-Sept 19 presental

INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

Prosecution's Witnesses	Page
Wild, Cyril Hew Dalrymple (resumed)	5829
Cross by Mr. Furness	5829
Redirect by Mr. Comyns Carr	5840

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

Pros. No.	Def. No.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
477		Excerpt from Interrogation of General OSHIMA, Hirost dated 1 February 1946	hi,	5913
478		Excerpt from Interrogation of General OSHIMA, Hiros dated 1 February 1946	hi,	5917

1	Thursday, 19 September, 1946
2	
3	
4	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL
5	FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal
6	War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan
7	
8	The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment,
9	at 0930.
10	
11	
12	
13	Appearances:
14	For the Tribunal, same as before.
15	For the Prosecution Section, same as before.
16	For the Defense Section, same as before.
17	
18	
19	
20	(English to Japanese and Japanese
21	to English interpretation was made by the
22	Language Section, IMTFE.)
23	
24	
25	

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	MARS	HAL	OF I	HE	COURT	: The	e II	nterr	nati	ional
Military	Trib	unal	for	· th	e Far	East	is	now	in	session
	THE	PRES	IDEN	TT:	Majo	r Furi	nes:	5.		

CYRIL HEW DALRYMPLE WILD, called as a witness on behalf of the prosecution, resumed the stand and testified as follows: CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. FURNESS:

Q Colonel Wild, do you know of any provision in any convention or treaty requiring the segregation of officers from enlisted men while held as prisoners of war?

A I have an idea that it is at least recommended in one of the conventions, but I have not referred to them for a long time past.

Q I have not been able to find any such provision, and I assume that you do not know which convention or which paragraph of any convention, is that correct?

- A Yes, your assumption is correct.
- Q You testified that among the Chinese who were fighting for you were a Straits Settlements Volunteer Corps and a Malay States Volunteer Corps?
 - A Yes, the Chinese formed companies

2 3

4 5

7

6

9

8

10

12 13

15

14

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

of their own within those forces.

Q And you also testified that there was a battalion of Chinese raised by your own corps head-quarters?

A I did.

Q Were both the volunteer corps and that battalion disbanded prior to the surrender of the British forces?

A They were.

Q Now, the Malay States Volunteer Corps consisted of men coming from the states to the north of Singapore Island, did they not?

A Correct.

Q And as you retreated through those states, were the men who came from those states disbanded in the course of your retreat?

A The Asiatic elements were given the option of continuing to serve or of handing over their weapons, be demobilized, and returning to their homes. That was done for fear of what the Japanese would do to them if they captured them, or of what they would do to their families if they continued to serve with us. Those fears, unfortunately, proved only too well grounded.

Q And members of those volunteer corps coming

25

1 from Federated Malay States north of Singapore Island 2 were disbanded in the course of retreat, were they 3 not? 4 Before we retreated from any individual state, 5 such as Pahang. The Pahang volunteers were 6 given the option that I have described. In the case 7 of Pahang, this option was put to the volunteers on 8 parade by my own corps commander. Those who elected 9 to return to their homes were disarmed and handed in 10 their uniforms at that parade. This was done in par-11 ticular on account of reports which had reached us 12 of the treatment of the dependents of the Kedah 13 Volunteer Force in the north by the Japanese. There 14 was never any suggestion whatever of leaving any of 15 these men behind as guerillas. They went home as 16 peaceful citizens. 17 But they did remain behind the Japanese lines, 18 did they not? 19 Those who elected to stay did so. 20 And they wore no uniform or distinctive badge 21 which would identify them as soldiers? 22 No, their uniforms were taken from them. 23

Q Not only the Penang Volunteer Force, but the forces of the other states were disbanded in the same way, were they not?

WILD

1 2

3

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

23

24

25

Not the, so far as I know, the Straits Settlements Volunteer Force which included Penang and Malacca. But I believe the Federated Malay States Volunteer Forces were given this option in the case of every state.

The duties of these volunteer corps were 0 chiefly outpost scouting and harassing of enemy communication lines, were they not?

Not the volunteer forces. They were, as I have already stated, like British territorial battalions. They were trained and fought as such.

Those were the duties, however, of the battalion which was raised by your own corps headquarters?

Largely so, yes.

0 Which was also disbanded prior to surrender?

I gather it was, sir. A

You testified that as far as giving information was concerned -- sorry, I am reading a question. Strike that out.

You testified that because the sympathy of the lecal population was, with a few exceptions, on the side of the defending troops, that it was probably a fact that information was from time to time conveyed to the British forces by local residents.

A I remember that.

1 It is also true, is it not, that such local 2 residents destroyed bridges, roads and other lines of 3 communication? 4 I never heard of any such incident, and I 5 do not believe that any such occurred. There was 6 never a suggestion of that having happened in any 7 information which reached my corps headquarters. 8 You will agree, however, that the Japanese 9 forces whose communications were being cut might 10 have information not available to you, would you not? 11 Your question assumes that they were cut. 12 have no information, as I say, that they were. You were not behind the Japanese lines, were 14 you? 15 No, I was not. I agree that if their communi-16 cations had been cut they would have been more likely 17 to know about it than I would. 18 Now. as to this Siam-Burma Railroad. That 19 railroad furnished a connection, did it not, between 20 the Bay of Bengal and Gulf of Siam? 21 A Yes. 22 And through connecting lines it furnished a 23 line of communication between the two great cities of 24 Bangkok and Moulmein? 25

Moulmein is not much of a city, but it does

	Ł	
6	1	
	7	
F	1	

Q It is also true, is it not, that such local residents destroyed bridges, roads and other lines of communication?

4

5

6

3

A I never heard of any such incident, and I do not believe that any such occurred. There was never a suggestion of that having happened in any information which reached my corps headquarters.

7 8

9

Q You will agree, however, that the Japanese forces whose communications were being cut might have information not available to you, would you not?

10

11

A Your question assumes that they were cut. I have no information, as I say, that they were.

12

Q You were not behind the Japanese lines, were you?

14

13

A No, I was not. I agree that if their communications had been cut they would have been more likely to know about it than I would.

1516

Q Now, as to this Siam-Burma Railroad. That railroad furnished a connection, did it not, between the Bay of Bengal and Gulf of Siam?

18

19

17

A Yes.

20

21

A les

22

Q And through connecting lines it furnished a line of communication between the two great cities of Bangkok and Moulmein?

23

Bangkok and Moulmein?

25

A Moulmein is not much of a city, but it does

connect the two. 1 It connects Burma and Siam, does it not? 2 That is correct. A 3 And it will be of great value in peace time. 4 will it not? 5 That is a most debatable point. I think it will be kept open but it is not absolutely certain. 7 When it was being built the Siamese had two objections 8 to it. One was that they didn't want it, and the 9 other that the Japanese were making them pay for it. 10 The decision as to whether it will be kept 11 open or not will depend somewhat on the decision of 12 the value of Singapore as a base, will it not? 13 I am not well up on my imperial geography 14 15 at present, but I don't think it would have any connection with that. 16 You will agree, however, that such a railroad 17 18 across -- which is equivalent to a connection across 19 the Kra Isthmus should be of great economic value in 20 peace time, won't you? 21 I do not know whether the economic value 22 of it will be such as to make it worthwhile maintain-23 ing it in that extraordinarily difficult and unpleasant

belt of country. It is a problem which we frequently

debated when we were building it and never arrived at

2 3

--

a satisfactory conclusion, and my own impression is that the point has not yet been decided.

Q How far was it from any fighting in Burma or Siam or elsewhere?

A I have no map in front of me at the moment, but I suppose when we finished cleaning up Burma the fighting came fairly near the end of it. It was, of course, an obvious target for Allied bombings, and as a result of the Japanese keeping the prisoners of war in huts at important railway junctions, there was very heavy loss of life among the prisoners of war. That is a matter for the war crimes courts in Singapore at present.

O That would be true, would it not, of almost any part of the world occupied by the Japanese, including Tokyo?

A I agree that in many places they tended to put their prisoners close to military targets.

Q How far was it from any ground fighting at the time that the railroad was under construction?

A Whatever the distance is from the railway to the outer camp; I cannot say how far that is without a map.

Q You have testified at different times that during the early part of captivity the food was adequate although lacking in vitamin content --

A I did.

Q (Continuing) and that it later became inadequate, particularly toward the end of the war.

A I think my expression was "grossly inade-quate."

O And that coincides, did it not, with the cutting of the Japanese lines of communication by the British and American air forces and navy -- naval forces?

A That process was certainly increasing steadily as the war went on.

Q And that would also affect the forwarding

20

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

5,837

WILD CROSS

25

1	of correspondence and the forwarding of information
2	with regard to prisoners of war.
3	A Yes. I gather in fact, I know for a fact
4	that air transport was increasingly used.
5	Q You testified that due to the fact that
6	cards for each prisoner of war were forwarded direct
7	to Tokyo, administration of prisoners of war came
8	direct from Tokyo to the Prisoner of War Administra-
9	tion in Malaya.
10	THE "ITNESS: Would you mind reading that
11	question? I missed the first part.
12	(Whereupon, the last question was
13	read by the official court reporter.)
14	(Continuing) Is it not a fact, however,
15	that the Administration was under the South Area
16	Army, Field Marshal TERAUCHI?
17 18	A In answer to your first remark, I don't re-
19	call saying that because the postcards were forwarded
20	to Tokyo I understand your meaning. You mean the
21	personal cards.
22	Q Yes.
23	A Yes.
24	Q I did not mean the postcerds; I meant the
	prisoner of war cards which, one was held by the

prisoner of war and one forwarded to Tokyo.

moment because, in captivity I heard the Japanese myself so often refer to Tokyo as a branch office would refer to its head office, and I never once heard a Japanese give the impression that the late Count TERAUCHI's headquarters at Saigon were their head office until, as I mentioned yesterday, Colonel NAGATOMO said that the documents in Siam went both to Count TERAUCHI's headquarters and to Tokyo. Also, on occasions, Japanese officers went from the Changi POW Administration -- went by air to Tokyo on duty and returned. They belonged entirely to the POW organization, no other unit.

I find that most difficult to believe for the

Q Does it not also so appear in prosecution's exhibits No. 473 and 474 which are the two reports which have been introduced into evidence?

A The passage is not in my mind.

Q Well, they speak for themselves.

On this correspondence, I mean personal correspondence of prisoners of war, the regulations were published, were they not?

