Record of Proceedings of the INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan The United States of America, the Republic of China, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Commonwealth of Australia, Canada, the Republic of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, New Zealand, India, and the Commonwealth of the Philippines -Against-ARAKI, Sadao; DOHIHARA, Kenji; HASHIMOTO, Kingoro; HATA, Shunroku; HIRANUMA, Kiichiro; HIRO-TA, Koki; HOSHINO, Naoki; ITAGAKI, Seishiro; KAYA, Okinori; KIDO, Koichi; KIMURA, Heitaro; KOISO, Kuniaki; MATSUI, Iwane; MATSUOKA, Yosuke; MINAMI, Jiro; MUTO, Akira; NAGANO, Osami; OKA, Takasumi; OKAWA, Shumei; OSHIMA, Hiroshi; SATO, Kenryo; SHI-GEMITSU, Mamoru; SHIMADA, Shigetaro; SHIRATO-RI, Toshio; SUZUKI, Teiichi; TOGO, Shigenori: TOJO, Hideki; UMEZU, Youshijiro; -Accused-Official Court Reporters Jack Greenberg, Chief Fred T. Abram James F. Barton Antoinette Duda Samuel Goldberg Robert B. Morse John J. Smith Daphne Spratt Elvira Whalen Julian Wolf Lorraine Yelden

INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

(none)

INDEX

Of .

EXHIBITS

Doc. No.	Pros. No.	Def.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
4061B	1086		Telegram from Ott in Tokyo to Ribbentrop dated 11 June 1941		9986
220 C(35)	1087		Draft of the Proposal receifrom NOMURA dated 15 June 1941		9988
219P(77)	1088		Excerpt from Telegram of Ambassador Grew to Secreta of State Hull dated 16 Jun 1941		9996
1632W(52)	1089		Entry in KIDO's Diary dated 18 June 1941		9998
1632W(53)	1090		Entry in KIDO's Diary dated 20 June 1941		9999
2200 (36)	1091		Oral Statement by Secretary State handed to Ambassador NOMURA dated 21 June 1941		10000
220 C(37)	1092		Draft Proposal of a Settleme between Japan and the U.S. the Secretary of State to Japanese Ambassador dated June 1941	the	10004

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Pros. No.	Def. No.	Description	For In Ident.Evidence
1093		Entry from KIDO's Diary date 22 June 1941	ed 10019
1094		Entry in KIDO's Diary dated 23 June 1941	10023
1095		Entry in KIDO's Diary dated 23 June 1941	10026
1096		Telegram from Ribbentrop at the German Embassy at Toky	ro 10029
1097		Telegram from the German Fil at Nuernberg from Ott to Ribbentrop dated 28 June 1	
1098		Entry in KIDO' Diary dated 28 June 1941	10036
1099		Message from the American Ambassador in Japan to the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs MATSUOKA dated 8 July 1941	10039
1100		Excerpt from an Oral State- ment of Ambassador Grew to Minister MATSUOKA dated 8 July 1941	10041
1101		Foreign Minister MATSUOKA's Reply of February 17 to Foreign Secretary Eden	10043
1102		Excerpt from Press Release by the Department of State in Washington dated 24 July 1941	10047
	No. 1093 1094 1095 1096 1097 1098 1099	No. No. 1093 1094 1095 1096 1097 1098 1099	No. No. Description 1093 Entry from KIDO's Diary dated 22 June 1941 1094 Entry in KIDO's Diary dated 23 June 1941 1095 Entry in KIDO's Diary dated 23 June 1941 1096 Telegram from Ribbentrop at the German Embassy at Toky 1097 Telegram from the German Fil at Nuernberg from Ott to Ribbentrop dated 28 June 1 1098 Entry in KIDO' Diary dated 28 June 1941 1099 Message from the American Ambassador in Japan to the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs MATSUOKA dated 8 July 1941 1100 Excerpt from an Oral Statement of Ambassador Grew to Minister MATSUOKA dated 8 July 1941 1101 Foreign Minister MATSUOKA dated 8 July 1941 1102 Excerpt from Press Release by the Department of State in Washington dated 24

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Doc. No.	Pros.	Def. No.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
1699	1103		Relating to Central Liaison Conferences held during 19	41	10051
2216	1104		Affidavit of the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, dated 7 June 1946		10067
239	1105		Affidavit of Ambassador Joseph Clark Grew		10089
2007B	1106		Excerpt from the Testimony of former Secretary of State Cordell Hull before the United States Con- gressional Committee for the investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack (pp. 1076 to 1083)		10109

Friday, 8 November, 1946 2 3 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, at 0930. 10 11 12 Appearances: 13 For the Tribunal, same as before with the 14 exception of the HONORABLE R. B. PAL, Member from 16 India, not sitting. For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 17 For the Defense Section, same as before. 18 19 20 21 (English to Japanese and Japanese 22 to English interpretation was made by the 23 Language Section, IMTFE.) 24 25

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

THE PRESIDENT: All the accused are present except OKAWA, HIRANUMA and MATSUI whe are represented by their respective counsel. We have certificates from the Medical Superintendent of Sugamo Prison to the effect that the accused HIRANUMA and MATSUI are still unable to attend the trial owing to illness.

The certificates will be recorded and filed. Major Moore.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Major Moore): If the Tribunal please, referring to exhibit 1066, record page 9877, line 7, the words "his opinion" should read "my opinion." We recommend this correction be made.

THE PRESIDENT: It will be adopted. Thank you, Major Moore.

Mr. Williams.

MR. E. WILLIAMS: We offer in evidence IPS document 4061 B which is a telegram dated June 11, 1941 from Ott in Tokyo to Ribbentrop. It was recovered from the German files in Nuernberg.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 4061 B will receive exhibit No. 1086.

4 5

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1086 and received in evidence.)

MR. E. WILLIAMS: We read prosecution exhibit No. 1086:

"Telegram (Secret Cipher Process)

"Tokyo" 11 June 1941

"Arrival 12 June 1941

"No. 927 of 11 June.

"Prince URACH has informed us of a conversation with the Commander-in-Chief of the KWANTUNG Army, General UMEZU, in HSINKING: 'Commander-in-Chief of the KWANTUNG Army, General UMEZU, stressed that he welcomed the Neutrality Pact JAPAN-RUSSIA for the moment. Since, however, the Tripartite Pact is the unchangeable basis of Japanese foreign policy, Japan's attitude towards the Neutrality Pact must undergo a change just as soon as the hitherto existing German-Russian relations undergo an alteration.

"OTT"

We offer in evidence IPS document No.

220 C (35) from exhibit for identification 58, Volume II, which is a draft of the document or proposal received from NOMURA June 15, 1941.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's decument

No. 220 C (35) will receive exhibit No. 1087.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 1087 and received in evidence.)

MR. E. WILLIAMS: We read prosecution's document No. 1087:

"DRAFT DOCUMENT RECEIVED INFORMALLY FROM ASSOCIATES
OF THE JAPANESE AMBASSADOR (NOMURA) ON JUNE 15, 1941

"The Governments of the United States and of Japan accept joint responsibility for the initiation and conclusion of a general agreement of understanding as expressed in a joint declaration for the resumption of traditional friendly relations.

"Without reference to specific causes of recent estrangement, it is the sincere desire of both Governments that the incidents which led to the deterioration of amicable sentiment between their countries should be prevented from recurrence and corrected in their unforeseen and unfortunate consequences."

CO

"It is our earnest hope that, by a cooperative effort, the United States and Japan may contribute effectively toward the establishment and preservation of peace in the Pacific area and, by the rapid consumation of an amicable understanding, encourage world peace and arrest, if not dispel, the tragic confusion that now threatens to engulf civilization.

"For such decisive action, protracted negotiations would seem ill-suited and weakening.

Both Governments, therefore, desire that adequate instrumentalities should be developed for the realization of a general understanding which would bind, meanwhile, both Governments, in honor and in act.

"It is the belief of the two Governments that such an understanding should comprise only the pivotal issues of urgency and not the accessory concerns which could be deliberated later at a Conference.

"Both Governments presume to anticipate that they could achieve harmonious relations if certain situations and attitudes were clarified or improved; to wit:

"1. The concepts of the United States and of

Japan respecting the international relations

and the character of nations."

1	"2. The attitudes of both Governments toward
2	the European war.
3	"3. Action toward a perceful settlement be-
4	tween China and Japan.
5	"4. Commerce between both nations.
6	"5. Economic activity of both nations in the
7	Pacific area.
8	"6. The policies of both nations affecting po
9	litical stabilization in the Pacific area
10	"7. Neutralization of the Philippine Islands.
11	"Accordingly, the Government of the United
12	States and the Government of Japan have come to the
13	following mutual understanding and declaration of
14	policy:
15	"I. The concepts of the United States and of Japan
16	respecting international relations and the charac-
17	ter of nations.
18	"Both Governments affirm that their national
19	policies are directed toward the foundation of a last-
20	ing peace and the inauguration of a new era of reci-
21	procal confidence and cooperation between our peoples.
22	"Both Governments declare that it is their
23	traditional, and present, concept and conviction
25	that nations and races compose, as members of a family,
	one household living under the ideal of universal

4 5

concord through justice and equity; each equally enjoying rights and admitting responsibilities with a mutuality of interests regulated by peaceful processes and directed to the pursuit of their moral and physical welfare, which they are bound to defend for themselves as they are bound not to destroy for others; they further admit their responsibilities to oppose the oppression or exploitation of other people.

"Both Governments are firmly determined that their respective traditional concepts on the character of nations and the underlying moral principles of social order and national life will continue to be preserved and never transformed by foreign ideas or ideologies contrary to those moral principles and concepts.

"II. The attitudes of both Governments toward the European war.

"The Government of Japan maintains that the purpose of the Tripartite Pact was, and is, defensive and is designed to prevent the participation of nations in the European war not at present involved in it.

"The Government of the United States maintains that its attitude toward the European hostili-

3

ties is and will continue to be determined solely and exclusively by considerations of protection and self-defense: its national security and the defense thereof.

5

"III. Action toward a peaceful settlement between Japan and China.

"The Government of Japan having declared

7

that the general terms, within the framework of which the Government of Japan will propose the negotiation

10

of a peaceful settlement of the China Affair, are implied in the KONOYE principles and in the practical

11

application of these principles, the President of the

13

United States, relying upon the policy of the Government of Japan to establish a relation of neighborly

14

friendship with China, will suggest to the Government

16

at Chungking that it enter with the Government of

17

Japan into a negotiation for a termination of hostili-

18

"IV. Commerce between both nations.

ties and resumption of peaceful relations.

20

21

ZL

22

23

24

25

"When official approbation to the present understanding has been given by both Governments, the United States and Japan shall assure each other mutually to supply such commodities as are, respectively, available and required by either of them. Both Governments further consent to take necessary steps

4

6

5

8

9

10

11 12

14

13

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

25

to resume normal trade relations as formerly established under the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation between the United States and Japan. If a new commercial treaty is desired by both Governments, it would be negotiated as soon as possible and be concluded in accordance with usual procedure.

Economic activity of both nations in the Pacific area.

"On the basis of mutual pledges hereby given that Japanese activity and American activity in the Pacific area shall be carried on by peaceful means and in conformity with the principle of non-discrimination in international commercial relations, the Japanese Government and the Government of the United States agree to cooperate each with the other toward obtaining non-discriminatory access by Japan and by the United States to commercial supplies of natural resources (such as oil, rubber, tin, nickel) which each country needs for the safeguarding and development of its own economy.

"VI. The policies of both nations affecting political stabilization in the Pacific area.

"Both Governments declare that the controlling policy underlying this understanding is peace in the Pacific area; that it is their fundamental

3

5

7

6

9

8

10

12

13

14

16

17

18

20

21

23

24

25

purpose, through cooperative effort, to contribute to the maintenance and the preservation of peace in the Pacific area; and that neither has territorial designs in the area mentioned.

"VII. Neutralization of the Philippine Islands.

"The Government of Japan declares its willingness to enter at such time as the Government of
the United States may desire into negotiation with
the Government of the United States with a view to
the conclusion of a treaty for the neutralization
of the Philippine Islands, when Philippine independence shall have been achieved.

"(Enclosure)

"ANNEX AND SUPPLEMENT ON THE PART OF THE GOVERNMENT
OF THE UNITED STATES

"IV. Commerce between both nations.

