March 5-1947. March Carelle

## INDEX

Of

## WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
MITARAI, Tatsuo (resumed)	17761
Direct by Mr. S. 9KAMOTO (cont'd)	17761
MORNING RECESS	17776
NOON RECESS	17794
Cross by Mr. Tavenner	17802
AFTERNOON RECESS	17819

## INDEX

Of

## EXHIBITS

Doc.	Def. Pros.		For In Ident. Evidence
Not Numbered	2345	Document entitled "Additional Notes to the 1931 Diary of Marquis KIDO"	
Not Numbered	2346	Document in Japanese hand- writing (produced by Witness MITARAI) re the resignation of the HIRANUM Cabinet	A 17836

Wednesday, 5 March 1947 2 3 4 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST 5 Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building 6 Tokyo, Japan 7 8 The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, 9 at 0930. 10 11 Appearances: 12 For the Tribunal, same as before with the 13 exception of: MAJOR GENERAL MYRON C. CRAMER, Member 14 from the United States of America now sitting. 15 For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 16 For the Defense Section, same as before. 17 18 The Accused: 19 All present except OKAWA, Shumei, who is 20 represented by his counsel. 21 22 (English to Japanese and Japanese 23 to English interpretation was made by the 24 Language Section, IMTFE.) 25

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

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Freeman.

MR. FRFEMAN: Mr. President and Members of the Tribunal, as his American counsel I have been requested by the accused SATO to inform the Court that Chikao FUJISAWA, former attorney of record for the accused SATO is no longer representing him from and after February 28, 1947, and request the record so show this fact.

THE PRESIDENT: The accused has full liberty to change his counsel but the notification comes rather late.

Mr. OKAMOTO.

TATSUO MITARAI, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. S. OKAMOTO (Continued):

Q I am continuing to interrogate the witness. When did the TANAKA Cabinet fall?

- A In June, 1929 -- in July 1929.
- Q What were the reasons for its fall?

  MR. TAVENNER: If your Honor please.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: The question elicits an opinion or conclusion of the witness. We object to the introduction on the ground the opinion and conclusion of the witness is no more entitled to weight than if it were a journalistic article which has been ruled upon many times by the Court.

THE PRESIDENT: If the evidence be relevant and material how else would it be proved and who is more qualified to prove it than this man? There would we get the facts upon which to base an opinion on such a matter?

MR. TAVENNER: As to the first question of how to prove it, I submit that the proper method would be to testify as to the occurrences and events and leave it to the Tribunal to draw its conclusions and inferences as to the meaning of the testimony and not permit the witness to do so.

THE PRESIDENT: Where do we get the facts?
Tho gives the facts on which we base an orinion of facts leading to the downfall of a cabinet and explaining the reason for its downfall? The facts might take days to relate. Are we to have them all related so we may form an opinion on a comparatively minor issue?

1

4

3

5

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

2425

MR. TAVENNER: As to the question of how the Tribunal is to get the facts, that is, from what source, WAKAMATSU himself has testified before the Tribunal on that subject. This witness is not a specially qualified witness on the subject; certainly no more so than any newspaper writer or journalist.

THE PRESIDENT: We have testimony relating to one cabinet. This man is going to testify to the downfall of a number of cabinets and we are, under the Charter, allowed to receive such things as reports of investigators showing that to some extent we may receive opinion evidence and in this case we have no practical alternative, assuming, of course, the evidence is at all material and I do not share the view that it is. Where the prosecution has alleged that a certain cabinet was brought about by the alleged conspirators or the accused for the purposes of what is charged against them, it ought to be sufficient for the defense to meet that particular case. Unless the prosecution in any case have proved the downfall of a cabinet was brought about by events covered by the Indictment we must assume that the downfall was not associated with those events.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: Mr. President, has this objection been overruled?

3

5

7 8

6

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

2324

25

THE PRESIDENT: I want to hear whatever argument you have in support of your question.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: If it is desired to ascertain the reasons for the downfall or ascertain the facts concerning the downfall of sixteen cabinets by means of direct testimony it would be necessary to call every one of the cabinet members of those cabinets to this stand. The present situation in which the defense finds itself does not permit of such a course. Therefore, we have decided to call this witness who was most familiar with the circumstances, with the political situation concerning these various cabinets, and therefore we are firmly convinced that under the circumstances this witness is the best possible witness on this question. Furthermore, concerning his testimony I would like to state that he is not going to give merely his own opinions as the prosecution has said. We intend that he will testify to those facts based on investigations which he made at the time and in as brief and direct a manner as possible.

THE PRESIDENT: How is this material. As far as I recollect, the prosecution are alleging that only one cabinet was affected by acts alleged in the course of carrying out the conspiracy.

Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: If your Honor please, a large number of counsel representing individual defendants are interested in this question.

THE PRESIDENT: We will hear only one counsel on this nevertheless. Do not waste our time, Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: I take an exception to the ruling of the Court.

THE PRESIDENT: That is sufficient now. We ask you to leave the lectern while we hear what Mr. OKAMOTO has to say.

MR. SMITH: I merely wanted to say I would like to be heard, your Honor, instead of overruling this objection.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: May I make a few remarks on this question of materiality? In Mr. Logan's opening statement he has recognized the materiality of this and has stated briefly the reasons for the fall of each cabinet. In a word, I wish to make it clear that there was no political basis upon which the alleged conspiracy could have been formed, and I believe that one of the most important questions in determining whether there was a conspiracy or not is this matter of whether any cabinet was overthrown by the pressure of the army. I believe that after the

23

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

witness has given his testimony, this point will be still more apparent.

to question the witness on the assumption that he will adduce facts as well as opinions and that we will be able to select the facts if we so wish and disregard the opinions. We are not yet clear as to the materiality of what you propose to adduce. The objections are overruled. Mr. Smith, no doubt, does not want his exception now.

BY MR. S. OKAMOTO (Continued):

Q (Continuing) Mr. Witness, please answer.

A The TANAKA Cabinet had committed many political blunders besides being guilty of political corruption and was already rather shaky when, in 1928, Chang Tso Lin was killed by a bomb explosion in Manchuria.

Correction: The TANAKA Cabinet committed a serious blunder in trying to dispose of this Chang

Tso Lin incident. The statement which the TANAKA

Cabinet made at the time of its resignation made it clear that it resigned because it felt it had not fulfilled its responsibilities towards the Emperor.

When did the HAMAGUCHI Cabinet fall?

A In April, 1931.

3 4

5

7

10

11

12

13 14

17

18

19

20

22

23

25

Please tell us the reasons for its downfall. On November 17 of the previous year Premier

HAMAGUCHI was shot by one, SAGOYA, Tomeo, a member of the Aikokusha. His wounds becoming more serious, by April he was unable to discharge his duties as Premier and, therefore, resigned.

Were military or naval men connected with SAGOYA's act?

After an inquiry into SAGOYA's motives as well as his background, made by the Court which was trying him at the time, it was found that he acted solely on his own because of anger at the result of the London Naval Conference and that no military or naval officers were connected in any way with this act.

When did the next cabinet, the WAMATSUKI Cabinet fall?

December, 1931. A

Please tell us the reasons for this fall. 6

The WAKATSUKI Cabinet was a continuation of the HAMAGUCHI Cabinet and continued the policies of the previous cabinet; but, by the end of the year its policies were coming to a complete standstill, both domestic and external.

THE MONITOR: Foreign.

(Continuing) Thereupon, Home Minister ADACHI

proposed a coalition cabinet with the Seiyukai, but
all the other cabinet members opposed such a move.
The Seiyukai was then the opposition party. There-
upon, the cabinet was forced to resign because of
internal dissension. This course is clearly set forth
in the statement which the cabinet gave out upon its
resignation.

Q Tell us about the INUKAI Cabinet -- the next cabinet and its downfall.

A The INUKAI Cabinet fell in May, 1932.

Q What are the reasons for ills fall?

A Premier INUKAI was assassinated on the 15th of May in an incident which was provoked by the outbreak of a few naval officers, military cadets and young farmers.

THE MONITOR: And this incident is known as "5-15 Incident."

Q Was there any connection between this incident and the superior -- higher strata of the army or the navy?

A The highest ranking officer among them was a lieutenant, senior grade.

Q As the result of investigations conducted by army and navy court martials, it was established that there were no higher officers -- there were no other

co-conspirators connected with them.

Correction on the previous statement: As a result of investigations conducted by military and naval court martials as well as ordinary courts --

Whalen & Duda

THE PRESIDENT: A colleague suggests shortening the cross-examination by asking one question: Did any cabinets fall because of military pressure; if so, which?

THE WITNESS: Should I answer now?
THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

THE WITNESS: I believe that I am supposed to answer questions by the counsel. I have not yet received a direct question from the President. Should I answer?

THE PRESIDENT: I expected counsel to ask you. The question is not mine; it is that of a colleague. But I will put it.

Did any of the cabinets fall through military pressure? If so, which cabinets were they?

THE WITNESS: May I inquire whether, by "military pressure" is meant by direct military action or by political pressure brought to bear by the army?

THE PRESIDENT: No such refinement is intended. Were the military responsible for the downfall of any cabinet, no matter what means they employed? We don't suggest direct violent assault.

