the State Department in 1941 which appears in the record. I haven't had occasion to read it for a long, long time, therefore, my memory on the facts is not very clear.

Do you know anything about the nature of the direction given with respect to Japanese shipping in the Panama Canal, and if so, when did it occur?

I know nothing about the matter other than contained in that official -- in the official record, in Volume 2. I believe it is in United States Foreign

10

11

12

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

13

15

14

16

17

18

19

20

22 23

24

Relations, and my memory on that is not very fresh. I'd have to have my memory refreshed on that. Well, you do recall that Japanese shipping 3 was restricted from using the Panama Canal for a number of months before Pearl Harbor? I don't know for how long. I believe a very 6 short period, because all Japanese shipping was being recalled to near-sea waters from overseas and I don't think there was much Japanese shipping in the Atlantic after July. What was the date, the earliest date, the 11 State Department knew that Japanese shipping had been recalled? I think it was early in July, 1941. And would it refresh your recollection if 15 I suggested that restrictions were put on Japanese shipping in the Canal as early as October, 1940? Tt would not.

Well, the restrictions on the use of the Canal was just one part of this economic war of the United States and other nations allied with it were carrying on against Japan, is that correct?

The question of the use of the Panama Canal, whereby we gave precedence to vessels carrying strategic commodities, was a part of self-defense.

1

4

8

9

10

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

And when you speak of "strategic commodities," you refer not only to ships of the United States. 2 but also the British and Dutch and the French ships 3 from all over the world, is that right? 4 I am referring to the ships of countries 5 resisting the world-wide movement of aggression and 6 the American Republics, as well as the American ships. 7 And at the time that the restrictions on 8 Japanese shipping went into affect the State Department 9 was aware that Japan had important export customers 10 in Mexico, Central America, Colombia, Brazil and the 11 Argentine, all nations whose perts of entry were on 12 the Atlantic side, is that correct? I don't know the extent to which the Panama 14 Canal was used by Japanese shipping trading with South 15 16 America. Q One of the reasons in denying the use of the 18 Canal, was it not, was to keep the Japanese from getting 19 any oil out of Mexico and Colombia? 20 I never heard that reason advanced. 21 Will you tell us when the Suez Canal was 22 closed to Japanese shipping? 23 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief of Counsel. MR. KEENAN: I have hesitated to object to this

line of questioning, but it seems to me it is now

13

17

24

getting far beyond the scope of the affidavit, and I, therefore, object to it as anticipating the defense, if it is material. I do not think all the time of this Court should be taken asking geographical points. We pointed out various actions of other nations. I, therefore, object.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief of Counsel, I cannot reprimand defense counsel and not reprimand you when you violate the red signal.

MR. KEENAN: I am sorry, Mr. President. I didn't realize that I was violating the red light.

THE PRESIDENT: What have you to say on the objection, Mr. Smith?

Yesterday it was gone into fairly extensively, but not enough to suit me, as to this military and economic encirclement of Japan for many months before Pearl Harbor.

THE PRESIDENT: You may give that evidence in the course of the defense evidence. I have told you that repeatedly. But is it fairly within the scope of this man's affidavit? He is an American official.

MR. SWITH: Well, your Honor, this affidavit covers everything under the sun, especially when you read some implications into it, and the way it is drawn. I don't know how this Court can say that anything is not relevant, especially as it bears on the sincerity of the American and Allied position in dealing with Japan in 1941.

THE PRESIDENT: I told you more than once that we would disregard the affidavit so far as it indulged in opinions. All we want from this witness is what was said and done by the State Department in Washington, and please cross-examine with that in view. I know you can cross-examine as to credit, but these questions are not directed to credit but to the issues, or they are intended to be.

MR. SMITH: Well, your Honor, with all deference to your statement that the Court will ignore conclusions, I still do not know where I stand and what is in this affidavit and what is outside of it.

THE PRESIDENT: I am sure, Mr. Smith, that you

recognize an opinion or a conclusion when you see it in print. We do.

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, as the point is apt to arise time and time again, I would like to point out some other aspects of this affidavit. For example, in this affidavit it says that Japan has been following a policy of military agarandizement ever since it emerged as a modern state.

THE PRESIDENT: That is a conclusion which we utterly disregard.

MR. SMITH: Well, your Honor, if we could have a similar statement it would greatly simplify it. For example, 1895, dealing with the Japanese annexation of Formosa, and 1905, the Russian-Japanese War, if that is going--

THE PRESIDENT: Observe that red light.

MR. SMITH: If those matters could be stricken out it would simplify the case. If they are going to stand, I have perhaps four hundred questions to ask him to justify Japan's position.

THE PRESIDENT: American counsel have told me that by striking out they don't mean expunging. You can rest assured that we have struck out those conclusions and opinions in that sense.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, your Fonor. Does your

4

7

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

Honor rule the witness cannot answer as to when the Suez Canal was closed?

THE PRESIDENT: Cross-examine him on any statement of fact in the affidavit, not on any opinion.

Well, I am asking you if you know as a fact when the Suez Canal was closed to Japanese shipping? THE PRESIDENT: That is not in his affidavit.

When did the United States and the Dutch and the British embargo the shipment of petroleum, gasoline and scrap iron, aircraft designs, and so forth, to Japan?

A It will take a long time to tell that. It is all in the record. And because these different steps were taken at different times, I don't know what steps the other governments took.

Didn't you tell us yesterday that the action of the United States in putting these economic embargoes on was followed within a day by similar action by the Dutch and British and that the United States would have not acted had it not been for a concert?

THE PRESIDENT: If he contradicts himself, leave it to comment later. It is not necessary to point out what he said yesterday in fairness to him, if he did say something different.

When these embargoes on oil and scrap iron

and a great many other things went on, did the Depart-1 ment of State estimate how long it would take for such 2 economic blockade to bring Japan to its knees? 3 No conclusion was reached on that subject at all. 5 6 Well, you knew in the Department of State at the time these embargoes went on that it would be a 8 matter, at most, of two or three years to stifle the economy of Japan and even to force her to withdraw 10 armies from China and capitulate there; is that correct? 11 As I said yesterday, those measures were taken 12 in self-defense. No conclusion was reached as to how 13 long or what the precise effect upon Japan would be. 14 Well, you knew in 1940 in the State Department 15 that Japan couldn't exist for long without petroleum, 16 cotton, wool, and food, did you not? 17 Everybody knew that Japan was not self-18 sustaining in many of these commodities. 19 Do you know when the British mined Singapore 20 Strait? 21 THE PRESIDENT: It does not arise out of his 22 affidavit. We will recess for fifteen minutes. 23 (Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken 24 until 1100, after which the proceedings were 25

resumed as follows:)