"It is understood that during the present international emergency Japan and the United States each shall permit export to the other of commodities in amounts up to the figures of usual or pre-war trade, except, in the case of each, commodities which it needs for its own purposes of security and self-defense. These limitations are mentioned to clarify the obligations of each Government. They are not intended as restrictions against either Government;

```
and, it is understood, that both Governments will
 1
     apply such regulations in the spirit dominating re-
 2
    lations with friendly nations."
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

We offer in evidence IPS document No. 1 219P (77) from wxhibit for identification 58, Vol-2 une I, which is an excerpt from a telegram of Ambas-3 sador Grew to Secretary of State Hull, dated June 16. 1941. 5 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 6 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 7 No. 219P (77) will receive exhibit No. 1088. 8 (Whereupon, the document above re-9 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 10 No. 1088 and received in evidence.) 11 MR. E. WILLIAMS: We read prosecution ex-12 hibit 1088: 13 "TELEGRAM 14 "THE AMBASSADOR IN JAPAN (GREW) TO THE SECRETARY OF 15 STATE 16 "TOKYO, June 16, 1941 - 9 p.m. (Received June 16 - 10:35 a.m.) 17 "Excerpts 18 "830. Chungking's 240, June 15, 3 p.m. 19 20 Without delay I immediately sought an appointment 21 with the Minister for Foreign Affairs and delivered 22 to him in person a signed note quoted below. I made 23 the most emphatic representations and pointed out the 24 grave danger to American Japanese relations involved in 25 recent bombing attacks on Chungking which have now

resulted in heavy damage to our Embassy property, including the residence of the Ambassador, and seriously jeopardizing both the lives of the Ambassador and other American nationals and the U.S.S. Tutuila.

"'Excellency: I have the honor to inform your Excellency that according to information just received from the American Ambassador at Chungking, during an air raid early on the afternoon of June 15, 1941, twenty-seven Japanese airplanes flying high bombed Chungking and also dropped several, about five, bombs within areas of one to three hundred yards of the entrance to the Embassy Chancery and the United States ship Tutuila. A bomb which dropped within fifty yards of the entrance to the Embassy dugout hit alongside of and heavily damaged the offices of the assistant military attache; about half way between the Chancery and the United States ship Tutuila. The concussion and flying debris damaged the Chancery, including the windows, transoms, tile roof, screens and shutters. Some damage was also caused at the Ambassador's residence a half mile away and at the Standard Oil offices near the Chancery.'"

13

14

15

16

2

3

4

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

We offer in evidence IPS document No. 1 1632W (52), an entry in KIDO's Diary, June 18, 1941. 2 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 3 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 4 No. 1632W (52) will receive exhibit No. 1089. 5 (Whereupon, the document above re-6 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 7 No. 1089 and received in evidence.) 8 MR. E. WILLIAMS: We read prosecution's 9 exhibit No. 1089: 10 "'Extract from Entry From Marquis KIDO's 11 Diary, 18 June '41.' 12 "June 18th, 1941 - (Extract) 13 ".....I had a visit from the Premier and 14 the Foreign Minister at 11 a.m.. The Foreign Minister 15 told me that instructions had been sent to have 16 the German Government negotiate with the Vichy Govern-17 18 ment in connection with the French Indo-China Prob-19 10m." 20 MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, may we 21 have that exhibit referred to the Language Section? 22 THE PRESIDENT: What do you suggest is wrong 23 with it, Mr. Logan? 24 MR. LOGAN: According to our translation, 25 it should read: "I had a visit from the Premier and

the Foreign Minister at 11 a.m.. The Foreign Minister 1 told me that instructions had been sent to negotiate 2 3 with the Vichy Government through the German Govern-4 ment in connection with the French Indo-China prob-5 lem." 6 THE PRESIDENT: There seems to be no sub-7 stantial difference, but we will refer it to the 8 Language Section. 9 Mr. Williams. 10 MR. E. WILLIAMS: We offer in evidence IPS 11 document No. 1632W (53) which is an entry in KIDO's 12 Diary, June 20, 1941. 13 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 14 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 15 No. 1632W (53) will receive exhibit No. 1090. 16 (Whereupon, the document above re-17 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 18 No. 1090 and received in evidence.) 19 MR. E. WILLIAMS: We read prosecution's 20 exhibit No. 1090: 21 "'Extract from Entry from Marquis KIDO's 22 Diary, 20 June 1941. 23 ".....Prince KONOYE called on me at 5:50 24 p.m. and informed me confidentially that there was 25 something hard to understand about the Foreign

Minister's opinion in view of the present strained international relations including the outbreak of the war between the Soviet and Germany. He took this occasion to refer to the responsibility of the Cabinet, but I advised him that it was still too early to discuss this. I promised him that we would talk over the matter with Mr. HIRANUMA, Minister of Home Affairs, at the earliest opportunity. He went home after about an hour's talk."

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, we would like to have this referred to the Language Section.

THE PRESIDENT: Why, Mr. Logan?

MR. LOGAN: The middle sentence should read:
"He took this occasion to refer to the responsibility
of the Cabinet, but I advised him that it was out of
the question."

THE PRESIDENT: It will be referred.

MR. E. WILLIAMS: We offer in evidence IPS document No. 220C (36) which is an oral statement by Secretary of State handed to Ambassador NOMURA, June 21, 1941.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 220C (36) will receive exhibit No. 1091.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit

3.

2

MR. E. WILLIAMS: We read prosecution's

exhibit No. 1091.

5

"ORAL STATEMENT HANDED BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE TO

7

THE JAPANESE AMBASSADOR (NOMURA) ON JUNE 21, 1941

No. 1091 and received in evidence.)

8

"Excerpt.

"The Secretary of State has no reason to doubt 10 that many Japanese leaders share the views of the Jap-

11

anese Ambassador and his associates as indicated above

12

and would support action toward achieving those high

13

objectives. Unfortunately, accumulating evidence

14

reaches this Government from sources all over the

15

world, including reports from sources which over many

16

years have demonstrated sincere good will toward Japan,

17

that some Japanese leaders in influential official

18

positions are definitely committed to a course which

19 20

calls for support of Nazi Germany and its policies of

21

conquest and that the only kind of understanding with the United States which they would endorse is one that

22

would envisage Japan's fighting on the side of Hitler

23

should the United States become involved in the Euro-

24

pean hostilities through carrying out its present policy of self-defense. The tenor of recent public

statements gratuitously made by spokesmen of the Jap-anese Government emphasizing Japan's commitment and intentions under the Tripartite alliance exemplify an attitude which cannot be ignored. So long as such leaders maintain this attitude in their official positions and apparently seek to influence public opinion in Japan in the direction indicated, is it not illusory to expect that adoption of a proposal such as the one under consideration offers a basis for achieving substantial results along the desired lines?

"Another source of misgiving in the Japanese proposal relates to the desire of the Japanese Government to include in its terms for a peaceful settlement to be offered to the Chinese Government, a provision which would permit the stationing of Japanese troops in certain areas in Inner Mongolia and North China as a measure of a cooperation with China in resisting communistic activities. While this Government has given careful thought to the considerations which have prompted the Japanese Government to make such a proposal, and while this Government does not desire to enter into the merits of such a proposal, it feels that the liberal policies to which the United States is committed, as explained on numerous

occasions to the Japanese Ambassador and his associates, would not permit this Government to associate itself with any course which appears to be inconsistent with these policies. Furthermore, although in matters affecting only this country there might be some latitude of decision as to the qualifying of rights, the matter under discussion affects the sovereign rights of a third country, and accordingly it is felt that this Government must be most scrupulous in dealing with such a matter.

"The Secretary of State has therefore reluctantly come to the conclusion that this Government must await some clearer indication than has yet been given that the Japanese Government as a whole desires to pursue courses of peace such as constitute the objectives of the proposed understanding. This Government sincerely hopes that the Japanese Government will manifest such an attitude.

"NOTE: In order to bring the current discussions up to date as far as the American attitude is concerned, there is being handed the Japanese Ambassacor separately a revision, bearing the date of June 21, of the document marked 'Unofficial, Exploratory and without Commitment' which was handed the Japanese Ambassador on May 31."

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief Counsel.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, the prosecution now offers in evidence IPS document 220 C (37) from exhibit for identification 58, Volume 2, which is draft proposal of a settlement between Japan and the United States by the Secretary of State to the Japan anese Ambassador June 21, 1941.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. MA. KEENAN: I hope the Court will permit me at this time to state for the clearer understanding, not only of the Court but the defense counsel, that this is a document very similiar to exhibit 1078, which was a draft handed by the Secretary of State to the Japanese Ambassador at Washington on 31 May 1941. There are the following changes in this draft: One has reference to the exchange of views as to the attitude toward the European War of the two nations by letters instead of by annexes to the document itself as of May 31. The second change has reference to the treatment of the subject matter of economic affairs in China, and the third includes the entire Pacific area instead of the Western Pacific.

The prosecution apologizes for its offering this entire document, because it is so closely in

8

9

11

1213

14

15

1617

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

resemblance to the former one, but believes this part of the case is so important it craves the Court's indulgence for such purpose. So, with the Court's permission, I will read this exhibit, if the Court admits it.

THE PRESIDENT: Read it, Mr. Counsel.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 220 C (37) will receive exhibit No. 1092.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1092 and received in evidence.)

MR. KEENAN: (Reading)

"DRAFT PROPOSAL HANDED BY THE SECKETARY OF STATE TO THE JAPANESE AMBASSADOR (NOMURA) ON JUNE 21, 1941.

"Unofficial, Exploratory and Without Commitment.
"Washington, June 21, 1941.

"The Governments of the United States and of Japan accept joint responsibility for the initiation and conclusion of a general agreement of understanding as expressed in a joint declaration for the resumption of traditional friendly relations.

"Without reference to specific causes of recent estrangement, it is the sincere desire of both Governments that the incidents which led to the

deterioration of amicable sentiment between their countries should be prevented from recurrence and corrected in their unforeseen and unfortunate consequences.

"It is our earnest hope that, by a cooperative effort, the United States and Japan may contribute effectively toward the establishment and preservation of peace in the Pacific area and, by the rapid consummation of an amicable understanding, encourage world peace and arrest, if not dispel, the tragic confusion that now threatens to engulf civilization.

"For such decisive action, protracted negotiations would seem ill-suited and weakening. Both Governments, therefore, desire that adequate instrumentalities should be developed for the realization of a general understanding which would bind, meanwhile, both Governments in honor and in act.

"It is the belief of the two Governments that such an understanding should comprise only the pivotal issues of urgency and not the accessory concerns which could be deliberated later at a conference.

"Both Governments presume to anticipate that they could achieve harmonious relations if certain situations and attitudes were clarified or improved,

to wit: 1 "1. The concepts of the United States and of 2 Japan respecting international relations and the 3 character of nations. "2. The attitudes of both Governments toward 5 the European war. "3. Action toward a peaceful settlement be-7 tween China and Japan. "4. Commerce between both nations. 9 "5. Economic activity of both nations in the 10 Pacific area. 11 "6. The policies of both nations affecting 12 political stabilization in the Pacific area. 13 "7. Neutralization of the Philippine Islands. 14 "Accordingly, the Government of the United 15 16 States and the Government of Japan have come to the 17 following mutual understanding and declaration of 18 policy: 19 "I. The concepts of the United States and of Japan respecting international relations and the character of nations. 22 "Both governments affirm that their national policies are directed toward the foundation of a lasting peace and the inauguration of a new era of

reciprocal confidence and cooperation between our

peoples.

"Both Governments declare that it is their traditional, and present, concept and conviction that nations and races compose, as members of a family, one household living under the ideal of universal concord through justice and equity; each equally enjoying rights and admitting responsibilities with a mutuality of interests regulated by peaceful processes and directed to the pursuit of their moral and physical welfare, which they are bound to defend for themselves as they are bound not to destroy for others; they further admit their responsibilities to oppose the oppression or exploitation of other peoples.

"Both Governments are firmly determined that their respective traditional concepts on the character of nations and the underlying moral principles of social order and national life will continue to be preserved and never transformed by foreign ideas or ideologies contrary to those moral principles and concepts.

"II. The attitudes of both Governments toward the European war.

"The Government of Japan maintains that the purpose of the Tripartite Pact was, and is, defensive

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

and is designed to contribute to the prevention of an unprovoked extension of the European war.

"The Government of the United States maintains that its attitude toward the European hostilities is and will continue to be determined solely and exclusively by considerations of protection and self-defense; its national security and the defense thereof.

"NOTE (There is appended a suggested draft of an exchange of letters as a substitute for the Annex and Supplement on the part of the Government of the United States on this subject which constituted a part of the draft of May 31, 1941. For discussion of the fundamental question underlying this whole section, vide the Oral statement handed the Japanese Ambassador on June 21.)

"III. Action toward a peaceful settlement between China and Japan.

"The Japanese Government having communicated to the Government of the United States the general terms within the framework of which the Japanese Government will propose the negotiations of a peaceful settlement with the Chinese Government, which terms are declared by the Japanese Government to be in harmony with the KONOYE principles regarding neighborly

friendship and mutual respect of sovereignty and territories and with the practical application of those principles, the President of the United States will suggest to the Government of China that the Government of China and the Government of Japan enter into a negotiation on a basis mutually advantageous and acceptable for a termination of hostilities and resumption of peaceful relations.

"NOTE (The foregoing draft of Section III is subject to further discussion of the question of cooperative defense against communistic activities, including the stationing of Japanese troops in Chinese territory, and the question of economic cooperation between China and Japan. With regard to suggestions that the language of Section III be changed, it is believed that consideration of any suggested change can most advantageously be given after all the points in the annex relating to this section have been satisfactorily worked out, when the section and its annex can be viewed as a whole.)
"IV. Commerce between both nations.

"When official approbation to the present understanding has been given by both Governments, the United States and Japan shall assure each other mutually to supply such commodities as are,

21 22

.25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

respectively, available and required by either of Both Governments further consent to take necessary steps to resume normal trade relations as formerly established under the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation between the United States and Japan. If a new commercial treaty is desired by both Governments, it would be negotiated as soon as possible and be concluded in accordance with usual procedures. "V. Economic activity of both nations in the Pacific area.

"On the basis of mutual pledges hereby given that Japanese activity and American activity in the Pacific area shall be carried on by peaceful means and in conformity with the principle of non-discrimination in international commercial relations, the Japanese Government and the Government of the United States agree to cooperate each with the other toward obtaining non-discriminatory access by Japan and by the United States to commercial supplies of natural resources (such as oil, rubber, tin, nickel) which each country needs for the safeguarding and development of its own economy. The policies of both nations affecting political stabilization in the Pacific area.

"Both Governments declare that the controlling

22

23

24

7 8

policy underlying this understanding is peace in the Pacific area; that it is their fundamental purpose, through cooperative effort, to contribute to the maintenance and the preservation of peace in the Pacific area; and that neither has territorial designs in the area mentioned.

"VII. Neutralization of the Philippine Islands.

"The Government of Japan declares its willingness to enter at such time as the Government of the
United States may desire into negotiation with the
Government of the United States with a view to the
conclusion of a treaty for the neutralization of the
Philippine Islands, when Philippine independence
shall have been achieved."

"(Annex 1) 1 Japanese Government. 3 4 between China and Japan. 5 section are as follows: "1. Neighborly friendship. 8 9 10 11 12 further discussion. 13 14 15 16 17 13 tories. 19 20 21 22 peace. 23 24

25

"Annex and Supplement on the Part of the

"III. Action toward a peaceful settlement

"The basic terms as referred to in the above

- "2. (Cooperative defense against injurious communistic activities -- including the stationing of Japanese troops in Chinese territory.) Subject to
- "3. (Economic cooperation.) Subject to agreement on an exchange of letters in regard to the application to this point of the principle of non-discrimination in international commercial relations.
- "4. Mutual respect of sovereignty and terri-
- "5. Mutual respect for the inherent characteristics of each nation cooperating as good neighbors and forming an East Asian nucleus contributing to world
- "6. Withdrawal of Japanese armed forces from Chinese territory as promptly as possible and in accordance with an agreement to be concluded between

Japan and China. 117. No annexation. 2 118. No indemnities. 3 119. Amicable negotiation in regard to Manchoukuo. 5 "(Annex 2) "Annex and Supplement on the Part of the Govern-7 ment of the United States. "IV. Commerce between both nations. 9 10 "It is understood that during the present inter-11 national emergency Japan and the United States each 12 shall permit export to the other of commodities in 13 amounts up to the figures of usual or pre-war trade, except, in the case of each, commodities which it needs 14 15 for its own purposes of security and self-defense. 16 These limitations are mentioned to clarify the obli-17 gations of each dovernment. They are not intended as 18 restrictions against either Government; and, it is 19 understood, both Governments will apoly such regula-20 tions in the spirit dominating relations with friendly 21 nations. 22 "(Annex 3) 23 "Suggested Exchange of Letters between the 24 Secretary of State and the Japanese Ambassador. 25 "The Secretary of State to the Japanese Ambassador: "EXCELLENCY: In Section II of the Joint Declaration which was entered into today on behalf of our two Governments, statements are made with regard to the attitudes of the two Governments toward the European war. During the informal conversations which resulted in the conclusion of this Joint Declaration I explained to you on a number of occasions the attitude and policy of the Government of the United States toward the hostilities in Europe and I pointed out that this attitude and policy were based on the inalienable right of self-defense. I called special attention to an address which I delivered on April 24 setting forth fully the position of this Government upon this subject.

"I am sure that you are fully cognizant of this Government's attitude toward the European war but in order that there may be no misunderstanding I am again referring to the subject. I shall be glad to receive from you confirmation by the Government of Japan that, with regard to the measures which this nation may be forced to adopt in defense of its own security, which have been set forth as indicated, the Government of Japan is not under any commitment which would require Japan to take any action contrary to or destructive of the fundamental objective of the present agreement,

to establish and to preserve peace in the Pacific areas.

"Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

"The Japanese Ambassador to the Secretary of State:

"EXCELLENCY: I have received your letter of June --.

