Nov 19, 1946 Index Mat & Cx. INDEX Of

## WITNESSES

Prosecution's Witnesses	Page
Ballantine, Joseph W. (resumed)	10809
Direct by Mr. Keenan (continued)	10809
Cross by Mr. Blakeney	10850

INDEX

01

## EXHIBITS

	Pros.	Description			For Ident.	In Evidence		
2215	1245-H	Exhibit of Jos			ffidav: ellant:			10811
2215	1245-I	Exhibit	n Tu	from	above	affidav:	lt	10815
2215	1245-J	Exhibit	uMu	from	above	affidavi	it	10825
2215	1245-K	Exhibit	"N"	from	above	affidavi	Lt	10830

1 Tuesday, 19 November, 1946 3 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan 8 The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, 9 at 0930. 10 11 12 13 Appearances: 14 For the Tribunal, same as before with the 15 exception of the HONORABLE R. B. PAL, Member from 16 India, not sitting. 17 For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 18 For the Defense Section, same as before. 19 20 21 22 (English to Japanese and Japanese 23 to English interpretation was made by the 24 Language Section, IMTFE.) 25

Duda & Wolf

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

THE PRESIDENT: All the accused are present except OKAWA, who is represented by his counsel. That will be taken to be the case at all future sessions of this Court until I amnounce otherwise

Mr. Chief of Counsel.

JOSEPH W. BALLANTINE, called as a witness on behalf of the prosecution, resumed the stand and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

MR. KEENAN: Mr. Ballantine, will you proceed with your testimony.

THE WITNESS: "The Japanese, soon after receiving this Government's memorandum of October 2, redoubled their emphasis upon the need of haste in reaching an agreement. They offered new formulas for dealing with limited and specific problems, and they stated that Japan had now placed all of its cards on the table and they had gone as far as they could in the direction of making so-called 'concessions.' In their new formulas, there was not discernible any evidence that the Japanese Government was moving even one step toward committing itself to courses of peace

and that it contemplated receding even one step from insistence upon full attainment of its declared objectives -- which were, in effect, political, economic, and cultural domination of the entire western Pacific area and China. After the new Japanese Cabinet, headed by General TOJO, came into office on October 17, the Japanese became even more insistent in urging upon this Government a quick decision on the Japanese Government's proposals, but, while pressing this Government for a decision, the Japanese Government showed no willingness to effect any fundamental modification of the Japanese position and no desire to apply practically in actual situations the basic principles of justice and equity essential to the building of a lasting peace in the Pacific.

"Although throughout the conversations with
the Japanese representative, the Secretary of State
repeatedly made it clear that the American Government
would consult with the Governments of the United
Kingdom, Australia, China and the Netherlands before
entering into actual negotiations with the Japanese
Government affecting the interests of those governments,
at no time did the Secretary of State make any statement
to Japanese representative which would have warranted
the Japanese in assuming that in the informal conversations

the Secretary of State was delegated to speak or act 1 for the other powers mentioned. 2 "On November 15, Mr. Saburo KURUSU, whom the 3 Japanese Government had decided to send to assist 4 the Japanese Ambassador in the conversations, reached 5 Washington. Shortly thereafter, on November 20, 6 the Japanese Ambassador and Mr. KURUSU presented to the Secretary of State a proposal which, on its face, 8 was extreme. A copy of that proposal is annexed as 9 exhibit K." 10 MR. KEENAN: And with the permission of the 11 Court we offer it in evidence. 12 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted. 13 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 14 No. 2215-K will receive exhibit No. 1245-H. 15 (Whereupon, the document above 16 referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 17 No. 1245-H and received in evidence.) 18 MR. KEENAN: With the permission of the Court 19 20 the prosecution would read this exhibit. 21 THE PRESIDENT: Read it, Mr. Chief Prosecutor. 22 MR. KEENAN: (Reading) 23 "Draft Proposal Handed by the Japanese Ambassador (NOMURA) to the Secretary of State on November 20, 1941."

24

	"1.	Both	the G	overnme	ents o	f Jar	oan ai	nd t	he
United	States	under	take 1	not to	make	any a	armed	adv	ance-
ment in	nto any	of th	e regi	ions in	n the	South	neast	ern	Asia
and the	Southe	rn Pa	cific	area	except	ing t	the pa	art	of
French	Indo-Ch	nina w	here t	the Jaj	panese	troc	ops an	re	
station	ned at p	resen	t.						

"2. The Japanese Government undertakes to withdraw its troops now stationed in French Indo-China upon either the restoration of peace between Japan and China or the establishment of an equitable peace in the Pacific area.

"In the meantime the Government of Japan declares that it is prepared to remove its troops now stationed in the southern part of French Indo-China to the northern part of the said territory upon the conclusion of the present arrangement which shall later be embodied in the final agreement.

"3. The Government of Japan and the United States shall cooperate with a view to securing the acquisition of those goods and commodities which the two countries need in Netherlands East Indies.

"4. The Governments of Japan and the United States mutually undertake to restore their commercial relations to those prevailing prior to the freezing of the assets."

1	"The Government of the United States shall
2	supply Japan a required quantity of oil.
3	"5. The Government of the United States
4	undertakes to refrain from such measures and actions
5	as will be prejudicial to the endeavors for the
6	restoration of general peace between Japan and China."
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	10,813
13	BALLANTINE DIPLOT
14	
15	
16	"The Government of the United States shall
17	supply Japan a required quantity of oil.
18	The Covernment of the United States
19	undertakes to refrain from such measures and actions.
20	as will be prejudicial to the endeavors for the
21	restoration of general pasce between Japan and China."
22	
23	
24	
25	

3

6

5

8

10

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

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

"Acceptance by the American Government of the Japanese proposal of November 20 would have meant condonement by the United States of Japan's past aggressions, assent by the United States to unlimited courses of conquest by Japan in the future, abandonment by the United States of its whole past position in regard to the most essential principles of its foreign policy in general, betrayal by the United States of China, and acceptance by the United States of a position as a silent partner aiding and abetting Japan in her effort to create a Japanese hegemony in and over the western Pacific and eastern Asia; it would have destroyed the chances of asserting and maintaining American rights and interests in the Pacific; and in its final analysis would have meant a most serious threat to American national security. Japan also clung to her vantage point in Indo-China which threatened the security of the countries to the south and menaced vital trade

routes. Their conditional offer to withdraw troops from southern Indo-China to northern Indo-China was meaningless as they could have brought those troops

back to southern Indo-China within a day or two, and
furthermore they placed no limit on the number of troops

6 they might continue to send there.

"On November 26, the Secretary of State made a reply to the Japanese representatives in the form of two documents, the first, an outline in a tentative form of a proposed basis for agreement between the United States and Japan, and the second, an explanatory statement in regard to it. A copy of that document is annexed as Exhibit L."

MR. KEENAN: Prosecution offers said exhibit in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 2215-L will receive exhibit No. 1245-I.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1245-L, and was received in evidence.)

MR. KEENAN: (Reading)

"Washington, November 26, 1941.

"The representatives of the Government of the United States and of the Government of Japan have been

8

7

3

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

·

carrying on during the past several months informal and exploratory conversations for the purpose of arriving at a settlement if possible of questions relating to the entire Pacific area based upon the principles of peace, law and order and fair dealing among nations. These principles include the principle of inviolability of territorial integrity and sovereignty of each and all nations: the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries; the principle of equality, including equality of commercial opportunity and treatment; and the principle of reliance upon international cooperation and conciliation for the prevention and pacific settlement of controversies and for improvement of international conditions by peaceful methods and processes.

"It is believed that in our discussions some progress has been made in reference to the general principles which constitute the basis of a peaceful settlement covering the entire Pacific area. Recently the Japanese Ambassador has stated that the Japanese Government is desirous of continuing the conversations directed toward a comprehensive and peaceful settlement in the Pacific area; that it would be helpful toward creating an atmosphere favorable to the successful outcome of the conversations if a temporary modus vivendi

4

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

could be agreed upon to be in effect while the conversations looking to a peaceful settlement in the Pacific were continuing. On November 20 the Japanese Ambassador communicated to the Secretary of State proposals in regard to temporary measures to be taken respectively by the Government of Japan and by the Government of the United States, which measures are understood to have been designed to accomplish the purposes above indicated.

"The Government of the United States most earnestly desires to contribute to the promotion and maintenance of peace and stability in the Pacific area, and to afford every opportunity for the continuance of discussions with the Japanese Government directed toward working out of a broad-guage program of peace throughout the Pacific area. The proposals which were presented by the Japanese Ambassador on November 20 contain some features which, in the opinion of this Government, conflict with the fundamental principles which form a part of the general settlement under consideration and to which each Government has declared that it is committed. The Government of the United States believes that the adoption of such proposals would not be likely to contribute to the ultimate objectives of ensuring neace under law, order and justice in the Pacific area, and it suggests that further effort be

23

22

3

4 5

6

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

24

25

made to resolve our divergences of views in regard to the practical application of the fundamental principles already mentioned.

"With this object in view the Government of the United States offers for the consideration of the Japanese Government a plan of a broad but simple settlement covering the entire Pacific area as one practical exemplification of a program which this Government envisages as something to be worked out during our further conversations.

fort to bridge the gap between our draft of June 21, 1941 and the Japanese draft of September 25 by making a new approach to the essential problems underlying a comprehensive Pacific settlement. This plan contains provisions dealing with the practical application of the fundamental principles which we have agreed in our conversations constitute the only sound basis for worthwhile international relations. We hope that in this way progress toward reaching a meeting of minds between our two Governments may be expedited."

"Document Handed by the Secretary of State to the Japanese Ambassador (NOTURA) on November 26, 1941.

"Strictly Confidential

Tentative and Without

Commitment.