		MADGULT OR THE COURT OF THE
G	1	MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
1 d	2	Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.
b	3	THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Smith.
er	4	BY MR. SMITH (Continued):
g	5	Q Mr. Reporter, would you repeat the last
&	6	question to the witness?
S	7	THE PRESIDENT: I disallowed that as not a-
pr	8	
at		rising out of the affidavit. It refers to alleged
t	9	mining of the Straits of Singapore by the British.
	10	Q Can you tell us when the United States
	11	acquired military bases in Iceland and Greenland,
	12	the Azores and leases in British territory for the
	13	construction of air fields?
	14	THE PRESIDENT: That does not arise out of
	15	the affidavit. The defense can give that evidence
	16	later.
	17	
	18	
	19	ferred fifty American destroyers to Great Britain?
	20	THE PRESIDENT: You know very well, Mr. Smith
	21	that the ruling on the last question covers this.
	22	MR. SMITH: Well, your Honor, I would like
		to defend these questions, if I may.
	23	THE PRESIDENT: There is no obligation
	24	on us to allow you to put those questions simply
	25	
		because you prepare them. I do ask you to act

reasonably. I want to avoid any sharp differences with counsel. MR. SMITH: Your Honor, I never contended because I prepared the question, every court had to allow it; but I would like to be heard on the question of its relevancy. THE PRESIDENT: I said you could crossexamine him on statements of fact in his affidavit. 9 The cross-examination that you are attempting is not limited to that. 11 MR. SMITH: Your Honor, I would like to make an objection that this Tribunal has applied such a narrow rule with respect to cross-examination, a rule narrower than any national court in the United States or Canada has ever applied. THE PRESIDENT: You may make that submission, but my colleagues on this Bench from the United States and Canada do not take that view. MR. SMITH: And I would also like to add, your Honor, that these defendants are being deprived 21

of a fair trial as guaranteed by the Charter because of an undue restriction on the right of cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: You must abide by the Court's ruling. I am not going to argue it with you.

1 2

3

5

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

Q Mr. Ballantine, are you aware that in November 1941 the Congress of the United States voted to repeal important sections of the Neutrality Law thus permitting the arming of merchant ships of the United States and their sailing into any combat zone or belligerent port in the world?

THE PRESIDENT: How does that arise out of the affidavit?

MR. SMITH: It bears on, your Honor, the good faith of the negotiations carried on in 1941, and it also bears on what the Japanese could reasonably apprehend were the intentions of a concert of nations.

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal does not take that view, Mr. Smith.

Q When did the United States begin supplying arms, ammunition, aircraft, trucks and food to the Kai-Shek regime in China?

THE PRESIDENT: The same objection applies to that. You can give evidence of all of these things. Do not talk about a fair trial being denied to you. I am afraid that is not meant for our ears, but for the ears of the public outside.

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, I seriously resent what your Honor just said to me. I am not talking

for the press; and what I am talking about aid to Kai-Shek is known all over the world. It is a matter of common knowledge.

THE PRESIDENT: If it is, why put matters -- all matters of common knowledge to this witness?

If you are allowed to put one matter, why not another?

MR. SMITH: Well, in order to save time and to pay due respect to your Honor's ruling, I had a long series of questions dealing with aid to the Kai-Shek regime, the efforts to keep the Burma road open and military assistance on construction.

Q Mr. Ballantine, these complaints that the United States Government lodged with the Japanese Government with respect to violation of the Nine-Power Treaty dealt in the main with the competitive conditions among merchants of different countries in China, is that correct?

A They dealt with the whole range of American rights and interests in China.

Q Well, the great bulk of the complaints that the State Department received from American merchants and traders, when analyzed, really boiled down to the fact that the Americans could not compete with the Japanese because of their low prices and quality

-

of their goods, is that right?

THE PRESIDENT: How does that arise out of the affidavit?

MR. SMITH: It arises out of the affidavit in many places, your Honor. The Witness has said there has been flagrant violation of the Nine-Power Pact, that they got no equality of treatment in China. I want to show that these complaints, when they were analyzed, were nothing more than the fact that they could not meet stiff competition.

THE PRESIDENT: I told you that had been stricken from the affidavit as an opinion or conclusion.

Q With further respect to the Nine-Power Treaty, was the State Department aware for a number of years before Pearl Harbor that China was opposed to any nation having any extraterritorial rights on Chinese soil?

THE PRESIDENT: What statement of fact in the affidavit is that based on? You may be able to point one out. I cannot recall one.

MR. SMITH: Well, your Honor, the United States has long since realized the futility of trying to maintain a territorial foothold in China. They have withdrawn their United States District

Court, have subjected their own citizens to Chinese law.

evidence, but to refer to the affidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: You are not there to give

MR. SMITH: The main point, as it touches the affidavit, and the point I am trying to make, is that the Nine-Power Treaty was practically a dead letter long before Pearl Harbor because of the Chinese attitude and the acquiescence in it by most governments.

THE PRESIDENT: You can give that evidence at the proper time. Now, at the present time, you are staging a holdup by putting questions you know must be disallowed on the Court's previous rulings.

MR. SMITH: I would like to have your Honor allow me a special exception to the remark that I am holding this Court up. I deny it emphatically.

THE PRESIDENT: You have an exception on my refusal to allow those questions you have been putting.

Q In the early negotiations with the Japanese in the spring of 1941 is it true that the Japanese spokesman and also the Civilian Committee asked the State Department to act as an "introducer" of peace in China?

A The proposal that the President of the
United States suggested to the Government of China
that it enter into negotiations for a peaceful
settlement with Japan arose right at the very
outset of the conversations, and we agreed to that
subject to an agreement on a general Pacific settle-
ment.

Q Did the State Department ever change its attitude about assuming a role of an introducer of peace?

A As I stated in my affidavit, that offer was never withdrawn.

Q Well, in your later -- the later proposals of the State Department to the Japanese, especially the one of November 26th, did not purport to act -- I am asking you this as a question -- did not purport to act as an introducer of peace between China and Japan, but the United States was going to settle the whole China war for China without China being consulted at all, is that correct?

THE PRESIDENT: The witness has already dealt with that, but let him answer again.

A finat is not correct.

Q Would you answer, Mr. Ballantine, as to what the true situation was, particularly as to

2

3

4

5

6

20

21

22

23

24

25

whether you were going to merely assume the role of an introducer, and let China and Japan work out their own problem, or the United States was unilaterally going to settle the whole China war?

A Careful reading of the explanatory statement which accompanied our November 26 proposal
should make the situation abundantly clear. We proposed going ahead with the conversations along the
basis of that proposal; when we reached a tentative
agreement, then we would take up the subject with
the other governments affected.

Q But, as I read the November 26, 1941 proposal, the State Department's position was that every Japanese soldier in China should be withdrawn. Now, my question is, if that came about, what would there be left to settle between China and Japan with respect to the war?

THE PRESIDENT: We do not want the witness' opinion. The matter is one for comment by counsel later.

Q Well, is it a fact that in the November 26 proposal the State Department ractically abandoned the idea of acting as an introducer of peace?