"I wish to state that my government is fully aware of the attitude of the Government of the United States toward the hostilities in Europe as explained to me by you during our recent conversations and as set forth in your address of April 24. I did not fail to report to my Government the policy of the Government of the United States as it had been explained to me, and I may assure you that my Government understands and appreciates the attitude and position of the Government of the United States with regard to the European war.

"I wish also to assure you that the Government of Japan, with regard to the measures which the Government of the United States may be forced to adopt in defense of its own security, is not under any commitment requiring Japan to take any action contrary to or destructive of the fundamental objective of the present agreement."

24 25

"The Government of Japan, fully cognizant of its responsibilities freely assumed by the conclusion of this agreement, is determined to take no action inimical to the establishment and preservation of peace in the Pacific area.

"Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my most distinguished consideration.

"(Annex 4)

"Suggested Letter to be Addressed by the Secretary of State to the Japanese Ambassador in Connection with the Joint Declaration.

"EXCELLENCY: In the informal conversations which resulted in the conclusion of a general agreement of understanding between our two Governments, you and your associates expressed fully and frankly views on the intentions of the Japanese Government in regard to applying to Japan's proposed economic cooperation with China the principle of non-discrimination in international commercial relations. It is believed that it would be helpful if you could be so good as to confirm the statements already expressed orally in the form of replies on the following points:

"1. Does the term 'economic cooperation'
between Japan and China contemplate the granting by the
Government of China to the Japanese Government or its

nationals of any preferntial or monopolistic rights which would discriminate in favor of the Japanese Government and Japanese nationals as compared with the Government and nationals of the United States and of other third countries? Is it contemplated that upon the inauguration of negotiations for a peaceful settlement between Japan and China the special Japanese companies, such as the North China Development Company and their subsidiaries, will be divested, in so for as Japanese official support may be involved, of any monopolistic or other preferential rights that they may exercise in fact or that may inure to them by virtue of present circumstances in areas of China under Japanese military occupation?

"2. With regard to existing restrictions upon freedom of trade and travel by nationals of third countries in Chinese territory under Japanese military occupation, could the Japanese Government indicate approximately what restrictions will be removed immediately upon the entering into by the Government of Chungking of negotiations with the Government of Japan and what restrictions will be removed at later dates, with an indication in each case in so far as possible of the approximate time within which removal of

restrictions would be effected?

Government that the Chinese Government shall exercise full and complete control of matters relating to trade, currency and exchange? Is it the intention of the Japanese Government to withdraw and to redeem the Japanese military notes which are being circulated in China and the notes of Japanese-sponsored regimes in China? Can the Japanese Government indicate how soon after the inauguration of the contemplated negotiations arrangements to the above ends can in its opinion be carried out?

"It would be appreciated if as specific replies as possible could be made to the questions above listed.

"Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

"Foreign Relations Volume II, pages 486-492."
THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Higgins.

MR. HIGGINS: We offer in evidence IPS document No. 1632W (55), an entry in KIDO's Diary, June 22, 1941.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 1632W (55) will receive exhibit No. 1093.

•

-

3

4

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HIGGINS: I read prosecution exhibit 1093:
"Extract from Entry from Marquis KIDO's Diary,
22 June 41.

"June 22nd, 1941 - (Extract)

"At 2 p.m. General SUZUKI, President of the Planning Board, telephoned me saying that the report relating to the outbreak of war between Soviet Russia and Germany had been received. Foreign Minister MAT-SUOKA also telephoned me to say that the official report of the commencement of the war between Soviet Russia and Germany from Ambassador OSHIMA had been received. So I asked TOKUGAWA, the gentlemen in waiting on duty, to consult the Imperial convenience to see Foreign Minister MATSUOKA, and it was decided that he would be granted an audience with the Emperor at 5.30 p.m. Before Foreign Minister MATSUOKA had his audience with the Emperor, I was received in audience by the Emperor to present my opinion based on my talk with Prince KONOYE and Baron HIRANUMA last night as follows: There has been a difference of opinion between the Premier and the Foreign Minister concerning our foreign policy to be followed in case of war breaking out between Germany and Soviet Russia. As this war would have a predominant influence upon the future of this country, it was very desirable that his Majesty the

Emperor should ask Foreign Minister MATSUOKA whether he had already consulted the Premier about it or not, and if not, prevail upon him to follow Prince KONOYE's opinion.

"At 5.30 p.m. Foreign Minister MATSUOKA had his audience with the Emperor. After that I was requested to proceed to the Palace and was received in audience from 6.40 to 6.50 p.m. On this occasion, the Emperor was pleased to point out that the Foreign Minister's policy would mean Japan's positive advance to both the Northern and Southern regions and that it was guite doubtful whether or not the Government and the Supreme War Command would agree and whether or not such policy would ever be appropriate in consideration of our national strength. His Majesty looked very anxious about this matter. I therefore telephoned Prince KONOYE to consult with him, but found he was not at home. Then I telephoned Baron HIRANUMA to say that it was desirable for him to pay careful consideration to this matter. At 9.30 p.m. I telephone Prince KONOYE to report the progress of Mr. HATSUOKA's audience with the Emperor, and to ask him to act with prudence at the Liaison Conference. At 00.30 a.m. Prince KONOYE telephoned me to say that he had just

had a visit from Foreign Minister MATSUOKA, who

2

4

)

7

0

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

explained that what he had reported to the Throne 1 yesterday was his prospect of the future and was never 2 meant as a matter to be put into action immediately." 3 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan. 4 MR. LOGAN: I ask that this be referred to 5 the Language Section, if the Tribunal please. 6 THE PRESIDENT: Why, Mr. Logan? 7 MR. LOGAN: There are so many corrections in 8 it that I think it would be quicker if I read the entire report the way we have it rather than make the 10 corrections line by line. 11 THE PRESIDENT: If they are lengthy, it will 12 be sufficient if you point them out to Major Moore, to 13 whom we refer the matter. 14 15 MR. LOGAN: Yes, sir. 16 MR. HIGGINS: We offer in evidence IPS 17 document 1632-W(56), which is an entry in KIDO's Diary, 18 June 23, 1941. 19 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 20 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 21 No. 1632-W(56) will receive exhibit No. 1094. 22 (Whereupon, the document above 23 referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 24 No. 1094, and was received in evidence.) 25 MR. HIGGINS: I read prosecution's exhibit 1094: "Extract from Entry from Marquis KIDO's Diary,
23 June 41.

"I went to my office at 10 a.m. I talked with the Chief Aide-de-Camp to the Emperor concerning the war between Germany and Soviet Russia. From 10:30 a.m. to 11 a.m. I was received in audience by the Emperor. and expressed my opinion about such matters as the Foreign Minister's report submitted to the Throne yesterday and the future outlook of the international situation. The Lord Chamberlain called on me at my office at 11:30 a.m. I informed him what I had just reported to the Throne. At 1 p.m. the Chief Aide-de-Camp to the Emperor called on me to report on matters relative to the Chief of the General Staff's audience with His Majesty, the Emperor. Prince KONOYE proceeded to the Palace. We talked from 2:40 p.m. to 4 p.m. exchanging frank opinions on the changed situation caused by Germany's war against Soviet Russia. I went to my official residence at 4:20 p.m. when I had a call from General SUZUKI, President of the Planning Board, with whom I exchanged opinions. He put forth his opinion as to the unification and reinforcement of the Imperial General Headquarters. I agreed in principle, but called his attention to the matter concerning consultation with the Board of Field Marshals and Fleet

2

1

5

4

7

6

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Admirals." MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, may we have prosecution exhibit 1094 referred to the Language Section? THE PRESIDENT: I think we had better give you general permission to point out what you think are errors to Major Moore without coming for express permission. MR. LOGAN: Thank you. THE PRESIDENT: That will apply to all documents.

MP. HIGGINS: We now offer in evidence IPS document 1632W(57), an entry of June 23, 1941, in KIDO's Diary.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

1632W(57) will receive exhibit No. 1095.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 1095 and received in evidence.)
MR. HIGGINS: I read presecution's exhibit 1095.

"Entry from Marquis KIDO's Diary, 25 June 41

"June 25th, 1941 - Full

"Mr. HASPIMOTO, Director of the Police Bureau, came to my house and reported about repercussions in various circles in this country. At 9 a.m. I went to Tokyo station to send off President WANG CHING WEI. After this I had an interview with Prince KONCYE who said that he had a private talk with WANG CHING WEI last night, when the latter had expressed his opinion regarding general peace between China and Japan, saying that for the purpose of bringing about general peace, it was quite necessary as a matter of course to win over LI Tsung-jen and PAI Chung-Hsi, but at the same time our political demarche to CHIANG Kai-Shek was also necessary.

for this purpose, Wang further said, the pro-American politicians would inevitably gain influence once more, but to meet this situation we would have to get our comrades properly posted in the Government. The matter of the adjustment of relations between CHIANG Kai-Shek and WANG Ching-Wei would be placed in the hands of TOYAMA. As regards the Japanese General Army Headquarters in China, the senior officers have a good understanding of our Chinese policy but the contacts between 'Superiors and inferiors', 'left and right', and 'front and rear' are bad. In consequence, it is no easy task to carry out our Chinese policy on the spot. Corrupt practices of the Army in China also have been indeed rife.

"At 9.20 a.m. Karoku NOMURA paid me a visit to talk with me. From 10.45 a.m. to 11.35 a.m. I was received in audience by the Emperor. At 1 p.m. I consulted the Chief Aide-de-camp to the Throne as to the holding of the Liaison Conference and on other problems. I went home, and then I left home again for the Empress Dowager's Palace to offer my congratulations on her birthday. At 4 p.m. the Premier, the Chief of the Army General Staff, and Chief of the Naval General Staff proceeded to the

<

Palace to report on the decisions of the Liaison Conference regarding the Japanese troops' entry into French Indo-China. I met Prince KONOYE at 4.30 p.m. and had a talk with him."

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, may I just point out at this time that many of these excerpts have very material errors in them, and I have checked it back with the translations that were made by the prosecution which they call "screen translations," as the Court will probably recall, and some of these excerpts are those screen translations. They are not revised.

THE PRESIDENT: We can do no more than give you complete access to Major Moore on all points, Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: 1 appreciate that. I just wanted to point that out, that some of them have material erros -- very material.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

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

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The Tribunal is 1 1 now resumed. 2 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Higgins. 3 28 MR. HIGGINS: Mr. President, we now tender 4 in evidence IPS document No. 4081-C. This is a e 5 1 telegram dated 28 June 1941, taken from the German d 6 е n files at Nuernberg and is from Ribbentrop at the 8 German Embassy at Tokyo. 9 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 10 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 11 No. 4081-C will receive exhibit No. 1096. 12 (Thereupon, the document above 13 referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 14 No. 1096 and received in evidence.) 15 MP. SHIMANOUCHI: I am counsel SHIMANOUCHI. 16 THE PRESIDENT: Counsel SHIMANOUCHI. 17 MR. SHIMANOUCHI: This document is similar 13 to IPS document No. 4033 and it had been presented 19 to the Court already numbered -- received Court 20 exhibit No. 587. The whole text was read by 21 Prosecutor Hyde. 22 THE PRESIDENT: You heard what he said, 23 Mr. Higgins. 24 MR. HIGGINS: Yes, your Honor. 25 MR. HARDIN: If it please you, Mr. President,

our advice from the record was that this was not -this is "C," 4081-C, and that the one that corresponded to 4033-D was 4081-B; and we left out--

THE PRESIDENT: But the counsel said this is already in as exhibit 587.

MR. HARDIN: If it is, it is an error of

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Tribunal please --THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The document which is now introduced is the same except for translation and the translation of one word changes the sense

THE PRESIDENT: What one word is that? MR. CUNNINGHAM: I would like to have it referred to the translation section to determine whether or not the document introduced by Mr. Hyde is the correct translation or the document introduced in this phase of the case is the correct

THE PRESIDENT: For our convenience, it might be read again if it is important enough.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If your Honor please, it is not that important but I would like to call attention to the translation section of the vital

feature. This document says that there is an agreement that OSHIMA "should" use his influence and the other document says there is an agreement that OSHIMA "will" use his influence, and I would like to have the correct translation.

THE RESIDENT: It seems very important so read it again and we will refer it to the trans-

MR. HIGGINS: Very well, Mr. President.

(Reading): "To be kept in locked file.

"Telegram (Secret Cipher Process)

"Special Train 28 June 1941, 2010 hours

"Arrival: 28 June 1941, 2030 hours

"No. 267/R German Foreign Office, 28 June

"No. 560 of 28 June 1) German Embassy Tokyo

2) Cipher-Bureau, Secret

remarks for officials in charge.
"(Marginal note: Sent on to Tokyo under No. 916,
28 June 1941, 2130 hours).

"I have agreed with Ambassador OSHIMA that he should influence his government to the effect of a speedy military action against Soviet Russia. I also request you now to utilize all available possibilities to influence to the same effect the government there, and other influential

7 8

circles. Please make use of the following arguments:

- "1) The war between Germany and Soviet Russia will not merely lead to the solution of more or less limited individual problems, but will result in a final solution through a fight to the finish /Endkampf-leesung/ of the Russian question.
- "2) The annihilation of Russian power by our military action, to be expected in relatively short time, will also make Germany's victory over England an irrevocable fact. If Germany gets hold of the Russian oil fields and wheat fields, sufficient provisions for the whole of Europe is thereby guaranteed, so that the British blockade becomes entirely senseless. Direct land communication to East Asia will likewise be established at this occasion.
- "3) In this way all requirements then exist for making possible the New Order of the European Sphere as intended by the Axis Powers.
- "4) The present situation provides Japan, too, with a unique opportunity just as Germany in Europe. Japan can now create the basis for the New Order planned by it in East Asia by a military action against Soviet Russia. After the elmination of Soviet power in the Far East also, the solution of

7 8

21 22

the Chinese problem as desired by Japan, will meet with no further difficulties.

"5) From the point of view of Japan's interests, the idea of a move to the South in the direction of Singapore is and will be of great importance. Since, at present, Japan is not ready for this, and in addition such move is not yet possible in the present phase of the war, it is in the utmost Japanese interest not to leave unused the at present available opportunity to solve the Russian problem in the Far East as well. She would thereby protect her rear for the move to the South.

- "6) In view of the speedy course of events to be expected, Japan should, without delay, decide upon a military attack against Soviet Russia. A Japanese move against an already beaten Soviet Russia would considerably injure Japan's moral and political position.
- "7) It may be counted upon that the speedy conquest of Soviet Russia, especially if Japan takes part in it from the East, will probably be the best way to convince the United States of the absolute futility of entering into the war on the side of England, then completely isolated and facing the most powerful alliance of the earth. RIBBENTROP."

I now offer in evidence IPS document 1 No. 4081-D, taken from the German files at Nuern-2 berg. It is a telegram, No. 1069, from Ott to 3 Ribbentrop, 28 June 1941. 4 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual 5 6 terms. 7 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's docu-8 ment No. 4081-D will receive exhibit No. 1097. 9 (Thereupon, the document above 10 referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 11 No. 1097 and received in evidence.) 12 MR. HIGGINS: I now read prosecution 13 exhibit No. 1097: "Telegram (Secret Cipher Process) 15 28 June 41 1145 hours "Tokyo 16 "arrival 28 June 41 2210 hours 17 "To be kept in locked file. 18 "No. 1069 of 28 June Secret! 19 "Re Telegram No. 1034 with Pol VIII, of 20 25 June. 21 "Within the last days the leadership 22 committee of the Cabinet has repeatedly met in the 23 24 presence of the Chief of Staff, the entire Cabinet 25 and deliberating committees without reaching a clear-

cut decision as to Japan's future attitude to the

1

3

4 5

6

8

9

11

12

14

15

16

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

German-Russian war. As far as could be found out, only preparatory measures for the various possible actions on the part of Japan have been ordered thus far. As Army memorandum confirms, preparatory measures have indeed begun with zest. Under the circumstances the preparations for attack against Russia will take at least six weeks, unless a decisive material and moral weakening of Russia in the Far Fast takes place beforehand. According to reliable, confidential information, Premier KONOYE and the majority of Cabinet Ministers, to be sure, seem to maintain the view that nothing must be undertaken that would injure Japan's military position in China. Hence, the Cabinet seems thus far merely to have resolved on tightening their grip on Indo-China for which purpose three divisions are allegedly being prepared.

"In public and behind the scenes discussions concerning the attitude to be taken are in full swing. Noted nationalists, who always closely work together with the Embassy, have held various confidential conversations -- cf. DNB No. 244 of 26 June -- in which caution towards the Soviet Union and determined action in the South was advocated.

"The danger exists that the Southern

expansion desired by this group will at first be limited to French Indo-China, while their efforts* (* Clear text evidently missing) could hinder Japan's activity in the North. Under these circumstances, the question arises whether the general directions, given to me at Berlin, to work, in the first place, for Japan's activity in the South while ignoring the Soviet Union, are still valid if a successful move to the South beyond Indo-China cannot be counted on at present. According to confidential reports coming to me from the Japanese Foreign Office,

Ambassador OSHIMA is said to have urgently advised the Japanese government to attack Russia soon.

"I request telegraphic instructions.

"Ott."

We now offer in evidence IPS document No. 1632W (58), which is an entry in KIDO's Diary, June 28, 1941.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

No. 16327 (58) will receive exhibit No. 1098.

("hereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1098 and received in evidence.)

MR. HIGGINS: I now read prosecution exhibit No. 1098:

"Extract from entry from Marquis KIDO's Diary, 28 June 41.

Palace, and after his withdrawal from the presence of the Emperor, he had a talk with me. He explained the following matters: (1) The Army's policy dealing with the German-Soviet War is that the attitude of the Kwantung Army towards that war should be calm and prudent. (2) Various information from Ambassadors in China regarding that war. (3) Political moves or demarches towards YEN Hsi-shan, LI Tsung-jen and PAI Chung-hsi. (4) The strengthening of the Imperial General Headquarters, and arrangements for them to meet every day in the Palace."

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, in view of the ruling this morning, may the record show after each one of these entries are read -- may it appear after each one is read in the record itself that that particular excerpt is referred to the language section without further order?

THE PRESIDENT: Every counsel, defense and other counsel, is at liberty to refer any point of translation to the head of the language section,

4.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Major Moore, without the permission of the Tribunal. If that right is fully exercised there will be no need for the Tribunal to refer any document to Major Moore. If Major Moore advises a correction he will notify the fact to the counsel who presented the document, who will read it as corrected unless he dissents when the Court may have to take other steps to secure finality, but we do not contemplate that in any circumstances.

Dr. KIYOSE.

DR. KIYOSE: I wish to make one request regarding the Court exhibit.