"Washington, November 26, 1941

"Outline of Proposed Basis for Agreement Between the United States and Japan

"Section I

"Draft Mutual Declaration Policy

"The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan both being solicitous for the peace of the Pacific affirm that their national policies are directed toward lasting and extensive peace throughout the Pacific area, that they have no territorial designs in that area, that they have no intention of threatening other countries or of using military force aggressively against any neighboring nation, and that, accordingly, in the national policies they will actively support and give practical application to the following fundamental principles upon which their relations with each other and with all other governments are based.

- "(1) The principle of inviolability of territorial integrity and sovereignty of each and all nations.
- "(2) The principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries.
  - "(3) The principle of equality, including

2

3

-

5

6

8

9

11

10

12

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

4

3

3 6

9

8 9

10

77 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

equality of commercial opportunity and treatment.

"(4) The principle of reliance upon international cooperation and conciliation for the prevention and pacific settlement of controversies and for improvement of international conditions by peaceful methods and processes.

"The Government of Japan and the Government of the United States have agreed that toward eliminating chronic polictial instability, preventing recurrent economic collapse, and providing a basis for beace, they will actively support and bractically apply the following principles in their economic relations with each other and with other nations and neonles:

- "(1) The principle of non-discriminating in international commercial relations.
- "(2) The principle of international economic cooperation and abolition of extreme nationalism as expressed in excessive trade restrictions.
- "(3) The principle of non-discriminatory access by all nations to raw material supplies.
- "(4) The principle of full protection of the interests of consuming countries and populations as regards the operation of international commodity agreements."

"(5) The principle of establishment of such institutions and arrangements of international finance as may lend aid to the essential enterprises and the 

-

continuous development of all countries and may permit
payments through processes of trade consonant with the
welfare of all countries.

"Section II

"Steps To Be Taken By the Government of the United States and by the Government of Japan.

"The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan propose to take steps as follows:

"1. The Government of the United States and
the Government of Japan will endeavor to conclude a
multilateral non-aggression pact among the British
Empire, China, Japan, the Netherlands, the Soviet Union,
Theiland and the United States.

"2. Both Governments will endeavor to conclude among the American, British, Chinese, Japanese, the Notherland and Thai Governments an agreement whereunder each of the Governments would pledge itself to respect the territorial integrity of French Indo-China and, in the event that there should develop a threat to the territorial integrity of Indo-China, to enter into immediate consultation, with a view to taking such measures as may be deemed necessary and advisable to meet the threat in question. Such agreement would provide also that each of the Governments party to the agreement would not seek or accept preferential treat-

1	
R	ment in its trade or economic relations with Indo-
2	China and would use its influence to obtain for each
3	of the signatories equality of treatment in trade
4	and commerce with French Indo-China.
5	"3. The Government of Japan will withdraw
6	all military, navel, air and police forces from China
y	and from Indo-China.
8	"4. The Government of the United States
9	and the Government of Japan will not support militar-
0	ily, politically, economicallyany government or regim
100	in China other than the National Government of the
2	Republic of China with capital temporarily at Chung-
3	king.
4	"5. Both Governments will give up all extra-
5	territorial rights in China, including rights and
5	interests in and with regard to international settle-
7	ments and concessions, and rights under the Boxer
8	Protocol of 1901.
9	"Both Governments will endeavor to obtain
0	the agreement of the British and other governments
1	to give up extra territorial rights in China, including

25

22

"6. The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan will enter into negotiations

and under the Boxer Protocol of 1901.

rights in international settlements and in concessions

7

9

11

12 13

15

14

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for the conclusion between the United States and
Japan of a trade agreement, based upon reciprocal
most-favored-nation treatment and reduction of trade
barriers by both countries, including an undertaking
by the United States to bind raw silk on the free
list.

"7. The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan will, respectively, remove the freezing restrictions on Japanese funds in the United States and on Imerican funds in Japan.

"8. Both Governments will agree upon a plan for the stabilization of the dollar-yen rate, with the allocation of funds adequate for this purpose, half to be supplied by Japan and half by the United States.

"9. Both Governments will agree that no agreement which either has concluded with any third power or powers shall be interpreted by it in such a way as to conflict with the fundamental purpose of this agreement, the establishment and preservation of peace throughout the Pacific area.

"10. Both Governments will use their influence to cause other governments to adhere to and to give practical application to the basic political and economic principles set forth in this agreement."

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

THE WITNESS: (Reading) "Although, it subsequently appeared, the Japanese treated the November 26 proposal as finally disposing of the question of negotiating a peaceful settlement covering the Pacific area, they kept up the appearance of continuing 6 negotiations right cown to December 7. "On December 2, the President directed that inquiry be made at once of the Japanese Ambassador and Mr. KURUSU in regard to the reasons for continued

Japanese troop movements into Indo-China. On December 5. the Japanese Ambassador called and presented to the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Welles, a reply to the President's inquiry of Lecember 2 containing the specious statement that Japanese reinforcements had been sent to Indo-China as a precautionary measure against Chinese troops in bordering Chinese territory. On December 6, President Roosevelt telegraphed a personal appeal to the Emperor of Japan that the 'tragic possibilities' in the situation be avoided. At the President's express direction the message was sent in the 'gray' code, a non-confidential code which the Japanese would have no difficulty in deciphering. In order to assure prompt decoding and delivery by Ambassador Grew of that message, a brief telegram was sent him shortly in advance to be ready for a message

22 23

24

evidence.

to the Emperor which was being put on the wires. The alerting message was dispatched on December 6 at 8 p.m.; the message to the Emperor at 9 p.m. There is annexed as Exhibit M a copy of the message to the Emperor."

MR. KEENAN: The exhibit is tendered in

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 2215-M will receive exhibit No. 1245-J.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 2215-M, and was received in evidence.)

MR. HIGGINS: I will read prosecution's exhibit No. 1245-J.

"'President Roosevelt to Emperor Hirohito
of Japan'

"'(Washington), December 6, 1941

"'Almost a century ago the President of
the United States addressed to the Emperor of Japan
a message extending an offer of friendship of the
people of the United States to the people of Japan.
That offer was accepted, and in the long period of
unbroken peace and friendship which has followed,
our respective nations, through the virtues of
their peoples and the wisdom of their rulers have

prospered and have substantially helped humanity.

"'Only in situations of extraordinary importance to our two countries need I address to Your Majesty messages on matters of state. I feel I should now so address you because of the deep and far-reaching emergency which appears to be in formation.

"Developments are occuring in the Pacific area which threaten to deprive each of our nations and all humanity of the beneficial influence of the long peace between our two countries. Those developments contain tragic possibilities.

"The people of the United States, believing in peace and in the right of nations to live and let live, have eagerly watched the conversations between our two Governments during these past months. We have hoped for a termination of the present conflict between Japan and China. We have hoped that a peace of the Pacific could be consummated in such a way that nationalities of many diverse recoples could exist side by side without fear of invasion; that unbearable burdens of armaments could be lifted for them all; and that all peoples would resume commerce without discrimination against or in favor of any nation.

"'I am certain that it will be clear to

1 2

Your Majesty, as it is to me, that in seeking these great objectives both Japan and the United States should agree to eliminate any form of military threat. This seemed essential to the attainment of the high objectives.

Government concluded an agreement with the Vichy
Government by which five or six thousand Japanese
troops were permitted to enter into Northern French
Indo-China for the protection of Japanese troops
which were operating against China further north.
And this Spring and Summer the Vichy Government
permitted further Japanese military forces to enter
into Southern French Indo-China for the common
defense of French Indo-China. I think I am correct
in saying that no attack has been made upon IndoChina, nor that any has been contemplated.

"During the past few weeks it has become clear to the world that Japanese military, naval and air forces have been sent to Southern Indo-China in such large numbers as to create a reasonable doubt on the part of other nations that this continuing concentration in Indo-China is not defensive in its character.

"'Because these continuing concentrations

in Indo-China have reached such large proportions and because they extend now to the southeast and the southwest corners of that Peninsula, it is only reasonable that the people of the Philippines, of the hundreds of Islands of the East Indies, of Malaya and of Thailand itself are asking themselves whether these forces of Japan are preparing or intending to make attack in one or more of these many directions. "'I am sure that Your Majesty will understand that the fear of all these reonles is a legiti-10

mate fear in as much as it involves their peace and their national existence. I am sure that Your Majesty will understand why the people of the United States in such large numbers look askance at the establishment of military, naval and air bases manned and squipped so greatly as to constitute armed forces capable of measures of offense.

"'It is clear that a continuance of such a situation is unthinkable.

"'None of the peoples whom I have spoken of above can sit either indefinitely or permanently on a keg of dynamite.

"There is absolutely no thought on the part of the United States of invading Indo-China if every Japanese soldier or sailor were to be

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

withdrawn therefrom.

assurance from the Governments of the East Indies, the Governments of Malaya and the Government of Thailand. I would even undertake to ask for the same assurance on the part of the Government of China. Thus a withdrawal of the Japanese forces from Indo-China would result in the assurance of peace throughout the whole of the South Pacific area.

this moment in the fervent hope that Your Majesty may, as I am doing, give thought in this definite emergency to ways of dispelling the dark clouds. I am confident that both of us, for the sake of the peoples not only of our own great countries but for the sake of humanity in neighboring territories, have a sacred duty to restore traditional amity and prevent further death and destruction in the world.

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

"(Foreign Relations, Vol. II, p. 784-786)"

THE WITNESS: (Reading) "The press was 1 informed by the White House at about 7.40 p.m. on December 6 of the fact that a message to the Emperor was being dispatched. "On Sunday, December 7, at about 12 o'clock noon, the Secretary of State, in response to a telephone request from the Japanese Ambassador, made an appointment to receive the Ambassador and Mr. KURUSU at 1 p.m. Shortly after 1 p.m., the Ambassador and Mr. KURUSU asked by telephone that the appointment be postponed until 1.45 p.m. They arrived at the Department of State at 11 12 2.05 p.m. and were received by the Secretary at 2.20 p.m. 13 The Japanese Ambassador said that he had been instructed 14 by his Government to deliver a paper at 1 p.m., but 15 that difficulty in decoding the message had delayed 16 him. He then handed the Secretary a document, a copy

MR. KEENAN: Exhibit N is tendered to the Tribunal in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted.

of which is annexed as Exhibit N."