A No. The fact that no mention was made of it in that thing doesn't rule it out. We had these

8

10

12

13

14

1516

17

18 19

21

23

22

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: This cross-examination, when relevant, is repetitive. Other defense counsel have

matters outstanding. We never withdrew the offer.

covered this ground.

In the November 26 proposal, as I remember it, among other things you offered to Japan to negotiate a reciprocal trade agreement binding raw silk on the free list; is that correct?

A Yes. There was a provision calling for binding raw silk on the free list.

Q Are you familiar with the tariff history of the United States since 1921 and the Tariff Act since then as it related to Japanese imports into the United States?

A I am not an authority on the American tariff policy or tariff legislation.

Q Do you recall the fact that in the Tariff
Act of 1921 -- these are all United States laws -the Emergency Tariff Act of 1922 and the Hawley-Smoot
Tariff Act of 1930 --

THE PRESIDENT: He does not purport to know anything about the tariff of the United States. He told you that. You must take his answer.

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, I am trying to explore what he does know about it. After all, he

was one of those who put this provision in, and I want to show that this proposal to enter into a reciprocal trade agreement was nothing but sham in view of the history which preceded it.

THE PRESIDENT: If you want to say those unpleasant things about your own country, wait until you are giving evidence. Do not try to get it improperly from this witness because he does not know.

BY MR. SMITH (Continued):

Q Were you informed, or the State Department informed, on December 6 or the early morning of December 7, 1941, Washington time, that some twenty-four hours previously an American destroyer had depth-charged and sunk a Japanese submarine some distance off Pearl Harbor?

A If it was a fact, I don't know about it.

White House, that is, informed in the State Department, on November 28, 1941 that Secretary Stimson had seen President Roosevelt that morning and had stated to the President that he was "inclined to feel that the warning given in August by the President against further moves by the Japanese toward Thailand justified an attack without further warning, particularly as their new movement southward indi-

3

4 5

7

8

6

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

24

25

cated that they are about to violate that warning, and that, on the other hand, he realized that the situation could be made more clean-cut from the point of view of public opinion if a further warning were given, and further, that it is axiomatic that the best defense is offense."

Did you get that message in the State Department on that day?

A I never heard of the matter or any matters of that nature except what I read in the Pearl Harbor report, I mean, in the Pearl Harbor Congressional Hearing.

Q You do know that Secretary of War Stimson did so testify in the Pearl Harbor Investigation.

A Yes. I have read Secretary Stimson's testimony in the Pearl Harbor Investigation.

MR. SMITH: That concludes my examination, your Honor, and I want to take this occasion to assure you most humbly that I had no intention of holding this Court up. I never had any such intention during the twenty-two years I've been a lawyer.

THE PRESIDENT: I accept your explanation,
Mr. Smith, and I hope that in the future we shall have
no differences.

Mr. Brannon.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. BRANNON:

I have just a short question or two, Mr. Ballantine.

In 1940 did the State Department advocate the use of the fleet in influencing Japan in regard to foreign policies?

A . The fleet, as well as all agencies of the American Government, as far as they can be instruments of foreign policy, are so utilized. It is always the case.

Then, other than across-the-table talk. Q economic sanctions and measures, are you stating that the United States State Office took into consideration the use of the fleet for whatever purpose they might have had in mind at the time?

As I understand it, that's what a fleet is for, is an agency of national policy.

Am I correct in stating that some time in the early portion of 1940 the American Pacific Fleet moved from the west coast of the United States to Hawaii?

THE PRESIDENT: Why not leave these fleet movements to Admiral Richardson, if he can tell us? I am sure he can, Mr. Brannon.

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. BRANNON: Mr. President, I was seeking to establish, perhaps, the fact that the fleet movement was due to a suggestion of the State Department and that that matter may not properly be within the Admiral's knowledge. Would not Mr. Ballantine, as a State Department official, be properly in a position to answer that, if anyone?

THE PRESIDENT: Answer, if you can, Mr. Ballantine.

A So far as I know, I do not know of any fleet movement that was made in response to any suggestion of the State Department.

Q The President of the United States
primarily is the head of the State Department, is he
not?

THE PRESIDENT: I think we can take judicial notice of the United States Constitution.

Q As a State Department official, do you know whether or not the President of the United States attached significance to the movement of the fleet at that time?

A As the Commander-in-Chief of the Navy, the President attached important significance to the movements of fleets at all times.

Q Do you know whether or not the President

7

6

8

10

11

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

25

stated to State Department officials that he had so ordered the movement of the fleet for its effect on Japan?

A I am sorry, but I don't have any exact or definite knowledge of that -- dates and times of those matters.

MR. BRANNON: That is all as far as I am concerned. Mr. Brooks has a few questions.

MR. BROOKS: Mr. President and Members of the Tribunal.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

B) MR. BROOKS:

Q Mr. Witness, on the first page of your affidavit, in the fifth paragraph you state that the State Department -- I assume that's what you were talking of -- took into consideration the background of the political situation.

A That is correct

Q (Continuing) And that it is essential to an understanding of the true significance of the conversations to have that well in mind.

A That is correct.

Q Now, would you agree that there could be no understanding of the merits of the controversy that was in progress over the Manchurian domination with-

out some consideration, first, of the nature of the government which was opposed to Japan; second, of the provocation under which Japan acted; third, of the character of the Japanese activities; and fourth, of the final purposes by which the Japanese were animated at that time?

THE PRESIDENT: You are assuming provocation in one of those questions, Captain Brooks. It is not fair to the witness to put it in that form.

MR. BROOKS: I am assuming that the witness, since, in his affidavit, stated that from 1909 until 1928 he had been serving in consular posts in Japan, would have read the Japanese newspapers and would have known the various acts and atrocities. If he does not know and wishes to discard that knowledge, well, I would like for him to speak.

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn now until half-past one.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

A AFTERNOON SESSION 1 b r a The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at m 3 4 1330. 28 5 MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International d Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. 7 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brooks. 8 9 JOSEPH W. BALLANTINE, called as a 10 witness on behalf of the prosecution, resumed 11 the stand and testified as follows: 12 CROSS-EXATINATION 13 BY MR. BROOKS (Continued): If the reporter will read 14 back to the witness starting with the question where 15 I dealt with the merits of the controversy in the 16 Manchurian situation. 17 (Whereupon, the official court 18 reporter read the question, as follows:) 19 "Q Now, will you agree that there could be no 20 understanding of the merits of the controversy that 21 was in progress over the Manchurian domination with-22 out some consideration, first, of the government 23 which was opposed to Japan; second, of the provoca-24 tion under which Japan acted -- " 25 MR. BROOKS: If any. You might add that.

2

-

6

8

0

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

25

THE REPORTER (Continuing): "Second, of the provocation, if any, under which Japan acted; third, of the character of Japanese activities; and fourth, of the final purposes by which the Japanese were animated at that time?"