I have been noticing this since yesterday that the translations presented to the Court by the prosecutors are, generally speaking, fairly accurate. However, in the translation of the diary of KIDO there are very many errors. It may be one way to read the documents here before any corrections are made and then corrected after consideration; however, if it can be arranged so that the translations can be presented to us beforehand, one day beforehand, I believe it would speed up matters here in the Court and there will be no misunderstanding on that point, and it would be much better both for the Tribunal and for

I hope the Court will consider this matter.

23

22

24

1 2 3

4

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

1415

16

17

18

20

21

22

--

25

THE MONITOR: Slight addition: If the translations are handed to us one day before the required time and necessary corrections made -- one or two days beforehand -- so that counsel will read the corrected copy.

THE PRESIDENT: If the Court's permission is availed of fully there will be no need for the Court to make any references to the language section. We insist on that course being followed.

Mr. Higgins.

MR. HIGGINS: We now offer in evidence IPS document No. 219P (78) from exhibit for identification No. 58, Volume 1. This is an excerpt from statement of Ambassador Grew to Foreign Minister MATSUOKA, dated 8 July 1941.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 219P (78) will receive exhibit No. 1099.

(Thereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1099 and received in evidence.)

2

3

4

5

7

9

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HIGGINS: I now read prosecution's exhibit No. 1099.

"THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR IN JAPAN (GREW) TO THE JAPANESE MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (MATSUOKA).

"Excerpt. No. 1845. TOKYO, July 8, 1941. EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to inform Your Excellency that during a severe Japanese air raid on Chungking on June 29, 1941, at which time the British Embassy was badly damaged, the concussion from bombs dropped on the south bank of the river caused some damage to the staff residence of the American Embassy."

I now offer in evidence I. P. S. document No. 220C (14), which is an excerpt from the press release by the Department of State -- no, I beg your pardon; I have skipped one -- (13) from exhibit for identification 58, volume II, which is an excerpt from an oral statement of Ambassador Grew to Minister MATSUOKA, 8 July 1941.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 2200 (13) will receive exhibit No. 1100.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit

No. 1100 and received in evidence.)

2 3

MR. HIGGINS: I read prosecution's exhibit No. 1100:

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"ORAL STATEMENT BY THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR IN JAPAN (GREW) TO THE JAPANESE MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (MATSUOKA).

"Excerpt.

"Since that time, information has been received to the effect that certain cargo at Hanoi as well as at Haiphong has been seized by the Japanese military, but that it was impossible to check the amount and nature of the cargo so seized because the rightful owners were not permitted to inspect the warehouses where their merchandise was stored. Nevertheless, it is known that a substantial amount of American cargo has been taken away.

"In bringing this subject again to the attention of the Foreign Office, it is urgently requested that immediate steps be taken to restore the merchandise to its rightful owners. The Government of the United States, as has been stated before, does not recognize the right of the Japanese military to take any action whatsoever in French - Indo China against property in which there is an American in-The American Embassy has been instructed to terest.

state that the result of persistence by the Japanese in action such as that described above can only be further deterioration in relations between the United States and Japan.

"TOKYO, July 8, 1941."

MR. HARDIN: Mr. President, may I ask permission to depart from the order here and introduce in evidence I. P. S. document No. 1339 '85). I desire this — this is the document which counsel called to our attention yesterday morning as being telegram No. 47. It does not show on the translation nor any of the English that we found, but they say that from the Japanese it is that telegram, and in obedience to your Honor's request we have investigated and are willing to accept that and read it in evidence.

MR. HARDIN: It has not been read before?

MR tarbin: It has not. It is similar to one which was read, but not identical.

THE PRESIDENT: A different translation has already been read, is that so?

MR. HARDIN: No, sir, another telegram very similar to this was in evidence, but not this one.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 1339A (5) will receive exhibit No. 1101.

4 5

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1101 and received in evidence.)

MR. HARDIN: We read prosecution's exhibit No. 1101:

"FOREIGN MINISTER MATSUOKA'S REPLY OF FEB. 17 TO FOREIGN SECRETARY EDEN.

"His Imperial Japanese Majesty's Minister for Foreign Affairs is rather surprised to learn about the undue concern shown on the part of His Britannic Majesty's Principal Secretary for Foreign Affairs which is, no doubt, based upon information emanating from the British Embassy in Tokyo and other sources. There is, of course, no way to ascertain what kind of information the British Government has been receiving, but the Minister for Foreign Affairs would like to avail himself of this opportunity to state that so far as he can see there is no ground for entertaining such alarming views on the situation in East Asia.

"On more than one occasion the Minister for Foreign Affairs has explained to the British Ambassador in Tokyo and even to the public at large that one of the primary purposes of the Tripartite Pact is to limit the sphere of the European war by

3

5

6

8

10

11

13

1415

16

17

18

19

21

23

2425

preventing those Powers not engaged in hostilities at present from joining the war and also to bring about its termination as quickly as possible. The Japanese Government has so far found no reason or occasion to alter this avowed aim which constitutes a fundamental basis of its policy. The British Government may rest assured on this point.

"However, the Minister for Foreign Affairs feels obliged to say candidly that he cannot help entertaining a certain amount of anxiety, if not misgivings, on the movements of the British and American Governments in their attempt to expedite and enlarge warlike preparations with an eye to meeting supposed contingencies in the Pacific and the South Seas. Press reports about these movements originating from American sources and elsewhere are causing increasing misgivings in Japan with the consequence that in some quarters it is even contended that Japan should lose no time in taking measures to meet the worst eventuality in these regions. The concern felt is quite natural in the face of these disturbing reports. If the American Government could only be persuaded to restrict its activities to the Western Hemisphere, and prudently avoid causing unnecessary anxiety to the Japanese.

the situation would indeed be very much mitigated.

"Having had the privilege of forming personal acquaintanceship at Geneva with His Britannic Majesty's Principal Secretary for Foreign Affairs and prompted by the belief that a general exchange of frank views at this juncture will be of some service in enabling the two nations to see eye to eye, the Minister for Foreign Affairs wishes to take the liberty of making further observations. The uppermost thought in my mind has always been world peace. He sincerely hopes that on the one hand, the China Affair will be brought to an end as soon as possible and on the other, the European war will see an early termination. It is my earnest and constant prayer that the Powers may gather again to discuss at a round table their differences and disputes and deliberate on the great question of organizing an enduring peace upon a just and equitable world order. In this connection, I desire to assure my eminent colleague that far from aspiring to control the destinies of, or to dominate, other peoples, it is Japan's established policy to inaugurate an era of peace and plenty and mutual helpfulness throughout the region of Greater East Asia by promoting the spirit of concord and conciliation. As repeatedly

2

1

3

5

7

Q

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

affirmed, Japan's motto is 'no conquest, no oppression, no exploitation.' I, therefore, strongly deprecate those biased reports designed to calumniate Japan.

"The Minister for Foreign Affairs frankly confesses his utter inability to see any good purposes served by prolonging the war whatever the motive.

Whatever the outcome, whoever the victor, there are present in the world situation, especially in Europe, elements of great danger such as would bring about a fearful state of chaos and confusion, possibly eventuating in the downfall of modern civilization.

It takes statesmanship of a high order to foresee and meet in time such catastrophic contingency. The Minister for Foreign Affairs has not lost hope yet that such statesmanship is not wanting in the British Empire.

"Lastly, the Minister for Foreign Affairs would like to make it clear that Japan, deeply concerned as she is with an early restoration of peace, is fully prepared to act as a mediator, not only in Greater East Asia but anywhere the world over, or to take whatever action is calculated to recover normal conditions.

"The Minister for Foreign Affairs trusts that

1 2 5 6 *8 9 10 11 12 13 We offer now in evidence I. P. S. document 14 15 16 1941. 17 18 19 20 21 22 and received an evidence.) 23 24 No. 1102: 25

His Britannic Majesty's Principal Secretary for Foreign Affairs will not hesitate to share with him the conviction that upon the shoulders of the leading Powers rests the great and grave responsibility of restoring peace and saving modern civilization from the impending collapse. Such a responsibility can only be fulfilled by a wise and courageous statesmanship willing to display an accommodating and generous spirit in listening to others' claims and contentions. It is hardly necessary to add that whatever Japan may do, she will always be actuated by the consciousness of the responsibility she owes to Humanity."

220C (14), which is an excerpt from press release by the Department of State in Washington, dated July 24,

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 220C (14) will receive exhibit No. 1102.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit'No. 1102

MR. HARDIN: We read prosecution's exhibit

"PRESS RELEASE ISSUED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF

STATE ON JULY 24, 1941.

"In response to inquiries by press correspondents, the Acting Secretary made the following statement:

Japanese Government gave expression on several occasions to its desire that conditions of disturbance should not spread to the region of the Pacific, with special references to the Netherlands East Indies and French Indo-china. This desire was expressly concurred in by many other Governments, including the Government of the United States. In statements by this Government, it was made clear that any alteration in the existing status of such areas by other than peaceful processes could not but be prejudicial to the security and peace of the entire Pacific area and that this conclusion was based on a doctrine which has universal application.

"'On September 23, 1940, referring to the events then rapidly happening in the Indo-China situation, the Secretary of State stated that it seemed obvious that the existing situation was being upset and that the changes were being achieved under duress. Present developments relating to Indo-China provide clear indication that further changes are now being effected

under duress.

"There is no doubt as to the attitude of the Government and people of the United States toward

acts of aggression carried out by use or threat of armed force. That attitude has been made abundantly

clear.

"'By the course which it has followed and is following in regard to Indo-Chins, the Japanese Government is giving clear indication that it is determined to pursue an objective of expansion by force or threat of force.

"There is not apparent to the Government of the United States any valid ground upon which the Japanese Government would be warranted in occupying Indo-Chinaor establishing bases in that area as measures of self-defense.

belief on the part of even the most credulous that the Governments of the United States, of Great Britain, or of the Netherlands have any territorial ambitions in Indo-chima or have been planning any moves which could have been regarded as threats to Japan. This Government can, therefore, only conclude that the action of Japan is undertaken because of the estimated

value to Japan of bases in that region primarily for the purpose of further and more obvious movements of conquest in adjacent areas. ""

MR. HARDIN: We wish to tender in evidence

I. P. S. document No. 1699, which is a document taken

from the Japanese Foreign Office, Tokyo, duly authenticated, and which relates to Central Liaison Conferences
held during 1941.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 1699 will receive exhibit No. 1103.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1103 and received in evidence.)

MR. HARDIN (Reading):

"Liaison Conferences held during 1941.

"(An Abstract from Article in Asahi)

"Date and place: 6:00 - 9:30 p. m., on 13
January at Megro-Saryo (Japanese Restaurant).

"Attendance: KONOYE (Prime Minister); ToJo (War Minister); SUGIYAMA (Chief of Army General Staff);
TOMIDA (Chief Secretary of the Cabinet); ANAMI (Vice Minister of War); MUTO (Chief of Military Bureau);
TSUKADA (Vice Chief of Army General Staff); TANAKA
(Director of Army General Staff); TOYODA (Vice Minister of Navy); OKA (Chief of Naval Affairs Bureau);
KONDO (Vice Chief of Naval General Staff); UGAKI (Vice Chief of Naval General Staff)."

"Remarks: Exchange of views." THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Hardin, the majority of 1 my colleagues do not want this read. 2 MR. HARDIN: Very well. We submit it in 3 evidence. THE PRESIDENT: If it showed the nature of 5 the business on each day, it would be different, but it does not in any detail, at all events. 7 MR. HARDIN: We will offer it in evidence 8 without reading it, your Honor. THE PRESIDENT: Well, is there any part you 10 would like to point out in particular? It may be an extremely useful document, but there is no advantage, so far as I can see, in reading it into the transcript if the nature of the business is so indefinite. 15 Mr. Smith. 16 MR. HARDIN: We think it important as to each defendant in this case to show his attendance at 18 Liaison Conferences during this period, even though this document does not show the business transacted at the Liaison Conferences. 21 THE PRESIDENT: Well, what advantage has it 22 as a part of the transcript that it does not possess 23 as an exhibit? MR. HARDIN: Well, Mr. President, I do not 25

7 8

know that there is any particular difference in its advantage on the transcript beyond its influence as an exhibit. It is the information that during this critical period these particular defendants were taking part in the conferences in this period leading to -- and all the context of the evidence in the case shows important matters were on hand.

THE PRESIDENT: As you deal with the happenings in these conferences you can indicate who was present.

MR. SMITH: If the Court please, we wanted to record an objection. This document has no probative value at all.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, it appears in the document which has been filed with the Tribunal that it is a copy which was taken from, prepared by somebody from this newspaper, Asahi, and filed in the Cabinet Secretariat's office. It does not appear from the document filed what date or dates of the newspaper were used in compiling that report which was filed in the Cabinet Secretariat's office. The newspaper or newspapers in which these reports appeared have not been filed with the Tribunal, and, furthermore, it does not seem possible — it may be so — that a

4 5

newspaper would publish data like this which is supposed to refer to secret conferences.

THE PRESIDENT: You might consider for what purpose you are really introducing this. You may have some good purpose. It may be that it will be sufficient to meet that purpose if you read only part of it. Think it over during the luncheon adjournment, Mr. Hardin.

We will recess until half past one.

(Whereupon, at 1155, a recess was taken.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

2

1

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

9

11

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

23

24

25

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

THE PRESIDENT: Major Moore.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Major Moore) : If the Tribunal please, referring to exhibit 587, record page 6562, line 18, and exhibit 1096, line 1, after consultation with both prosecution and defense, it has been agreed to recommend that in exhibit 587 the word "will" be deleted and, in exhibit 1096, the word "should" be deleted. Thus, in both cases, the line will read, "OSHIMA that he influence," and so forth.

THE PRESIDENT: Both exhibits will be read accordingly. Thank you, Major.

Mr. Hardin.

MR. HARDIN: Mr. President, as to exhibit 1103, we have conferred during the noon hour and are still of the opinion that the document is important, and we would like to have it in the record. This document will be followed later during this trial with evidence from interpretations of the various defendants as to the purpose of these liaison conferences, as to the questions discussed, and the decisions made at them.

the need for us to refer back to this document? MR. HARDIN: I, of course, see the force of 1 that. But, in those interrogations, they will not be 2 definite as to the number of these conferences or the 3 4 dates of them and as to the individuals who attended. 5 This evidence --6 THE PRESIDENT: Can you not tell us then 7 the dates and the persons present? 8 MR. HARDIN: Yes, sir. 9 THE PRESIDENT: This document at this stage 10 of the transcript would be no more useful to us than 11 the exhibit itself if omitted from the transcript. 12 MR. HARDIN: At this time, simply because it 13 is dated within this period, I am happy to give the 14 names of the defendants and the dates of these con-15 ferences. In each case I would like to add that 16 Premier KONOYE was present at all of them but three. 17 THE PRESIDENT: You had better read it. 18 MR. HARDIN: I shall start at the first 19 although I have read a little. 20 (Whereupon, IPS document No. 1699, 21

23

25

22

"Date and place: 6:00 - 9:30 p.m. on 13 January at Megro-Saryo (Japanese Restaurant).

"Liaison Conference held during 1941.

exhibit No. 1103 was read as follows:)

"Attendance: KONOYE (Prime Minister); TOJO 1 (War Minister); SUGIYAMA (Chief of Army General 2 Staff); TOMIDA (Chief Secretary of the Cabinet); 3 4 ANAMI (Vice Minister of War); MUTO (Chief of Military 5 Bureau); TSUKADA (Vice Chief of Army General Staff); 6 TANAKA (Director of Army General Staff); TOYODA 7 (Vice Minister of Navy); OKA (Chief of Naval Affairs Bureau); KONDO (Vice Chief of Naval General Staff); 9 UGAKI (Vice Chief of Naval General Staff). 10 "Remarks: Exchange of views. 11 "Date and place: 11:00 a.m. on 16 January 12 at the official residence of the Prime Minister. 13 "Attendance: KONOYE; HIRANUMA (Home 14 Minister); MATSUOKA (Foreign Minister); TOJO: 15 OIKAWA (Navy Minister); TSUKADA; KONDO. 16 "Remarks: Exchange of informations and views 17 on important matters. 18 "Date and place: 9:00 - 11:00 a.m. on 19 17 January at the official residence of the Prime 20 Minister. 21 "Attendance: KONOYE; HIRANUMA, MATSUOKA, 22 TOJO, OIKAWA, SUGIYAMA, KONDO. 23 "Remarks: Discussion of important matters. 24 "Date and place: "10:30 a.m. on 19 January." 25 No remarks, no record of attendance.

1	"Date and place: 11:00 - 12:00 a.m. on 23
2	January.
3	"Remarks: Conference on various matters of
4	the day.
5	"Date and place: 4:30 - 6:30 p.m. on 30
6	January at the official residence of the Prime
7	Minister.
8	"Attendance: KONOYE; MATSUOKA, TOJO, OIKAWA,
9	HIRANUMA, SUGIYAMA, KONDO, MUTO, OKA, TOMIDA.
10	"Remarks: Exchange of informations and
11	views.
12	"Date and place: 4:00 p.m. on 3 February.
13	"Attendance: KONOYE, MATSUOKA, TOJO, OIKAWA,
14	HIRANUMA, SUGIYAMA, KONDO, MUTO, OKA.
15	"Remarks: Exchange of views on matters of
16	the day.
17	"Date and place: 11:15 a.m. on 13 February.
18	"Attendance: KONOYE; MATSUOKA, TOJO, OIKAWA,
19	HIRANUMA, SUGIYAMA, KONDO, TOMIDA, MUTO, OKA.
20	"Remarks: Exchange of views."
21	THE PRESIDENT: They are all the same, are
22	they not?
23	MR. HARDIN: That is the same thing. I beg
24	your pardon, no. I reread it.
25	May I correct a remark of a while ago? The

1	sheet shows dittos on the two previous ones on the
2	first page instead of no attendance.
3	(Reading) "11:00 a.m. on 20 February.
4	"Attendance: MATSUOKA, TOJO, OIKAWA, HIRA-
5	NUMA, SUGIYAMA, KONDO, MUTO, OKA.
6	"Remarks: Exchange of views on problems
7	concerning latest international affairs.
8	"Date and place: 11:00 a.m. on 23 February.
9	"Attendance: MATSUOKA, TOJO, OIKAWA, HIRA-
10	NUMA, SUGIYAMA, KONDO, MUTO, OKA.
11	"Remarks: Exchange of views on matters of
12	the day.
13	"Date and place: 5:00 - 7:30 p.m. on 2 March
14	at KONOYE's private residence at O.gikubo, Tokyo.
15	"Attendance: KONOYE, TOJO, OIKAWA, MATSUOKA,
16	HIRANUMA, MUTO, TOMIDA, SUGIYAMA, KONDO.
17	"Romarks: Exchange of views.
13	"Date and place: 11:00 - 12:30 a.m. on 6
19	March at the official residence of the Prime Minister.
20	"Attendance: KONOYE, MATSUOKA, TOJO, OIKAWA,
21	HIRANUMA, SUGIYAMA, KONDO, TOMIDA, MUTO.
22	"Remarks: Exchange of views.
23	"Date and place: 5:20 - 7:30 p.m. on 7 March.
24	"Attendance: KONOYE, MATSUOKA, TOJO, OIKAWA,
25	HIRANUMA, SUGIYAMA, KONDO, TOMIDA, MUTO."
	, and a state of the state of t

Same as to remarks. 1 2 "Date and place: 9:30 - 10:10 a.m. on 11 March. 3 4 "Attendance: KONOYE, MATSUOKA, TOJO, OIKAWA, 5 HIRANUMA, SUGIYAMA, KONDO, TOMIDA, MUTO." 6 Same as to remarks. 7 "Date and place: 4:30 p.m. on 10 April. 8 "Attendance: KONOYE, TOJO, OIKAWA, HIRANUMA, 9 OHASHI (Vice Minister of Foreign Ministry), SUGIYAMA, 10 NAGANO (Chief of Naval General Staff), MUTO, CKA, 11 TOMIDA. 12 "Date and place: In the fore-noon on 17 13 April. "Attendance: KONOYE, TOJO, OIKAWA, HIRANUMA, 15 SUGIYAMA, NAGANO, OHASHI, MUTO, OKA, TOMIDA. 16 "Remarks: Exchange of views on matters of 17 the day. 18 "Date and place: 1:00 p.m. on 3 May at the 19 official residence of the Prime Minister. 20 "Attendance: KONOYE, MATSUOKA, TOJO, OIKAWA, 21 HIRANUMA, SUGIYAMA, NAGANO, MUTO, OKA, TOMIDA. 22 "Remarks: Exchange of views. 23 "Date and place: 11:00 - 12:15 a.m. on 24 8 May. 25 "Attendance: KONOYE, HIRANUMA, MATSUOKA,