THE WITNESS: There is no cabinet which fell directly as the result of political pressure brought to bear upon it by the army. But there are cabinets,

as I have just stated, which fell not as the result 1 2 of action by the army, but as the result of action by 3 military or by naval personnel. 4 THE PRESIDENT: What cabinets were they, and 5 what were the circumstances? 6 THE WITNESS: The INUKAI Cabinet is one 7 example, and it fell as the result of action by 8 military and naval men. 9 Correction: It fell because the Prime Minister 10 was assassinated by the action of military and naval 11 men. 12 Later, the OKADA Cabinet also fell because of 13 the action of military and naval men. However, I 14 would like to point out that there is a distinct dif-15 ference between the action of the army and between that 16 of individual military or naval men. 17 Even though a few servicemen should commit 18 a certain action, it does not necessarily follow that 19 that was the action of the army or the navy as a whole. 20 I believe I have answered the President's 21 question. 22 THE PRESIDENT: That will do for the time 23 being. 24

Q Please tell us the time and the circumstances

of the downfall of the SAITO Cabinet.

It was in July of 1934.

2

. 5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you are not adopting my colleague's suggestion. You are still going on to asking about each cabinet. Subject to any objections, you may do so.

There were certain members of the cabinet, the SAITO Cabinet, as well as those in high government posts, who were concerned in a scandal and were publicly indicted.

MR. TAVENNER: If your Honor please, it is quite apparent from the answer that this matter is entirely irrelevant to the issues involved, and for that reason I make the additional objection.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I have a question to ask you. Will the prosecution make clear what cabinets they say fell because of the action of the accused in carrying out their alleged offenses?

3

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

MR. TAVENNER: The WAKATSUKI Cabinet fell, according to the testimony of that individual, as the result of army pressure.

The testimony introduced in regard to the INUKAI Cabinet is that there was extreme military pressure due to the position that that cabinet took in opposition to the military aims in Manchuria.

The evidence that the prosecution has introduced in regard to the HIROTA Cabinet shows the existence of a political difference between the army and the political parties based primarily upon the army's views toward expansion in China.

The prosecution's evidence shows that military influence was used in the HIRANUMA Cabinet to accomplish the purposes of the army or else bring about the fall of the cabinet.

As to the YONAI Cabinet, the prosecution's 17 evidence shows that there was criticism on the part 18 of the army based upon its view that the YONAI Cabinet 19 was not strong enough to put over the military alliance 20 with Germany and Italy, and for that reason a new 21 cabinet should be formed.

22 The fall of the Third KONOYE Cabinet in Octo-23 ber 1941 was influenced by the decisions of the War 24 Minister. In addition to those matters there have been

3

4

6

7 8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

24

25

numerous instances shown in evidence in which the army influenced the constitution of new cabinets through the principle of requiring the recommendation of the three military chiefs before a War Minister could be appointed. A striking illustration of that is the failure of UGAKI to be able to establish a cabinet to succeed that of HIKOTA's.

THE PRESIDENT: That is very helpful, Mr. Tavenner. Cross-examination should be confined to those matters referred to by Mr. Tavenner. I mean examination in chief. I made a mistake in using the term cross-examination; examination in chief.

Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: On behalf of Mr. HIROTA, if the Court please, I want to take an exception to the undue interference of the Tribunal with the ordinary examination of the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: Will you repeat what Mr. Smith said? I was reading a note from a colleague, and I always give those notes pricrity. I could not listen to Mr. Smith and read that.

(Whereupon, the statement by Mr. Smith was read by the official court reporter.)

THE PRESIDENT: You will use respectful terms

3

4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

here, Mr. Smith. You will not speak of undue interference by the Tribunal. You will withdraw that or you will leave this Court as counsel; and you will apologize.

MR. SMITH: I would like to explain to the Tritunal I have been trying cases for twenty years and using that language--

THE PRESIDENT: You will withdraw that offensive expression "undue interference by the Tribunal."

I will not listen to another word from you until you do. And you will apologize for using the expression, and if you fail to do so I shall submit to my colleagues that they cancel your authority to appear for the accused.

You can always submit that the Court should allow counsel to proceed as he proposed, but you are not authorized to use offensive expressions to the Court in making your submission. That is the difference.

MH. SMITH: I had no intention of offending the Court or using offensive language, and I do not understand the nature of the impertinence to which your Honor refers.