THE PRESIDENT: I think we are all of the opinion that you should put several questions covering that one.

MR. BROOKS: I will do so.

Q Mr. Ballantine, to what extent did your department investigate as to the actual conditions existing, and what was the sources of the knowledge as to the conditions in the Far East, that you utilized?

THE PRESIDENT: He could never undertake to tell you all they had in mind about the Far East.

MR. BROOKS: I am going to break it down.

Q Did you send, for instance --

THE PRESIDENT: I think, Captain Brooks, I must confine you this way: You must suggest to him, if you can, that in considering the position they overlooked certain matters, naming them.

MR. BROOKS: Thank you, your Honor.

Q Now dealing, Mr. Ballantine, with the first part of the general question, as to the nature of

3

4

5

7 8

9

11

12 13

14

1.5

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

the government which was opposed to Japan -- did your department consider that the government of China at that time was really effective and responsible? I am speaking of the authority that you recognized in the Nanking government.

A The Nanking government was the government that was recognized by the government of the United States, as well as all other governments at that time.

Q However, it was a fact, was it not, that its authority actually extended over but a small fraction of the territory and the people of China, did it not?

THE PRESIDENT: That is really a matter of opinion as to how far that government was effective, geographically and otherwise. You can ask him whether he took into account the position in China, but you can hardly ask him to state fully what it was.

Q Well, Mr. Ballantine, the State Department knew, did they not, and did they not consider that in the territory in issue in Manchuria that the young marshal, Chang Hsueh-Liang, by right of inheritance from his father was actually the one that was effective and responsible in that area, and that at that time, even in the south, that the

4

7 8

9

10

12 13

1415

16

17 18

19

21

22

2324

25

authority	of	the Na	nkir	ng gove	rnn	nent	was eff	ectivel;
challenged	by	what	was	known	as	the	Canton	govern-
ment?								

A I consider that our government of the United States was well informed on the situation throughout China and took into careful considerations all the circumstances involved.

Q Your department urged Japan to deal only with the leader, Chiang Kai-shek, at all times. Is that not so?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, he has already made that clear. They did.

Q And did your department not have knowledge that the widow of Sun Yat Sen, the real founder of the Chinese Republic, had denounced the government which you were urging them to deal with at that time?

A I don't think it is a question of whether any unofficial person's views would have affected the position of the government in regard to their attitude towards China to a very large extent.

Q From a diplomatic viewpoint that might be so, but I am talking about the sincerity and the practicability of the discussions, and trying to arrive at a peaceful solution of the problem, and it

is my understanding from your testimony thus far that the State Department's attitude was that things were well in 1922 as a result of those conferences, and that you were not recognizing any change in the facts and circumstances to alter and move from that position. Is that correct?

A We did not consider that there were any circumstances that called for revision or reconsideration of the Nine-Power Treaty.

Q Now, the Japanese rise in Manchuria dated from this treaty negotiated in 1915, but really had their origin in earlier agreements with both China and Russia. Is that not right?

A Certain rights dated from certain times.

The treaty that Japan contracted with China in 1905
was one of them.

Q Your department knew that for some years after the period 1922 that the Chinese had been endeavoring to nullify these treaties by a systematic violation of certain provisions. Did they not?

I call your attention to some of them that were contended by the Japanese, I imagine, in your conversations with them. As the building of the railway lines parallel to the South Manchurian Railway, the raising of the duty on Fuchan coal, although the

10

12

13

11

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

23

25

24

price had been fixed by a formal agreement, and the enlistment of business men in a campaign of boycott against Japanese interests, and the advancement of the campaign of propaganda which led to many persecutions and the killing of guards and many other incidents, I think numbering around three hundred at that time, with which I imagine you were familiar, were you not?

A I knew that there were claims by one side and counter-claims. I don't think that the United States undertook to pass upon the merits of those claims. What we advocated was their adjustment by peaceful processes by the two countries.

Q Now, Mr. Ballantine, your representatives did tell you of the protests -- of the diplomatic protests made by the Japanese as to the invasion of these rights, did they not, by the Chinese?

A I think we were informed by diplomatic representatives of what was going on on both sides.

Do you know why the Chinese evaded settlement of these diplomatic issues?

THE PRESIDENT: That assumes they did so evade.

> MR. BROOKS: I would like to change that. Do you know if the Chinese persistently

2

3

5

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

evaded settlement of these diplomatic issues:

A As I say, our government didn't undertake to pass upon the merits of the claims and counterclaims of the two sides.

- Q Do you know the approximate number of cases, as cited by the Japanese, as being outstanding at the time of the Manchurian Incident September 18, 1931?
  - A I do not recall.
  - There was several hundred, were there not?
  - A I don't know how many there were.
- Q Did you take any of those cases in consideration in considering the actions of the Japanese following September 18, 1931?

THE PRESIDENT: He could not unless he determined the merits first, and he says he didn't.

- Q Is the President's statement correct, in view of that -- of your knowledge?
  - A Of course.
- Q Under the treaties the Japanese had certain extra-territorial rights which had led them to invest over a billion dollars in Manchuria, had they not, previous to '31?

THE PRESIDENT: That is beyond anything that was said or done or decided in the State Department, and he is limited to that.

Q I asked you this question, Mr. Ballantine, because you state in your affidavit it is essential to an understanding of the true significance of the conversations which took place.

THE PRESIDENT: I told you, Captain Brooks, how we regard his affidavit. My colleagues assure me they take the view that it is purely argumentative.

Q Was there any discussion in these conversations as to the investments and the amount of investments made by Japan?

A I do not recall that there was any particular discussion of investments in Manchuria during the conversations.

Q Was there any comparison made by the Japanese diplomats in their conversations with you and your department between their position and their actions in Manchuria as being analagous to those of the United States in Nicaragua or in Cuba?

THE PRESIDENT: That involves a judgment.

It is outside the scope of the affidavit.

Q Well, did he --

THE PRESIDENT: We are not trying what happened in Nicaragua or any of those South American or other places.

22 23

MR. BROOKS: If your Honor please, I don't think they need trial. I hadn't finished what I was getting at, Mr. Ballantine, was did they advance any of the justifiable reasons, any defense of their actions in Manchuria, as was utilized by the United States in actions that they took when their interests were in question?

A I am afraid I don't get all the parts of that question together. There seem to be two or three parts that are disconnected and I can't get them very well.

Q Well, did the Japanese not urge or insist that their actions were an exercise of police power for the purpose of protecting their property and their people, and it was not war? One point.

THE PRESIDENT: That is an issue for us and he can not swear it.

Q The point I am making is a question of whether the Japanese emissary that was carrying on these conversations made that an insistence and is a fact, and I think he can testify as to the facts.

THE PRESIDENT: He can tell us anything they said during the negotiations.

MR. BROOKS: That's what I asked him.