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 2215-N will receive exhibit No. 1245-K.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1245-K, and was received in evidence.)

21

17

18

19

20

22

23

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

MR. HIGGINS: I read Prosecution exhibit No. 1245-K.

"Memorandum Handed by the Japanese Ambassador (NOMURA) to the Secretary of State at 2.20 P. M. on December 7, 1941.

"1. The Government of Japan, prompted by a genuine desire to come to an amicable understanding with the Government of the United States in order that the two countries by their joint efforts may secure the peace of the Pacific Area and thereby contribute toward the realization of world peace, has continued negotiations with the utmost sincerity since April last with the Government of the United States regarding the adjustment and advancement of Japanese-American relations and the stabilization of the Pacific Area.

"'The Japanese Government has the honor to state frankly its views concerning the claims the American Government has persistently maintained as well as the measures the United States and Great Britain have taken toward Japan during these eight months.

1112. It is the immutable policy of the Japanese Government to insure the stability of East Asia and to promote world peace and thereby to enable

S p

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

all nations to find each its proper place in the world.

"'Ever since China Affair broke out owing to the failure on the part of China to comprehend Japan's true intentions, the Japanese Government has striven for the restoration of peace and it has consistently exerted its best efforts to prevent the extention of war-like disturbances. It was also to that end that in September last year Japan concluded the Tripartite Pact with Germany and Italy.

Great Britain have resorted to every possible measure to assist the Chungking regime so as to obstruct the establishment of a general peace between Japan and China, interfering with Japan's constructive endeavours toward the stabilization of East Asia. Exerting pressure on the Netherlands East Indies, or menacing French Indo-China, they have attempted to frustrate Japan's aspiration to the ideal of common prosperity in cooperation with these regions. Furthermore, when Japan in accordance with its protocol with France took measures of joint defence of French Indo-China, both American and British Governments, wilfully misinterpreting it as a threat to their own possessions, and

inducing the Netherlands Government to follow suit, they enforced the assets freezing order, thus severing economic relations with Japan. While manifesting thus an obviously hostile attitude, these countries have stengthened their military preparations perfecting an encircelement of Japan, and have brought about a situation which endangers the very existence of the Empire.

settlement, the Premier of Japan proposed, in
August last, to meet the President of the United
States for a discussion of important problems
between the two countries covering the entire
Pacific area. However, the American Government,
while accepting in principle the Japanese proposal,
insisted that the meeting should take place after
an agreement of view had been reached on fundamental
and essential questions.

"'3. Subsequently, on September 25th
the Japanese Government submitted a proposal based
on the formula proposed by the American Government,
taking fully into consideration past American
claims and also incorporating Japanese views.
Repeated discussions proved of no avail in producing readily an agreement of view. The present

cabinet, therefore, submitted a revised proposal, moderating still further the Japanese claims regarding the principal points of difficulty in the negotiation and endeavoured strenuously to reach a settlement. But, the American Government, adhering steadfastly to its original assertions, failed to display in the slightest degree a spirit of conciliation. The negotiation made no progress.

"Therefore, the Japanese Government, with a view to doing its utmost for averting a crisis in Japanese-American relations, submitted on November 20th still another proposal in order to arrive at an equitable solution of the more essential and urgent questions which, simplifying its previous proposal, stipulated the following points:

"'(1) The Governments of Japan and the United States undertake not to dispatch armed forces into any of the regions, excepting French Indo-China, in the Southeastern Asia and the Southern Pacific area.

"'(2) Both Governments shall cooperate with the view to securing the acquisition in the Netherlands East Indies of those goods and commodities of which the two countries are in need."

3

4 5

6

8

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

25

take to restore commercial relations to those prevailing prior to the freezing of assets.

"The Government of the United States shall supply Japan the required quantity of oil.

undertakes not to resort to measures and actions prejudicial to the endeavours for the restoration of general peace between Japan and China.

"'(5) The Japanese Government undertakes to withdraw troops now stationed in French Indo-China upon either the restoration of peace between Japan and China or the establishment of an equitable peace in the Pacific Area; and it is prepared to remove the Japanese troops in the southern part of French Indo-China to the northern part upon the conclusion of the present agreement.

"'As regards China, the Japanese Government, while expressing its readiness to accept the offer of the President of the United States to act as introducer' of peace between Japan and China as was previously suggested, asked for an undertaking on the part of the United States to do nothing prejudicial to the restoration of Sino-Japanese peace when the two parties have commenced direct

negotiations.

jected the above-mentioned new proposal, but made known its intention to continue its aid to Chiang Kai-shek; and in spite of its suggestion mentioned above, withdrew the offer of the President to act as so-called 'introducer' of peace between Japan and China, pleading that time was not yet ripe for

it. Finally on November 26th, in an attitude to impose upon the Japanese Government those principles it has persistently maintained, the American Government made a proposal totally ignoring Japanese

claims, which is a source of profound regret to the Japanese Government.

negotiation the Japanese Government has always maintained an attitude of fairness and moderation, and did its best to reach a settlement, for which it made all possible concessions often in spite of great difficulties. As for the China question which constituted an important subject of the negotiation, the Japanese Government showed a most conciliatory attitude. As for the principle of non-discrimination in international commerce, advocated by the American Government, the Japanese

18,

Government expressed its desire to see the said principle applied throughout the world, and declared that along with the actual practice of this principle in the world, the Japanese Government would endeavour to apply the same in the Pacific Area including China, and made it clear that Japan had no intention of excluding from China economic activities of third powers pursued on an equitable basis. Furthermore, as regards the question of withdrawing troops from French Indo-China, the Japanese Government even volunteered, as mentioned above, to carry out an immediate evacuation of troops from Southern French Indo-China as a measure of easing the situation.

"'It is presumed that the spirit of conciliation exhibited to the utmost degree by the Japanese Government in all these matters is fully appreciated by the American Government.

ment, always holding fast to theories in disregard of realities, and refusing to yield an inch on its impractical principles, caused undue delay in the negotiation. It is difficult to understand this attitude of the American Government and the Japanese Government desires to call the attention of the

5 6

8 9

American Government especially to the following points:

in the name of world peace those principles favorable to it and urges upon the Japanese Government the acceptance thereof. The peace of the world may be brought about only by discovering a mutually acceptable formula through recognition of the reality of the situation and mutual appreciation of one another's position. An attitude such as ignores realities and imposes one's selfish views upon others will scarcely serve the purpose of facilitating the consummation of negotiations.'"

"'Of the various principles put forward by
the American Government as a basis of the JapaneseAmerican Agreement, there are some which the Japanese
Government is ready to accept in principle, but in
view of the world's actual conditions, it seems only
a utopian ideal on the part of the American Government
to attempt to force their immediate adoption.

"'Again, the proposal to conclude a multilateral non-aggression pact between Japan, United States
Great Britain, China, the Soviet Union, the Netherlands
and Thailand, which is patterned after the old concept
of collective security, is far removed from the realities of East Asia.

lation which states—'Both Governments will agree that no agreement, which either has concluded with any third power or powers, shall be interpreted by it in such a way as to conflict with the fundamental purpose of this agreement, the establishment and preservation of peace throughout the Pacific area'. It is presumed that the above provision has been proposed with a view to restrain Japan from fulfilling its obligations under the Tripartite Pact when the United States participates in the War in Europe, and, as such, it cannot be accepted by the Japanese Government."

"The American Government, obsessed with its own views and opinions, may be said to be scheming for the extension of the war. While it seeks, on the one hand, to secure its rear by stabilizing the Pacific Area, it is engaged, on the other hand, in aiding Great Britain and preparing to attack, in the name of self-defense, Germany and Italy, two Powers that are striving to establish a new order in Europe. Such a policy is totally at variance with the many principles upon which the American Government proposes to found the stability of the Pacific Area through peaceful means.

the principles it rigidly unholds, objects to settle international issues through military pressure, it is exercising in conjunction with Great Britain and other nations pressure by economic power. Recourse to such pressure as a means of dealing with international relations should be condemned as it is at times more inhumane than military pressure.

"'4. It is impossible not to reach the conclusion that the American Government desires to maintain and strengthen, in coalition with Great Britain and other Powers, its dominant position it has hither-to occupied not only in China but in other areas of East Asia. It is a fact of history that the countries

1

3

5

7

6

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

been compelled to observe the status quo under the Anglo-American policy of imperialistic exploitation and to sacrifice themselves to the prosperity of the two nations. The Japanese Government cannot tolerate the perpetuation of such a situation since it directly runs counter to Japan's fundamental policy to enable all nations to enjoy each its proper place in the world.

"The stipulation proposed by the American Government relative to French Indo-China is a good exemplification of the above-mentioned American policy. Thus the six countries, -- Japan, the United States, Great Britain, the Netherlands, China and Thailand .-- excepting France, should undertake among themselves to respect the territorial integrity and sovereignty of French Indo-China and equality of treatment in trade and commerce would be tantamount to placing that territory under the joint guarantee of the Governments of those six countries. Apart from the fact that such a proposal totally ignores the position of France, it is unacceptable to the Japanese Government in that such an arrangement cannot but be considered as an extension to French Indo-China of a system similar to the Nine-power Treaty structure which is the chief factor

2

4 5

7

8

9

11

1213

14

1516

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

responsible for the present predicament of East Asia.