A No. I received the instructions verbally in about August, '42 from the Japanese officer who handed me the first batch of postcards at River Valley Road Camp. He told me then that the regula-

21 22

WILD CROSS

tions were that we should be allowed to write every three months as much as we could get onto a post-card. He announced it to the troops immediately, and it cheered them up a lot. In fact, no one got more than another four postcards to write during the next three years.

Q You know, however, there was no incoming mail being deliberately withheld, do you?

A There is a considerable mass of written material to the effect that that was done, in the form of affidavits, but not -- I do not propose to quote it here largely because, in the places where I was, although there were the most intolerable delays, I always thought that they were due more to stupidity than malice. However, I did, as I say, discover two sacks of untouched mail under a pile of rubbish at the end of the war.

As a prisoner of war, you did not expect to have any direct official communication with your government, did you?

A I don't see why not at all. I think it is quite reasonable in those circumstances. Correspondence on questions of rank, and so on, were permissible between officers and the war office in Europe.

Q Direct from you to the War Office?

)

2 3

A Yes, indeed, subject, as I said, to offering the document for the strictest Japanese censorship.

MR. FURNESS: No further cross-examination by the defense.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COMYNS CARR:

Q You were asked about the cars on the railway up to Banpong and back again, and a comparison was suggested between them and the 40-man trucks in France. Would you just explain that and the accommodation in the cars in which you traveled?

A Well, the railway system on which we traveled is one meter gauge. The French gauge, if I remember rightly, is about four feet eight inches, half as wide again. I have, of course, seen photographs of the French vehicle described, and that, I mentioned, is quite considerable. Our rice cars were the smallest form of rolling stock used on the Federated Malay States Railways.

Now, we sat on a steel floor where, I think, they had straw in those French ones. I know of no journey in France which could take four days and four nights. Actually, with twenty-seven in a box car,

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

you can all sit down cross-legged; but, if a third of the men wanted to lie down, the other two-thirds really had to stand up.

Q Did you have any break for rest during the journey?

A Yes, very occasionally we were allowed to get out and stand on the track.

? For how long?

A Sometimes for a few minutes, sometimes for as much as an hour. It depended on how quickly the train could get along. Of course, traveling fifty—seven to a box car, as I did once, you all had to stand up — we all had to stand up, and it was really difficult to breath owing, I mean, to the pressure of other men's bodies on one's chest.

Q Now, with regard to the Burma-Siam railway after it was finished, you have told us what went up towards Burma. What, if anything, was in the trucks which came back?

A Piles of engineering stores and tools.

Q Now, the last matter: You were asked about courtesies extended to the wife of a general officer or to a general officer as the result of the illness of his wife. First it was suggested that it was General Percival and then that it was some other

officer. I think you must tell us the real facts about that, please, Colonel Wild. The lady in question was Lady Heath, the wife of my own corps commander. She was a very brave woman. I've seen her under shellfire. She refused to leave Singapore while it was besieged or before. She was doing some welfare work, and I think that both she and perhaps the corps commander, too, 9 hoped that, if they survived the fall of the city. 10 the Japanese might leave them together. 11 0 Where was she placed after the fall of the 12 city? 13 In Changi Jail. The General was in Changi 14 Camp. 15 Did you succeed in obtaining any interviews 16 with her while she was in the jail? 17 Yes, I did. She was the lady I mentioned 18 having seen twice in Changi Jail. 19 What was her state of health? 0 20 When I saw her, she was partially recovered 21 from a very dangerous illness. 22 Had she been in Changi Jail all the time? 23 No, she was sent to the hospital in about 24 June or July, 1942 where she gave birth to a child.

The child was dead; and, in the opinion of the gyne-

1	cologist, his life would have been saved if two pots
2	of marmite would have been given to her shortly be-
3	fore birth.
4	C Had she been adequately fed in Changi Jail?
5	A Not in the way in which I would have ex-
6	pected somebody in her condition to be looked after.
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

IM
W
0
U
1
1
_
T
f
- V
72
0
8
-
Y
Y
44
-
9
-
-
1
100
-
~
d
10000
0
е
1000
CETE OF S
n

	Q	After	your	release	did	you	see	Sir	Lewis
and	Lady	Heath	agair	1?					

Yes, I did, but I saw him as well just after A this episode had taken place at Changi.

What was his own state of health at that time?

He was suffering from dysentery, amoebic dysentery, and he was none the better for the treatment which he had had in Fort Canning as I described previously from Major HAYASHI.

Later was he sent out of Malaya?

Yes. He missed the boat with the other general officers on account of his illness and he went to Formosa later in the year, in October or November.

And where did his wife remain?

She remained in the hospital for sometime and then she was put in a convent for a little while during her illness and then returned to Changi Prison. She was back in Changi Prison certainly by the beginning of 1943.

Now, did you see them both after the war after your release?

Yes, I did.

Did he show you anything at that time or was it at the earlier time you saw him that he showed you

a document?

2

.

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

16

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

A It was on the earlier occasion, in August, 1942, that he showed me a newspaper.

Q Yes. What newspaper was it?

A It was the official Japanese propaganda newspaper in English called the "Singapore Shimbun."

Q What particular part of the newspaper did he show you?

A He showed me an item at the left of the page about two-thirds of a column long. I remember the look of it to this day.

What did it purport to be?

A It purported to be a letter of thanks from General Heath to the commander of the Japanese forces. It was couched in the most fulsome terms, remarking among other things that no other nation in the world could have matched the Bushido of the Japanese Army in the treatment which they had given to Lady Heath.

Q And what did General Heath say about that letter?

A He mentioned first what he thought about the way she had, in fact, been treated. Then he pointed at this passage and said to me, "I have learned a good deal about Japanese Bushido during the last few months. This is a bare-faced forgery and

. . 23

I could not have believed that any army in the world would have stooped to such baseness."

MR. COMYNS CARR: That is all I have to ask the witness, your Honor.

The document, prosecution No. 1810, which was put in in the course of the witness' evidence, exhibit, I think, 473 is it not -- 473, was referred to the Language Section for dispute on translation and it turns out that there were certain corrections to be made and also that a portion of it has been inadvertently omitted. When the corrections are completed I shall ask leave to substitute a correct copy -- translation -- for the translation which is at present before the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: I suppose that can be done but since the witness has testified from the copy which has been submitted, I suppose also it might affect his testimony.

THE PRESIDENT: If it does we shall take appropriate steps to protect the interests of the defense.

The witness may go on the usual terms.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

Mr. Chief Prosecutor.

3

2

5

6

8

10

12

23

15

16

17

18

20

21

23

24

25

MR. KEENAN: May it please the Court, so that the Court may be apprized, the defrase counsel have been supplied with a schedule of proof of the prosecution to the termination of the prosecution's case. We deem it proper with the permission of the Court to advise defense counsel as well as the Court that the evidence with reference to the invasion of China and the planning and initiating of aggressive warfare in that phase has been substantially completed; and we now proceed to that phase having to do with the relations of Japan, Germany and Italy, which will be presented to the Tribunal under the direction of Honorable Frank Tavenner, United States Attorney from the Western District of Virginia, now on leave from the Department of Justice, with his associates, Mr. Hyde and Mr. McKinney, from the Department of Justice, likewise on leave.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: In view of the fact that it is near time for recess, may we adjourn a few minutes early, your Honor, so that the defense may get their appropriate papers relating to this phase?

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess now for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1042, a recess

was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

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

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

(Reading):

"The subject of this phase of the case is collaboration between Japan, Germany and Italy. Evidence will be introduced to prove that the accused planned, prepared, initiated and waged wars of aggression and wars in violation of international law, treaties, agreements or assurances, and that they participated as leaders, organizers, instigators or accomplices in the formulation and execution of a common plan or conspiracy for this accomplishment as charged in Counts 1 to 36 inclusive of the indictment. The evidence introduced will also substantiate charges set forth in the remaining counts of the indictment.

"For the purpose of proving that the accused participated in the formulation and execution of the common plan or conspiracy charged, and for the purpose of demonstrating the effective and indis-

7 8

9

1

2

3

4

5

6

11

12

13

10

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

pensable contribution made by leaders in Germany and Italy in the attainment of the objects of the conspiracy, we shall introduce evidence, much of which has hitherto been secret, regarding clandestine negotiations for the conclusion of various treaties and collaboration between the participating powers under these treaties. This evidence will show that in spite of the distrust that each Axis power had for the others and occasional differences that arose among them by reason of immediate conflicting interests, Japan, on the one hand, sought and obtained from the alliance with her Axis partners tremendous military strength and political bargaining power, and that Germany and Italy, on the other hand, likewise profited substantially thereby. The manner in which this military strength and political bargaining power was used in furtherance of the objects of the conspiracy will unfold as the evidence progresses. This evidence will prove both the fact of conspiracy and that the accused were parties to it.

"The evidence relating to various treaties and agreements and the subdivisions thereof will disclose the following facts:

23

23

1

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

I.

"THE ANTI-COMINTERN PACT AND SECRET

AGREEMENT

"As shown in earlier phases of the case, the Kwentung Army in the early part of 1936 was restrained in its westward advence from Manchuria into Mongolia by the danger of war with the Soviet Union. Japan's expansion from Manchuria into the remainder of China also was checked temporarily as the result of the refusal of Chinese war lords in North China to desert the National Chinese Government. Confronted with this situation, Japan entered into negotiations for a military alliance with Germany, a totalitarian power then engaged in a program of military preparedness for aggressive war in Europe.

"Negotiations, begun in June 1935, the date of the so-called HO-UMEZU Agreement referred to in a previous phase of the case, were conducted through military channels because of the fact that the subject of negotiations was a strictly military matter and because no treaty of this type could have been made without the approval of the Japanese Army. In April 1936, shortly after the conclusion of the Mongolian-Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Pact

3

5

6

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

24

25

of Mutal Assistance, the General Staff of the Japanese Army transferred the conduct of the negotiations from the accused Colonel OSHIMA, Hiroshi, then Military Attache to Germany, to the Foreign Ministry.

"The pact was concluded on 25 November 1936, and on its face was directed against the activities of the Communist Internationale. A supplemental protocol provided for the establishment of a permanent committee for the purpose of facilitating close collaboration in matters concerning the exchange of information regarding the activities of the Communist Internationale and the defensive measures to be taken against it. At the time of the conclusion of this pact, a secret agreement was entered into between Japan and Germany in which it was provided that in case one of the signatories was attacked, or was threatened with an unprovoked attack by the Soviet Union the other party to the pact was not to take any action which would provide effective relief to the Soviet Union, and the signatories would hold an immediate conference to formulate measures to be taken for the protection of their common interests.