A Well, they advanced many reasons why they

wanted these items that they asked for in the conversations, such as the stationing of troops, and they also spoke of the sacrifices they had made during the last four years of fighting with China.

Q Now, in these discussions, Mr. Ballantine, didn't the representatives of Japan, discussing the Manchurian situation, state, to summarize it, that Japan needed and wanted a stable government that would respect the treaty obligations, and that there was no limit placed by the Japanese on the method of assuring that stable government, was there?

A I don't recall that the Manchurian situation was discussed in those conversations. There was, of course, a point about the recognition of Manchukuo in their proposals, but I don't think there was any discussion of that subject. At least I don't recall it.

Q Then their position in Manchuria was not considered by the Department of State. Am I to gain that from your statement? Or was it left to be later discussed?

A I can only say that there was no discussion in the conversations about that subject. The subject of Manchuria and Japan's claims in regard to Manchuria was something that the Department of State had been

1	considering for years.
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23 · 24	
25	

2

3

5

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

		Q	Now,	the	Depar	rtmen	t of	Sta	ate in	n consid	lering	
thi	.5	prob	lem,	did	they	make	any	pri	ivate	investi	gatio	ns
as	to	the	cond	ditio	ons th	nere,	eith	ner	econo	omically	or	
pol	it	ical	ly?									

THE PRESIDENT: You would be advised by 6 your representatives in those countries, no doubt. You would not need to make private inquiries, would you? What do you have consuls for?

MR. BROOKS: Can he answer the question?

- (Continuing) I mean besides your regular official channels?
- Our official channels seemed adequate for us. If it hadn't been adequate we would have increased them.
- Did you utilize the reports of any commissions or other bodies making investigations from a commercial standpoint, in those areas?
- We gave most careful consideration to the Lytton Report, for example.
- And was that the only report that you utilized as a basis for arriving at your conclusions later?
- Well, we had our consular and diplomatic reports and the Lytton Report. I can't think -- recall any other at this moment that we had.
  - Were you familiar, Mr. Ballantine, with the

O'Ryan commission headed by General O'Ryan of New 1 York? 2 I recall that he was engaged by the Japanese 3 and went out to make an investigation for them. That was also a joint enterprise with some American business interests in New York, was it not, that he was representing? If that is so, I didn't know about it. 8 9 Did you or any of your Department ever have any discussion with any members of that commission? 10 don't recall. I believe that General 11 O'Ryan did come down to the State Department and see 12 13 somebody down there. 14 Q Did they not make available to your Department 15 the report and the information that they had obtained? 16 If he did, I don't recall seeing it. 17 Did you know Mr. Willis J. Abbott who 18 was editor-in-chief of the Christian Science Monitor? 19 THE PRESIDENT: There is no limit to the length 20 of a cross-examination of this type if it is permitted. 21 You could \* ask \* him about opinions of every man in 22 America. 23 MR. BROOKS: I am asking him, your Honor, in 24 following up the questions to refresh his memory as to 25 the commissions and reports that they used that were

unofficial, and I was suggesting to him this last man because he is a prominent American newspaperman who made that investigation to present a fair and unbiased view of the problem.

THE PRESIDENT: Thoragare bundreds of prominer

THE PRESIDENT: There are hundreds of prominent newspapermen throughout the world who gave their attention to these things and surely you are not going to ask him his opinion of those or what influence they had in Washington.

MR. BROOKS: I am asking him for this reason:
That in these cases here that I have cited these men
had information that could have been available to
the State Department, and in fact, may have been offered
but I do not believe was ever used as I have gained
so far by him, that was available to them.

THE PRESIDENT: No doubt the press of America entertained a variety of opinions and expressed them, perhaps pressed them, but is he to tell us all those things? Why should they go outside the reports of their trained advisors on the spot?

(Addressing the witness) Did you consider the views of journalists?

THE WITNESS: We did.

THE PRESIDENT: Was your judgement determined by the opinions of influential newspapermen?

1	THE WITNESS: Our opinions were determined
2	by consideration of our consular reports, other reports
3	and we also gave consideration to reports of journalists
4	They were not determined by reports of journalists.
5	BY MR. BROOKS (Continued):
6	Q Or by any one of those particular things in
7	particular, were they?
8	A They were not. Our conclusions were not
9	determined by any one set of reports.
10	Q However, the facts as reported were considered
11	and reflected in your conclusions, were they not?
12	A We tried to give full consideration to all
13	facts.
14	Q Now, did you
15	THE PRESIDENT: The State Department
16	would have files of all the leading newspapers of
17	America at all events?
18	THE WITNESS: It does have.
19	Q But the particular man, Mr. Abbott, that I
20	asked you about had been there to make a study and
21	make a report. Did you see his report?
22	A I don't recall it. That must have been a long
23	time ago.
24	Q That was in December of 1931.
25	

That's a long time ago.

Now, I want to ask you in considering the Manchurian invasion and its effect on your discussions later on: Is it not true that all of your conclusions as to that were based entirely upon the Lytton Report?

A No.

Q Is it not true that your Department had taken the stand to try to maintain the conditions of 1922 and would not consider investigating the facts as to the changing events in history of the times after that?

A I think our Government gave consideration to all the facts, also the facts connected with the character -- circumstances of Japan's invasion of Manchuria.

Q Did you -- your Department -- examine into the facts that had happened just previous to the Manchurian Incident?

A As I say, we had full reports from our consular representative of pertinent facts and we gave them careful study and consideration.

Q Did these reports deal with the invasion of the extra-territorial rights of Japan or any other nation?

A I think these reports dealt with all aspects of these questions.

Q In January 1932 China made another effort

to cancel extra-territorial rights of other nations than Japan, did she not? THE PRESIDENT: How is that relevant to any issue here? MR. BROOKS: I want to know if the State Department considered this attempt to repudiate certain of China's own treaties at that time in light with the same -- similar effect that she had with Japan previous to that time, if they considered that. THE PRESIDENT: We must confine ourselves to China's attitude to Japan. 

3 4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

Yet they asked the government that was repudiating these treaties -- asked Japan to deal with a government that was repudiating these treaties and to deal with her as being able and effective to assume the responsibility for her property and people in these areas.

THE PRESIDENT: The witness need not answer.

MR. BROOKS: I base that, your Honor, upon the assumption that it was either due to a misunderstanding of the facts or circumstances, or there would be some other reason for it.

THE PRESIDENT: We cannot undertake to decide all the disputes between nations here.

Your Department did know that Japan had attempted to negotiate a settlement of this controversy originally with the young marshal, did they not?

I have no clear recollection of that.

From the reports and information that you had from these areas, do you know thy it was that Japan considered it necessary to negotiate with the young marshal for the settlement of the controversy rather than with the government at Manking by taking that up with the League of Nations?

THE PRESIDENT: We do not want him to tell us Japan's attitude. You can tell us that in the course

of giving evidence later.