"'5. All the items demanded of Japan by the American Government regarding China such as wholesale evacuation of troops or unconditional application of the principle of non-discrimination in international commerce ignored the actual conditions of China, and are calculated to destroy Japan's position as the stabilizing factor of East Asia. The attitude of the American Government in demanding Japan not to support militarily, politically or economically any regime other than the regime at Chungking, disregarding thereby the existence of the Manking Government, shatters the very basis of the present negotiation. This demand of the American Government falling, as it does, in line with its above-mentioned refusal to cease from aiding the Chungking regime, demonstrates clearly the intention of the American Government to obstruct the restoration of normal relations between Japan and China and the return of peace to East Asia.

tains certain acceptable items such as those concerning commerce, including the conclusion of a trade agreement, mutual removal of the freezing restrictions, and stabilization of yen and dollar exchange, or the abolition of extra-territorial rights in Thina. On the other hand,

,

however, the proposal in question ignores Japan's sacrifices in the four years of the China Affair, menaces the Empire's existence itself and disparages its honour and prestige. Therefore, viewed in its entirety, the Japanese Government regrets that it cannot accept the proposal as a basis of negotiation.

for an early conclusion of the negotiation, proposed simultaneously with the conclusion of the Japanese-American negotiation, agreements to be signed with Great Britain and other interested countries. The proposal was accepted by the American Government.

However, since the American Government has made the proposal of November 26th as a result of frequent consultation with Great Britain, Australia, the Netherlands and Chungking, and presumably by catering to the wishes of the Chungking regime in the questions of China, it must be concluded that all these countries are at one with the United States in ignoring Japan's position.

"'7. Obviously it is the intention of the American Government to conspire with Great Britain and other countries to obstruct Japan's efforts toward the establishment of peace through the creation of a new order in East Asia, and especially to preserve

Anglo-American rights and interests by keeping Japan and China at war. This intention has been revealed clearly during the course of the present negotiation. Thus, the earnest hope of the Japanese Government to adjust Japanese-American relations and to preserve and promote the peace of the Pacific through cooperation with the American Government has finally been lost.

"The Japanese Government regrets to have to notify hereby the American Government that in view of the attitude of the American Government it cannot but consider that it is impossible to reach an agreement through further negotiations.

"'Washington, December 7, 1941.'

"(Foreign Relations, Vol. II, p. 787-792.)"

THE WITNESS (Reading):

2

1

3

4

5

6

/

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"The Japanese message was not a declaration of war with reasons or an ultimatum. It was not even a declaration of intention to sever diplomatic relations.

"The allegations in the Japanese message are contrary to fact. Since the outset of the conversations between the two governments, the effort of the Japanese Government was directed toward inducing the United States to surrender its basic policy, while the Japanese Government maintained intact its policy of aggression and force. The immutable policy of the Japanese Government to ensure the stability of East Asia was predicated upon establishing at the outset a complete Japanese military and economic stranglehold over China, calling for Japanese control over strategic Chinese industries and facilities, referred to euphemistically in terms such as 'conomic cooperation with China, and retention in large areas of China for an indefinite period of large Japanese garrisons to protect Japan's holdings, a stipulation cloaked under the innocent sounding provision 'jointdefense against Communism. These terms were embodied in the so-called 'treaty' of 1940 between Japan and the puppet Wang Ching-wei regime. The Japanese Government sought to obtain American assent to the imposition of

these terms on the Chinese Government. At no time did the Japanese Government budge from insistence upon these terms, and for the Japanese Government to speak of making the utmost concessions is a monstrous distortion of the facts. It was because of this intransigent position of the Japanese Government that it would heed no suggestion looking toward an amicable adjustment of its differences with China. The contention that the Japanese Government's proposal of September 25 was based upon the American proposal is not sustained by a comparison of the two proposals. An analysis of the espential characteristic of the Japanese proposal of November 20 has already been presented above.

"Refusal on the part of China to come to agreement with Japan of Japan's terms was due not to failure on the part of China to understand Japan's true intentions, as alleged, but to the fact that Japan's true intentions were clearly understood by China. The American policy of assisting the Chinese Government was inspired by a desire to prevent Japan from coercing China with a peace settlement under which China would become completely dominated by Japan. The policy of the United States and its friends, including the imposition of freezing measures, was one of self-defense against the publicly proclaimed Japa-

nese policy of general aggression. The offer of the Government of the United States, contained in its proposal of June 21, under which 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! was of course made contingent upon Japan's entering into a general agreement along the lines of the June 21 proposal and was never withdrawn. The American Government's proposal of November 26 represented a practical application of principles which had been under discussion during months of negotiations, and was nothing new; it offered Japan various benefits which would have been welcomed by any country bent on pursuing peaceful courses. Such delay as occurred in the conversations arose entirely from the firm adherence of the Japanese Government to its fixed policies of aggression. It is not clear what is meant by the Japanese contention that the American proposal for a multilateral non-aggression pact was far removed from the realities of East Asia, unless it was that the proposal conflicted with the Japanese plan for establishing Japanese domination of the entire Western Pacific area. The charge that the

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

United States was scheming for an extension of the war was, on its face, preposterous. The charge that the United States, in conjunction with Great Britain, was exercising economic pressure in order to deal with international relations refers obviously to the freezing measure which was resorted to as a necessary measure of self-defense after Japan had launched its largescale forward military movement into Southern Indo-China so as to imperil the security of American, British and Dutch territory. The charge that the United States desired to maintain and strengthen its alleged dominant position in China is, on its face, absurd as the United States never sought nor did it ever have a dominant position in China or in the Far East. With regard to the contention that the United States sought to obstruct the creation by Japan of a new order in East Asia, it is of course true that the United States was consistently opposed to Japan's pretensions to the arrogation to itself of a position of military dominance throughout the Far East and the western Pacific area.

"The Secretary of State read the Japanese document, turned to the Japanese Ambassador, and said, 'I must say in all my conversations with you /the Japanese Ambassador/ during the last nine months I

23 24

25

have never uttered one word of untruth. This is 1 borne out absolutely by the record. In all my fifty 2 years of public service I have never seen a document 3 4 that was more crowded with infamous falsehoods and 5 distortions -- infamous falsehoods and distortions on a 6 scale so huge that I never imagined until today that any government on this planet was capable of uttering 8 them. 1 9 "The Ambassador and Mr. KURUSU then took 10 their leave without making any comment. "This interview, as later appeared, took 12

place more than an hour after the Japanese armed forces had struck without warning at Pearl Harbor and over two hours after an actual Japanese landing in Malaya and four hours after they had crossed the boundary of the International Settlement at Shanghai. These facts were not mentioned by NOMURA and KURUSU.

18

11

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KEENAN: You may cross-examine.

2

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

BY MR. BLAKENEY:

A

23

22

24

25

Who: prepared your affidavit, Mr. Witness?

I prepared it largely myself from the records.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

That is to say, you wrote it yourself? Q

MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, the Tribunal has already stated that it would not take into consideration any conclusions of the witness. At the conclusion of the testimony of this witness 6 the defense believes that his master affidavit, not the documents which he introduced in support thereof, but his master affidavit in its entirety, not only amounts to a conclusion of the witness, but in addition, to a summation, a summation of the prosecution's viewpoint on this matter, and is not the testimony of the witness. We, therefore, ask that the master affi-

from the record for that reason, so that the defense will not have to contend with it in this cross-examination.

davit only, not including the exhibits, be stricken

THE PRESIDENT: There is much in the affidavit that is admissible, much that is not. We gave our decision yesterday, and we are not going to review it.

Major Blakeney.

3

4

5

6

/

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22 23

24

25

A Largely myself.

Q Since I note that approximately sixty-five per cent of it is taken verbatim from the Department of State's "Peace and War" or its "Diplomatic Relations" or Mr. Hull's Statement to Congress, may I assume that you wrote those documents also?

A There were a number of people that collaborated in the drafting or preparation of the documents.

I was one of those people.

Q As one of the staff of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs of the Department of State in 1941, did you participate rather extensively in the Japanese-American conversations?

A I was present at most of the conversations between the Secretary of State and the Japanese representatives.

THE PRESIDENT: Speak closer to the microphone, please, Mr. Ballantine.

The IBM is out of order. We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1200. after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.
THE PRESIDENT: This Court will not sit on
Thanksgiving Day which is Thursday of next week.
That is because it has been decreed a holiday by the
Supreme Commander.

Will the reporter kindly repeat the last three questions and answers?

(Whereupon, the official court reporter read as follows:)

"Q Who prepared your affidavit, Mr. Witness?

"A I prepared it largely myself from the records.

"Q That is to say, you wrote it yourself?

"A Largely myself.

"G Since I note that approximately sixty-five per cent of it is taken verbatim from the Department of State's 'Peace and War' or its 'Diplomatic Relations' or Mr. Hull's Statement to Congress, may I assume that you wrote these documents also?

"A There were a number of people that collaborated in the drafting or preparation of the documents.

I was one of those people.

"Q As one of the staff of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs of the Department of State in 1941,

did you participate rather extensively in the Japanese-American conversations? 11 A I was present at most of the conversations 3 between the Secretary of State and the Japanese 4 5 representatives. 6 THE PRESIDENT: Speak closer to the micro-7 phone, please, Mr. Ballantine. 8 The I. B. M. is out of order. We will 9 recess for fifteen minutes. 10 BY MR. BLAKENEY (Continued): 11 Did you also, then, Mr. Witness, attend to 12 the drafting of proposals and counter proposals and 13 other documents submitted in the course of these 14 conversations? 15 I collaborated as one of a team in the 16 drafting of documents. 17 Was that team under your direction? 18 That team was under the direction --19 constant direction of the Secretary of State him-20 self, and I was the most junior member of the three 21 principal advisers of the Secretary of State on Far 22 Eastern matters. 23 May we have the names of the other two, 24 please? 25

Stanley K. Hornbeck, adviser -- political

2

4

6

8

9

11

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

22

24

25

adviser, and Maxwell Hamilton, Chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs.

Q You were, then, however, quite familiar with the course and progress of the conversations, were you not?

A Yes.