```
TOJO, OIKAWA, SUGIYAMA, NAGANO, TOMIDA, MUTO, OKA."
              Same as to exchange of views.
2
              "Date and place: 5:00 - 6:10 p.m. on 12
3
    May.
4
              "Attendance: KONOYE, MATSUOKA, TOJO, OIKAWA,
5
    HIRANUMA, SUGIYAMA, NAGANO, TOMIDA, MUTO, OKA."
6
             Same as to remarks.
7
8
             "Date and place: 11:00 a.m. on 15 May.
9
              "Attendance: KONOYE, MATSUOKA, TOJO,
10
    OIKAWA, HIRANUMA, TOMIDA, MUTO, OKA, SUGIYAMA,
11
    NAGANO."
12
             Same remarks.
13
             "Date and place: 11:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.
14
    on 22 May.
15
             "Attendance: KONOYE, MATSUOKA, TOJO, OIKAWA,
16
    TOMIDA, MUTO, OKA, SUGIYAMA, NAGANO."
17
             Same as to remarks.
18
             "Date and place: 11:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.
19
    on 29 May.
20
             "Attendance: KONOYE, MATSUOKA, TOJO, OIKAWA,
21
    HIRANUMA, SUGIYAMA, NAGANO, TOMIDA, MUTO, OKA."
22
             Same as to remarks.
23
             "Date and place: 9:30 - 10:35 a.m. on
24
    6 June.
25
             "Attendance: KONOYE, MATSUOKA, HIRANUMA,
```

	TOTO OTKANIA NACANO MENEVADA MEMBO OKA MONTDA
1	TOJO, OIKAWA, NAGANO, TSUKADA, MUTO, OKA, TOMIDA.
2	"Remarks: Conference on problems of the
3	day.
4	"Dates and place: 3:00 p.m. on 11 June.
5	"Attendance: KONOYE, HIRANUMA, MATSUOKA,
6	TOJO, OIKAWA, SUGIYAMA, NAGANO, MUTO, OKA, TOMIDA.
7	"Remarks: Exchange of views on important
8	matters of the day.
9	"Dates and place: 11:10 a.m 1:55 p.m.
10	on 12 June.
11	"Attendance: KONOYE, HIRANUMA, MATSUOKA,
12	TOJO, OIKAWA, SUGIYAMA, NAGANO, MUTO, OKA, TOMIDA.
13	"Remarks: Exchange of views.
14	"Dates and place: 2:30 p.m. on 16 June.
15	"Attendance: KONOYE, MATSUOKA, TOJO,
16	OIKAWA, HIRANUMA, SUGIYAMA, NAGANO, MUTO, OKA,
17	TOMIDA.
13	"Remarks: Exchange of views on important
19	problems of the day.
20	"Dates and place: 3:00 p.m. on 23 June.
21	"Attendance: KONOYE, MATSUOKA, TOJO,
22	OIKAWA, HIRANUMA, SUGIYAMA, NAGANO, MUTO, OKA,
23	TOMIDA.
24	"Remarks: Conference on matters of the
25	day.

"Dates and place: 1:00 p.m. on 25 June. 1 "Attendance: KONOYE, MATSUOKA, HIRANUMA, 2 TOJO, OIKAWA, SUGIYAMA, NAGANO, MUTO, OKA, TOMIDA. 3 "Remarks: Conference on matters of the day. 4 "Dates and place: 10:10 a.m. on 26 June. 5 "Attendance: KONOYE, TOJO, OIKAWA, MATSUOKA, 6 HIRANUMA, OHASHI, SUGIYAMA, TSUKADA, NAGANO, KONDO, 7 MUTO, OKA, TOMIDA. "Remarks: Exchange of views on important 9 10 problems of the day. "Dates and place: 1:30 p.m. on 27 June. 11 12 "Attendance: Same persons as yesterday. 13 "Remarks: Continuous conference on the 14 same subject as on previous occasion. 15 "Dates and place: 2:00 p.m. on 28 June. 16 "Attendance: KONOYE, MATSUOKA, HIRANUMA, 17 TOJO, OIKAWA, SAKAMOTO (Director of Euro-Asiatic 18 Bureau of Foreign Ministry), SUGIYAMA, TSUKADA, 19 NAGANO, KONDO, TOMIDA, MUTO, OKA. 20 "Remarks: Exchange of views on the 21 important problems of the day. 22 "Dates and place: 5:00 p.m. on 30 June. 23 "Attendance: Same persons as above. 24 "Remarks: Exchange of views. 25 "Dates and place: 4:00 p.m. on 21 July

D7.

at the office of the High Command situated at the Imperial Grounds.

"Remarks: It was decided that the Prime Minister, accompanied by the Foreign Minister and other Ministers concerned, should attend this place occasionally and exchange views and project national policies with War, Navy ministers and Staffs of the High Command."

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: May we have a direction from the Tribunal that the prosecution furnish the defense with the date that this report was made and the date or dates on which the extracts appeared in the newspaper Asahi?

THE PRESIDENT: This exhibit is the document as you found it, I take it. You have not made it up from the newspaper. Well, I do not know why we should direct that you supply the defense with the material from which the Japanese made it up.

MR. HARDIN: Yes, sir. We will be happy to do that. Oh!

We will not prevent you; but I do not think we will direct you to do it.

MR. HARDIN: I did not understand.

THE PRESIDENT: We cannot give the direction sought by Mr. Logan.

3

4

MR. HARDIN: We now offer in evidence IPS document No. 2216 which is an affidavit of former

5

Secretary of State Stimson. We ask that it be marked as an exhibit.

6

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

8

MR. LOGAN: The defense objects to testimony

9

of the Honorable Henry L. Stimson by affidavit on

10

the grounds that no reason has been advanced by the

11

prosecution why Mr. Stimson could not be here and

THE PRESIDENT: He is in America and not

MR. LOGAN: Secondly, he was, at the time of

12

testify in person.

he has drawn.

13

in Japan.

15

14

1

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

and he has set forth certain facts and certain conclusions in this affidavit in which certain acts are characterized by him as being aggressive. The defense should be given an opportunity to crossexamine him on these facts and the conclusions which

the events testified to by him, Secretary of State,

a high official of the United States Government;

THE PRESIDENT: We have decided -MR. LOGAN: And by his absence we have been

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

deprived of the fundamental right, as we all know it, of cross-examination of this witness. Furthermore, it is a method adopted by the prosecution of proving a case by ex parte evidence which we do not believe should be permitted with a witness of Mr. Stimson's caliber.

I understand, although he is in his seventies, that Mr. Stimson is in good health; and, in the event that this affidavit is admitted, we ask that a subpoena be issued by the Tribunal for him to appear here and testify.

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, I want to request that, due to the importance of this witness, if the affidavit be accepted that it be done conditioned upon the production of the witness by the prosecution for cross-examination.

MR. HARDIN: Mr. President, our highest hope was to have --

(Whereupon, a discussion off the record was had by the Members of the Tribunal.)

MR. HARDIN: Our highest hope was to have Mr. Stimson here. My information was that due to his age he was unable to undertake the travel across

the ocean to get here.

the affidavit and, therefore, to overrule the objection to its admission. If further examination of Mr. Stimson is desired by the defense, it could be done on commission in America, or by way of interrogatories. We can see no need for his attendance here. He is a statesman in the highest category; and no such statesmen were called in Germany, at all events. That is not conclusive, of course.

Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document
No. 2216 will receive exhibit No. 1104.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 1104 and received in evidence.)

A 2 r a 3 m 4 & 5 M 6 r 5 e 8

MR. HARDIN: We read prosecution's exhibit 1104:

"INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST.

"The UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA, THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND" --

THE PRESIDENT: Don't read that. You can say "United States and others against ARAKI and others."

MR. HARDIN: All right, sir. (Reading)
"United States of America, Against IRAKI, and others.
"COUNTY OF SUFFOLK, STATE OF NEW YORK, UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA.

"I, Henry L. Stimson, being duly sworn, on oath depose and say:

"I was Secretary of State of the United States of America from March 5, 1929, to March 4, 1933.

Prior to that time, in 1928, I was appointed Governor-General of the Philippine Islands, which office I held until I was named Secretary of State.

"On the basis of my personal observation and contacts, as well as on the information coming to me in the course of my official duties, I verily believe the following statements to be true:

*

13

10

11

12

15

14

16

17 13

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

"When I took office as Secretary of State,

Japan, together with the United States and various
other nations, was a party to the following treaties,
pacts, and agreements, and others, or had subscribed to the principles therein announced:

- "(1) The Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, signed at The Hague 29 July 1899;
- "(2) The Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, signed at The Hague 18 October 1907;
- "(3) The Hague Convention No. III relative to the Opening of Hostilities signed 18 October 1907;
- "(4) Agreement effected by exchange of notes between the United States and Japan, signed 30 November 1908, declaring their policy in the Far East;
- "(5) Treaty between the British Commonwealth of Nations, France, Japan, and the United States relating to their Insular possessions and Insular Dominions in the Pacific Ocean, 13 December 1921;
- "(6) The Treaty between the United States of America, the British Commonwealth of Nations, Belgium, China, France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, and Portugal, concluded and signed at Washington

6 February 1922, known as the Nine-Power Treaty;

- "(7) The Treaty concluded and signed at Paris
 27 August 1928, known as the Kellogg-Briand Pact
 and as the Pact of Paris;
- "(8) Convention respecting the Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers and Persons in War on land, signed at The Hague 18 October 1907.

"As a party to the above listed treaties, pacts, and agreements, and others, or as a subscriber to the principles therein announced, Japan had agreed, <u>interalia</u>:

"To use its best efforts to insure the Pacific settlement of international differences; in case of serious disagreement or conflict, before an appeal to arms, to have recourse, as far as circumstances allow, to the good offices or mediation of one or more friendly Powers; not to commence hostilities without previous and explicit warning; to maintain the existing status quo in the region of the Pacific Ocean and to defend the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry in China and to support the independence and integrity of China; in event of controversy in any Pacific questions to invite other Parties to a joint Conference; to respect the sovereignty, independence,

and the territorial administrative integrity of China; to use its influence to effectually establish and maintain the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations throughout the territory of China; to refrain from seeking special or monopolistic privileges in China detrimental to the rights or interests of other foreign powers or their nationals; to condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies and to renounce war as an instrument of national policy; not to move troops or convoys across the territory of a neutral Power.

"In 1931 Manchuria was actually and legally part of China. Japan claimed some exceptional rights in Manchuria, and many of these rights, while always asserted with emphasis, were not attested by documentary evidence which was unchallenged. Some of the treaties upon which Japanese claims rested were asserted by China to be either unauthentic or to have been executed under duress. Under cover of these treaties, however, Japan exercised powers of the administration and police throughout a zone which bordered the South Manchuria Railway, based upon the armed forces she was permitted to maintain. These areas included towns and portions of cities like

7.3

21 22

Mukden and Changchun.

"While there was no cleavage in Japanese feelings as to the existence and importance of special
interests in Manchuria, there was a very fundamental
difference in political thought in Japan as to the
method by which that interest should be supported and
enforced. This difference in general corresponded
with the alignment between those leaders who were
following the ideals of popular government on the
one hand, and the conservative and military leaders
on the other. The policy of the latter group rested
ultimately upon military force, and assumed that
Japan's rights were political and sovereign.

"On the night of September 18, 1931, armed hostilities broke out in Manchuria, and Japanese forces occupied not only the city of Mukden, but other cities in South Manchuria. The incident which was claimed by the Japanese to have caused their action, namely an alleged act of sabotage by the Chinese on the South Manchurian Railway, diminished to such small proportions as strongly to suggest its actual non-existence. Meanwhile the Japanese army was found to have acted with such promptness as to make it evident that they were moving under a previously arranged strategic plan. By the afternoon of September

2 3 4

19, 1931, cities like Antung, Changchun, and Newchwang, several hundred miles from one another, had
been occupied by the Japanese forces, who at once
assumed the place of the civil authorities in those
cities. Within forty-eight hours the whole of
southern Manchuria, not only along the Japanese
South Manchuria Railway, but also along some of the
railroads built by the Chinese had thus been effectively occupied. The evidence pointed to a deliberate action planned and authorized by the
highest Japanese authorities in Manchuria and possibly
with direction from the high military command in
Tokyo.

"On September 25, 1931, the Japanese Ambassador in Washington left with the Under Secretary of State a Statement issued after an extraordinary meeting of the Japanese Cabinet on September 24, 1931. This Statement contained an assurance that while on September 21 a detachment was despatched from Changchun to Kirin it was not with a view to military occupation but only for the purpose of removing the menace to the South Manchuria Railway on flank and that as soon as that object had been attained it would be withdrawn. The Statement contained a firm assurance that the Japanese Government harbored no

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

13

14

1516

17

18

19

20

22

23

25

territorial designs in Manchuria. As early as October 8, following this firm assurance on the part of Japan, I was informed by the American Charge in Tokyo that the Japanese General Staff had issued an information bulletin to foreign military attaches stating that Japan found it impossible to withdraw the Japanese Army to their original stations or even to the contiguous territory.

"After the capture of Mukden by the Japanese on September 19, 1931, the headquarters of the Chinese Government and forces had been removed to Chinchow. Soon after September 30, General Honjo, the Japanese Commander-in-Chief in Manchuria, publicly announced that the Government of Marshal Hsueh-liang would no longer receive Japanese recognition. Other statements followed to the effect that Japanese forces would not cease their activities until Marshal Chang and his government were driven entirely out of Manchuria. Not only were these statements left without reprimand from the Tokyo government, but Japanese military planes began to enforce this policy in a most drastic manner. On October 8, 1931, a squadron of eleven Japanese planes dropped thirty or forty bombs upon the unarmed and unwarned city of Chinchow, killing and wounding a number of the inhabitants.

In the latter part of October, the Japanese high command in Manchuria sent a military expedition to

Tsitsihar in northern Manchuria. This was several hundred miles north of any portion of the South Manchuria Railway and far outside the zone of any of the treaty rights which Japan claimed. This expedition defeated and destroyed the forces of Chinese General Ma Chan-shan and thus destroyed all the organized forces of Marshal Chang in North Manchuria.

"The capture of Tsitsihar left the Chinchow Dis-

"The capture of Tsitsihar left the Chinchow District as the only fragment of Manchuria in which
Marshal Chang's authority remained intact, and towards the latter part of November the Japanese forces
began to move towards Chinchow. On behalf of the
United States I made vigorous representations through
diplomatic channels, and the Japanese forces were
withdrawn to Mukden on November 28, 1931. On November
24, 1931, the Japanese Foreign Minister stated to the
American Ambassador that 'the Premier, the Secretary
of War, the Chief of Staff and he are agreed that
towards Chinchow there shall be no hostile operations
and orders have been issued to that effect.' After
December 11, 1931, however, the movement towards
Chinchow was resumed and that city was seized by the

4 5

Japanese army on January 3, 1932. This completed the destruction of the organized forces of Marshal Chang and left the control of all Manchuria in the hands of the Japanese.

"On October 26, 1931, the Japanese Government made public fundamental points upon which normal relations between China and Japan should be based, and it appeared then that they included the settlement of the entire question of the disputed treaty rights of Japan in Manchuria. While Japanese representatives disclaimed her intention to use military force to achieve her national objectives, it seemed clear that she was bent on doing just that very thing. Her army was not withdrawing; it was actually pushing forward and the Japanese government was declining to interfere until all these fundamental questions of national policy between the two nations should be settled.

"On December 22, 1931, I received from the American Ambassador in Tokyo a telegram in which the Ambassador stated that the Prime Minister of Japan had called at the American Embassy and assured him that Japan would never allow a situation to arise in Manchuria which would be fraught with the danger of war, and that Chinese sovereignty would never be impaired."

"The Prime Minister reiterated that Japan merely desired the protection of Japanese persons and interests. In the same telegram the American Ambassador reported that active preparations were continuing for further operations in Manchuria where a free hand seemed to have been given to the military."

"On December 22, 1931, I requested the American 1 Ambassador in Japan to inform the Foreign Minister of my apprehension of Japanese forces taking action against Chinese regulars south of Chinchow. I requested the Ambassador to inform the Foreign Minister that a new attack by Japanese forces on Chinese regulars would be regarded as unwarranted and would be interpreted as indicative of indifference to obligations assumed in various treaties to which Japan and China, as well as the United States, were parties. On December 27, 1931, I received a memorandum from the American Ambassador 11 which had been delivered to him by the Vice Minister 12 of Foreign Affairs in which it was stated that the 13 Imperial Government was determined to remain loyal to 15 the League of Nations Convenant, the No War Treaty, 16 other various treaties and the two resolutions adopted by the Council of the League of Nations regarding the Manchurian situation. On December 29, 1931, the American Minister in China informed me that Marshal Chang Hsuehliang ordered withdrawal of all Chinese forces from Manchuria, stating that he was motivated by a desire 22 to deprive Japanese of any excuse for further aggres-23 sion in North China. 24 "On January 7, 1932, I sent a note to Japan and China informing them that the United States could not