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

MR. BROOKS: My question asks him as to the effectiveness of the young marshal's control.

THE PRESIDENT: That, again, involves a judgment. It is not for a diplomat.

MR. BROOKS: As it was known by their Department from their official reports as well as otherwise, they should know who was effective to deal with.

THE PRESIDENT: They said they treated Chungking, meaning Nanking, as the effective government in those days. Chungking was at the time of Pearl Harbor and thereabouts.

What did the reports; at this time, your official reports, show as to the effectiveness of dealing with Chungking in relation to dealing with the young marshal?

I had better ask that this way, Mr. Ballantine: If an agreement had been made by Japan with the Nanking Government at that time, from the information that you had as to your official reports, do you think that it would have been effective and settled the controversy?

THE PRESIDENT: I told you repeatedly we won't accept his opinion, so don't ask for it. Please spare me the necessity to have to repeat that

again. I have repeated it twenty times today.

MR. BROOKS: I think that is all I have at this time, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. LOGAN:

Q Mr. Ballantine, up to the imposition of sanctions by the United States, isn't it a fact that Ambassador Grew pointed out that when these embargoes went into effect against Japan, that the relations between the United States and Japan would probably go downhill and would in all probability lead to war?

A I don't recall exactly the exact time or the exact wording of references made by Mr. Grew on that subject. I do know that he did make them.

Q And he was your representative on the spot, and after receipt of this advice, did the State Department take into consideration that the imposition of embargoes would in all probability make future negotiations with Japan impossible?

A As I have already stated, the conversations with the Japanese had been suspended when the freezing measures were adopted. After the freezing measures were adopted the Japanese came around and asked to

have the conversations resumed.

Q I realize that, Mr. Ballantine. But the point I am trying to make is that after you received this advice from Mr. Grew to the effect that embargoes might lead to war, the State Department, nevertheless, put through the recommendation that embargoes be put on the goods, with the knowledge that after the embargoes were placed it would be more difficult to continue or even reopen negotiations with the Japanese? In other words, Mr. Ballantine, it created another problem for consideration in any negotiations; isn't that so?

A The Japanese move into southern Indo-China had also created another problem for consideration.

Q. When you say "another problem," I assume by that that you agree with me that this embargo question did create another problem; is that right?

A That is correct.

9 Now, on October 9, 1941, Ambassador Grew also reported to the State Department that the frozen credit policy of the United States was driving Japan into national bankruptcy, and that she would be forced to act, is that correct?

A There, again, I don't recall the exact wording, but I believe it is substantially correct.

Q So that, Mr. Ballantine, the observation made

by Mr. Grew prior to the time the embargoes were imposed, his prediction at that time, actually came true; isn't that so?

A I don't recall that his previous representations to which you refer said that Japan would be driven into national bankruptcy.

Q I am referring to the fact that he stated that she would be forced to act. That is what I had in mind.

A Well, the two things are quite different. One is your references to "national bankruptcy," the other is "forced to act." Japan always had the opportunity before her of reverting to peaceful courses.

THE PRESIDENT: I think, Mr. Logan, we are covering the same ground again. We have been over this.

Q Yesterday, Mr. Ballantine, in answer to a question as to why Mr. Hull suddenly abandoned the modus vivendi, you stated that you -- or, Mr. Hull felt that it would be a very discouraging factor on the Chinese, who were being hard-pressed.

Did the State Department also at that time discuss the advantage to the United States of keeping the Japanese Army occupied in China if the incident between Japan and China was not terminated at that time?

A One of the paramount considerations before us,

in accordance with our fixed national policy, was to							
aid nations resisting aggression.							
Q Will you answer the question, please?							
A I thought my answer would have covered your first							
question.							
MR. LOGAN: Will the stenographer please							
repeat it?							
(Whereupon, the question was read							
by the official court reporter.)							
A I don't recall that that subject was discussed.							
THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen							
minutes.							
(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was							
taken until 1500, after which the proceedings							
were resumed as follows:)							

G 0 1 d b 9 r g 80 p

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

BY MR. LOGAN (Continued):

Mr. Ballantine, yesterday when a question was directed to you -- it may have been today -- yesterday, about a statement that had appeared in your affidavit with respect to the AMAU statement, you stated that if you recalled correctly that the idea of putting that in your affidavit was suggested by counsel here, and that you wrote your own wording of it independently of having before you or having in mind any similar statement by Mr. Hull. Now. isn't it a fact, Mr. Ballantine, that that statement is taken word for word out of Mr. Hull's prepared statement which he submitted to the hearings before the Congressional Investigation with the exception of the fact that you used the word "AMAU" whereas Mr. Hull used the words, "hands off China"?

In my statement yesterday I was referring to the statement I made on the first page of my affidavit. Apparently, the first page of my affidavit has gotten torn off here, and I cannot check on it, but it was a statement in regard to my --

(Whereupon, a document was handed

Ö

to the witness.)

A (Continuing) -- I was referring to the third paragraph of my statement on page 1.

Q Well, the reord indicates, Mr. Ballantine, that you were referring to the statement I just referred to? If I read this to you it might refresh your recollection on it.

A Then it is a complete --

THE PRESIDENT: Is it worthwhile wasting time on it, Mr. Logan? As he drafted his affidavit, no doubt he had before him papers, perhaps including Mr. Hull's statement. Why couldn't he adopt Mr. Hull's language, if it expressed the position as he saw it?

Q Well, isn't it usual, Mr. Ballantine, that quotation marks be given to extracts from other documents, particularly in diplomatic circles?

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, that is a matter of ethics at most. It does not affect us.

Q I will ask you, Mr. Ballantine, who selected the passages which you used in your affidavit from Mr. Hull's prepared statement? Was it you or counsel for the prosecution?

A It was I who selected practically all, if not all. I do not recollect exactly, but practically

all I selected myself.

4

5

7

9

10

12

14

16

18

19

20

21.

23

24

25

Q And was that selection made, Mr. Ballantine, with the idea of presenting to this Tribunal that part of Mr. Hull's testimony which would be more favorable to the prosecution's case?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you know what Mr. Hull said, and you know what is in the affidavit.

MR. LOGAN: I appreciate that, your Honor, but my point is this: That here we have a witness who comes ten thousand miles to testify at this trial, and he presents to the Tribunal an affidavit in which he does not state that much, if not most, of the affidavit is taken from Mr. Hull's testimony; and in addition to that, he omits that part of Mr. Hull's testimony which has not been put in evidence by the prosecution and which we contend is favorable to the accused in this case.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you can put it in later. There will be ways of doing it without calling Mr. Hull.

MR. LOGAN: Well, it is my understanding, your Honor, that this witness is supposed to present the entire attitude of the State Department -- not a one-sided attitude.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you can put to him

7

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

the things which you think he should have included in his affidavit from Mr. Hull's statement, in a short form. I mean.