In your affidavit commences with the suggestion which had been informally brought to the attention of the Secretary of State. This you say was followed by discussions between the Secretary of State and the President and the Japanese Ambassador.

A Yes.

Q And you then referred to the Japanese proposal of the 12th of May, which is exhibit B to your affidavit. Was there not actually a preceding draft proposal of some nature?

A There was a draft proposal brought informally to the Secretary of State on April 9.

Q That is the document, is it not, which has been introduced in this case as exhibit No. 1059, entitled "Proposal Presented to the Department of State Through the Medium of Private American and Japanese Individuals on April 9, 1941"?

A Yes.

1
2
4
3
2
1
4
5
1
1
6
7
1
8
8
0
9
9
LILY TO
10
10
11
11
12
17
12
13
13
13
13
13 14
14
14
14
14
14
14 15
14 15
14
14 15
14 15
14 15 16
14 15 16
14 15 16
14 15
14 15 16
14 15 16 17
14 15 16 17
14 15 16 17
14 15 16
14 15 16 17
14 15 16 17
14 15 16 17 18
14 15 16 17 18
14 15 16 17 18
14 15 16 17
14 15 16 17 18
14 15 16 17 18 19 20
14 15 16 17 18 19 20
14 15 16 17 18

23

24

25

Q And the existence of this document then explains the references in your exhibit B to amendments to the original draft proposal, does it not?

A That is correct.

Q Can you tell us who prepared this original draft presented on the 9th of April, 1941?

A I do not know. It would be just an assumption on my part.

Q Well, let me put it this way: Who were the priviate individuals, American and Japanese, whom you knew to be working on this question and who discussed it with the Department of State?

A The private individuals were a Mr. WIKAWA,
Takao and a Colonel IWAKURO, and a Father Drought of
the Maryknoll Mission, and also, I believe, Bishop
Walsh of the Maryknoll Mission.

Q Was Postmaster General Walker also one of that group?

A As far as I know, he didn't participate in any drafting; he simply acted as medium for communications.

Q Bishop Walsh and Father Drought had visited Japan either early in 1941 or late in 1940, had they not?

A According to what Father Drought told me,

3

5

4

6

8

10

11

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

25

he	and	Bishop	Walsh	had	visited	Japan	in	the	latter
par	et of	1940.							

Q Did they also tell you that while in Japan they had had talks with Premier KONOYE and other individuals in high offices?

A They told me that they had talks with high individuals. I do not recall definitely whose names they specifically mentioned except Mr. MATSUOKA.

They did mention him specifically, I recall definitely.

Q Then you do not know whether these people prepared the original draft proposal, but they were interested in it and working on the matter.

A That is correct.

Q How was this draft actually brought to the attention of the President and the Secretary of State?

A If I recall correctly, it was delivered to the Secretary of State by the Postmaster General, but I couldn't swear to that.

Q In discussing the matter, you used several times the expression "it was represented that."

May I ask who made these representations? I am referring to paragraph six of page 7 of your affidavit.

A It was represented -- my information on it

	was derived from Father Drought; and, from what he
1	told me, he had got his word from WIKAWA.
2	Q Mr. WIKAWA was a private citizen connected
3	with a bank in New York, was he not?
4	A So far as I know, at that time he was not;
5	he was connected with the Cooperative Banks in
6	Japan.
7	Q After this draft proposal came into the
9	hands of the Department of State, it was discussed,
10	was it not, between Secretary Hull and Ambassador
11	NOMURA?
12	A It was discussed on April 14 and April 16
13	as the record in Foreign Relations will show.
14	Q Ambassador NOMURA told Secretary Hull that
15	he was aware of the existence and nature of this
16	draft, did he not?
17	A Yes. He said he collaborated with these
18	private individuals.
19	Q However, there was no suggestion that the
20	draft had official standing, was there?
21	A That is correct.
22	Q On either side.
23	Now, leaving the question of this draft out
24	of consideration for the moment, I ask you at whose
25	initiative the Japanese-American conversations were

## commenced?

A I think you will find in the record on -some time in March that Mr. Hull and Ambassador
NOMURA had agreed that such efforts to be made to
improve Japanese-American relations were to be
considered a joint initiative.

Q Isn't it a fact that so far as the records show, the subject was first raised by President Roosevelt in talking with Ambassador NOMURA on the 14th of February, 1941?

A I don't know how far you could go on that. It would normally lead between the Ambassador coming to present his credentials to the President -- the President would take the lead in a conversation of that nature.

Q Well, the point that I am asking you to confirm is that, whatever would usually happen, on this occasion the President did, in effect, invite Ambassador NOMURA to initiate informal discussions with the Secretary of State.

A Well, I think that record speaks for itself.

Q In any event, may we assume that the record as published in the Department of State's "Foreign Relations" is correct?

3 4

A Yes.

Q Have you any information as to the light in which the Japanese representatives -- the Ambassador and others -- viewed the draft proposal of the 16th of April and, specifically, whether they viewed it as being an American proposal or a Japanese proposal or a private individuals' proposal?

A I think the Secretary of State made it perfectly clear to the Japanese Ambassador that it was not an American proposal because he explained that there were some parts in it we could accept, some parts that would require revision, some parts we couldn't accept.

Q May I ask whether Secretary Hull also requested Ambassador NOMURA to obtain instructions from his government on the basis of this draft proposal before conversations should start?

A As I recall, Mr. Hull said to Ambassador NOMURA that he could not have official conversations except on a proposal that the Japanese Ambassador presented under instructions. I think that he also left to the Ambassador the question of whether he wanted to get instructions on that particular proposal.

Q And Ambassador NOMURA then did later state

that he had been authorized to commence discussions, did he not?

A He did so when he presented the draft of May 12.

Morse & Barton

Q The draft of the 12th of May purports to be a proposal of amendments to the original text of the 16th of April. Do you consider that there are significant differences between the two drafts?

A In the first place, the question of whether it is an amendment or a redraft is a matter to be inferred from their explanatory statement. There are quite a few differences, however, between the April 9 draft and the May 12 draft.

Q In your affidavit you have undertaken a comparison of the draft of the 16th of May with the American counter proposal of the 21st of June. As I understand from this comparison, what you designate as essential differences of substance between the two drafts fall into three broad classes. These are, first, the question of the attitudes of the respective governments toward the European War, or what we might call the Tripartite Pact question. Is that so?

A That is one.

Q Second, the question of Chinese-Japanese relations and the settlement of the China Affair. Is that another?

A That is correct.

Q And, thirdly, the question of the economic activities of the two nations in the Pacific area and

especially with reference to non-discriminatory 1 commercial opportunity in China. 2 A Well, the third I would modify to say non-4 discriminatory -- the principle of non-discrimination in international intercourse throughout the Pacific area. 7 Very well. We will accept your amendment. 8 Then these three main questions represented, as of that time, the fundamental points of difference between 10 the two governments, did they? 11 That is correct. 12 And is it also correct that, broadly speaking, 13 these three questions furnished the subject matter of 14 the conversations from beginning to end? 15 Except as created by the new situation, by 16 Japan's movement into southern Indo-China. There was 17 the Indo-China question and the resulting freezing 18 measures which added two further topics. 19 Then it was these three questions which I 20 have mentioned, plus the Indo-China and freezing of 21 assets question which you have added, which finally 22 resulted in the failure of any agreement? 23 I would say so except that these questions 24 were -- represented applications of principles of

peace which caused the failure to reach an agreement.

Q Yes. That is to say that, as usually occurs in diplomatic negotiations, the principles were agreed upon but the applications could not be agreed upon. Is that so?

A Well, even the fundamental principles, there were no clear-cut commitments by the Japanese.

Q In any event, let us discuss these points of difference seriatim, and first the Tripartite Pact question. Now, is this a fair statement of the problem involved, that the problem on our side was to convince the Japanese that our involvement, which we foresaw, in the European War was being brought about by the demands of American self-defense, and that in a situation so brought about the Japanese should agree not to consider themselves bound to action under the Tripartite Pact?

A Our problem was to -- we envisaged an agreement for peace covering the entire Pacific area. One of the possibilities through which war might come in the Pacific area was if Japan, interpreting its obligations under the Axis, thought it might have to attack us if we got involved in the European War. We wanted to make perfectly clear to the Japanese our concept of becoming involved through acts of self-defense.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Ballantine, to save time will you kindly speak in short sentences and pause for

1 translation at the end of each sentence?

- Q Had you finished your answer?
- A Yes.

Q The differences between the parties on this point eventually turned on the definition of self-defense, did they not?

A No. The difference turned on the failure of the Japanese to give us any assurance that we would not -- that Japan's obligations under the Tripartite Pact, as she interpreted herself, did not require Japan -- or might not require Japan to attack us. There was no difference in the concept that each country must be its own judge of its own self-defense.

Q Did not the Japanese negotiators, time after time, state to the officials of the Department of State that they did dissent from the American contention that each nation had a right to judge the requirements of self-defense?

A I don't recall any contention of that nature.

Q So there shall be no misunderstanding whatever, I will put it still more specifically. Did not Ambas-sadors NOMURA and KURUSU repeatedly state to Secretary Hull and to you that they could not accept the American definition of self-defense because it was too broad?

A There was no difference on the point that each

nation must be the judge of what should constitute its own self-defense. What the Japanese representatives said was they could not, in an agreement, give us a blank check and agree not to attack us on our concept of self-defense.

Q Attack us, that is, if we became involved in the European War acting in self-defense?

A They said that if we became involved in the European War they would independently make their own interpretations of what their obligations were under the alliance.

Q But we said that if, acting in self-defense, we becake involved in that war there was no room for interpretation of their obligations.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, I would like to enter an objection to the question in that form unless Mr. Blakeney explains whom he means by "we". He is representing Japanese defendants accused in this case.

MR. BLAKENEY: I have been an American all my life and I still speak as one.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection, of course, was to your making a statement to the witness instead of putting a question to him. You can use your own discretion as to the extent to which you will identify yourself with your Japanese clients.