"Japan proclaimed to the world that the

Japanese-Cerman agreement simply provided for cooperation between the two countries against the
Communist Internationale and was not directed
toward any particular country although in truth
and in fact the Anti-Comintern Pact was directed
against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
and all democratic nations. It was designed and
intended to strengthen the hand of Japan in China,
to create the impression in all countries that the
signatories constituted a united front, and to
afford an excuse for continued military aggression.

"The accused, Premier HIROTA, Koki; Navy Minister NACANO, Osami; Director of the Foreign Europe-Asia Bureau TOGO, Shigenori; and President of the Council HIRANUMA, Kiichiro were present at the meeting of the Privy Council which approved the pact. The accused MATSUOKA, Yosuke, then an official of the South Manchurian Railway, admitted in 1940 that he was one of those responsible for the conclusion of the pact.

"A few weeks after the extension of the Japanese-Chinese war at the Marco Polo Bridge on 7 July 1937, Germany strongly protested to Japan that the Anti-Comintern Pact did not include the objective of fighting communism in the territory

3 4 5

of third states and expressed disapproval of Japan's action in carrying on radio propaganda in the German language directed toward Germany in which Japan was attempting to picture the war against China as a fight against Communism, intending thereby to force upon Germany the necessity of taking sides. Germany denied that the contractual relationship by reason of the Anti-Comintern Pact obligated her to approve or assist morally the Japanese aggression in China and refused to enter into negotiations regarding German delivery of armaments to China and the withdrawal of military advisers from that country.

"When the siege of Shanghai resulted in extended major military and naval operations without bringing to an end the regime of CHIANG KAI-SHEK, as shown in a previous phase of the case, Japan, in November 1937, made demands upon China as the price of peace. Germany served in the capacity of 'letter carrier' between the two powers, but by separate negotiations endeavored to persuade Japan to alter her policy with respect to military aggression in China. The aggressive policy of the Japanese Government was dominated and directed by the Army. The accused TOGO, Shigenori, Japanese

Ambassador to Germany, announced that the Japanese Government was determined to carry on the war to its bitter end.

"While CHIANG KAI-SHEK was considering the Japanese proposals, the 'Rape of Nanking' occurred. Japanese demands increased and further severe military action was threatened. The accused Premier HIROTA refused a Chinese request for clarification of terms with the reply that the military insisted upon an immediate and clear answer. On 16 January 1938, negotiations were terminated with the threat of continued military action. Germany expressed conviction that Japan would bear responsibility to the world for breaking off the disc ssions.

TOGO declared to Reich Foreign Minister VON NEURATH that the Japanese Government could no longer recognize CHIANG MAI-SHEK as the representative of the Chinese people, and that Japan would now try to negotiate concerning peace with new Chinese governments in Peiping and Shanghai. When it was called to his attention that a big and not yet pacified area, of China remained unpacified, Ambassador TOGO replied that Japan was 'prepared for everything'

and 'would know how to carry the burden of a prolonged state of war.' Ambassador TOGO also asserted
that the moment would soon come when 'we would have
to start talking about German cooperation with Japan
in the new China which is to be constructed.'

"With the unsuccessful close of German efforts to bring the Sino-Japanese conflict to an end, a new chapter of the war began. Germany, believing that Japan would emerge from the conflict as the military victor, considered it necessary to re-orient her policy toward the China conflict and to re-examine German-Japanese relations. On 4 February 1938 Chancellor HITLER assumed supreme command of the military and naval forces of Germany and shortly thereafter Germany withdrew her military advisers from China, stopped delivery of war materials to China, and recognized the so-called State of Manchukuo.

"In line with the provisions of the protocol to the Anti-Comintern Pact, the German Army and the Japanese Army in September or October 1938 agreed to furnish each other with intelligence about the Russian military. This resulted in the undertaking of long range projects aimed at the dis-

7 8

integration of Russia, the preliminary steps of which were the use of white Russians in propaganda and subversive activities in Russia, Afghanistan and Roumania, in which the accused OSHIMA, Military Attache, played an important part.

"Sub. Itly Italy, Manchukuo, Hungary and S in were admitted as participants to the pact and on 25 November 1941 the pact was renewed for an additional period of five years with Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, Croatia, Roumania, Slovakia, and the puppet regime of Nanking as participants.

"At a meeting of the Privy Council on 22 February 1939, at which the accused HIRANUMA, Premier, and General ITAGAKI, Seishiro, Minister of War, were present, it was declared that the signatories were not stopping at the mere exchange of information, and that a general policy had been adopted with regard to further methods of collaboration in economic and financial relations.

7 8

II.

"THE TRI-PARTITE PACT

"A. Negotiations for a Tri-Partite Military

Alliance

"Shortly after the re-orientation of Germany's policy with respect to the Sino-Japanese conflict and German-Japanese relations VON RIBBENTROP, then German Foreign Minister, proposed a German-Japanese military alliance aimed at the entire world. The accused General OSHIMA, who had by this time become Ambassador to Germany, and the accused SHIRATORI, Toshio, Ambassador to Italy, were sent to Rome for the purpose of inducing MUSSOLINI to unite in the proposed alliance and early in January 1939 MUSSOLINI indicated his approval.

"Ambassadors OSHIMA and SHIRATORI desired a military alliance without reservations. To this the Army in Japan was prepared to agree but the Navy was not entirely in favor of such an alliance. After holding numberous meetings, the HIRANUMA Cabinet reached a compromise which contemplated that there should be reserved to each of the signatories the right to determine whether an emergency had occurred which required the treaty to be put into operation. For the purpose of fully acquainting the Japanese

Ambassadors OSHIMA and SHIRATORI with this compromise
proposal and for the purpose of advising them as to
the limits beyond which they should not go, the ITO

Commission was sent to Berlin and Rome.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"Ambassadors OSHIMA and SHIRATORI refused to follow the directions delivered by the ITO Commis-SHIRATORI previously had secretly advised Italy not to accept the anticipated compromise proposal. The Ambassadors refused to communicate with -Germany and Italy through official channels and wired the Japanese Foreign Office to accept the pact of -alliance without reservation, asserting that unless this was done they would resign, which action they averred would bring about the fall of the Cabinet. As a result of this action, the Foreign Ministry by wire to Ambassador OSHIMA modified its position to a mere declaration that Japan did not want to give more than non-military aid if the country concerned was one other than Russia. On 4 May 1939, Premier HIRANUMA, in a declaration addressed to HITLER, stated that Japan was firmly and steadfastly resolved to furnish military aid to Germany and Italy even if one of these two powers were attacked by a power other than-Russia, but that such support, in view of Japan's existing situation, could not be given until a change

of circumstances make it possible. While the negotiations were still being conducted Germany and the Soviet Union concluded a non-aggression pact on 23 August 1939, which Japan considered constituted a violation of the secret agreement attached to the Anti-Comintern Pact. Repercussions in Japan were so great that the HIRANUMA Cabinet immediately fell.

"B. Conclusion of the Tri-Partite Pact

"Both Japan and Germany continued with their respective plans for aggression. Japan's interest in the area south of China and in the Pacific was shown by the seizure and occupation of Hainan Island off the coast of Indo-China on 11 February 1939 and the Spratley Islands southeast of Indo-China on 31 March 1939, and in September 1939 Ambassador OSHIMA expressed the view to HITLER that Japan, especially the Navy, was ready for an advance in Southeast Asia, which action he had proposed.

"In March 1940 there was an apparent stiffening of political attitude by the Japanese on the
one hand and England and America on the other, arising
out of protests against the establishment of the WANG
CHING WEI Government in China. The accussed War
Minister HATA, Shunroku along with the Navy Minister
and Army spokesmen in the Diet indicated the attitude

4 5

of the Japanese Government by strong language to the effect that Japan's progress in China could not be stopped by the Nine Power Treaty which they considered obsolete. In opposition to the YONAI-ARITA Government's effort to reach an agreement with Britain and America, Germany endeavored to excite Japan's feeling against America by influencing the press and leading political personalities and by representing that a conflict between America and Japan in the long run was inevitable. Former Ambassadors OSHIMA and SHIRA-TORI, who had resigned upon the failure to conclude the Tri-Partite military alliance, worked in confidential cooperation with the German Embassy in this program, and the German Ambassador was directed by RIBBENTROP to keep in close touch with these two collaborators.

"After Germany's invasion of the Netherlands, Japan demonstrated concern regarding Germany's inter lons with respect to the Netherlands East Indies. On 19 June 1940, two days after the fall of France, Japan expressed similar concern regarding French Indo-China and requested Germany to accord Japan a free hand in these areas. The German Ambassador to Japan recommended to his government the annexation of French Indo-China by Japan on the grounds that it would in-

2

3

12

11

10

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

flict that it would intensify the differences between Japan and the Inglo-Sexon powers to such an extent that the danger of an agreement would be eliminated for a long time, and that it would result in a severe blow to the YONAI Cabinet and probably bring about its replacement by a more pro-German cabinet if the government should fail to act in this matter.

"On the same day, 19 June 1940, negotiations for a Japanese-German alliance were renewed by KURUSU, Japanese Ambassador to Germany. He represented that by close cooperation between Japan and Germany in the development of heavy industry Japan would gain 'freedom of action towards the United States' and that if economic circles in Japan could see Germany's great industrial development and realize that Germany had overtaken the United States in many fields, they would gladly switch over to Germany. He further represented that he and the accused TOGO, then Ambassador to Russia, were feverishly working for the improvement of Japanese-Russian relations and it had become more and more clear in Japan that the future of the nation lay in the south, wherefore the enemy in the morth must be made a friend. This alleged attitude of friendship toward the Soviet Union was at most tempor-

12

5

9

10

11

14

13

15

16 17

18

19

20

22

23

24

ary in character, as will be demonstrated in a later phase of the case.

"On 24 June 1940, the accused General MUTO, Akira of the War Ministry informed the German Military Attache that Japan was greatly interested in Indo-China in connection with the China conflict and the accused General KOISO, Kuniaki, Minister of Overseas Affairs, inquired of the German Ambassador as to what Germany's attitude would be with regard to military activity of Japan in Indo-China and in parts of the Netherlands East Indies. The German Ambassador referred to the prior declaration that Germany was not interested in the question of Dutch East Indies and added that Germany would have no objection against Japanese action in Indo-China upon the condition that Japan obligate herself to tie up America in the Pacific area, for instance by a promise to attack the Philippines or Hawaii in case of an American participation in a war against Germany."