I just want to call to your attention, Mr. Ballantine, among other things which you omitted was Mr. Hull's discussion of the embarge on page 412 of his record, his mention of the Selective Service Act which was passed in the United States' preparation for war, and his statement with respect to the presqure which was brought upon Japan from other countries. I would also like to call your attention to the bottom of page 12 of your affidavit --

THE PRESIDENT: You will make your question too long unless you let him answer the first part, Mr. Logan.

What have you to say about the Selective Service Act -- you said something yesterday about it -and the pressure brought by other countries?

THE WITNESS: Was there a question addressed to me, Mr. President? I did not understand it.

THE PRESIDENT: It is suggested that you are suppressing the truth, that you omitted any reference to Mr. Hull's statement about the Selective Service Act and the pressure brought on Japan by

3

5

7

8

10

11

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

25

other countries.

of suppressing the truth. I certainly received no suggestion from counsel as to the omission or inclusion of any of these portions. I was trying to make this affidavit as concise as possible, and I used the selection -- used my best judgment as to what would be most appropriate for this occasion.

MR. LOGAN: We will accept that, Mr. Ballantine.

Q Will you now turn to page 12 of your affidavit, at the bottom of the page. You make this
statement, which is a direct quotation from Mr. Hull's
prepared statement on page 430 of the record:

"On November 20 the Japanese Ambassador and Mr. KURUSU presented to me a proposal which, on its face, was extreme."

But, you omit the next sentence in Mr.

Hull's testimony, wherein he said: "I knew, as did
other high officers of the Government, from intercepted messages supplied to me by the War and Navy
Department that this proposal was the final Japanese proposition and an ultimatum."

In the last paragraph of your page 12 of your affidavit, however, you say:

"Before and after presenting that proposal,
Ambassador NOMURA and Mr. KURUSU talked emphatically
about the urgency of the situation and intimated
vigorously that this was Japan's last word and if
an agreement along these lines was not quickly
cencluded ensuing developments might be most unfortunate."

Now, is that last sentence in your affidavit intended by you to take the place of the sentence I read to you from Mr. Hull's prepared statement?

Ment, but also the statement contained in our summary of conversations that we prepared shortly after Pearl Harbor. I had no particular motives in using one instead of the other. I do not remember what considerations I had on that. I had no reason -- I mean I have no reason for omitting the Secretary's statement. I had those both before me, and I leaned towards this other statement, and did not see any need of both of them.

Q Do I understand, Mr. Ballantine, that that last paragraph on page 12 of your affidavit came from some other memorandum?

A I don't know about the exact wording, but

7

8

10

12

14

13

15

16

17

18

20

22

23

24

I think it follows pretty closely what appears in the summary of conversations in Foreign Relations, United States-Japan, 1931 to 1941.

Q Can you tell us with whom Ambassader NOMURA and Mr. KURUSU had these talks which I referred to in that last paragraph on page 12?

A They had these talks with the Secretary of State, at which I was present.

Q Now, Mr. Ballantine, aside from the quotations which you have presented in your affidavit from Mr. Hull's testimony and statements from other memoranda which you have not designated, the balance of your affidavit is your own personal opinion, isn't that so? I mean, pardon me -- may I explain that a little bit -- I mean by that that it is an opinion which you drew up while you were here and which has never been submitted to the State Department for its approval?

THE PRESIDENT: Ignore his opinion, Mr. Logan. We are doing so.

MR. LOGAN: I am doing that, your Honor, but I want him to state that that is his opinion, and not the State Department's opinion which he has in that affidavit, if that be the fact.

THE PRESIDENT: He can tell if it is the

. 17

State Department's opinion, yes.

MR. LOGAN: If your Honor please, I am asking him if the balance of that affidavit, aside from the statements which he has incorporated from Mr. Hull's testimony and from other documents, I am asking him if the balance of that affidavit which he has submitted here is his own opinion and not the opinion of the State Department.

THE PRESIDENT: That is an allowable question, certainly.

A I take full responsibility for the contents of this affidavit. I will say that I did show this affidavit in its entirety to associates of mine in the State Department. This affidavit, however, has never been officially cleared with the State Department.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: I am OKAMOTO, Shoichi, counsel for the defendant, MUTO, Akira.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. OKAMOTO.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: Owing to the efforts of American defense attorneys, the extent of my cross-examination has become very narrow, and I have only a few simple questions to ask.

25

G CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) r 1 BY MR. S. OKAMOTO: 0 2 On page 1, paragraph 4 of your affidavit, n 1 3 you state as follows: "During practically all of my e T 4 career in the foreign service, I have dealt with Far g 5 80 Eastern Affairs and have followed closely the course 6 B of Jananese-American relations. Up until 1931 the relations between the United States and Japan were r t generally friendly and the American Government and 0 n people consistently had an attitude of good will 10 toward the government and people of Japan. The 11 Japanese occupation of Manchuria caused an impairment 12 of those relations." I wish to ask you two or three 13 questions concerning this paragraph. 14 In your capacity as an official of the State 15 Department and also through the studies in foreign 16 affairs which you made are you aware that there was 17 an American named Bates in the employ of the Japanese 18 Foreign Office -- as an adviser of the Japanese 19 20 Foreign Office? 21 I know Mr. Dennison personally. 22 THE MONITOR: Correction: Mr. Dennison. 23 THE PRESIDENT: I thought he said "Bates."

THE MONITOR: Mr. President, the correction

was overlooked, and it has been made just now. The

the Russo-Japanese War?

correction is: "Mr. Dennison" instead of "Mr. Bates." 1 Do you know that Mr. Dennison worked in the 2 Foreign Office from 1880 to 1914, which covered both 3 the period of the Sino-Japanese War and the Russo-Japanese War? 5 A I do not know the exact years that he was 6 in the Foreign Office, but I know he was there a long time. 8 Have you heard that he was held in great 9 respect by Foreign Ministers MUTSU and KOMURA? 10 I understand that that was the case. 11 Are you aware that Mr. Dennison participated 12 in the drafting of the Sino-Japanese Peace Treaty? 13 I believe I recall that, yes. 14 15 Are you aware that the Japanese ultimatum 16 to Russia, just before the outbreak of the Russo-17 Japanese War, was penned solely upon the responsibility 18 of Mr. Dennison? 19 I didn't know that. 20 Are you aware that in 1899 John Hay 21 enunc: >ted the Open Door Policy towards China? 22 I am remiliar with that. 23 Was the Russiam southward advance in Man-24 churia contrary to this Open Door principle before

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, that is hardly within the scope of the affidavit.

3

MR. S. OKAMOTO: I am trying to dissect his statement regarding the so-called friendly relations between the United States and Japan and wish to clear up his statement regarding that.

5

THE PRESIDENT: You are not doing it in this way.

8

9

7

MR. S. OKAMOTO: Then I shall change my question.