admit the legality of any situation de facto and did not intend to recognize any treaty entered into between those Governments which might impair the treaty 3 rights of the United States or its citizens in China, including those which relate to the sovereignty, the independence, or the territorial and administrative integrity of China, or to the international policy 7 relative to China, commonly known as the open door policy, and that the United States did not intend to 10 recognize any situation, treaty or agreement which 11 might be brought about by means contrary to the 12 obligations of the Pact of Paris of August 27, 1928. 13 On January 16, 1932, the Japanese government replied 14 to our note of January 7. The argument made in that 15 note was to the effect that China was in an 'unsettled 16 and distracted state' and that this fact relieved Japan 17 from the obligation to carry out the covenants of the 18 Nine-Power Treaty and the League of Nations Covenant, 19 which may be fairly said to have become the argument 20 upon which Japan thereafter relied with the greatest 21 assurance, but which was rejected as untrue and un-22 sound by the unanimous report of the Lytton Commission. 23

In the middle of January, 1932, Japan's aggression in Manchuria seemed to have achieved success. By May 1, 1932, Japan had attempted to extend her

aggressive action to the Yangtze River and to break up the efforts of the Chinese at Shanghai to maintain an economic boycott against her business. There Japan received a military set-back in being checked by Chinese soldiers. In the hostilities around Shanghai, on January 28, 1932, the Japanese forces bombed the unwarned and helpless civilian native quarter of Chapei. This was an act of inexcusable cruelty. Not only were 9 bombs dropped upon positions held by Chinese troops, but incendiary bombs were used which soon had the entire 10 11 quarter in flames. Thereafter, the Japanese barricaded 12 the streets in the International Settlement of Shanghai, 13 disarmed the police, and paralyzed all regular municipal 14 functions. Numerous excesses against the Chinese popu-15 lation were committed, including many summary execu-16 tions, and a veritable reign of terror resulted. 17 Japanese troops even invaded the American sector of 18 defense at Shanghai where they committed acts of 19 violence against Chinese. On February 24, 1932, I sent 20 to Senator Borah, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign 21 Relations of the Senate, a letter in which was outlined 22 the position and policy of the American Government with 23 respect to the situation in China in relation to the 24 application of treaties.

"Almost immediately after its army had

À

overthrown the Chinese Government of Manchuria, Japan commenced to establish political and economic control over that country. This was done by forcible creation of an ostensibly independent but really puppet state controlled by Japan and known as Manchukuo. Thereafter, as soon as other nations had announced their intention not to recognize as valid any fruits of this conquest, the Japanese government proceeded to take further steps designed to make this policy of the rest of the world as difficult and ineffective as possible.

"On April 4, 1932, the Japanese Ambassador in Washington called upon me and in the course of discussion, admitted that promises made by Japan had been broken but said that chauvinist conditions were so acute in Japan that the Government could not take any other position. On June 23, 1932, I received a telegram from Ambassador Grew in Tokyo that the press had cabled to Imerica a statement by General ARAKI, Minister of War, before the Supreme Military Council to the effect that the resolutions of the League of Nations and statements made by Japan in regard to Manchuria before the establishment of Manchukuo could no longer be considered as binding on Japan.

"On January 5, 1933, the Japanese Ambassador in Washington called upon me and stated that in any

event Japan had no territorial ambition south of the 2 Great Wall. He stated that his information as to the 3 affair in Shanhaikwan was that it was a local incident, 4. provoked by a minor outbreak of Chinese against Japanese there. On February 23, 1933, the Japanese Ambassador came to tell me on the instruction of his Government that the State of Manchukuo was determined to suppress irregular forces in the Province of Jehol, and that under the treaty between Manchukuo and Japan, Japan was obliged to support Manchukuo and, therefore, the Japanese forces were co-operating in this movement in Jehol. On February 27, 1933, I reminded the Japanese Ambassador that when the Manchurian outbreak occurred in September, 1931, I had not attributed it to the Government of Japan or to the statesmen whom I used to know or to the people of Japan but to the efforts of a small group of persons of militaristic ambitions and desires. The Ambassador said that he knew this very I pointed out the importance of the treaties as instruments to preserve peace and the Ambassador said that he recognized this. He also said that on his part although he had been disappointed many times when he had given me assurances which were afterwards not carried out in Manchuria he still believed in his people and that sooner or later the moderate elements would

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

not disappoint us. I told him at that time that I joined in his hope that this would be so.

"I retired as Secreatry of State on March 4, 1933, and was succeeded by the Honorable Cordell Hull who then assumed the burden of office in connection with Japanese-American relations."

(Signed) "Henry L. Stimson."

"Subscribed and sworn to."

We now offer in evidence IPS document No. 239. This is an affidavit of former /mbassador Joseph C. Grew, and we ask that it be identified as a exhibit in the evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: If your Honor please, we object to the admission of this affidavit unless the prosecution produces the witness here for cross-examination.

We make the point that Mr. HIROTA -- Neither Mr. HIROTA or the other defendants in this case can have that fair trial contemplated by the Charter unless the accused are confronted by the witnesses against them. The right of an accused to be confronted by the witnesses against him is found in nearly every constitution in the world, and it is in the new Japanese Constitution which has been promulgated with the approval of the Supreme Commander, and I submit to your Honor that the

Supreme Commander could not have had a lesser require-1 ment in mind when he provided in this Charter for a 2 fair trial. In this affidavit, which consists of 3 about fifteen pages, double spaced, Mr. Grew covers 4 practically ten years in which he was American Ambas-5 sador in Tokyo. This affidavit is written in a terse, 6 sweeping style and many of the statements in it are 7 misleading in their present form and are contradicted 8 by Mr. Grew's own widely published books, "Ten Years 9 in Japan" and "Report from Tokyo." 10

Your Honor, we have no funds to take any depositions and if your Honor adheres to the ruling made in connection with the Affidavit of Mr. Stimson we would like to have the Court advise Mr. Grew that we will take his deposition and make some provision to pay for the expenses of taking it.

Mr. Grew lives in Washington, D.C. He is in good health and I understand he is about 72 years of age. Counsel just raised a controversey as to how I know Mr. Stimson is in good health.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Grew.

MR. SMITH: I mean Mr. Grew. I was born in Washington, D.C., and I lived there nearly all my life until I came to Tokyo. I saw Mr. Stimson quite often.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Grew.

.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. SMITH: I mean, Mr. Grew. Before he came No. to Toky and after he returned from Tokyo. And just a fewweeks ago I got out here a copy of the New York Times which showed Mr. Grew attending a social function which, as I remember, was in New York City. He appeared to be in very good health and spirits.

.

Eder & Spratt

MR. LEVIN: I don't want to add anything to what has already been mentioned both by Mr. Smith, in relation to this affidavit, and by Mr. Logan in relation to Mr. Stimson's affidavit.

There are two things which I would like to suggest: (1) That this affidavit was made on May 28, 1946. Had the prosecution notified the defense that this affidavit had been taken it would have been possible for us to have cross-examined him either by commission or interrogatories, in view of the fact that a number of defense counsel have been in Washington since that affidavit was made.

I believe, Mr. President, there is greater validity in requiring Mr. Grew to be present than Mr. Stimson, because Mr. Grew, I understand, is still presently connected with the State Department.

I am advised by my colleagues that Mr. Grew has been recently retired, although he was connected with the State Department for quite some time.

It does seem to us that a witness of this calibre, having made the affidavit that he did May 28th, should have been examined. That is, the defense should have had an opportunity to examine him orally, and I believe that opportunity should still be given him.

.7 8

I should like to add that Major -- that it is contemplated that Major Furness will go to the United States very shortly, and when he does he could cross-examine him at that time.

MR. HARDIN: Mr. President, it is pleasing information that the gentleman is able to find Mr. Grew in good spirits from his picture. It is my information that Mr. Grew has been in not good health, a bad state of hearing -- his hearing almost gone -- and that he has been retired from service in the State Department for quite a while -- just how long I don't know.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, the health of Mr. Grew can be checked very readily, in short order. Colonel Warren has just come back from the States and I can telephone him and, I think, find out just what his state of health is.

I think it is a well known fact that Mr. Grew has been almost totally deaf for many years. He makes that statement in his book. But it didn't prevent him from leading a most active life.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, I would just like to add that a witness of the stature of Mr. Grew, whose name has predominantly appeared throughout this trial, should be produced by the

prosecution to give us a first-hand story of the situation as he saw it and the facts as he knew them. He knew, perhaps, all of these accused, talked to many of them, and a great deal more, I believe, could be acquired by the Tribunal from information obtained from him from the witness! box, and seeing him and listening to him, than what can be obtained from reading a cold affidavit.

MR. HARDIN: Mr. President, what I have said is not to oppose the interrogatories or even a deposition from Mr. Grew. I do not believe he could come here.

THE PRESIDENT: Neither the new Japanese
Constitution nor General MacArthur's attitude towards
it has any bearing on the question of a fair trial.

No matter what may be the state of health of Mr. Grew at present, we see no immediate need, at all events, to bring him here. We have decided to admit his affidavit and to overrule the objection to its admission.

An application can be made to me in Chambers to have Mr. Grew examined on commission or by way of interrogatories in the United States. The question of expense can be dealt with before me in Chambers. If a commission is decided upon it will be,

2 3

nest.

- 20

1 of course, a great convenience to have it taken 2 while Major Furness is in America. 3 The affidavit is admitted on the usual 4 terms. 5 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's docu-6 ment No. 239 will receive exhibit No. 1105. 7 (Whereupon, the document above 8 referred to was marked prosecution's 9 exhibit No. 1105 and received in evidence.) 10 THE PRESIDENT: I think this is a con-11 venient break. This is a long affidavit and it will 12 take most of the afternoon. We will recess for 13 fifteen minutes. 14 (Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was 15 taken until 1500, after which the proceed-16 ings were resumed as follows:) 17 18 19 20 22 23 24

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The Tribunal is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Hardin.

MR. HARDIN: (Reading)

"The United States of America," and others,
"Against ARAKI, Sadao," and others.

"City of "ashington, District of Columbia, United States of America.

"I, Joseph Clark Grew, being duly sworn, on oath depose and say:

Japan, at Tokyo, from June 1932 until the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941. Diplomacy has been my life work since 1904. Prior to World War I, I served in the United States Foreign Service in Egypt, Mexico, Russia, Austria-Hungary end Germany. I was counselor at the American Embassy in Berlin during World War I. In 1918 I became acting head of the Western European Division of the United States State Department. I took part in the peace negotiations at Paris and also represented the United States during the negotiations with Turkey, at Lausanne, in 1922. I also served as Minister to Denmark and to Switzerland, as Under Secretary of State, and, just prior to my appointment to Tokyo,

3.

as Ambassador to Turkey.

"The statements hereinafter set forth relate to matters which arose from time to time in connection with the carrying out of my duties at Tokyo as diplomatic representative of the American Government in Japan, and I vouch for the truth thereof.

"At the time I became Ambassador to Japan, as aforesaid, Japan, along with the United States and other nations, was a party to the following treaties, pacts and agreements, and others, or had subscribed to the principles therein announced:

- "(1) The Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, signed at the Hague 29 July 1899;
- "(2) The Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, signed at the Hague 18 October 1907;
- "(3) The Hague Convention No. III relative to the Opening of Hostilities, signed 18
 October 1907;
- "(4) The agreement, signed 30 November 1908, effected by exchange of notes between the United States and Japan, declaring their policy in the Far East."

1
2
4
3
4
-
5
6
0
7
8
0
9
10
10
11
11
12
40
13
14
1-1
15
1)
16
17
10
13
19
1)
20
20
21
22
-
23
26
24

"(5) The Treaty between the British
Commonwealth of Nations, France, Japan and the
United States relating to their Insular possessions
and Insular Dominions in the Pacific Ocean, 13
December 1921;

"(6) The so-called 'Nine-Power Treaty' concluded and signed at Washington 6 February 1922;

"(7) The so-called 'Kellogg-Briand Pact' concluded and signed at Paris 27 August 1928;

"(8) The Convention respecting the Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers and Persons in Wars on Land, signed at the Hague, 18 October 1907.

"As a party to the above-listed treaties, pacts and agreements, and others, or as a subscriber to the principles therein announced, Japan had agreed, inter alia:

"to avoid the use of force in the settlement of international differences; in case of serious
disagreement or conflict to have recourse to the
good offices or mediation of one or more friendly
power; not to open hostilities without a declaration
of war; to submit international disputes to arbitration; to respect and support the sovereignty, independence and territorial administrative integrity
of China; to use its influence to effectually

6

5

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

establish and maintain the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations throughout the territory of China; to refrain from seeking special or monopolistic privileges in China detrimental to the rights or interests of other foreign powers or their nationals; to renounce war as an instrument of national policy; not to violate the territory of neutral powers.

"At the time I became Ambassador as aforesaid Japan had gained military control of Manchuria and had established there the Japanese controlled puppet state of Manchukuo. The official records of the United States Department of State with respect to the Manchurian affair, with which I had familiarized myself, indicated that Japan had pursued its course of action in Manchuria despite frequent protests by the United States and other nations that its aggressive action was in contravention of Japan's treaty obligations. The Department's official records further indicated that Japan had consistently defended its aggressive action as a purely defensive measure for the protection of Japanese nationals, and had repeatedly assured the United States Government that Japan had no territorial ambitions or intentions of disturbing the rights and

interests of third parties, in China.

"During all of my stay in Tokyo as United States Ambassador I repeatedly callet to the attention of the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs. and occasionally the Japanese Prime Minister, and other responsible government officials the fact that the American Government considered the Japanese military operations in China as a violation of Japan's obligations, under various treaties and agreements hereinbefore mentioned, to respect the territorial integrity of China, to maintain the principle of the Open Door in China and to refrain from endangering the lives and interests of nationals of the United States and other powers, to refrain from the use of force in settlement of disputes, to submit disputes to arbitration and abide by results thereof. I pointed out that Japan was rapidly losing the good will of the American Government and people and of other peoples of the world by its aggressive policy and by the excesses of its military forces. The excuse given was that the military operations were purely defensive measures against Chinese bandits or Communists whom the Chinese Government was unable to control, or were for the protection of Japanese nationals and interests in China from abuses resulting

1 2

3

5

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

1516

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

from the anti-Japanese feeling deliberately aroused by the irresponsible Chinese Government. I was repeatedly assured by the officials referred to that Japan had no territorial ambitions in China, that Japan was solicitous of the rights and interests of third parties and was earnestly endeavoring to protect them and preserve the status quo, and, up until the end of 1938, that Japan intended to preserve the principle of the Open Door in China.