1 MR. BLAKENEY: I will be glad, if the Tribunal desires, to add "is that not so." 2 THE WITNESS: May I have the question repeated 3 4 again? (Whereupon, the question was read by 5 the official court reporter as follows: "But we said that if, acting in self-defense, we became 7 involved in that war there was no room for inter-8 pretation of their obligations, is that not so?") 9 A We wanted clarification from the Japanese as 10 to what their attitude was, what they would do in case 11 we became involved through acts of self-defense, and we explained clearly what we meant by self-defense. 13 14 THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn now until half past one. 15 (Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

ħi.	1	AFTERNOON SESSION
0	1	
1 f	2	The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at
&	3	
D	4	1330.
u	5	MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
a		Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed,
	6	THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.
	7	THE FRESIDENT: Major brakeney.
	8	
	9	JOSEPH W. BALLANTINE, called as a
	10	witness on behalf of the prosecution, resumed
	11	the stand and testified as follows:
	12	CROSS-EXAMINATION
	13	BY MR. BLAKENEY (Continued):
	14	MR. BLAKENEY: May I ask the reporter to read
	15	the last answer.
	16	(Whereupon, the answer was read by
	17	the official court reporter as follows: "We
	18	wanted clarification from the Japanese as to
	19	what their attitude was, what they would do in
	20	case we became involved through acts of self-
	21	defense, and we explained clearly what we meant
	22	by 'self-defense.'")
	23	Q Then I ask you again whether the Japanese
	24	response was not in effect this: That they agreed

unconditionally to the existence of the right of

self-defense, but could not accept your explanation of its scope?

A The right of self-defense was not at issue nor was the question as to its -- our definition as to its scope at issue. The question of their giving us any commitments after we explained what our attitude was.

Q But did they not explain to you that the reason that they could not give that commitment was that they could not give you a blank check for anything which you might call self-defense.

The Japanese came to us and asked for an agreement covering peace in the whole Pacific area. There was one factor which might be likely to cause a disruption of that peace. Japan was a member of the Tri-Partite Alliance. There was a possibility that we might become involved in the war in the Atlantic. We wanted to ascertain from them their attitude, their obligations under the Pact as it affected that possibility.

Q And your position was, the position of the United States was, was it not, that certain acts were being taken which in the view of the United States were self-defense?

A Certain acts were being taken or might be taken

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in the future.

And the United States was requesting Japan to agree that if such acts of self-defense were taken in the future and did lead to involvement in the European war, that Japan would not be committed to action under the Tri-Partite Pact; is that a correct

A. That is only part of the story. The rest of the story is that we didn't ask for a new agreement. Japan came to us and asked for an agreement; so when they proposed us this proposal of May 12, we wanted clarification on that point.

And the Japanese wanted clarification on the point of how far you contended that your right of self-defense extended; did they not?

We volunteered that information to them at the outset.

How far did the right of self-defense extend? 0 MR. KEENAN: I object to that question, Mr. President, as being an improper one.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you mean to ask him whether the extent of the right was discussed and decided upon? MR. BLAKENEY: Yes, sir, I do.

THE WITNESS: I think that that right of self-defense is made clear in that speech that Mr. Hull

made, which is in the record. 1 That is Mr. Hull's speech of the 24th of 2 April. 1941? 3 I am not very good at remembering dates, but 4 I believe that is correct. 5 Q At any rate, was that the speech wherein he 6 stated that the defense of the United States called for resistance wherever resistance would be most effective? I didn't quite get the point of your ques-10 tion. 11 May I have it repeated, please. 12 (Whereupon, the last question was 13 read by the official court reporter.) 14 A (Continuing) That is correct. 15 16 Did he also point out in that speech that 17 the United States need not await an attack on the 18 American continent to call into exercise that right of 19 self-defense? 20 MR. KEENAN: If the Court please, the 21 prosecution objects to that on the ground that the 22 speech is in syidence, speaks for itself, and there 23 is no point in having this witness repeat certain 24 parts of it.

MR. BLAKENEY: The witness is not being asked

to repeat anything. He referred to the speech for his definition and I am asking him if the definition from that speech, as I stated it, is correct. 4 THE PRESIDENT: You can ask him whether 5 Mr. Hull is correctly reported in that speech, if 6 you really challenge it's accuracy. MR. BLAKENEY: I do not challenge it's 8 accuracy, sir. I am trying to make sure that the witness refers to the definition in the speech which I am offering to him as being the State Department's definition presented to the Japanese. THE PRESIDENT: The objection is upheld if that 13 is so. 14 Major Blakeney, I do not want to interfere 15 with the cross-examination, or I should say the Tribunal 16 does not, but it does appear to me at all events if you put to this witness the things which you say NOMURA and KURUSU said to him, or to Mr. Hull, and which do not appear in the exhibits, you will give us the maximum assistance. We will get very little assistance from any academic discussion about the mean-

ing of self-defense, or the right to it. MR. BLAKENEY: I propose doing what your Honor suggests, but I should like to point out that I think this witness can give us great assistance in one other

7

9

10

11

12

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

way. I think that we laymen, or at least this layman, require considerable assistance in understanding diplomatic negotiations, and here you have an expert on the subject.

THE PRESIDENT: From what I told you yester-day I think you should have inferred that we are not treating him as an expert; that is, as a person who can draw conclusions for us.

There is no diplomatic language, really; there may be a diplomatic style. But we reserve the right to give our meaning to the words used without any help from any diplomat.

MR. BLAKENEY: Perhaps the term "expert" was ill-chosen. I meant to suggest that this witness actually conducted many of these negotiations, many of the conversations which do not appear in the proposals and counter-proposals but supplement them.

of the Tribunal that the Japanese put all they had to say in writing. If you have been instructed that something has been left out, something that was said to Mr. Hull or to Mr. Ballantine, you may put it to him to see whether he accepts it or not.

MR. BLAKENEY: Obviously, sir, it was not all put in writing, because the witness has testified at length about informal conversations which went on over a period of six months.

THE PRESIDENT: There will be, of course, much reiteration, and there will be much stating of the

same thing in different ways. But we can rest assured that the Japanese did not fail to put in writing anything that was really material; unless you are instructed that something material was omitted and was known to Mr. Hull or to the witness.

MR. BLAKENEY: No, sir, I am not instructed to that effect. But my position, which I apparently haven't yet clearly stated, is that the negotiations, then-selves, the conversations, are material. Many of these documents on their face seem to say that the parties were in agreement, but we know that they were not. And I am trying to get--

THE PRESIDENT: It is going to be most difficult for us to pass over the documents and rely on conversations which the witness may or may not recollect.

MR. BLAKENEY: I do not ask the witness for his memory of the conversations. They are recorded.

THE PRESIDENT: Then you are asking him to interpret for us the writings which record them. We will not let him do it.

MR. BLAKENEY: I am asking him to narrow down for the Tribunal the actual issues in dispute so we can see what they came to.

BY MR. BLAKENEY (Continued):

Q We were speaking of self-defense. Was the American position on the scope of the right of self-defense also defined in a speech by President Roose-velt given over the radio on the 27th of May 1941?

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, I object to that question. There is nothing clearer than that the President of the United States is the chief executive of that government. What he says is recorded in writing and speaks for itself, and this Court can interpret the language as well as either this witness or counsel for the defense.

MR. BLAKENEY: I do not ask him to interpret.

I ask him whether it is a fact that there was such a speech defining the right of self-defense.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, if I may be permitted to observe, the speech is in the record. It is an exhibit in this case. I would suggest again that counsel is indirectly attempting to do that which I understood the Court said it did not wish to be done. Therefore, I object.

THE PRESIDENT: Are you referring to a speech already in evidence, Major Blakeney?

MR. BLAKENEY: Well, frankly, sir, I do not know. There are one thousand two hundred some odd

,

exhibits, and I am just not sure.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, we have a speech in the record of President Roosevelt dated in October. That may be a different one that Major Blakeney is referring to.

THE PRESIDENT: Mention the date of the speech to the witness.

Q 27th of May, 1941.

A I do not have any present recollection of that speech.

Q Do you remember any speech of President
Roosevelt in the spring of 1941 in which he stated
that the United States will decide for itself whether
and when and where our American interests are attacked
or our security threatened?

A I have no clear recollection of any speech at any particular time.

Q Do you agree that acceptance of the American definition of the right of self-defense required foreign nations to give advance approval to America's involvement in the European War as self-defense whenever and however it might have come about?

THE PRESIDENT: He told you the definition recognized by the State Department was in Mr. Hull's speech; and it will be for us to say what it means.

Q When the United States War Council, so-called, and the Cabinet of the United States on various occasions, such as the Cabinet meeting of the 7th of November 1941, discussed the possibility of ourselves attacking Japan, was that considered in the light of an act of self-defense?

MR. KEENAN: The prosecution objects to that question as being without the scope of the cross-examination, proper cross-examination.

MR. BLAKENEY: It seems to me that the scope of proper crrss-examination of the witness who conducted these negotiations involving these questions is anything concerning the interpretation of the question -- not of documents, but the question.

THE PRESIDENT: We will permit him to testify only as to what was said and done during the negotiations.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	Q Was any such statement as that made to you
1	by Secretary of State Hull or any other American
2	official high official?
3	A No.
5	Q I refer to the Executive Order of the 26th
6	of July, 1941, freezing Japanese assets in the

Q I refer to the Executive Order of the 26th of July, 1941, freezing Japanese assets in the United States referred to on page 10 of your affidavit, paragraph 3. You stated that, if I understand you correctly, that this executive order was an act of self-defense. Was this action, freezing assets, taken jointly by agreement with the governments of other nations?

A I do not know.

Q Do you know whether that action of the United States Government was followed on the following day -- was adopted on the following day by the governments of Great Britain and the Netherlands?

A I merely know that that action was either followed or taken about the same time by these two other governments.