THE PRESIDENT: I ask you again to withdraw

the offensive expression "undue interference by the Tribunal." MR. SMITH: Well, I decline to do that, your Henor. THE PRESIDENT: The Court will recess to consider the position. We will recess for fifteen minutes. (Whereupon, at 1025 a recess was taken until 1100, after which the pro-ceedings were resumed as follows:) 

Goldberg & Kapleau

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

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Smith.

The Tribunal has decided to exclude Mr.

Smith from all further proceedings before it until such time as a full withdrawal of the remarks which the Tribunal considers offensive and an apology for making them is tendered to the Tribunal by him.

MR. SMITH: May I say to your Honor, most respectfully, I have no intention of changing my position and see no reason to change it, so I will assume I have been permanently excluded from defending Mr. HIROTA in this trial; and I would like an exception on behalf of my client if it is the last one I am permitted to take in this case.

THE PRESIDENT: The accused HIROTA is ably defended by Japanese counsel and maybe by other American counsel; I am not sure. Nothing has happened except that we shall no longer have the assistance of Mr. Smith.

Doctor UZAWA.

DR. UZAWA: We have received the Court's decision, your Honor. We Japanese counsel have nothing to add or to say with respect to the decision just handed down by the President. As for

us, we have done our best all through this trial to cooperate with the proceedings, and now this unexpected incident has occurred. Inasmuch as this question of Mr. Smith has arisen quite suddenly, and inasmuch as we Japanese counsel have to consider the important matter of carrying out our duties as counsel for the accused, we would like to request the Court for a brief recess in order that we may be permitted to confer among ourselves as to our future course.

affected by the individual conduct of any single counsel. The use of an offensive expression by an American counsel or a Japanese counsel can have no proper bearing on the conduct of other counsel except as a warning to others who are likely to effend similarly, and there are none such. The only question now is whether accused HIROTA decides to have American counsel in the place of Mr. Smith. If he does we shall do all in our power to assist him to get that American counsel.

Will you please tell me, Doctor UZAWA, why Japanese counsel want to confer about this matter:

DR. UZAWA: It is difficult for we Japanese

counsel to speak of such a thing, but, in our feeling, it seems as if there have been more restrictions placed upon the defense case than was in the
case of the prosecution in presenting evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Smith could have made his submissions in respectful language. He could have withdrawn the offensive language and apologized, and he would have been here now. No restrictions have been placed on Japanese defense counsel other than those required for a proper trial.

under no misapprehension. The question for you to decide is whether you Japanese counsel desire this Court to be insulted or whether you do not. This Court was insulted by Mr. Smith. He made no apology for the insult, and you apparently suggest that Japanese counsel might support him in his conduct. Mr. Smith could be here at this minute if he withdrew his language -- if he withdrew his remark and apologized for it. Do not try to confound the issue.

DR. UZAWA: I understand, your Honor. I have no idea whatsoever of trying to confound the issue. As to the Tribunal, we Japanese counsel only hold the deepest respect, and Japanese counsel must have the highest respect for this Tribunal.

1 2 3

4 5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

1516

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: There is no occasion for any adjournment at this moment to enable Japanese counsel to confer. We will proceed with the trial.

DR. UZAWA: Then, we shall consult among each other during the regular recess, and I presume that there might be something to report to this Court as a result of such consultation.

THE PRESIDENT: There is no occasion to report anything. We would like to know now whether the accused HIROTA desires American counsel. His Japanese counsel can come to the lectern and tell us that.

DR. UZAWA: There are some points, your Honor, which require consultation among Japanese counsel, and whether we have anything to report to your Honor as a result of it or not I don't know. However, inasmuch as I do not desire to take up this Court's time, I shall leave this lectern. I reserve the right, however, to report.

MR. HANAI: Counsel HANAI for the accused HIROTA.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you speak English? MR. HANAI: I can.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you understand it at all?

Mh. HANAI: I do a little.

1,

You have just spoken, your Honor, with respect to whether or not the accused HIROTA desires an American counsel. Inasmuch as this development was rather sudden, I have not had the opportunity of asking the accused HIROTA, to get his ideas or desires on the matter. There are two associate Japanese counsel cooperating with me in the defense of the accused, and we should like to confer among each other as quickly as possible and let the Court know of our desire.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, pending your coming to a decision, the trial will proceed, and the defense of the accused HIROTA will be in capable Japanese hands.

MR. BRCOKS: Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, I would like for just two or three minutes to express a view on the situation that is before the Court and I think will solve the situation entirely if a study of the record is made. In the first place, a close study of the record will show that Mr. Smith did not make an objection to the Court.

THE PROSIDENT: This is cut of order. We cannot hear you on Mr. Smith's case.

Will Mr. OKAMOTO please come to the lectern and continue his examination in chief?