10 11

12

13

Q I wish to question you concerning the Japanese Exclusion Act, concerning which Mr. Smith asked you previously. Is it not a fact that this Act, which was passed in 1923 -- 1922, greatly excited the Japanese people -- 1923?

15 16

THE PRESIDENT: That is beyond the scope of the affidavit as it is to be read now.

18

17

Then I shall ask you a very short question: You have stated that up until 1931 the relations between the United States and Japan were generally friendly. However, did you not receive information that, owing to the Oriental Exclusion Act, the Washington Conference, the Naval Limitation Treaty. and the Nine-Power Pact, as far as Japan was con-

cerned she considered herself oppressed to quite a

19

20

21 22

24

25

degree by the United States? My understanding is that the Japanese Govern-2 ment entered voluntarily into those treaties referred 3 to. 4 And what about the trend of Japanese public 5 opinion? 6 THE PRESIDENT: That is beyond the scope of 7 the affidavit. 8 MR. S. OKAMOTO: Then I shall again change 9 10 my question. 11 On page 2 of your affidavit, in paragraph seven you state as follows: that after "Japan gave 13 formal notice of its intention to withdraw at the end 14 of 1936 from the Naval Limitation Treaty," .... "Japan 15 proceeded energetically to increase her armaments. 16 preparatory to launching her invasion in China." 17 What do you mean by the word "energetically"? 18 THE PRESIDENT: It speaks for itself. There 19 is no need to answer. 20 I shall ask you concerning another point: 21 THE PRESIDENT: In any event, that part of 22 the affidavit was disallowed as expressing an opinion. 23 It goes on: "preparatory to launching her invasion 24 in China." 25

(Continuing) I shall question you concerning

another point: In your affidavit you state that Japan was waging an undeclared war against China. Did the United States State Department consider, even in war time, that Japan was still waging an undeclared war?

A I don't quite understand the question.

In your affidavit you have used the phrase "undeclared war." Before drawing up this affidavit, that is, during the period of the Sino-Japanese conflict, did the American State Department recognize that an undeclared war existed between Japan and China and conduct its foreign affairs accordingly?

A Yes. We knew that the Japanese Government had not declared war against China, that is, before 1941, and that we had to take the facts into consideration that hostilities on a large scale were going on.

Q Then, were the provisions of the Neutrality Act put into effect?

A No.

Q If you recognized that an undeclared state of war existed, was it a mistake not to have put the provisions of the Neutrality Act into effect?

THE PRESIDENT: That is an opinion which he is not invited to give.

Then I shall ask you, as a matter of fact,

Great Britain?

was the Neutrality Act not put into effect? 1 put into effect. 3 quantities, and also including weapons? as we could. people? Great Britain. But, do you know?

As I said before, the Neutrality Act was not 2 Then, is it a fact that it follows that 4 material to aid the Chiang Regime was sent in large 5 6 Yes. It was our policy to assist the Chinese 7 Government, and we assisted in sending such materials 9 10 Q But, is it not also a fact that England on 11 the 19th of July, 1939, as a result of the ARITA-12 Craigie conversations, recognized that a state of war 13 existed in China and agreed not to aid the Chinese 14 side, and agreed to let this be known to the English 15 16 THE PRESIDENT: Well, that is really outside 17 the cope of the affidavit. He does not speak for 18 19 20 THE WITNESS: Well, I do know for three 21 months the Burma Road was closed by the British. 22 Was not the United States note abrogating the 23 Commercial Treaty -- the Treaty of Commerce and Navi-24

gation with Japan as a means of trying to influence

THE PRESIDENT: That requires an opinion.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: I wish to ask whether America was not stimulated by this action of Great Britain and thus served notice of the abrogation of the Commerce and Navigation Treaty, and that the United States did this in order to check or to restrain Britain from that policy.

THE PRESIDENT: What was the view of the State Department?

THE WITNESS: I don't know of any considerations entering into the abrogation of the Commercial Treaty other than those stated in my affidavit.

BY MR. S. OKAMOTO (Continued):

Q I shall ask you on another point: You have written in your affidavit of the Siberian Expedition. Did not Japan send troops to Siberia upon the invitation of America?

THE PRESIDENT: That is outside the scope of the affidavit. At least you may point out something in the affidavit that warrants it. I cannot recall anything.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: It is on page 14 of the Japanese text. I am trying to find out what page it is on in the English text from my colleagues.

THE MONITOR: At the top of page 6 in the

2

4 5

6

8

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

24

25

English text.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. A colleague has sent me this note. I think it is correct, too. He said, "they were entitled to send seven thousand and didsend seventy thousand, or something like that."

Answer the question, if you can.

A I think that the actual, initial proposal did come from the United States.

Q However, in 1920 America sent Japan notice that she was withdrawing her troops --

THE MONITOR: Correction: But, in January, 1920, America withdrew her own troops without consultation with Japan and sent merely notice to that effect to Japan.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you know that?

A I believe that is correct.

Q Did Baron SHIDEHARA, then Japanese Ambassador to Washington, protest to the State Department?

Did not Baron SHIDEHARA protest, saying that "a unilateral withdrawal of troops -- that America's unilateral wathdrawal of troops was uncalled for and that, hereafter Japan will be at liberty whether she chooses to remain or to withdraw her troops"?

A I do not recall that.

Q Towards the end of page 16 of the Japanese

text --

3 4

THE MONITOR: This is still page 6 of the English text.

Q (Continuing) in paragraph 6 of page 6 you state: "On April 15, 1940, Mr. ARITA, then Japanese Mirister for Foreign Affairs, said" et cetera, et cetera, and then "Following the occupation of the Netherlands by Germany that spring, Japan sent a Commercial Commission to the Indies which asked concessions so far reaching that, if granted, they would have reduced the Indies practically to a Japanese colony."

THE PRESIDENT: We decided to ignore that opinion. You may do so.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: Thank you.

graph of the English text, you state as follows:
"Notwithstanding the various objectionable features
of the Japanese Government's proposal, in view of the
world situation the Government of the United States
decided to explore thoroughly every possible means,
starting with the Japanese proposals, of coming to
an agreement. The Secretary of State on numerous
occasions at which I was present emphasized to the
Japanese Ambassador that this Government was aware of

the difficult internal situation which the Japanese Government faced and was prepared to be patient and to give the Japanese Government ample time to bring Japanese public opinion into line in support of a liberal broad-gauge program, such as the Secretary of State and the Japanese Ambassador had been discussing in their conversations."

What information had the State Department received concerning the difficult internal situation of the Japanese Government of which you speak?

A We had received information from these unofficial Japanese representatives; we had had constant -- had representations made to us about these liberal forces ready to come forth if we'd only be patient; and many other representations of that character.

THE PRESIDENT: Will you be much longer, Mr. OKAMOTO?

MR. S. OKAMOTO: I still have a few more questions to ask.

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn now until half-past nine on Monday.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Monday, 25 November 1946 at 0930.)

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