Are you able to state whether the effect of the British and Dutch action upon trade between those nations and Japan was the same as the effect of the American action upon Japanese-American trade; that is, to bring about its virtual cessation?

-		
ı	L	
f		
-	)	

A I do not know.

Q Do you know whether the effect of the war in Europe had been to bring about a virtual cessation of trade between Japan and European countries?

THE PRESIDENT: That is beyond the scope of the affidavit, which is confined to the United States position.

MR. BLAKENEY: Well, possibly he does not know, but he does testify in his affidavit about the freezing of assets by Great Britain and the Nether-lands.

THE PRESIDENT: The American freezing.

Q Well, let me sum it up this way: Do you know whether after the freezing of assets by these governments Japan was in effect cut off from commercial intercourse with all of the world except those parts of Asia adjacent to her?

A I have no direct knowledge of the fact. I have not seen any trade figures, but it would be just a matter of assumption.

Q Do you know whether it is correct to say that the result of the freezing of assets by these various nations and the consequent cessation of trade had the effect of reducing Japan's foreign trade by about seventy-five per cent? Pardon me, I meant to

2

3

4 5

6

7 8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

say "imports", not "foreign trade."

I don't think I have ever made a calculation of that.

Are you able to sav that that is approximately correct without making a calculation?

A Well, I would make it within a much wider \$ range than that. It might be seventy-five percent, but then it might be, for all I know, it might be fifty-five per cent.

Then is it not true that the freezing of assets with the consequent cessation of trade to Japan constituted economic warfare upon Japan?

THE PRESIDENT: He is invited to express an opinion, and we do not want his opinions.

Did the State Department know in taking the steps toward freezing of Japanese assets that such steps would inevitably drive Japan to seek elsewhere and perhaps in other ways the necessary imports and raw materials upon which to operate?

A One could hardly know in advance what somebody else is going to do.

Did not the Department of State consider it highly probable that Japan would be compelled so to do?

A Not necessarily, because at that time the President offered Japan a peaceful alternative to the

3

5

6

7

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

course that she was pursuing.

What offer do you refer to?

His offer for the neutralization of Indo-China of July 24th.

But I refer to the time when it was decided to impose the assets freezing order, and I ask you whether the State Department did not consider it highly probable then that with the imposition of that order and its consequent effects Japan would turn elsewhere to secure the necessary trade and supplies?

That was only one alternative. The other put by the President's offer in regard to Indo-China was still pending. It was only two days since the offer was made.

Well, mention of the Indo-China question brings up another point. You knew, of course, the Japanese contention and complaint that Japan was being encircled?

We had heard a great deal about that.

Now was there not in truth an A, B, C, D, American, British, Chinese, Dutch cooperation on the subject of Japan and Pacific relations?

Naturally, in the situation then prevailing, it was necessary or desirable that the countries affected would consult with each other about means of

self-defense.

Q Then you of the Department of State did know that from, say January 1941, there had been military cooperation among those nations plus Australia with respect to possible action against Japan?

A I would say military consultations.

Q And did you of the Department of State know during the year 1941 that the joint defense plans of those nations were the only plans in existence for military defense of American Facific territories?

A I do not know that any particular plans of consultation were the only plans for defense.

Q Now, of course, the United States never accepted the implications of the term "encirclement," did it?

A The Acting Secretary of State told the Japanese Ambassador that the American policy was the opposite of encirclement policy.

O Nevertheless, accepting or rejecting the concept of encirclement, must we not concede that there was a basis in fact for the Japanese view that there existed the A, B, C, D combination for action against her?

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, the prosecution objects to that question as being without the scope -- proper scope of cross-examination. This witness is

offered to tell what he knew and what he saw and what he heard with reference to conversations leading towards peace. Now he is being asked about military combinations without the scope of the State Department or without the scope of his direct examination.

THE PRESIDENT: He is asked in effect to assume the Japanese had a certain view, and then he is asked whether on that assumption there was not a basis for . that view. That does not appear to be a proper question to put in cross-examination.

You, Major Blakeney, should know upon what the Japanese based their view, if they held it, and you should put to the witness that such were the facts; but you cannot properly ask him whether the Japanese view, if they held it, was properly held.

MR. BLAKENEY: I do not insist on the question at all. sir, but I should like to point out that the witness has testified in chief in very sweeping terms as to the attitude of the Department of State in negotiating.

THE PRESIDENT: I told you the Tribunal would disregard everything in the affidavit except statements of fact; that we would disregard his opinions, and only to his opinions can you justly apply the term "sweeping."

Well, let us return to the negotiations. On

3

5

7

6

9

8

10

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23 24

25

the question of the Tripartite Pact, did the positions of the parties gradually draw closer together?

A No.

Q We were referring to your comparison of the draft proposals of the 12th of May and the 21st of June. Meanwhile, however, have you not omitted one of the intervening drafts, that of the 31st of May?

That is the American draft of the 31st of May.

A I did omit that in my affidavit.

Was there any particular reason for its omission except that you considered it of little importance?

A Well, our June 21st draft was up to the time of our November 26th proposal, our last complete proposal. It represented the end of the thinking out and the discussions together of their original proposal of May 12th and, therefore, I thought to save time that I would make a comparison between those two proposals.

Q This draft. however, I refer to the 31st of May draft, does appear in the Department of State's "Foreign Relations," Volume II, does it not?

THE PRESIDENT: Have you seen Exhibit 1078, Major Blakeney?

MR. BLAKENEY: Which is that, sir?

2

3

4 5

6

Q

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: It bears on that question.

MR. BLAKENEY: 1078? I do not recognize it
by number, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: It is the proposal of the 31st of May, by Mr. Hull to Ambassador NOMURA.

MR. BLAKENEY: That is the document in question, and I wish to ask the witness to confirm that it contains this statement concerning the Tripartite Pact question.

THE PRESIDENT: The document speaks for itself, Major. We do not want his elucidation of it.

MR. BLAKENEY: I do not know any way to call the Tribunal's attention to the point I am trying to cross-examine unless I can call it to his attention.

THE PRESIDENT: Very well, proceed.

Q Very well. Then the 31st of May draft was redrafted in your June proposal, was it not?

A That is correct.

Q And was it on the basis of this June draft, or the May draft, or both, that on the 28th of August Ambassador NOMURA said to Secretary Hull that he did not feel there would be any difficulties about the Tripartite Pact question at the proposed Roosevelt-KONOYE meeting?

	4
	45.
27	
1	4
•	4
	1
	4

A I do not know the basis of NOMURA's contention.

Q Well, the June draft proposal was the then current one, if any was, was it not?

A That is correct.

Q Do you remember that at that time, in discussing the proposed meeting between President Roosevelt and Premier Prince KONOYE, that Ambassador NOMURA said that the Japanese people regarded their adherence to the Axis as merely nominal?

A I do not recall that definitely at that time, but I do know that there was a great deal of confusion and conflict between what they would say at one time

and another time.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Thereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

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

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

BY MR. BLAKENEY (Continued):

Q During the negotiations on the subject of the Tripartite Pact, was it the position of the Department of State that Japan should be required formally to abrogate the Pact?

A As far as I know, we never took any position on that point, only we didn't want any situation or interpretation of that Pact which was inconsistent with the peace agreement which the Japanese sought for the Pacific.

Q Then the Department of State was requiring, and would have been satisfied, would it, merely with such an interpretation by Japan of the Pact as would not be in conflict with the peaceful settlement in the Pacific?

A I think I can answer that question best by referring you to the point -- I believe it was point 9 -- in the steps to be taken by the two countries in the November 26 proposal.

Q Yes. That is, then, what was demanded was an interpretation, not a denunciation of the Pact.

A I think that that provision -- the wording

18 19

20

21

23

24

25

3

4 5

6 7

> 8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

speaks for itself. But, when you use the word
"demand," that should you should consider that
in reference to the paragraph in our explanatory
statement, the penultimate paragraph of the explana-
tory statement, the paragraph before the last.
Shall I read that provision?

CROSS

If you will just tell us what page it is on.

It is on page 2 of exhibit L. A

Yes. I think you need not read it.

Do you remember what your representative in Japan, Ambassador Grew, advised the Department on the 29th of September relative to the Tripartite Alliance?

I would have to have my memory refreshed on that point.

I refer especially to the following words of Ambassador Grew as taken from his book "Ten Years in Japan," page 441; that the Ambassador points out that in regard "to Japan's Axis relations the Japanese Government, though refusing consistently to give an undertaking that it will overtly renounce its alliance membership, actually has shown a readiness to reduce Japan's alliance adherence to a dead letter by its indication of willingness to enter formally into negotiations with the United States."

Grew's?

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

2324

25

Do you now recollect that despatch of Mr.

A Yes, I recollect it.

Q What was the view of the Department on that suggestion of Mr. Grew's?

A With regard to that point, there needed to be something much more definite and concrete.

Q "Much more definite" -- what?

A "And concrete."

Q Was anything more definite and concrete offered thereafter by the Japanese Ambassadors?

A I believe that KURUSU said at one time that Japan might do something to outshine the other alliance, but that wasn't made any more explicit than that.

Q Did not the Department of State understand that remark of Mr. KURUSU's as meaning that the conclusion of an agreement for general peace in the Pacific would so unequivocally fix Japan's orientation that the Tripartite Pact would be a dead letter?

A We didn't reach that point in the conversations. We didn't reach a point where all the other things were so clear that we would have to reach a decision on this one remaining question. There were

too many outstanding questions. The Japanese proposals were being successfully narrowed down.

Q You see, Mr. Witness, you repeat that the Japanese proposals were being narrowed, but I am trying to find the basis of fact for that statement. I am asking you now whether the Japanese representatives did not give a series of different suggested phraseologies for the interpretation of this Tripartite Pact in the endeavor to meet the American position.

A The furthest they got was to say that they would interpret the Pact independently.