"I protested repeatedly against the indiscriminate bombing of non-military objectives which endangered the lives and properties of noncombatant Chinese and foreigners. A few of the more flagrant examples were the bombing and sinking of the U.S.S. Panay on the Yangtze, in which two American nationals were killed, and the machine-gunning of the small boat in which the Panay's captain and others were being taken ashore, the deliberate bombing of the U.S.S. Tutuila at Chungking, the reckless and wanton bombing of residential and business districts of Nanking after a totally inadequate warning had been given, the machine-gunning by a Japanese plane of five Americans while horseback riding within the International Settlement at Shanghai, the bombing of American-owned mission property in Tungpeh in which

an American national (Phoebe Nyhus) was killed, the destruction by Japanese planes of a commercial passenger plane belonging to the Chinese National Aviation Corporation (in which Pan-American Airways had a large interest) resulting in the loss of lives of a number of noncombatant passengers and the endangering of the life of the American pilot, the destruction by five Japanese planes of another properly marked Chinese Aviation Corporation commercial passenger plane, which had just landed at Chanyi and in which the American pilot was killed. the bombing and complete destruction of an American church at Chungking after eight previous bombings all of which had been made the subject of separate protests. The number of instances in which churches, schools and other American properties were repeatedly bombed and damaged could not but compel the conclusion that the attacks were intentional. Furthermore, in most cases the Japanese had been furnished beforehand with maps on which had been marked the locations of the properties in question. In virtually all instances the Japanese Government disclaimed responsibility on one pretext or another, claiming, among other things, that the property was too close to a military objective or was used by Chinese forces

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1.2

13

14

15

16

17

18

10

20

21

23

23

24

25

-

3

4 5

6

9

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

24

25

(which excuses were not justified by facts brought out by investigations), or that the bomb release mechanism in the plane apparently did not function properly, or merely that a mistake had been made.

"In spite of my protests American business men and missionaries were prevented from returning promptly to Nanking even after hostilities in that area had ceased, as, for instance, when the Shanghai University property was evacuated by Japanese troops and the American missionary societies which owned the property were not permitted to immediately reoccupy it, even for the purpose of preventing its further deterioration. In refusing American nationals permission in such cases to return and resume business or protect and preserve their property, the excuse given was that peace and order had not been sufficiently restored. The lack of any basis for this excuse was usually illustrated by the presence of many Japanese merchants and their families in the areas in question.

"On July 7, 1934 I forwarded to the Japanese Ministry for Foreign Affairs an informal memorandum regarding the establishment by the authorities in Manchuria of a discriminatory petroleum selling monopoly. Attention was invited to the fact that the

cooperation and approbation of the Japanese Government in the project, which would close the door in Manchuria to sales by American oil companies of their products, would violate the principles of the Open Toor, to which Japan was committed, and which it had declared it would uphold, and, further, that the proposed project would contravene the provisions of Article 3 of the Nine-Power Treaty of 1922 and the explicit provisions of the Sino-American Treaty of In a reply thereto dated August 2, 1934, the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs stated that since Manchukuo was an independent state the question was one concerning the American and Manchukuo Governments, and denied that contravention of any treaty obligations by Japan was involved. I again addressed an informal memorandum to the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs, pointing out that the project planned would unquestionably result in a monopoly prejudicial to the treaty rights of American nationals and counter to the principles of the Open Door, and that since plans therefor were being formulated with the concurrence and cooperation of Japanese nationals, the participation of quasi-official organizations such as the South Manchuria Railway, and the assent or approval of the Japanese Government, the carrying out of the

project would be in contravention of Japan's treaty obligations as well as of her unqualified assurances previously given to the American and other governments.

"It was undeniable, of course, that Japan had assured maintenance of the Open Door policies in Manchuria even after the establishment of the so-called independent regime of Manchukuo, for the maintenance of those policies had been promised in the speech of Count UCHIDA (then Minister for Foreign Affairs) before the Diet on August 25, 1932, and in the Japanese Government's public statement of September 15, 1932, issued on the occasion of the recognition of Manchukuo. Moreover, the protocol between Japan and Manchukuo, of September 15, 1932 itself was predicated upon observance by Manchukuo of international obligations applying to that territory, as shown by the second paragraph of the Preamble of the Protocol, reading:

""Thereas Manchukuo has declared its intention of abiding by all international agreements entered into by China in so far as they are applicable to Manchukuo, * * * *

Consequently, on November 30, 1934 I delivered another memorandum to the Minister for Foreign Affairs

24

25

reiterating my previous protests at establishment of the oil monopoly in Manchuria in violation of treaty obligations and assurances to the contrary. I had a long discussion with Mr. HIROTA on the subject. He remarked that Americans were free to purchase stock in the petroleum company and that, therefore, the door was not being closed to them. The fact was, however, as I informed him, that forty percent of the stock had already been issued to the South Manchuria Railway, a quasi-official Japanese organization, twenty percent to the Government of Manchuria and forty percent to four Japanese companies. Mr. HIROTA said he thought we and the British were taking too legalistic an attitude. The discussion continued for half an hour, but the Minister's arguments were specious, and it was obviously impossible for me to get anywhere.

"On April 10, 1935, the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs forwarded to me an answer to my note of November 30, 1934, on the Manchurian oil matter, which consisted of a repetition of the previous denials of Japan's responsibility for the actions of the Government of Manchukuo. I communicated the contents thereof to the American Government, and, as instructed by the Secretary of State, advised the

Japanese Foreign Minister, by note dated April 15, 1935, of the American Government's refusal to recognize the contentions advanced by Japan, and of the American view that the ultimate responsibility for injury to American interests would rest upon Japan. I called on the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs on April 16, 1935, to point out again the American view that Japan was violating its treaty obligations and also the assurances it had made on prior occasions (identifying them specifically) that the principles of the Open Door would be maintained. His only reply was that these assurances were conditioned upon recognition of Manchukuo by the interested powers.

"On December 1, 1937 I registered with
the Japanese Foreign Minister an objection to the
manifesto issued by the Manchurian Government regarding extra-territorial rights of foreigners other than
Japanese, and to the promulgation of a law under
which an American branch bank at Harbin had been
advised to prepare to register and to appoint a
representative and I called attention to the fact
that the extra-territorial rights of United States
nationals in Manchuria were governed by treaties between the United States and China and that the law

1

3

5

7

8

9

11

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

21

22

24

25

by which the Manchurian Government sought to assert jurisdiction over American nationals was in direct contravention of American treaty rights. The Foreign Minister's reply merely disclaimed any responsibility on Japan's part for the acts of the Government of Manchukuo.

"As in the case of the oil monopoly in Manchuria, I protested frequently and strongly against the taking over of the Chinese Customs Administration by the Japanese at Shanghai, Canton, Swatow and other places, and the revision of customs regulations to favor Japanese imports. I protested further in the case of the seizure of the Salt Tax Administration. I pointed out that large American and other foreign loans had been secured against customs revenues and salt tax revenues and that the United States and other nations had vital financial interests in the administrative integrity of the Chinese Maritime Customs and the Salt Administration and were entitled to be consulted in connection with any change in regulations or procedure or diversion of revenues. These protests were, like all others, to no avail, the Japanese Foreign Minister and other officials claiming that the steps taken were required by military necessity and by the fact that Chinese officials would not cooperate. "

"Other specific instances when assurances 1 which were later violated were given to the American Government, through me or in statements issued to the 3 press by the Japanese Government for publication, were the following:

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"(1) On April 25, 1934 the Japanese Foreign Minister (HIROTA) assured me personally that Japan had no intention whatever of seeking special privileges in China, of encroaching upon the territorial and administrative integrity of China, or of creating difficulties for the bona-fide trade of other countries in China. He further stated that there was no intention or desire on the part of Japan to claim a privileged position in derogation of the rights and responsibilities to which the signatories of the Nine-Power Treaty were entitled, and that the policy of Japan was complete observance and support of the provisions of the Nine-Power Treaty in every respect. I observed to him that the American Government and people would be less impressed by statements of policy than by more concrete evidence,

"(2) On September 1, 1937 the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs (HORINOUCHI), in a radio broadcast to the United States, defended Japan's actions in China on the ground of China's anti-Japanese acts and asserted that Japan's intentions were peaceful; he stated that

North China and Shanghai was the realization of a state permitting genuine cooperation between the two countries; and declared that the Japanese forces in China had not been sent there for aggressive purposes and that Japan had no territorial designs. Mr. HORINOUCHI's radio address was similar to speeches subsequently made in the Diet by the Foreign Minister (HIROTA) and the Prime Minister (KONOYE).

with the Minister for Foreign (ARITA), I reminded him of his government's previous statements to the effect that Japan had no territorial ambitions in China; I called his attention to the recent occupation of Hainan Island by Japanese forces; and I asked for an expression as to the intentions of the Japanese Government in connection with the occupation of the island in view of the fact that there were numerous American residents and substantial American missionary and educational properties on the island. The Minister replied that the purpose of the occupation was to strengthen the blockade of the South China coast and to hasten the suppression of the Chiang Kai- shek regime; he repeated the former statements of the Japanese Government that Japan had no

territorial ambitions in China and added that the

occupation 'will not go beyond military necessity.'

"(4) On April 15, 1940 the Foreign Minister

(ARITA), on being questioned by newspapermen concerning

Japan's position with regard to the possible involvement

of the Netherlands in the European war and its

repercussions in the Netherlands East Indies, stated

that 'the Japanese Government can not but be deeply

concerned over any development accompanying an aggravation

of the war in Europe that may affect the status quo of

the Netherlands East Indies.'

"In July, 1941 the Japanese Foreign Minister assured me that Japan had not so far considered the possibility of joining the hostilities against Russia.

During that month I had forwarded to the Japanese Prime Minister a memorandum expressing the hope of the United States Government that there was no truth in the reports that Japan intended to enter upon hostilities against Russia, referring to contemporaneous statements of responsible Japanese officials that Japan desired to maintain and preserve peace in the Pacific area. The reply thereto, which came from the Japanese Foreign Minister, recited that maintenance and preservation of peace in the area of the Pacific had always been the sincere and genuine desire of the Japanese Government which had consistently contributed earnest efforts toward

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

11

13

1.1

1516

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

achieving that purpose and that Japan had not so far considered the possibility of joining the hostilities against the Soviet Union.

"During 1938 the establishing of a new order in East Asia began to be mentioned. The Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister referred to the extension of the campaign in China from Manchuria to North China and thence into Central and South China and expressed the hope for the emergence of a new regime in China cooperative with Japan, repeating, however, the customary assurances of intention to continue the policies of the Open Door and to protect the rights and interests of third powers. Later the Foreign Minister indicated that the hostilities in China would go on to a finish; that no dealings would be had with General Chiang Kai-shek even if he should sue for peace; and (significantly) that since the main purpose of the campaign was to make possible economic and social cooperation of China and Japan, it was a 'small matter' whether the territory was Chinese or Japanese, and that China should be powerful enough to put itself in order before extraterritoriality and unequal treaties could be abolished in that country. Then, in November, 1938, the Japanese Foreign Office, in announcing the fall of Canton and three Wuhan cities, stated 'all vital areas of China

1 have thus fallen into our hands. No mention was made of the rights or interests of third parties, the 3 statement merely expressing Japan's confidence that 4 other powers would adapt their attitude to the new condit-5 ions prevailing in East Asia. The Japanese poeple were 6 cautioned, however, that these victories would not bring an era of peace but rather that since Japan was entrusted with the task of constructing a new Far East ' the actual fighting has just started.' By the end of 1940 10 the idea of a new order in East Asia had progressed 11 and developed to the point where the Japanese Government 12 openly admitted it was determined to secure for Japan 13 the position in 'greater East Asia including the South 14 Seas! to which it considered itself entitled as a result of its growth as a first-class power in the modern world, 16 and which would remove the territorial and economic restrictions previously hampering it. 18 "In making the representations, protests and

15

17

19

20

21

22

23

objections on behalf of the American Government, as herein set forth, I was always dealing with the Japanese individual or individuals who, as the official records of the Japanese Government will show, were filling the indicated civil office in the Japanese Government at that time. In most cases I took up the matter in question with the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs;

1 some were referred to the Vice-Minister for Foreign 2 Affairs, and some to responsible subordinate officials 3 of the Foreign Ministry; and a few cases were referred 4 to the Prime Minister. The matters herein related constitute a small, but representative, proportion of all 6 those which occurred during my Ambassadorship. At the end of 1938 over 400 separate protests had been filed by me and the number of instances of depredations against American property, discriminations against American business men, and endangering of American lives by the Japanese in China was steadily increasing and continued to do so until the end of my term as Ambassador."

/s/"Joseph Clark Grew."

14

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Goldberg & Spratt

With the permission of the Tribunal, we now wish to offer in evidence I. P. S. document No. 2007B, which is an excerpt from the testimony of former Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, given before the United States Congressional Committee for the investigation of the Pearl Harbor Incident, and we ask that this be identified as an exhibit in the prosecution's testimony.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, we are not making any objections to the introduction of this document, but we do wish to point out that the prosecution's excerpts of the prepared statement which Secretary Hull gave before the Committee — that this prepared statement covered a period up to and including December 7, 1941, but that the prosecution is only offering that part of the statement up to June 21, 1941; and it does not include any of the answers which Secretary Hull gave to questions which were asked him before the Committee.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: If your Honor please, I object to the matter which appears on the first page, because it is too remote. It goes back to 1895, 1905, 1910, and 1915, and if we have to answer for the Russian-

Japanese War, we will just have to fight that all over again, and this case will never come to an end.

MR. HARDIN: Mr. President, as to Mr. Logan's objection, you may recall that request was made -- application was made for the right to present excerpts, and the defendants asked for additional, and we have supplied them by due processing with all the additional that they asked for.

As to Mr. Smith's objection, that is just briefly some of the background and history which has some effect, however remote, upon the relations between the countries involved in this inquiry.

THE PRESIDENT: Of course, we may discover upon considering these various statements that there is much in them that is not properly evidence before us. I would not care to say that what happened in 1895 was relevant to any issue. The objection is not overcome by calling it background. However, we are not in a position just now to undertake a revision of these various documents which contain, perhaps, statements which are not proper -- which cannot properly be regarded as evidence.

In Mr. Stimson's affidavit there are conclusions there that we are not going to be bound by simply because he draws them. Well, of course, the