19

1

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

"On 8 July 1940 Ambassadors SATO and KURUSU in a conference with Foreign Minister RIBBENTROP and Consul General STAHMER, renewing discussions for close cooperation between Japan and Germany, drew a parallel between the New Order being brought into existence in Europe through German action and the efforts that Japan had made over the past three years to construct a New Order in the Far East and the South Seas. Ambassador SATO pointed out that Japan had facilitated Germany's task of creating a New Order in Europe by drawing the attention of English, French and American governments to herself since the beginning of the war in China and had tied up the American fleet in the Pacific Ocean for that period. He represented that Japan was putting forth strong endeavors to finish the Chinese war 'in order to have free hands,' and in this connection he said that public opinion in Japan had become extraordinarily nervous in respect to Indo-China and the Dutch East Indies. Japan, he said, had been trying to orient her policy in one direction since the outbreak of the Manchurian conflict but time and again had been forced somewhat to moderate this new o dentation. In reply to Ambassador SATO's report, the Foreign Minister indicated concern that Germany had begun to foster an ambition in the South Seas

to take the French and Dutch East Asiatic colonies under its influence.

"So strong was the desire for the conclusion of the military alliance between Japan, Germany and Italy that a joint conference of the Japanese Army, Navy and Foreign Office officials was held on 12 July 1940 for the purpose of intesifying efforts to procure such a pact and a tentative draft thereof was presented at this conference. The conference reconvened on 16 July 1940 for the purpose of obtaining the opinions of the Army and Navy and the adoption of a unified policy with regard to the draft of the proposed pact. In the discussion which followed, grave concern was expressed over the possibility that Germany at the close of the war would take over politically Indo-China and the Netherlands East Indies, which action on the part of Germany, it was resolved, should be firmly opposed.

"The Japanese conception of 'political leadership' in its strictest sense in the establishment
of the New Order in East Asia was considered to be
'occupation.' Although the view was expressed that
Japan was not thinking of 'occupation' at the present,
it was declared that 'it is necessary that the whole
country conspire and unite on the point of political
leadership and make Germany recognize as strong a
political leadership as possible.'

in East Asia and thereby hasten her surrender, it was asserted that this could be fulfilled by the secret instigation of independence movements in India and Burma and the adoption of a strong policy towards Hong Kong, Shanghai and Tientsin. A further step by striking England through an attack upon Singapore was also discussed.

"The question was posed as to whether it would be advisable to take 'joint action with Germany against America after the establishment of the New Order in East Asia a few years hence,' and the possibility of taking joint action with Germany against America in South America was discussed.

"It was considered that Italy should be a party to the coalition in the same manner as Germany because of the possibility of an Italian advance into Iran and India, which would bring her in conflict with Russian interests. The opinion of the conferees was unified on these matters and the necessity for immediate execution of their plans was expressed.

"After several attempts to bring about the downfall of the YONAI Cabinet had proved unsuccessful, the military resorted to the device of having the War Minister resign. General HATA, War Minister, tendered his resignation to Premier YONAI on 16 July 1940. The

three chief military officers were unwilling to recommend a successor without which the cabinet was powerless to fill the vacancy. Therefore, Premier YONAI was left no other alternative than to tender to the Emperor a general resignation of his cabinet, which action he took on the same day that General HATA resigned as War Minister. The Army considered that delay in the negotiations with Germany and Italy would be fatal to Japan, that the YONAI Cabinet 'was not feasible in carrying out satisfactorily the foreign policy,' and that a cabinet change was necessary to face the grave international situation.

"MATSUOKA was appointed Foreign Minister.

The retiring War Minister, General HATA, secretly recommended to the Emperor the appointment of the accused TOJO, Hideki as War Minister prior to Prince KONOYE's acceptance of TOJO for that post. SHIRATORI declined appointment as Vice-Foreign Minister, but he let it be known that hewas being considered for appointment as permanent adviser to the Foreign Ministry, in which capacity he expected to exercise a far-reaching influence in the new government. The Matchurian group in the new government was further strengthened by the appointment to the Vice-Foreign Minister post of OHASHI, a former member of the

Manchurian State Council, and an adherent of the German course of Japanese foreign policy.

"In a meeting on 26 July 1940 the new cabinet outlined Japan's basic national policy. The fundamental aim of the basic policy was determined to lie 'in the establishment of world peace in accordance with the lofty idea of Hakko Ichiu, on which the Empire is founded. First of all, it is directed toward the consturction of a New Order of Greater East Asia built upon a firm solidarity of Japan, Manchukuo and China, with this Empire as the center. "e will therefore speedily secure for herself an unshakable national structure such as conforms to the new world situations and march forward toward the realization of the national policy by mobilizing the total strength of the nation. It was further determined that armaments should be so increased as 'to insure the execution of national policy on the basis of a state structure for national defense through manifestations of the nation's total strength.' The educational system was recognized as having been removated in full accord with the fundamental principle of the national policy. Establishment of an economic self-sufficiency policy making Japan, Manchukuo and China as a single unit and embracing the whole of Greater East Asia and the establishment

2

3

1

4

6

8

10

13

12

15

14

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

3

4

6

8 9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22 23

24

25

of a land development plan aimed at the development of the co-ordinated national strength of Japan,

Manchukus and China were among the projects planned.

"On 1 August 1940 Ambassador KURUSU was still pursuing the quest for Japanese-German cooperation. and sought an expression of German attitude regarding the Dutch and French colonies in the East. Ambassadore KURUSU desired to know in what way RIBBENTROP wanted Japan to cooperate, and especially to know if and at what time Germany desired the Japanese weight to be thrown 'on the scale of the present conflict.' He expressed the hope that Japan be made a part of the New Order and that after the war Japan would not be forgotten in the new apportionment of the world. With regard to the New Order in the so-called Greater East Asia area, KURUSU assented that Japan did not intend conquest, oppression or exploitation in these areas and expected nothing of the sort from any third power. On the same day these views were expressed by Foreign Minister MATSUOKA to the German Ambassador and both KURUSU and MATSUOKA sought to be informed of Germany's attitude on these matters.

"The strengthening of Japan's foreign policy with regard to Japanese -German coalition immediately became apparent. War Minister TOJO entered upon a

program by which he sought to promote anit-British feeling among the Japanese. Foreign Minister MATSUOKA, having made a demand on the Republic of France for consent to the use of certain Indo-China territory and facilities in connection with the war against China, requested the German Government to support the Japanese demands by 'influencing the French Government.' On 23 August 1940, Foreign Minister MATSUOKA announced the recall of numerous ambassadors, ministers, councillors and consuls and declared to the press that this action had become necessary in order to make 'secure' the new foreign policy introduced by him. The new government formed a commission of twenty-four leading persons consisting mostly of followers of the policy of collaboration with the Axis powers, with the aim of planning suitable action for the adjustment of state affairs on an authoritarian basis. On this commission SHIRATORI was appointed the representative for foreign political matters.

"A Four Minister Conference attended by Prime Minister KONOYE, Foreign Minister MATSUOKA, War Minister TOJO and the Navy Minister was held in early September 1940, at which time it was determined that the time was now ripe 'for speedy initiation of conversations' for the strengthening of collaboration among Japan, Germany

21222324

11

12

13

14

35

16

17

18

19

20

and Italy. The basic principle was declared to be the making of a fundamental agreement among the three countries in order that they shall mutually cooperate 'by all possible means' in the establishment of a New Order in Europe and Asia. Inasmuch as the proposed agreement contemplated that the three countries would cooperate 'by all possible means' for the construction of the respective New Orders, Japan, it was stated, should be resolved, if need be, 'to take any action, including recourse to armed force.' It was also asserted that in the event Germany might not immediately require Japanese armed cooperation against Britain, Japan's main objective would be the United States. It was recognized that unless Japan was resolved on the employment of armed force, it would be impossible for Japan to carry on any useful talks with Germany. It was determined that Japan should take steps, as the situation might require, in order to eliminate the political and economic interests of Britain in East Asia, including the South Seas. Concerning the possible use of armed force against Britain and the United States, Japan was to make decisions independently, and in the event the 'China Incident had been settled, ' Japan, it was said, would 'use armed force by taking as favorable an opportunity as may be

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

afforded by the situation prevailing at home and abroad. In the event the 'China Incident' has not been settled Japan's guiding principle was to be to take action within limits short of war, although it was further asserted that if 'the development of the international situation permits of no further delay Japan will resort to armed force.'

"In the atmosphere of these conferences 1 and in the light of all proper inferences to be 2 drawn from the extended negotiations, STAHMER, Spe-3 cial Envoy of VON RIBBENTROP, arrived in Tokyo in early September 1940 to prepare the stage for the 4 conclusion of a pact which was described by MATSUOKA 6 as the most important document in the history of the Japanese Empire. STAHMER, in a secret conference 3 with MATSUOKA, asserted that Germany of that juncture 9 did not look for Japan's military assistance with 10 England, and hardly thought that she and the United 11 States would come to blows in the near future, but 17 asserted the belief that 'war between Japan and the 13 United States cannot eventually be avoided.' The 14 importance of being thoroughly prepared effectively 15 to meet an emergency at any moment was stressed, to 16 which end Germany promised to restrain the United 17 States in the Atlantic and furnish Japan with as much war equipment, planes, tanks and war tools as she 19 could reasonably spare. Germany recognized Japan's 20 leadership in East Asia and agreed to cooperate in 21 such areas to further Japan's aims. 22

"In the Privy Council Meetings which followed, attended by the accused, Foreign Minister MATSUOKA; War Minister TOJO; Chief of the Planning

18

23

24

Board HOSHINO, Naoki; and Director of Military

Affairs Bureau of the War Department Major General

MUTO, the discussions fully developed the spirit in

which the pact was concluded and may be turned to as

a pro forma statement of events that were expected

to occur.

"MATSUOKA asserted that Japan had such strength she could tip the balance of the world as she liked; that Japanese supremacy in 'Greater East Asia' in the building of the 'New Order' meant for the time being French Indo-China, Thailand, Burma, the Strait Settlements, and such Oceanic islands as the Netherlands East Indies, New Guinea, New Caledonia and others, and that it would gradually extend to include Australia, New Zealand and other territories and that Japan expected the cooperation of Germany and Italy in the 'economic exploitation' of these areas. With regard to the United States, MATSUOKA declared that Japan would enter into a military alliance with Germany and Italy with America as the objective; that preparation for the eventuality of United States participation in the war should consist of strengthening the international situation by the conclusion of the pact and taking diplomatic, economic and military measures for the purpose of procuring

5 6

necessary natural resources for national defense from the South Seas and other places; and that the proposed alliance with Germany would put Japan in a position to be able to manipulate to her interest the twenty millions of German-descent Americans who were considered to hold an influential position in the United States.