Q Did they explain "independently" of whom?

A Well, from the context it was clear that they meant to imply that they weren't under German domination and that they were an independent nation, and that they would reach their own decision without reference to Germany. I suppose that's what they meant.

Q Was not that explanation of an intention to interpret the Pact independently considered by the Department of State to be sufficient evidence of Japan's desire to escape from the Tripartite Pact without formally denouncing it?

A We had no basis for reaching that conclu-

sion. At one time, I believe, the Secretary of State said that the Cabinet of Japan might change, and what might go for one Cabinet might not go for the next Cabinet.

Q Let me call your attention to exhibit J to your affidavit which is the oral statement handed by the Secretary of State to the Japanese Ambassador on the 2nd of October.

THE PRESIDENT: That is exhibit No. 1245-G.

Q (Continuing) I refer to page 4 of paragraph 2 thereof where the language is that, with reference to the Tripartite Pact -- I am paraphrasing -- "this Government has noted with appreciation the further step taken by the Japanese Government to meet the difficulties inherent in this aspect of the relations between the two countries."

Now, if the Japanese position in this matter was being consistently narrowed, what was the further step which was noted with appreciation?

A The position of the Japanese Government was being consistently narrowed primarily in regard to commitments of peaceful intent -- they were qualifications, and also in regard to qualifications in regard to non-discrimination of international intercourse. The very next sentence after the one you

quoted shows clearly that the American Government was not satisfied with the step that the Japanese Government had taken.

Q Yes, I was going to ask you about that. The American Government was not satisfied, and yet here it clearly states that some progress had been made, does it not?

A I think you will note the general tone of that note. We tried to be as conciliatory and friendly as possible. The first sentence should be interpreted in the light of that atmosphere that we were trying to create.

Q Well, now, Mr. Witness, that first sentence either does or does not mean what it says. Which is it?

A You will note the very first paragraph of that communication we had in mind, that Japanese proposal of September 6, was what we were largely addressing ourselves to. The Japanese proposal of September 6 is contained in exhibit G; and under C of that report the Japanese had gone a little further in their proposal of May 12. That is the last clause, C: "In case the United States should participate in the European War, the interpretation and execution of the Tripartite Pact by Japan shall

be independently decided." I can't say positively at this late date that that was the point to which we were referring, but I think that that was, that they had taken this further step.

Q Yes. Well, that's what I was trying to get at there, that they had not narrowed their position at that point as the State Department said.

Now, on the 10th of November, Ambassador NOMURA called on President Roosevelt, did he not, and at that time read to him a memorandum?

A That is correct.

Q I note that this memorandum also is not included with your affidavit or referred to therein, from which fact I infer that the Department of State considered it of little importance in the negotiations.

A Perhaps you will recall that among these intercepted Japanese telegrams which were released at the time of the Pearl Harbor Inquiry there was a telegram of November 5. That telegram will not be in this "Foreign Relations." It will be in this volume that was -- it was the first exhibit in the Pearl Harbor Inquiry. I don't know whether it is in evidence here or not. In that telegram there was an instruction to Ambassador NOMURA in regard to the

question of stationing troops in China which shows a complete lack of good faith because he was instructed to make specious explanations of their reasons for wanting to state, and be vague and indefinite as to what they wanted. In the light of that aspect of the situation, that had to be taken into consideration in connection with any Japanese proposals that were being made to us about that time.

A
b
r
a
m
&
M
0
r
S
е

Q	Well, if	I follow	you,	then,	your	answer	is
"Yes,"	you didn't	consider	this	of muc	h im	portance	

A You couldn't take any one point at a time; you had to consider the whole situation as a whole.

My question was why you omitted the Japanese proposal in question from your discussion of the negotiations in your affidavit. I did not suppose there was any reason for your omitting it; that you considered it of little importance. I wonder if that is correct.

A We were at that time exploring the whole field.

Q Yes, but why was this document not mentioned in your affidavit, Mr. Witness?

A That was one of many documents that were not mentioned in my affidavit, because it was one, in my judgment, of lesser importance.

Q Yes, so I assume. Now, in connection with the Tripartite Pact, I want to call your attention to the occasion when this document was presented by Ambassador NOMURA to President hoosevelt on the 10th of November. Do you remember that at that time in discussing with the President the matter of the Tripartite Pact the Ambassador said as follows: This is in Foreign Relations, Volume 2, page 716.

)

,

"The present circumstances under which Japan is placed do not permit my Government to go any further to write in black and white than what is proposed in the draft of September 25th, which I have just quoted. All I have to ask you is to read between the lines and to accept the formula as satisfactory."

A Isn't there a line there that the Ambassador erased?

Q Yes. That is what I want to ask you about. The last sentence in the publication is lined out and is followed by the notation, "deleted by Ambassador NOMURA." Was any explanation given of why he desired it deleted?

A I wasn't at that conversation, and if any explanation was made to me I don't recall it.

Q Now, continuing on the matter of the Tripartite Pact for just a moment, was there any feeling
in the Department of State by say November that the
parties were measureably near to agreement of the
Tripartite question alone?

A I don't recall that there was any such feeling. As I say, we were trying to look at this question as a whole and getting a little closer, slightly closer on one point without getting any nearer on other points. I don't think that they

\_

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

attached too much importance to any single point because we were so far apart on many of those questions as a whole.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President --

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief of Counsel.

MR. KEENAN: For the purpose of keeping this cross-examination confined within proper limits with reference to inquiry about the Tripartite, I respectfully call the Court and counsel's attention to exhibit 1245-K, which is the note from Japan delivered to Secretary Hull approximately an hour after Pearl Harbor was attacked on December 7, 1941. On page 4, paragraph 2, of this last official document from the Government of Japan the language is as follows: "The American proposal contained a stipulation which states both governments will agree that any agreement which either has concluded with any third power or powers shall be interpreted by it in such a way as a conflict with the fundamental purpose of this agreement, the establishment and preservation of peace throughout the Pacific area. This version, with the above provision, has been proposed with a view to restrain Japan from fulfilling its obligation under Tripartite Pact when the United States participates in the war in Europe and as

such it would not be accepted by the Japanese Government."

Mr. President, in the face of that what is the purpose of consuming all of this time in attempting to find out from this witness what was the position of Japan with reference to the Tripartite Pact?

THE PRESIDENT: I take it you are objecting to the cross-examination about the Tripartite Pact?

MR. KEENAN: Yes.

,

MR. BLAKENEY: Well, I can state my position very shortly about that. The witness states reneatedly in his affidavit that the Japanese position became extreme, that it became narrowed, or that the State Department considered that to have occurred. Since the witness is the man, as the prosecution assures us, who was the official representative of the United States of America in these negotiations, I think we can cross-examine him to find the factual basis for those statements. He has told us that there were three large points of difference between the two nations. We are examining now about one of them.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there anything to be gained by it in view of the very explicit terms of that last document received in evidence? Japan's adherence to that Pact is made clear beyond any question. And what does it matter if you establish that during the course of the negotiations the Japanese may not have expressed that view so clearly?

MR. BLAKENEY: There is, of course, no question whatever that in the end Japan adhered to the Tripartite Pact. I am not contending that.

THE PRESIDENT: Not merely that, but they suggest there they had that adherence throughout. If that be the fact, were they sincere in what they may

have said in the course of the negotiations to modify that?

MR. BLAKENEY: Of course, the contention is not made that the Japanese ever, at any given time, were not adherent to the Tripartite Pact. That is not the question. They continued as an adherent to the Pact because no agreement superceding it was ever reached. I am trying to find why it was not reached.

THE PRESIDENT: In the fact of that very clear declaration delivered to the Secretary of State on the 7th of December, 1941, the cross-examination would appear to be quite unhelpful and the objection is upheld. I cannot say it is irrelevant in view of the affidavit, but it is wholly immaterial.

MR. BLAKENEY: Do I understand then that cross-examination on no aspect of negotiations concerning the Tripartite Pact is permitted? That is, I do not understand the scope of the objection and the ruling and I should like direction.

THE PRESIDENT: In view of the very explicit statement to which I have just referred, the attitude of the Japanese as to the Tripartite Pact in the course of the negotiations becomes wholly immaterial. I should say the apparent attitude. Immateriality is a ground for excluding evidence.

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

MR. BLAKENEY: Yes. Of course, I should like to point out that when the time comes that the defense has the opportunity to go into the cuestion of this apparent attitude mentioned by your Honor, the opportunity for cross-examination will be gone.

THE PRESIDENT: That does not make the cross-examination material.

MR. BLAKENEY: Very well.

BY MR. BLAKENBY (Continued):

Q Now, let us return to consider the second of the big points of difference between the two nations in these conversations. This was, I believe you said, the question of the settlement of the China Affair within which is included the question of stationing Japanese troops in China. Is it correct to say that, of all, this was the question which most concerned and interested the United States in the problem of this Pacific settlement?

A I wouldn't say that, no.

Q Well, perhaps we had better simply say this, then, that it was a problem which loomed very large, which was raised on the American side, and which, in the end, proved to be one of the chief stumbling blocks to agreement. That much is correct, is not it?

A That is correct.

W Now, in order to accempt to define clearly
the problem involved, I call your attention to the
following language on page 14 of your affidavit, para-
graph 3, that: "The immutable policy of the Japanese
Government to ensure the stability of East Asia was
predicated upon establishing at the outset a complete
Japanese military and economic stranglehold over China,
calling for Japanese control over strategic Chinese
industries and facilities, referred to euphemistically
in terms such as 'economic cooperation with China,'
and retention in large areas of China for an indefinite
period of large Japanese garrisons to protect Japan's
holdings."

THE PRESIDENT: Answer the question tonight, please. Did you finish that question?

MR. BLAKENEY: No, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: You had better repeat it in the morning.

We will adjourn now until half past nine.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment
was taken until 0930, Wednesday, 20 November
1946, at 0930.)

----