MR. BROOKS: I want to make this on my own behalf because it deals with exceptions, taking of exceptions in rhetorical language and I think that is a misunderstanding before the Court.

THE PRESIDENT: Your conduct is not in question, and I will not hear another word from you of this kind. When your conduct comes in question, and I hope it never will, Captain Brooks, we shall deal with it.

MR. BROOKS: May I ask the Court then to be heard in Chambers on this matter for an explanation?

THE PRESIDENT: That is a proper attitude which I appreciate.

MR. LOGAN: Mr. President, may I as American Chairman of Division One make a few statements with respect to the testimony of this witness, why we are asking the questions we are.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan, I may assure you that we are going to allow Mr. OKAMOTO to proceed as he intended.

MR. LOGAN: Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: That is to say, to deal with all the cabinets individually.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: Mr. President, I have certain doubts about the proceedings that have just occurred and I should like to put a question about them. The Prosecutor came before this lectern and presented an objection as to the causes of the SAITO Cabinet's downfall. I believe that my explanation as to that matter has not yet been heard.

THE PRESIDENT: I just announced, and you apparently did not hear it, that we are not going to interfere with your examination in chief. So proceed to question the witness as you intended; that is to say, deal with all the cabinets, if you wish, specifically.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: At this time, in order to enable the Tribunal to understand more fully, I should

374	
1	like to present the purpose of my interrogation;
2	that is, its relevancy.
3	THE PRESIDENT: I invite you to state it.
4	I have done so before. I invite you to do so.
5	MR. S. OKAMOTO: As the prosecution has
6	said
7	THE MUNITOR: No.
8	MR. S. OKAMOTO: I shall explain all the
9	reasons for the downfall of all sixteen cabinets
0	not only as the prosecution has stated, those who
1	fell because of pressure from the military, and this
2	will help make clear the internal signation in Japan.
3	Then, after having examined in chief, I shall make an
4	explanation as to relevancy. I have changed my
5	manner of proceeding on the desires of my colleagues.
6	
7	Please read the record on what the witness
8	has said about the causes of the downfall of the
9	SAITO Cabinet.
0	THE INTERPRETER: The Japanese reporter has
1	changed.
2	THE JAPANESE COURT REPORTER: If it is
3	necessary, we shall call the one who took the report.
4	THE PRESIDENT: I understand from Nord
5	Patrick that what he said was this: Some public

officials and some members of the Cabinet were indicted

for scandal in office.

BY MR. S. OKAMOTO (Continued):

- Q Does that cover all your answer?
- A No, I have more to say.
- Q Please continue.

THE WITNESS: Before continuing I have a request to make of the President. May I be permitted to say a few words, sir?

THE PRESIDENT: Just answer questions.

Answer a question when I put it. At present I have not put one. Have you anything to add about your evidence as to the indictments for scandal in office of cabinet ministers in the SAITO Government?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have a few words to add, but before doing so I would like to make a few remarks by way of explanation if I may be permitted to say so.

THE PRESIDENT: Make your explanation follow your answer. That is always allowed.

THE WITNESS: Yes, it is relevant, sir.

With respect to my statement the prosecution argued and gave the impression as if there were some falsehood with respect to my statements in connection with the WAKATSUKI Cabinet. The prosecution said in refuting my statement with respect to the cause of

the fall of the WAKATSUKI Cabinet by saying that 1 Baron WAKATSUKI, himself, in this Court in his testi-2 3 5 6 8 9 10 11

mony said that the downfall was caused as a result of the Manchurian Incident. I do not know about Baron WAKATSUKI's testimony before this Tribunal, but my statements are based upon official documents and facts. Hence, any remark to the effect that I was -- or creating the impression that I was telling a falsehood reflects upon my honor. If necessary, and if permitted, your Honor, I should be very glad to read the statement expressing -- the official statement expressing the reason for the fall of the WAKATSUKI Cabinet issued by that Cabinet at the time of its resignation.

THE PRESIDENT: We invite you to read it. It should be most helpful.

17

16

12

13

14

15

18

19

21

22

23

24

3

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: (Reading)

"Home Minister ADACHI had different opinions and views with respect to the organization of the Cabinet and proposed that the then Cabinet in cooperation -that the party then in power should cooperate with another party in order to meet the situation. After deep consideration and thorough consideration of ADACHI's proposal I came to the conclusion that this was impossible of realization. I brought this matter before the full Cabinet council for discussion and all Cabinet members agreed with me with the exception of Home Minister ADACHI. Hence, Home Minister ADACHI was asked to reflect upon his position, to reconsider his position, but he would not consent. There was no alternative before the Cabinet except to ask Mr. ADACHI 16 to resign, but because Mr. ADACHI refused to resign or to submit his resignation, and it being impossible to meet the situation under such circumstances, the Cabinet had no alternative but to resign. Thus the individual resignations of the Cabinet members has been collected and has been tendered before His Majesty."