"War Minister TOJO asserted that 'as far as our Army is concerned, only a part of its whole strength would be enough to engage in the event of war with America' and that on this ground there was no cause for concern; that it was necessary to strive in bringing the 'China Incident' to an end promptly so that preparation for a worse crisis could be made; that there was a sufficient supply of war materials on hand to cover requirements for a fairly extended period, and that regardless of whether the war lasted for a short or a long period, in his opinion 'there will be no alternative other than to strive for a way out of the desperate situation.'

"Navy Minister OIKAWA asserted that preparation of ships for field operations already had
been completed; that war materials, heavy oil in particular, were sufficient in amount to cover operations
for a fairly long period; that in the event of whole-

sale fleet to fleet clashes the present stock of oil would not be exhausted in the course of a half to one year, and that in the event the war is drawn out over a long period the frequency of battles would automatically drop; that no concern was felt in regard to the manpower problem as the Navy personnel is by its very nature limited in its size; that he was confident of winning a short war, and that as to Japan's future plans he expected to take measures to increase war strength by improving as far as possible the inner structure of Japan's forces.

"Chief of the Planning Board HOSHINO reported that a great deal had been accomplished in storing up a supply of fuel oils, gasoline for aeroplanes in particular; that in the event of a long term war steps would be taken for procuring necessary materials from the Dutch East Indies, Sakhalin and elsewhere, and that in the mobilization program as to materials the center of gravity was laid on the items for military purposes.

"Councillor ARIMA made the statement that if Japanese-American hostilities were at all events unavoidable it might be best to avail of the present opportunity and Chairman of the Committee SUZUKI expressed the view that Japan must be resolved to

anticipate a Japanese-American war as inevitable.

"With unprecedented speed the pact was concluded on 27 September 1940. By its provisions Japan, Germany and Italy attempted to apportion the world by establishing areas in which the leadership of the respective powers was recognized. Each pledged full cooperation in the establishment of leadership within the sphere of the others, and political, economic and military aid was pledged in the event of an attack against any one of the signatories by a nation not then involved in the European war or in the war with China. It was provided that the terms of the pact did not in any way affect the political status which existed between each of the signatories and the Soviet Union. This pact in its essence contained the ultimate development of the plot of the aggressive powers directed toward the division of the world and the establishment of the so-called 'New Order,' which had for its purpose the extinguishment of democracy throughout the world and the subjugation of all the nations by the aggressive states. Letters were secretly exchanged providing for consultation among the signatories for the purpose of determining whether action or a chain of actions would constitute an attack within the meaning of the pact. By these

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

23

14

15

16

27

18

19

20

21

32

secret communications, Germany also agreed to turn over to Japan the Mandated Islands at the conclusion of the war, and to use its best offices in introducing the Soviet Union as a participant in the pact. The objects sought to be accomplished under the provisions of this pact and the action subsequently taken in furtherance thereof will be shown to be in violation of specific treaty obligations.

"In an article entitled 'The Tri-Partite Pact and the World of Tomorrow, ' published in December 1940, SHIRATORI stated that the character of the New Order to be greated under the leadership of the Three Powers was to be considered in the light of the fact that the Three Powers had discarded the ideologies of individualism and democracy and had adopted the totalitarian point of view. In Japan, he asserted, the nation had revolted against the so-called evils of liberalistic civilization and its dissatisfaction had found expression in the form of the Manchurian Incident of 1931. This incident was a challenge externally to unjust conditions long forced upon mankind by the democratic powers, and internally to all alien ideas and thoughts grafted upon the Japanese paople. The characteristics of this movement in Japan,

24

23

1 he stated, had become more accentuated in the current 2 China affair, the ultimate object of which, in con-3 sonance with the classic expression Hakko Ichiu 4 adopted as a national slogan, was the establishment of a New Order in East Asia. Unless the present wars 6 were considered in the light of these statements, it 7 was said, the real nature of the new world order of S tomorrow which is to be established through Japanese-9 German-Italian cooperation could not be understood. 10 "In addition to the original signatories to 11 the Tri-Partite Pact, the following countries joined 12 on the dates indicated: Hungary, 20 November 1940; 13 Roumania, 23 November 1940; Slovakia, 24 December 14 1940; Bulgaria, 1 March 1941; and Croatia, 15 June 15 1941." 16

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until half past one.

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

19

17

18

21

22

23

24

Whalen & Morse

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

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

THE PRESIDENT: Yes?

MR. TAVENNER: If it please the Tribunal, the next subdivision of the topic of Tri-Partite Pact is under the heading: "C. Collaboration between Japan, Germany and Italy under the Provisions of the Tri-Partite Pact.

"Evidence will be introduced under this subject showing that the accused, acting through their leaders and in full collaboration with their Axis partners, unified the government and nation behind the Tri-Partite Pact, and by their declarations and conduct put into motion forces designed to accomplish the objects of the conspiracy charged in the indictment.

"In the period that followed the conclusion of the Tri-Partite Pact, SHIRATORI continued to play an indispensable part in promoting pro-German relations in Japan. Under his leadership, activist circles in Japan, as early as January 1941, demanded an attack on Singapore as the key British position in the west

Pacific Ocean. In November 1940, Ambassador KURUSU 7 had declared that Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese 2 agreements were required as a prerequisite for a 3 Japanese advance through the region south of China, including Siam, without the use of which Singapore could not be successfully attacked. The evidence will show that such an attack was designed to give Japan a free hand in establishing her Greater East Asia policy 2 in China and in the Pacific and Indian Oceans in con-9 formity with the purposes set forth in the Tri-Partite 10 The capture of Singapore by Japan will also be 11 shown as the fulfillment of Japan's desire to aid 12 Germany in bringing the war against England to a speedy It was considered that a sudden attack by Japan 14 upon Singapore without a declaration of war would con-25 stitute a blow that would prevent the United States from 16

effectively interfering.

17

18

19

30

21

12

23

24

35

"The German Ambassador to Japan made a report on 31 January 1941 to his government of the result of a two-day research with the attaches of the armed forces, in which it was concluded that the chances of success of an attack by Japan against Singapore were favorable; that it would have to be carried out in steps by occupying Saigon and the Malayan Peninsula, and that if the American Pacific Ocean fleet should

1

7

6

9 10

11 12

14

13

15 16

17

18

19 30

21 22

23

24

25

attempt to interfere from Hawaii it would easily be detected on the overly long approaches and annihilated. Japan, with the assistance of Germany, resorted to the crafty device of using her position of so-called mediator in the French Indo-China-Thailand border dispute to improve her situation with those two countries and obtain bases therein to serve as a springboard for an attack on Singapore.

"Foreign Minister MATSUOKA determined upon an official visit to Berlin and, after expressing intention to obtain wide authority from his Cabinet and particularly from War Minister TOJO, he advised the German Ambassador of the principal questions he desired to discuss, including a Japanese attack on Singapore. Ambassador OSHIMA was also advised by MATSUOKA of the important questions to be discussed.

"On 22 February 1941, in a conference with the Secretary of State of the Reich Foreign Ministry. Ambassador OSHIMA expressed the view that Singapore must be seized in grand style from the sea and from the land, but that it was first necessary to take Hong Kong. On the following day an extended conference was held between Ambassador OSHIMA and Foreign Minister Ribbentrop, in which Von Ribbentrop voiced the opinion that the decisive blow against England should be a

Japanese attack on Singapore, which would eliminate England's key position in East Asia and which would secure a position in that area which Japan could win only by war. The suggestion was made that the occupation of Singapore must take place with lightning speed, without a declaration of war in order to contribute to a speedy termination of hostilities. Ambassador OSHIMA represented that preparations for the occupation of Singapore would be complete by the end of May; that military preparations must be made against England and America; that the moment for occupation of Singapore must be coordinated with operations in Europe; and that the occupation of Hong Kong and the Philippines had been provided for in case of need.

"A few days after the OSHIMA conference, Ribbentrop directed the German Ambassador in Japan to
work with all the means at his command to the end that
Japan take possession of Singapore by surprise as soon
as possible. This was followed on 3 March 1941 by the
High Command of the Armed Forces, Fuehrer Headquarters
issuing directive number 24 concerning collaboration
with Japan, in which it was stated that the aim of
the cooperation based on the Three Power Pact must
be to bring Japan as soon as possible to active operations in the Far East, and that the conquest of

Singapore, England's key position in the Far East,

would mean a decisive success for the three Axis powers.

The importance of the question was again emphasized

when on 18 March 1941 General Jodl, in a report to

Hitler, stated that Japan must take steps as soon as

possible to eliminate Singapore, since the opportunity

would never again be as favorable.

"Events were moving swiftly in Japan. On 25 March 1941, Chief of the Japanese Navy General Staff, Admiral KONDO, reported that the Navy was vigorously preparing for an attack on Singapore, and Chief of the Japanese General Staff, General SUGIYAMA, reported that the Army was also making preparations for an attack.

"Foreign Minister MATSUOKA arrived in Berlin in the latter part of March 1941, and between 27 March and 5 April 1941 conferred with Hitler, Ribbentrop, Goering, Funk and others on matters relating to joint military and economic cooperation of the Tripartite Powers. Although declaring he could not accept the obligation at the moment to act for the Japanese nation, MATSUOKA stated in a conference with Hitler that Japan would act decisively when she has the feeling that she would otherwise lose a chance which might only return after a thousand years; that Japan would advance

regardless of the condition of her preparations; that he had personally held the view that Japan should attack Singapore and put an end to British influence in that area; and that it was only a matter of time until Japan would attack.

"Japanese concern over German intentions with regard to political domination and control of the Netherlands East Indies and French Indo-China has been referred to in a previous section of this opening statement. In his conference with Hitler, MATSUOKA took the occasion to state that although Japan expected to keep Defore her the motto of 'No conquest, no oppression, no exploitation,' Japan would proceed by force, if necessary, in establishing the New Order according to the principle of the preamble to the Tripartite Pact, and would have to lead with a strong hand the nations affected by this New Order.