Court will pay regard only to such matters as are properly evidence directed to the issues, and will disregard other matters.

The statement of Mr. Hull is admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 2007B will be given exhibit No. 1106.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was given exhibit No. 1106 and received in evidence.)

MR. HARDIN: We read prosecution's exhibit No. 1106:

"EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY OF SECRETARY OF STATE HULL GIVEN BEFORE THE JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON THE INVESTIGATION OF THE PEARL HARBOR ATTACK.

"pp. 1076 to 1083.

"I. BACKGROUND of 1941 CONVERSATIONS.

"The Japanese proposal for conversations was directed toward the conclusion of an agreement between Japan and the United States relating to the Far East. It was made early in 1941. Before accepting or rejecting this proposal, the President and I gave the subject thorough consideration against the background of such factors as Japan's record of

4 5

international aggression, her record of duplicity in international dealings, the sharp divergence between the policies traditionally and currently pursued by Japan and by the United States, and the current situation in the Far East, in Europe, and in the United States.

"A. Japan's Record of Aggression:

"The President and I had to bear in mind and to take into account Japan's past record of aggression and the trend of contemporary developments in the Far East.

"Almost from the outset of Japan's emergence as a modern state she had been pursuing a policy of military aggrandisement. For the most part, except during certain brief periods when forces of moderation appeared to be in the ascendancy, the intervals between one aggressive step and the next were but periods of consolidation.

"In 1895, following Japan's successful war against China, Japan annexed Formosa and tried unsuccessfully to establish a foothold in Manchuria.

"In 1905, after the Russo-Japanese war,
Japan established herself securely in Manchuria by
acquiring a lease of the Kwantung territory and
ownership of the South Manchuria Railway. At that

_

•

time Japan also acquired southern Sakhalin.

"In 1910 Japan annexed Korea after years of encroachment by pressure and intrigue.

"In 1915 Japan took advantage of the preoccupation of her European allies with the war
against Germany to present to China the notorious
Twenty-one Demands.

participated in the Washington Conference of 1921-22 and became a party to the treatles concluded there. Among those treatles was the Nine-Power Treaty relating to principles and policies concerning China. That treaty envisaged the creation of conditions designed to provide the fullest and most unembarrassed opportunity to China to develop and maintain for herself an effective and stable government. Japan pledged herself to the policies of self-restraint toward China on which the Nine Power Treaty rested.

"In 1928, however, following the advent of the Cabinet of General TANAKA in 1927, Japan adopted a so-called 'positive' policy toward China under which it manifested an increasing disposition to intervene in China's internal affairs.

"In 1931 Japan invaded Manchuria and subsequently established there a puppet regime under

4 5

the name of 'Manchukuo.' By that action, which was a flagrant violation of the Nine-Power Treaty, Japan broke completely away from the policy of cooperation agreed upon in the Washington Conference treaties.

"I recalled how early in 1934 I welcomed an approach by the Japanese Government in the form of a note (February 21, 1934) by Mr. HIROTA, the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs, in which he stated that he firmly believed that no question existed between the United States and Japan 'that is fundamentally incapable of amicable solution.' In my reply (March 3, 1934) I concurred in that view and emphasized our Government's belief in adjustments of questions by pacific processes.

"Only a short time after that exchange of notes, however, Japan again unmasked the basic purpose of aggression consistently adhered to by powerful policy-making elements in Japan. On April 17, 1934 the Japanese Foreign Office spokesman gave out a truculent official statement known as the 'hands off China' statement. In that statement Japan made clear a purpose to compel China to follow Japan's dictate and to permit other countries to have relations with China only as Japan allowed."

8 9

notice of its intention to withdraw at the end of 1936 from the Naval Limitation Treaty signed at Vashington on February 6, 1922. That notice was another clear and significant move in the direction of a course of conquest. Following the giving of that notice, Japan proceeded energetically to increase her armaments, preparatory to launching her invasion in China.

versations with Nazi Germany which resulted in the conclusion by the two countries, on November 25, 1936, of the Anti-Comintern Pact. In 1937 Italy adhered. While the Pact was ostensibly for self-protection against communism, actually it was a preparatory move for subsequent measures of forceful expansion by the bandit nations -- the first step in the creation of the so-called 'Axis.'

"In July 1937, Japan deliberately took advantage of a minor incident between Chinese and Japanese forces at a point near Peiping and began flagrantly to invade China on a huge scale. She poured into China immense armies which spread fantine over great areas, including industrial and other key centers. These armies raped, robbed, murdered,

ī								
1	and	committed	all	kinds	of	lawless	acts.	Particularly
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								
13								
14								
15.								
16								
17								
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								
								Control of the Contro

7 8

barbarous were the outrages in Nanking following occupation of that city by Japanese military on December 13, 1937.

"On December 12, 1937 Japanese aircraft bombed and sank the U. S. S. Panay in the Mangtze River.

"To gain public support in Japan for its program of military expansion, slogans were used such as 'the new order in Greater East Asia' and 'East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere.' The United States and other countries were charged with attempting to choke Japan's development.

"In August and September 1940 Japan with German assistance extorted an agreement from Vichy France under which Japanese troops moved into northern Indo-China.

"In September 1940 Japan entered into the Tripartite Pact with Germany and Italy. That alliance was aimed directly at the United States. It was designed to discourage the United States from taking adequate measures of self-defense until both Japan and Germany had completed their programs of conquest in Asia and Europe, when they could turn on the United States then standing alone.

"On October 4, 1940 Premier KONOYE

was quoted by the press in a statement on the Tripartite Pact as having said in part:

stand the real intentions of Japan, Germany and Italy and continues persistently its challenging attitude and acts . . . those powers will be forced to go to war. Japan is now endeavoring to adjust Russo-Japanese political and economic relations and will make every effort to reduce friction between Japan and Russia. Japan is now engaged in diplomatic manouvers to induce Russia, Britain and the United States to suspend their operations in assisting the Chiang regime.

"B. Japan's Record of Duplicity:

"The President and I also gave thought to the fact that Japan had a long record of duplicity in international dealings. This duplicity was due largely to the fact that the Japanese military were a law unto themselves and consistently over-rode commitments which civilian Japanese had given.

"In 1904, Japan guaranteed Korea's independence and territorial integrity. In 1910, Japan annexed Korea.

"In 1908, Japan pledged with the United States to support the independence and integrity of

4 5

China and the principle of equal opportunity there. In 1915, Japan presented to China the notorious 'twenty-one demands.'

"In 1918, Japan entered into an inter-allied arrangement whereby forces, not exceeding above 7,000 by any one power, were to be sent to Siberia to guard military stores which might be subsequently needed by Russian forces, to help the Russians in the organization of their own self-defense, and to aid the evacuating Czechoslovakian forces in Siberia. The Japanese military saw in this enterprise an opportunity, in which they were eventually unsuccessful, to annex eastern Siberia and sent more than 70,000 troops.

"In the Nine-Power Treaty of 1922, Japan agreed to respect China's sovereignty, independence, and territorial and administrative integrity. Japan also agreed to use its influence to establish the principle of equal opportunity there. Japan's whole course in China since 1931 of military occupation and economic domination was in violation of those pledges.

"On November 21, 1932, Mr.MATSUOKA then Japanese delegate to the League of Nations, said:
'We want no more territory.' By the end of 1932

Japanese forces had occupied the whole of Manchuria and in subsequent years they moved southward and westward occupying a vast area of China.

"On July 27, 1937, Prince KONOYE, then
Japanese Premier, said 'In sending troops to North
China, of course, the Government has no other
purpose, as was explained in its recent statement,
than to preserve the peace of East Asia.' In
order to 'preserve the peace of East Asia.'
Japanese forces for four years had carried warfare and suffering over the greater part of China.

"On October 28, 1937, the Japanese Foreign
Office said, 'Japan never looks upon the Chinese people as an enemy . . Japan showed its friendly feeling for China by bombing Chinese civilian populations,
by burning Chinese cities, by making millions of
Chinese homeless and destitute, by mistreating and
killing civilians, and by acts of horror and
cruelty."

"On April 15, 1940, Mr. ARITA, then Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs, said the 'Japanese Government cannot but be deeply concerned over any development ... that may affect the status quo of the Netherlands East Indies'. 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.

"After the outbreak of Japan's undeclared war against China in July, 1937, Japanese civilian leaders time and again gave assurances that American rights would be respected. Time and again the Japanese military acted in violation of those assurances...

"pp. 1084 - to 1088

"Time and again the Japanese gave assurances that American lives and property in China would be respected. Yet there were reported in steadily mounting numbers cases of bombing of American property with consequent loss or endangering of American lives.

"Time and again the Japanese gave assurances that American treaty rights in China would be respected. Unnumbered measures infringing those rights were put

into effect in Japanese occupied areas. Trade monopolies were set up, discriminatory taxes were imposed, American properties were occupied, and so on. In addition, American nationals were assaulted, arbitrarily detained, and subjected to indignities.

"C. Divergence between Japanese and American Policies:

"The President and I have very much in mind the fact that the United States and Japan had widely different concepts and policies. We went over the successive steps our Government had taken to influence Japan to adopt peaceful policies.

"We recalled that Japan's action in 1931 in embarking on a course of aggression, expansion by force and of disregard of treaties had ushered in an ever widening conflict between force of aggression and those desirous of maintaining peace. Our Government's opposition to Japan's course in Manchuria was set forth in a communication addressed by the then Secretary of State, Mr. Stimson, to the Japanese Government on January 7, 1931 --"

That is blurred. I can't make it out for sure.

"--and in a further communication of February 25, 1935, to the Secretary General of the L

League of Nations.

"On January 17, 1933 the President-elect,
Mr. Roosevelt, made clear his support of the
principle of sanctity of international treaties by
writing out, in reply to a question, a statement as
follows:

" 'I am ... wholly willing to make it clear that American foreign policies must uphold the sanctity of international treaties. That is the cornerstone on which all relations between nations must rest.'

"In his first inaugural address, on March 4, 1933, President Roosevelt said that in the field of world policy he would dedicate this nation to the policy of the good neighbor -- 'the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others -- the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors.'

"Thus in 1931-1933, while Japan was carrying forward its program of aggression, the American Government was moving steadily ahead in advocacy of world support of sanctity of treaties and peaceful processes.

"On May 16, 1934 I had a general conversation

with Japanese Ambassador SAITO, one of many conversations in which I endeavored to convince the Japanese that their best interests lay in following policies of peace.

Japanese Ambassador. During the conversation the Ambassador repeated the formula which his Government had been putting forward publicly for some weeks to the effect that Japan had a superior and special function in connection with the preservation of poace in Eastern Asia. I brought to the Japanese Ambassador's attention the clear implications contained in the Japanese formula of the intention on the part of Japan to exercise an overlordship over neighboring nations and territories.

"On June 12, 1936 in a conversation with
the Japanese Ambassador to Great Britain, I told
the Ambassador that the impression of the American
people was that Japan sought the economic domination
first of Eastern Asia and then of other areas such as
it might select, and that this would ultimately
mean political as well as military domination. I
urged upon the Ambassador the benefit to Japan from
its associating itself in a peaceful and constructive
program."

"Despite all our pleas and efforts, Japan in July 1937 proceeded to invade China. Therefore, on July 16 the Government of the United States issued a statement of fundamental principles of international policy which was directed at rallying all countries to the support of peaceful processes.

"In a further statement of August 23,
1937, I applied the principles of the July 16
statement expressly to the situation in China. I
stated that the issues, in that situation, of
concern to the United States went far beyond the
immediate question of the protection of American
nationals and American interests. Serious hostilities
in any part of the world were of concern to all
nations. Accordingly, I urged on both the Chinese
and Japanese Governments that they refrain from
hostilities.

"On October 6, 1937 the American Government stated that the action of Japan in China was inconsistent with the principles which should govern relationships between nations and was contrary to the provisions of the Nine-Power Treaty and of the Briand-Kellogg Pact.

"In November 1937 the United States participated with eighteen other nations in a conference

held at Brussels to 'study peaceable means of hastening the end of the regrettable conflict which prevails' in the Far East. The conference was held in accordance with a provision of the Nine-Power Treaty of 1922. The repeated refusals of the Japanese Government to participate in the conference effectively prevented efforts to bring about an end to the conflict by mediation and conciliation.

On November 24 the conference suspended its sittings.

"pp. 1089

"On April 15, 1940 the Japanese Foreign
Minister issued a statement disclosing an underlying
purpose to extend Japanese control to the South
Seas regions, especially the Netherlands East Indies.
On April 17 I took cognizance of that statement. I
pointed out the importance of the Netherlands Indies
in international relationships. I said that intervention in the domestic affairs of the Netherlands
Indies or any alteration of their status quo by
other than peaceful processes would be prejudicial
to the cause of stability, peace, and security, not
only in the region of the Netherlands Indies but
in the entire Pacific area. I urged that peaceful
principles be applied not only in every part of the
Pacific area but in every part of the world."

"p. 1090

"p. 1092

"The President had an eye to the situation

"During the winter of 1940 and the spring of 1941 I had clearly in mind -- and I was explaining to members of Congress and other Americans with whom I came in contact -- that it was apparent that the Japanese military leaders were starting on a mission of conquest of the entire Pacific area west of a few hundred miles of Hawaii and extending to the South Seas and to India. The Japanese were out with force in collaboration with Hitler to establish a new world order, and they thought they had the power to compel all peaceful nations to come in under that new order in the half of the world they had arrogated to themselves.

"I was saying to those Americans that beginning in 1933 I had commenced a systematic and consistently earnest effort to work out our relations with Japan. I had been trying to see whether it was humanly possible to find any way to approach the Japanese and prevail on them to abandon this movement of conquest. We had been urging the Japanese to consider their own future from the standpoint of political, economic, and social aspects.

in the Far East when on January 6. 1941 in his address to Congress he declared that 'at no previous time has American security been as seriously threatened from without as it is today'. The President said that the whole pattern of democratic life had been blotted out in an appalling number of independent nations and that the assailants were still on the march threatening other nations, great and small.

"p. 1093.

"On January 15, 1941, in a statement in support of the Lend-Lease Act before the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives, I said:

" 'It has been clear throughout that Japan has been actuated from the start by broad and ambitious plans for establishing herself in a dominant position in the entire region of the Western Pacific. Her leaders have openly declared their determination to achieve and maintain that position by force of arms and thus to make themselves master of an area containing almost one-half of the entire population of the world. As a consequence, they would have arbitrary control of the sea and trade routes in that region.'"

"I pointed out that mankind was face to face with an organized, ruthless and implacable movement of steadily expanding conquests, and that control of the high seas by law-abiding nations is the key to the security of the Western Hemisphere".

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you have just finished part I. We will hear part II on Tuesday morning. We will adjourn until half-past nine on Tuesday morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Tuesday, 12 November, 1946, at 0930.)