This is a statement giving the reasons for the fall of the Cabinet presided over by Baron "AKATSUKI himself as Prime Minister, giving the reason for the resignation en blog of the Cabinet and which were published

12

13

14

18

19

before the Japanese nation. So long as this statement is not a falsehood I state emphatically that my statement before this Court is based upon truth. However, the remark made by the prosecution a little while ago. gave the impression that I was telling a falsehood. Inasmuch as I have appeared before this Tribunal and swore -- and took an oath before this Tribunal to tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth, such statements reflects upon my honor and I should like to leave this matter in the good judgment of the President of the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: I have nothing to add. Please proceed to question him.

Please tell me the time and the reasons for the fall of the OKADA Cabinet.

To add a few more words with respect to the cause of the fall of the SAITO Cabinet, I must say that because the events which took place in his time were of a nature that I have described the SAITO Cabinet itself did not announce publicly the reason why it fell. However, the members of the Cabinet Press Club were asked or 22 instructed by the various newspapers to inquire into the 23 true reason for the resignation of the SAITO Cabinet, and in the statement giving the reasons for the real -the real reasons for the resignation of the SAITO Cabinet,

the Chief Secretary of the Cabinet stated as I have already described to this Tribunal. 0 Then, explain to us the time and reasons for the fall of the OKADA Cabinet. If my memory serves me right the OKADA Cabinet resigned officially on the 8th of March, 1936, but the real date of its fall was February 26 of that year.

> 0 The reasons then.

20 some odd young army officers falsely leading men under their command, started a rebellion.

THE MONITOR: A thousand men -- about a thousand men.

(Continuing): For several days this rebellion created quite a commotion and confusion in the City of Tekyo. The OKADA Cabinet fell taking the responsibility for this uprising.

Q Is there any connection between the acts of these young officers and the upper circles of the Navy and the Army?

The highest ranking officer who took part in this uprising was an army captain and the fact that 23 there were no connections whatsoever between these officers 24 and higher levels in the army or navy was later made 25 clear at courts martial and other trials which were

8

7

1

2

3

4

5

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

7 8

held subsequently. I must point out especially that one army general was suspected for having--for complicity in this incident, but after a full trial it was discovered that he had no connection whatsoever with the actions of these younger officers.

- O What is the name of that general?
- A MAZAKI, Jinzaburo.
- Q Please tell us the date and the reasons for the fall of the HIROTA Cabinet?

the reason: A very violent debate took place in the House of Representatives between a member of the House of Representatives and the Mar Minister. As a result of this heated debate, a strong conflict in opposition was created between the Government and the Diet. There were members of the Cabinet who were in favor of dissolution of the Cabinet and the Diet, and some in opposition of such a measure and the Cabinet was forced to resign because of disunity of views within the Cabinet.

3

5

6

8

10

9

11

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

Q Who was this member of the House of Representatives?

A HAMADA, Kunimatsu of the Seiyukai political party.

Q Who was the Minister of War at the time?

A TERAUCHI, Julichi.

Q Next tell us when the HAYASHI cabinet fell.

A June 1937.

Q Please tell us the reasons for its fall.

A The HAYASHI cabinet succeeded in passing the budget and other important bills through the Diet through cooperation with the various parties represented in the House of Representatives. However, on the last day of the Diet the cabinet ordered a dissolution of the Diet. As a result of this move on the part of the government the strong opposition grew up between the government and the Diet, and as a result of the general election which followed, out of 466 seats in the Diet the opposition took over 400 seats.

THE MONITOR: 400 and ten odd seats.

Thus the opposition party just before the convening of the next session of the Diet held a mass rally calling for the resignation en bloc of the HAYASHI government. That event took place on the 25th of May and the cabinet tendered its official

2,3

resignation on the 31st of May. The cabinet clearly indicated that reason in its statement made public with regard to its resignation.

Q Please tell us next the date and the reasons for the fall of the first KONOYE cabinet.

A It fell in January 1939. As to the reason for the resignation of the first KONOYE cabinet, I refer to the statement issued by the cabinet announcing its resignation. That statement said that in order to meet the new situation there must be installed a new cabinet with new ideas and new concepts, and with such renovation to meet the newly developing situation. I think that the cause of the KONOYE cabinet's downfall-resignation-was as expressed in its statement.

Q Can you give us some more details, such as its policy, as not having been able to carry out its policy?