"In a conference on 29 March 1941 with the Reich Foreign Minister VON RIBBENTROP, after discussing in detail general plans relating to Singapore and trade relations between Japan and Germany, MATSUOKA pointed out that he was doing everything he could to reassure the English about Singapore; that he acted as if Japan had no intention at all regarding this key position of England in the East; and that he assumed this attitude not only in order to reassure the British but also in order to fool the pro-British and pro-American elements in Japan until one day he would suddenly open the attack on Singapore. He took the position that a sudden attack against Singapore would unite the entire Japanese nation with one blow.

"In a conference on 4 April 1941, MATSUOKA secured from HITLER a promise to place at the disposal of the Japanese technical information and inventions which were needed by Japan, including especially that acquired by Germany's experience in sub-marine warfare.

conference with VON RIBBENTROP that he had long been of the opinion that every nation was offered an opportunity only once in a thousand years and that Japan was confronting such an opportunity and would have to

3 4

7 8

assume the risk connected with it. She would have to act decisively at the right moment, he said, in order to take advantage of this unique condition of affairs. Finally, he requested RIBBENTROP to assist the Tri-Partite Powers Commissions, and especially the Economic Commission, in the performance of their functions.

"The commissions formed under the provisions of the Tri-Partite pact included in their membership the accused, MATSUOKA, Yosuke; OSHIMA, Hiroshi; TOGO, Shigenori; MUTO, Akira; OKA, Takasumi; and SATO, Kenryo.

"On 24 May 1941 a report was made by the German Military Attache in Tokyo to the German Foreign Intelligence Office that Japan acknowledged her treaty obligations in event the United States entered the war, but that hostilities would not be opened immediately. He added, however, that Japanese preparations for attack on Singapore and Manila stand.

"On 22 June 1941 Germany invaded Russia.

RIBBENTROP reiterated the great importance from the standpoint of Japanese interests of a drive toward the south in the direction of Singapore, but advised that in view of her present unpreparedness for this action, Japan would solve her Russian question by joining Germany in the war against Russia. After the

4

1

6 7

9 10

11

8

12 13

14 25

16 17

19 20

21 22

23

造4

25

anticipated swift downfall of Soviet Russia, he said, Japan, safe in the rear, would be free to make a drive in the south.

"At the important Imperial conference of 2 July 1941 a resolution was adopted which had the effect of postponing definite action on Germany's request that an attack be made on the Soviet Union from the East. At the same time a renewal of determination was voiced to establish the so-called 'Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Spere, regardless of any change in the international situation. For the accomplishment of this, it was determined to continue the disposition of the so-called Chinese incident and to accelerate the southward advance. A decision was reached to make preparations for a war with Britain and the United States and all measures, especially those relating to the execution of military and naval plans, were referred for definite decisions. The stabilising plan for the southern advance was to be accomplished by the execution of 'schemes against French Indo-China and Thailand, ' which will be demonstrated in later phases of the case. It was also announced that should the conditions of the German-Soviet war progress favorably to Japan, Japan would 'execute arms to solve the northern problems, thereby securing stability in the northern regions.'

"The events between 2 July 1941 and the attack
on Pearl Harbor, although based in a large measure
upon Japanese, German and Italian collaboration, appear
more properly to belong in the phases of presentation
of evidence relating to French Indo-China, Thailand,
the Netherlands East Indies, the British Commonwealth
of Nations and the United States, wherefore reference

ate Peace Pact of 11 December 1941.

"Cultural and Trade Agreements between Japan, Germany and Italy.

will be made in this phase of the case only to those

matters within this period which affect the No Separ-

"The evidence will show that cultural and trade agreements parallelled political and military collaboration between the Axis powers. Within the framework of the Anti-Comintern Pact, and in furtherance of its spirit, cultural treaties were concluded between Germany and Japan on 25 November 1938 and Italy and Japan on 23 March 1939. These treaties provided for systematic promotion of cultural relations in the fields of science, fine arts, music, literature, motion pictures, radio broadcasts, child and youth movements, sports, and so forth. The result sought to be obtained was alleged to be the strengthening of the ties of friendship between the nations concerned.

16.

17

14

15

16

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

"Commercial arrangements were made throughout the entire period of Japanese-German collaboration but these are too numerous and of too detailed a character to justify an extensive description in this opening statement. Raw materials intended for use in military operations in Europe were made available to Germany by Japan from the Netherlands East Indies. French Indo-China and China. Special trade considerations over other nations were given Germany in China. In this connection Japan insisted that 'North China' as used in a commercial agreement should be changed to 'China,' for the reason that Japan intended to dominate and control commerce and trade in all of China.

"The No Separate Peace Pact and the Military Agreement Between Japan, Germany and Italy.

"When the Tri-Partite Pact was concluded on 27 September 1940, MATSUOKA in reply to a question stated that an agreement would be negotiated between the three powers for a 'No Separate Peace Pact' in the event of hostilities.

"In the latter part of November 1941, Germany was informed of the state of negotiations between Japan and the United States and of the fact that hostilities between Japan and the United States were

1

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

imminent. On 29 November 1941, Ribbentrop advised that it was essential that Japan effect the New Order in East Asia without losing the existing opportunity. 'There never has been and probably never will be,' he said, 'a time when closer cooperation under the Tri-Partite Pact is so important. If Japan hesitates at this time, and Germany goes ahead and establishes her European New Order, all the military might of Britain and the United States will be concentrated against Japan. ' He further stated: 'Should Japan become engaged in a war against the United States, Germany, of course, would join the war immediately. There is absolutely no possibility of Germany's entering into a separate peace with the United States under such circumstances. The Fuehrer is determined on that point.'

"Between the 1st and 3rd of December 1941,
Ambassador OSHIMA received a telegram from Tokyo stating that the Japanese Government desired Germany's participation in the event of a United States-Japanese conflict and further that the Japanese Government desired that a no separate peace pact be signed. The Japanese Ambassador to Italy, invoking the provisions of the Tri-Partite Pact, on 3 December 1941, called upon Italy to declare war upon the United States after

the opening of hostilities. Mussolini advised that if Japan should declare war on the United States and Great Britain, Italy would immediately do likewise.

Both Ribbentrop and Mussolini agreed prior to 7 December 1941 to enter into a treaty by which Japan, Germany and Italy would not conclude a peace treaty separately. Such a treaty was formally concluded on 11 December 1941, to remain in force as long as the Tri-Partite Pact of 27 September 1940.

"On 14 December 1941, at a reception given by Hitler to Ambassador OSHIMA, at which Hitler presented OSHIMA with the Grand Cross of the Order of Merit of the German Eagle in gold, Hitler declared that Japan had taken the right course in attacking without masting time in declaring war. He commented that he had used this system and that he expected to use it in the future.

G 1 r e n 3 b e 8 8 6 B 7 2 8 r 0

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

"On 18 January 1942 the Japanese, German and Italian armed forces concluded a military agreement in the spirit of the Tri-Partite Pact of 27 September 1940, and provided for operational coordination among them. The world was divided into zones for military operations. Japan was assigned the waters eastward from about 70 degrees, east longitude to the west coast of the American continent, as well as the continent and islands situated in these waters and also the Asiatic continent east of 70 degrees, east longitude. Germany and Italy were assigned the waters westward from about 70 degrees, east longitude to the east coast of the American continent, as well as the continent and islands situated in these waters, and also the Near East, the Middle East and Europe westward from about 70 degrees east longitude. General operational plans were outlined, and the main points of military cooperation were specified.

19 20

"The evidence relating to collaboration among Japan, Germany, and Italy and the conduct and declarations of the accused in connection therewith will now be offered to prove the common plan of conspiracy to wage wars of agression as charged in the indictment and the manner and method by which

the conspiracy was to be executed. Mr. G. Osmond Hyde, Special Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, and Mr. Worth McKinney, Assistant United States Attorney for the Western District of North Carolina, will assist in the presentation of this evidence."

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Tribunal please, Mr.

Cunningham for Mr. OSHIMA.

In view of the statements contained in the opening statement of the prosecutor, just read, outlining the facts which the prosecution proposes to prove, I feel it timely at this time to present to

THE PRESIDENT: We will entertain no proposition of law except in support of a motion or an objection.

the Tribunal the following proposition of law.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I reword the last sentence to read as follows: I submit the following objection to evidence.

Comes now the defendant OSHIMA, Hiroshi, through his counsel and submits to the Tribunal for its consideration his objection to the introduction of any evidence in support of the Indictment or any of its counts, or of any crime charged therein against him on account of acts committed in his capacity as a member of the Ambassadorial suite, or as Ambassador, and states in support of this objection the following reasons:

One: The defendant, at the time of the acts alleged in the Indictment, was either an Ambassador

or a member of an Ambassadorial suite, and his acts were privileged under the diplomatic immunity rule of international law; and it is an inviolable rule of the law of nations.

Two: That any process issued against the defendant by any nation or group of nations complaining of acts performed by the defendant in his official capacity as Ambassador or member of the suite is null and void according to the law of nations.

Three: That under the extra-territoriality rule, the personal representative theory, the naturalist law doctrine, or the established rule of immunity, the defendant is exempt from punishment or criminal responsibility for his acts by virtue of this established principle of diplomatic immunity.

Four: Immunity is a vested right which attaches at the time of appointment and survives the assignment.

Five: The Ambassador represents the person of the sovereign, and any insult, or violence, or arrest, or deterrence of the right of embassy which belongs to all sovereigns is regarded then as a hostile act against that sovereign and is punishable in itself as a violation of international law.

THE MONITOR: Will the reporter please read

1 | the last statement?

(Whereupon, the fifth reason was read by the official court reporter.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: "And is punishable under municipal law" I said, I believe.

Six: The law of both international law and the law of nations affords to the Ambassador and members of the Ambassadorial suite as great a privilege from process as it does the sovereign he represents.

Now, if the Tribunal please, this is a fundamental principle of international law, and it is, I believe, sound basis for an objection to any evidence against the defendant in this case.

I see the Members of the Tribunal digesting the Charter for the provision, and I anticipate that the question will arise which takes precedence: the provision in the Charter or the principle of international law which is already established in every country of the world.

Of course, if the Tribunal please, I take
the position that not one nation or any group of
nations outside of a United Nations Organization can
speak and change the established rule of international
law; and I do not give the Charter the authority, or
concede in any manner that it has the authority to

vary, or alter, or amend, or modify the established 1 rules of international law. The only recognition which the Charter can possibly have in this Tribunal is a matter declaratory of international law where 5 it is silent heretofore. 6 THE MONITOR: Will the reporter please read 7 the last statement? 8 (Thereupon, the last paragraph of 9 Mr. Cunningham's statement was read by the 10 official court reporter.) 11 THE MONITOR: Will you read the last sen-12 tence once more again, slowly? 13 (Whereupon, the sentence referred 14 to was read by the official court reporter 15 as follows:) 16 "The only recognition which the Charter can 17 possibly have in this Tribunal is a matter declaratory 18 of international law where it is silent heretofore." 19 MR. CUNNINGHAM: You can change that to: 20 On matters of international law where it was silent 21 before. 22 If the Tribunal please, I have gone to great 23 lengths in preparing a brief and memorandum upon the 24 legal authorities in this proposition, but I will 25

submit it to the Court as a separate document; and

_

4 5

at this time I should like to entertain any question which the Court might have concerning this proposition or objection.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, Mr. Cunningham, I am glad you used the word "submit" in the last sentence because up to that stage it appeared that you were making declarations of law and not making submissions under the law.

At an earlier stage of the proceedings we indicated, if my recollection serves me rightly, that points such as this might be raised in the final addresses of the defense after they had given their evidence.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: On that proposition, it occurred to me that if an objection was to be made to evidence, that it should be made before the evidence was introduced, and that the objection now is timely; and, if the question of law was well taken, it would save considerable time in introduction of evidence concerning official acts of the defendant.

THE PRESIDENT: That, of course, is an alternative.

Now, although it may seem to be an extraordinary thing that an Ambassador, guilty of a crime against international law, should be beyond the reach of the long arm of international law, nevertheless, you will be able to argue that at the conclusion of the case. However, the point taken now is not going to prevent the Tribunal from hearing the evidence which is offered.

The objection is overruled subject to your right to raise this question later if my colleagues are satisfied it has not already been determined. In notes to me, it appears a question arises which warrants that last qualification.

E

MR. TAVENNER: If it please the Tribunal, the evidence will relate first--

THE MONITOR: Just a moment, please. We haven't finished our interpretation yet of the last remark.

MR. TAVENNER: If it please the Tribunal, the evidence will relate first to the conclusion of the Anti-Comintern Pact and secret agreement and transmittal of secret communications.

of our subject dealing with the Anti-Comintern Pact and succeeding subdivisions dealing with efforts to conclude a military alliance between Japan, Germany and Italy cover the approximate period of the years 1936 to 1939, both inclusive. Many of the documents to be introduced refer to official positions without designating the holders of those positions. I desire therefore to call to the Tribunal's attention that from the personnel records of the accused heretofore introduced in evidence, major positions of importance were held by the accused during this period as follows:

ARAKI, Sadao, Minister of Education, May, 1938 to 29 August, 1939; Cabinet Councillor from 15 October, 1937 to 27 May, 1938.

HATA, Shunroku, Inspector General of the

21 22

(

Military Education and concurrently Military Councillor, the latter a Cabinet position from 26 August, 1937 to 14 February, 1938; Military Councillor, 15 December, 1938 to 25 May, 1939.

HIRANUMA, Kiichiro, Head of the Privy
Council, 13 March, 1936; Prime Minister from 5 January,
1939 to 29 August, 1939.

HIROTA, Koki, Foreign Minister to April, 1936; Prime Minister from April, 1936 to 1 February, 1937; Foreign Minister from 4 June, 1937 to 4 January, 1939, concurrently with his service as Foreign Minister he was a member of the Supreme War Council; President of the Planning Board from 10 June, 1937 to 25 October, 1937.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Court please, I would like to object to this as repetitious. The documents are in evidence and this is oral testimony by the counsel of the facts and certainly repetition of the record.

THE PRESIDENT: It is helpful to the Tribunal to know against whom the evidence is really offered. This is an attempt to indicate that. There is nothing repetitious about it in a true sense. The objection is overruled.

MR. TAVENNER: (Continuing)

ITAGAKI. Seishiro. Minister of War. 5 1 January, 1939 to 29 August, 1939. 2 KAYA, Okinori, Councillor of the Cabinet 3 Investigation Bureau, 24 February, 1937; Minister of 4 Finance, 4 June, 1937 to 4 January, 1938. 5 KIDO, Koichi, Minister of Education, 22 6 October, 1937; Welfare Minister, 11 January, 1938 7 to 5 January, 1939. S KOISO, Kuniaki, Minister of Overseas Affairs, 9 7 April, 1939 to 29 August, 1939. 10 MATSUI, Iwane, Cabinet Councillor, 20 July, 11 1938 to 23 January, 1940; Member of the Committee of 12 East Asia Commission, 5 July, 1939. 13 MATSUOKA, Yosuke, Councillor of the Cabinet, 14 15 October, 1937 to 23 January, 1940. 15 THE PRESIDENT: Why mention him? 16 MR. TAVENNER: For the reason, your Henor, 17 that his acts and conduct involve all the other 18 defendants in the conspiracy. 19 THE PRESIDENT: He is one of the others now? 20 MR. TAVENNER: Yes. 21 MUTO, Akira, Director of Military Affairs 22. Bureau of the War Ministry and concurrently Chief 23 Secretary of the Supreme War Council, 30 September, 24 1939; Councillor of the Planning Board and member of 25

10 11 12 13 G oltab 14 15 е 16 r g 17 & 18 S 19 p r 20 a t 21 22 23 24 25

1

2

6

7

8

9

the Committee of the Cabinet Information Bureau, 12 October, 1939; Councillor of the Overseas Affairs Bureau of the Overseas Affairs Ministry, 7 November, 1939.

OKA, Takasumi, Member of the Committee of the Information Bureau of the Cabinet, 21 January, 1938.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess now for fifteen minutes.

> (Whereupon, at 1440, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

MR. HANAI: I am HANAI, defense counsel for the defendant Koki HIROTA.

In the prosecutor's statement it appeared that HIROTA, Koki was President of the Cabinet Planning Board. This is a mistake. I respectfully ask for a correction. One other correction. The prosecutor has stated that HIROTA, Koki was Foreign Minister until January, 1939. Mr. FIROTA was Foreign Minister until May of 1938 and was, therefore, not Foreign Minister in 1939. I respectfully ask that this also be corrected.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you admit those corrections, Mr. Tavenner?

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

1314

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

MR. TAVENNER: If this is a misquotation from the personnel records, I will, of course, be very glad to correct it.

THE PRESIDENT: Those records should be compiled with scrupulous care.

MR. TAVENNER (Reading): "OKA, Takazumi, member of the Committee in the Information Bureau of the Cabinet, 21 January 1938. OSHIMA, Hiroshi, Military Attache to Germany to 8 October, 1938 and Envoy Extraordinary and Ambassador Plenipotentiary in Germany 8 October 1938 to 27 December 1939. SATO, Kenryo, Investigator of the Planning Office, 24 June 1937 to 25 October 1937, Secretary of the Planning Board, 26 November 1937 to 29 July 1938 and member of the Cabinet Information Board Committee prior to December, 1938. SHIRATORI, Toshio, Envoy Extraordinary and Ambassador Plenipotentiary to Italy from 22 September 1938 to 28 August 1940. SUZUKI, Teiichi, Member of the Intelligence Bureau of the Cabinet, 28 December 1938, Councilor of the Planning Bureau, 30 May 1939. TOGO, Shigenori, Envoy Extraordinary and Ambassador Plenipotentiary to Germany from 27 October 1937 to 15 October 1938. TOJO, Hideki, Councilor of the Planning Board, and concurrently Member of the Cabinet Board of Information, 15 June 1938. UMEZU, Yoshijiro, Councilor of the Information Bureau, and Councilor of the Cabinet Investigation Bureau, 13 July 1936, Councilor in the Planning Board, 26 November 1937 to 30 May 1938."

While Japan was consolidating her position in Manchuria and North China, as shown in an earlier phase of the case, the following events, of which the Tribunal has taken judicial notice by its order No. 400, occurred in Europe. These events are presented for the purpose of showing that during the formative period of Japanese-German relations, Germany and Italy were engaged in a program of military preparedness for aggressive action in Europe. They are as follows:

On 14 October 1933, Germany withdrew from the Disarmament Conference; on 14 October 1933, Germany resolved to withdraw from the League of Nations; on 9 March 1935, foreign air attaches in Berlin were informed that German air force had come into existence officially as of March 1; on 16 March 1935, Hitler introduced compulsory military service in Germany; on 7 March 1936, German troops occupied the Rhineland; in 1934 Italy began preparations for war against Ethiopia; on 3 October 1935 Italian armed forces invaded Ethiopia; and on 11 December 1937 Italy resigned from the League of Nations.

I offer in evidence prosecution's document 2156-B, an excerpt from the interrogation of the accused OSHIMA, Hiroshi, for the purpose of showing that at the time of the establishment of the Japanese-dominated and controlled Eastern Hopeh Anti-Comintern Autonomous Council in November, 1935, the Japanese General Staff sent Lieutenant Colonel WAKAMATSU to Berlin where he and Colonel OSHIMA, Military Attache to Germany continued discussions of the Japanese-German alliance which had been the subject of talks since June, 1935, the date of the UMEZU-HO Agreement.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I wish to object to the introduction of this excerpt from the statement of Mr. OSHIMA and to other excerpts from the statement unless the prosecution tenders in advance page 233 of the interrogations which shows the conditions under which it was received.

THE PRESIDENT: Are you alleging some inducement or threat or promise or something of that sort?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: No, the statement was made with the reservation that it should be returned to Mr. OSHIMA to be corrected, and there were a great many misinterpretations and mistakes in the statement

as they were originally taken through interpretation. That is why I object to the introduction until they are returned to him, and the corrections made, and the true version of the interrogations represented to the Court at this time.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner, what have you to say?

MR. TAVENNER: The entire interrogation was filed with the Court on the 31st day of July of this year, and was certainly available for any inspection had they desired to make it. There is no agreement to my knowledge that the document was to be returned to the accused for correction, but, of course, if there are corrections to be made, we do not object to his pointing them out.

In addition to this, your Honor, the record shows a statement by the accused commending the interpreter for the very excellent and faithful job of interpretation which he had done.

THE PRESIDENT: Has the accused ever asked the prosecution for the opportunity to correct this interrogation?