A That is a little difficult but I might also include in my explanation what he personally told us as members of the press with respect to his reasons for resigning. The China Incident at that time showed every tendency of being protracted and one of the important issues confronting the nation and the government then was to bring about a speedy conclusion. Another reason was that a proposal was presented by the German

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

2324

25

government to Japan with regard to the reinforcement of the Anti-Comintern Pact and in the light of the changing international situation there was the problem of settling this proposal in the light of the changing international situation, and it was KONOYE's view at that time that in order to handle this situation a new cabinet composed of new men with new ideas and with new strength should take over.

Q When did the HIRANUMA cabinet fall?

A I think it was July 1939; it may have been August. My memory is not quite sure.

Q Please tell us the reasons therefor.

A The reason for its resignation is clearly expressed in the statement issued by that cabinet at the time of its resignation. According to that statement HIRANUMA stated that he was resigning because of the changing European diplomatic situation which has become exceedingly complex, strange and perplexing, and that he was unable to foresee that his government—that his government was unable to foresee these developments and therefore had no excuse to offer to His Majesty and therefore decided to resign.

Q Have you got this declaration with you?

A I have.

Q Can you read it to us, to be more precise

2

3

4

5

·

0

9

10

141

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

about this matter?

"Because of the conclusion of the German-Soviet non-aggression pact, the situation in the European world has become extremely strange, complex and perplexing. In view of this sudden -- of this new development we will have to abandon some of the plans that we had been following, and we have come to the point where another new policy must be adopted. This new development has been quite different and contrary to what I have hitherto been reporting to His Majesty, the Emperor, and I have caused great concern to the mind of His Majesty. I cannot but feel trepidation for the anxiety I have caused His Majesty in the light of my responsibility to assist His Majesty in government. Therefore, for me to remain in office under such a situation and condition any longer would invite the criticism that I am, as a subject of His Majesty, basking in the Imperial graces."

Q Next, when did the ABE cabinet fall?

A January 1940.

taken.)

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess until half-past one.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was

1 2 G 3 r e e n b е 6 r g y & M 9 0 r 10 11 12 13 14 15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330, Justice Delfin Jaranilla, Member from the Commonwealth of the Philippines, not sitting.

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

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. OKAMOTO.

TATSUO MITARAI, recalled as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. S. OKAMOTO (Continued):

Q When did the ABE Cabinet resign, Mr. Witness?

A January, 1940.

Q What was the reason for its resignation?

A According to the statement issued by the cabinet, in view of the serious situation, it feared that it was unable to presecute the national policy. To elaborate on the meaning of the reason given by the cabinet at the time of its resignation, I would express it this way:

3

5

6

9

8

11

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

Because of the repeated failures in the prosecution of various national policies, the ABE Cabinet invited the anger and indignation of the members of the House of Representatives. On the first day of the session of the Diet, over 280 members of the House of Representatives met in the Diet Building and passed a resolution to the effect that the Cabinet should make up its mind and resign. And, therefore, it is interpreted that the ABE Cabinet resigned because it did not see any prospects of weathering the session of the House of Representatives harmoniously and smoothly.

- Q When did the YONAI Cabinet fall?
- A August, 1940.
- What was the reason for its collapse?
- A According to the statement issued by that cabinet at the time of its resignation, it was because the Minister of War submitted his resignation from the cabinet.
  - Q When did the second KONOYE Cabinet resign?
  - A July, 1941.
  - What was the reason of its resignation?
- A According to the statement issued by the cabinet, the KONOYE Cabinet resigned because, in view of the new situation then confronting the nation, and

1 2 3

21 22

in view of the necessity for the country to pursue an active diplomatic policy, it was necessary to bring about a reinforcement of the internal national structure and at the same time to renovate and strengthen the government organization. By a study of the situation prevailing before and after the resignation of the cabinet, this can be said: that, in order to render smooth and effective Japan's negotiations with the United States, it was necessary for the KONOYE Cabinet to bring about the resignation of the then Foreign Minister, Mr. MATSUCKA, Yosuke and, in order to do so, to effect a reorganization, a reshuffle of the cabinet.

Q How was it when the TOJO Cabinet fell?

THE MONITOR: When was it that the TOJO
Cabinet fell?

A August, 1944. The statement issued by the cabinet at the time of its resignation was rather long, but the gist of it was to the effect that, in view of the decisive war situation which the nation was then confronting, it was necessary for the cabinet to strengthen its cabinet personnel. But, in view of the fact that the TOJO Cabinet failed to effect this reinforcement, it chose to resign.