MR. TAVENNER: I understand that the witness did, on one occasion, state that he would like to have his interrogation to look it over.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it has been on the 1 file for some time, according to you, Mr. Tavenner, 2 and the accused counsel would have known that, and this is the first attempt to have any correction made --MR. TAVENNER: Yes, sir. 5 THE PRESIDENT: -- Although the accused did 6 express a desire to see what you had attributed to 7 him. 8 MR. TAVENNER: I may state in addition, 9 10 if your Honor please, that the record will show that 11 at several times during the interrogation the accused 12 asked that considerable portions be read back to him. 13 which was done without correction by him. 14 MR. CUNNINGLAM: If the Tribunal please, the 15 only reason that I suggest that page 233 be intro-16 duced as a precedent to the introduction of these 17 pages is so we can base the corrections upon that 18 reservation which he made at the time he made the 19 statement. 20 THE PRESIDENT: Is this a short statement, is 21 it, page 233, is it? 22 MR. CUNNINGHAM: 233. 23 THE PRESIDENT: You had better have it read. 24 MR. CUNNINGHAM: At the end this is what he 25

I don't have the specific line on the other.

(Reading): "I thank you for the manner in which zeal and integrity you have interpreted in excellent Japanese for over twenty interrogations." This is a hold-over from diplomatic protocol. He made that remark in addition, that he suggested that he thanked him. I said that is a hold-over from a diplomatic protocol. The last line was "interrogations," and I continue.

THE MONITOR: Is there any difference in those two "hes"?

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: You had better ask counsel there.

THE MONITOR (to Counsel): I don't get your reference to two "hes," -- "he suggested that he thank him" -- which one of "he" is the accused?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Mr. OSHIMA thanked the interpreter.

MR. TAVENNER: I move, your Honor, that the statement referred to be struck from the record as it was no part of the accused OSHIMA's statement.

THE PRESIDENT: What I am looking for, if there be one, is an arrangement that this statement be not used until it is perused by the accused. There is no such arrangement. If there were, we might see fit to respect it.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Court please, there is, and it is here. May I continue to read the statement of the accused concerning the statement which he made?

THE PRESIDENT: Read it.

Abram & Morse

things that have been discussed dealt with diplomacy and treaties, and consequently there were many very complicated matters which would make it very difficult for anyone to interpret. Therefore, I wish to read over the transcript from beginning to end and correct parts that might have been necessary to change. However, as there does not seem to be enough time, you would not accede to this. In so far as the main points go, I believe there are no mistakes, but there might be some small mistakes on which I wish to retain the privilege of correcting at a later date.

THE PRESIDENT: Still no arrangement with the prosecution is disclosed. That may be an attempt to impose a condition after he has given his statement. As it is, the position as I see it is that we should admit the statement and you are always able to contradict it by evidence for the defense later.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: But I did not wish to be in the position later on to try to correct the statement and then not be able to for not objecting at the time on account of the discrepancies and errors in translation.

THE PRESIDENT: Actually the only course

open to us is to admit it and let you give evidence 1 to correct it later. The objection is overruled. Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 2156-B will receive exhibit No. 477. 6 (Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 477, 8 and received in evidence.) 9 MR. TAVENNER: (Reading) 10 When did you first become acquainted with 11 RIBBENTROP? 12 AII In 1935, for the first time. 13 110 What was the occasion for these numerous 14 meetings with RIBBENTROP in 1936? 15 In 1936 we concluded the Anti-Comintern 16 Pact, which was finally signed by Ambassador 17 MUSHAKOJI, but I had a good many talks on matters 18 preceding the final settlement. 19 Had you ever discussed with Mr. HACK the 20 subject matter of this proposed alliance against 21 Russia with Germany? 22 Yes, I had discussed with him, and in 23 this regard, if you desire, I shall tell you of the 24 events leading up to this pact in detail. I shall 25 tell you all I know about this pact, including secret

matters pertaining to it. To start with it was in the spring of 1935, in May or June, I believe, that HACK came to me and said the following was AIBBEN-THOP's own idea and had nothing to do with the policy of the German government, but would there not be a possibility of some sort of defensive alliance against Hussia between Germany and Japan. In this regard they knew that the Japanese army had penetrated into Manchuria and might have an interest in such an alliance - the reason for this being that the army was on the borders of the U.S.S.R.

"Q Did you have an idea that probably HACK would carry these ideas back to HIBBENTROP?

"A Naturally, I thought so. However, I could not definitely give any answers, unless I knew exactly how GHQ felt.

"Q Continue with the story.

"A Subsequent to this AIBBENTROP said that he wished to see me and I met him for the very first time at HACK's home in October of that year. At this meeting RIBBENTROP said that this was simply his own idea and he did not know how Hitler or the Government felt about it, and he said further that he believed there would be some possibility of its being put into effect. However, he asked me what the

Japanese military would think about it, and I said that there was no way of knowing, so that he asked me to find out exactly how they would feel, and he asked me to communicate with the Japanese military end find out how they would feel about it. I subsequently sent the telegram to GHQ about the matter. At this time RIBBENTROP stressed the fact that this was his own personal idea and for me not to feel bad about matters in case the German Government did not back him up - I said the same thing in regard to my own Government.

"Q This is the second communication to Tokyo relative to this proposal?

"A Yes.

"Q Continue.

"A HACK was at this meeting and there were just the three of us. Following this communication of mine to Japan I received the reply from GHQ that there was no overall opposition to the proposal, but that they wished to look into matters more fully before they committed themselves, and in this regard they would send Lt. Col. WAKAMATSU of the German Division of GHQ. This officer arrived in Berlin in early December 1935, I believe, although I am not too sure of dates. During this interim I did not

have any communication with RIBBENTROP.

2 3

Did you have any communication with your own Foreign Office relative to this communication?

4

6

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MA No. This was simply a military matter. Prior to Lt. Col. WAKAMATSU's arriving in Berlin HACK came to see me several times and I told him that he should wait until the arrival of the above mentioned officer. When he came I took the Colonel to see RIBBENTROP and also General BLOMBERG and WAKAMATSU told them that GHQ was in favor of a more or less general treaty, but that it was his duty, as this was still given only as RIBBENTROP's personal idea, to find out what the German Government felt about it. Also WAKAMATSU stated that while the Japanese Army favored it, to bring it into fruition the Government would have to be consulted."

MR. TAVENNER: I tender in evidence prosecution's document 2156-C, an excerpt from the interrogation of OSHIMA, for the purpose of showing, one: that negotiations for the military pact were conducted through military channels, and, two: that the Japanese Army was strong enough to enforce its will upon the Japanese Government.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Objected to unless the prosecution submits the parts which are omitted

between the lines, which gives the matter continuity and completeness of thought.

THE PRESIDENT: As I have said before on several occasions, the defense may complete the interrogations later. The objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 2156-C will receive exhibit No. 478.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 478, and received in evidence.)

MR. TAVENNER: (Reading)

"A I wish to point out to you that the Japanese military and naval attaches are not under the jurisdiction of the ambassador, but are directly responsible to the respective staff headquarters in Tokyo.

As far as the embassy goes, they are under the ambassador, but as far as their duties go they are responsible to their military superiors in Tokyo.

"Q Are they authorized by virtue of their position as military attache to enter into negotiations with the military of another nation, looking towards a pact or a treaty or an international agreement between the two nations?

"A Yes, if it was a strictly military matter

they may discuss these matters without going
through the ambassador. Before I go any further
I would like to stress here that they were sounding
out the opinion of the Japanese army and not that of

would have been the ambassador's duty.

"Q Is it not also a fact that if hibbentrop or any one else in Germany could sell the military of Japan on this idea that the military was then probably in a position whereby they could persuade the Foreign Office to go along with the idea?

the Japanese government because if they had been that

"A Yes, that is one point and quite true that the army had enough power to very probably sell the pact to the Japanese government. The second point is the one I stressed before that hibbentrop was not in an official capacity at the time. Particularly, in this point, he had seen how the Japanese army had taken possession of Manchuria and, therefore, naturally, concluded from that that the Japanese army would be in the strongest position to push a treaty of this type. I would say that no treaty could possibly have been made on this if the army had not wished it."

MR. LOGAN: Before introducing this document, if the Tribunal please, I understood the prosecutor

)

to say that he was introducing it for one reason to show that the Japanese Government at this time was completely under military control. 3 THE PRESIDENT: The document speaks for itself. It may or may not go as far as the prosecution 5 contends. MR. LOGAN: I appreciate that, your Honor, 7 but what I would like to know is if that is the view of this prosecutor who is conducting this phase of 10 the case, or is that the view of the entire prosecution, 11 because if so that is something new. 12 THE PRESIDENT: I take him to be speaking for the Chief Prosecutor, the whole prosecution, 14 but he must, of course, answer for himself. 15 Mh. LOGAN: Then, your Honor, we understand 16 that as early as 1935 it is the claim of the pro-17 secutor the Japanese Government was completely under 18 the control of the military. 19 THE PRESIDENT: This must not develop into 20 a side argument. I understood you were going to 21 make some objection. 22 MR. SHIMANOUCHI: I am SHIMANOUCHI, defense 23 counsel for the accused OSHIMA. There are several gross errors in the Japanese text of the interrogation 24

of OSHIMA just read. Yesterday my colleague pointed

out these gross mistakes to the prosecution section, but these corrections have not yet been made, and I would respectfully request a ruling from the Tribunal. THE PRESIDENT: You might enlighten us, Mr. 5 6 Tavenner. Did you undertake to make any corrections? 7 MR. TAVENNER: No errors in translations 8 were pointed out to me or any of my associates. 9 Apparently the matter to which he refers is the 10 translation from the English to the Japanese. 11 MR. SHIMANOUCHI: It is the translation 12 from English to Japanese. May I point out these 13 errors before the Tribunal? 14 THE MONITOR: These gross errors. 15 THE PRESIDENT: They don't affect the ex-16 hibit and it is a matter really for himself to 17 remedy by correcting his translation with the ex-18 hibit itself. 19 Mr. Smith. 20 MR. SMITH: Your Honor, I would like to make 21 a point in connection with the prosecutor's statement 22 as to what he intends to prove by this last document, 23 exhibit 478, as the exhibit, the questions and 24 answers, refer to no time whatsoever, and it would 25

only be by evidence alone that you could fix the

time at all. That is tied in with the prosecutor's
statement that at this time the Japanese Army was
strong enough to impose its will on the civil government. So I suggest, your Honor, in order that the
matter may be made intelligent in the record that
the prosecutor be required to read such additional
parts of the interrogation as will fix the time to
which the statement refers.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think at some stage or other we have invited you to state the purpose for which you tender the document, to state the drift of the document, and apparently you are doing so now, but do you really wish to show that the Japanese Army was in control and not the government? Perhaps you would like to consider the matter further, Mr.

We will adjourn now until half past nine tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Friday, 20 September 1946 at 0930.)