The factual background which describes the

circumstances leading to the fall of the TOJO Cabinet may be put thusly:

The military situation was then very much unfavorable to Japan, and the public sentiment had been alienated from the TOJO Government. In the light of these facts, over twenty leading members of the Imperial Rule Political Assistance -- Assistance Political Society, who were members of the House of Representatives, submitted a resolution demanding the resignation of the TOJO Cabinet to the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal. Simultaneously, a large number of members of the Imperial Rule Assistance Political Society in the Diet also passed a resolution to the same effect expressing non-confidence in the TOJO Cabinet.

I might point out the fact that this resolution was tendered to General ABE, President of the Imperial Rule Assistance Political Society, and to the Prime Minister, General TOJO.

Q I overlooked the third cabinet -- KCNOYE Cabinet which preceded the TOJO Cabinet. When did the third KONOYE Cabinet collapse and what was the cause of its collapse?

A That was in October, 1941. According to the cabinet announcement issued at the time of the resig-

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	nation, in order to surmount the critical national
2	situation, there was not a unity of views within the
3	cabinet. If necessary, I should be very glad to read
4	the statement of that cabinet.
5	Q I shall not require you to do so.
6	When did the KOISO Cabinet resign?
7	A That was in April, 1944 '45.
8	Q What was the cause?
9	A According to its announcement, in view of
10	the very decisive war stage on which the country had
11	entered upon, an even stronger cabinet was necessary
12	to handle the situation.
13	Q In accordance with a wish expressed by one
14	of my colleagues, I should like you to read the
15	statement issued by the third KONOYE Cabinet at the
16	time of its resignation.
17	MR. TAVENNER: I merely desire to call to
18	the Tribunal's attention that that has been read in
19	owidence as a prospertionly orbibit Wy only number

call to n read in evidence as a prosecution's exhibit. My only purpose in objecting is that it is in evidence once and that it is a needless repetition. The exhibit No. is 1152.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: In order to impress upon the Court accurate facts, I should like to read it with the permission of the Court at this opportunity.

THE MONITOR: I should like to have the

witness read it. THE PRESIDENT: There is no need to do it. We do not want to hear it twice. Objection upheld. 

3

5

4

7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

23

22

24

25

Now, Mr. Witness, can you classify in simple words reasons for which those sixteen cabinets fell. the reasons of the fall of those sixteen cabinets of which you have testified?

THE PRESIDENT: There is no need for that either.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: I conclude my leading examination now. I should like to explain to the Court at this opportunity my idea about the relevancy of this testimony. Then I should like to have Mr. Logan who is in charge of the first phase to add some words about that matter.

THE PRESIDENT: You have said enough about it. I don't know what Mr. Logan has to say. He may have something useful to add.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: I don't think I have said enough about the question of relevancy myself.

THE PRESIDENT: I beg to differ from you. We will hear Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: I have nothing to say, your Honor. It was taken care of.

MR. F. OKAMOTO: This is all I have to say, and the prosecution may cross-examine the witness. Perhaps one of the defense counsel may be permitted to cross-examine him before the prosecution.

THE MONITOR: To examine him.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think he said anything hostile to the defense or any defendant.

Mr. Tavenner.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. TAVENNER:

Q Mr. MITARAI, I understand that you have specialized in the study of political history and that you have written articles on the inside story of political circles, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q In your testimony regarding the WAKATSUKI
Cabinet were you endeavoring to testify regarding
the inside story of political circles or were you
merely confining your testimony to the official declaration of the cabinet at the time of its fall?

A Both.

Q You have stated that the cabinet fell because of a disagreement regarding a coalition in the cabinet or the formation of a coalition cabinet. Is that all you have to state as to the cause of the fall of the WAKATEUKI Cabinet?

A With respect to certain developments, they may arise out of one cause and they may arise out of

3 4

1

2

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

1/

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

many causes, and it is normal that a cabinet would decide upon its own fate because of various -- an accumulation of various reasons, indirect reasons and also direct reasons.

Q Are you intending to state that there are reasons other than the one assigned by you for the fall of the WAKATSUKI Cabinet?

A No. The reason is that the fall of the WAKATSUKI Cabinet was brought about -- the reason which I stated as bringing about the fall of the WAKATSUKI Cabinet was the direct and foremost reason.

Q Will you state what other reason occurs to you as to why the cabinet fell?

A It is going to take quite a long time. Will that be all right?

Q Can you state briefly the subject of any other cause without going into details?

A I will try. First of all, the personnel matters in the cabinet had come to a dead end. Secondly, the economic policy of the government also was faced -- had come to a dead end. With respect especially to this second reason I might state that the gold reserves in the country had already come -- the gold reserves of the country was then almost nil. As a result of this a very serious depression set in;

the people were in lack of food and industries were 1 almost on the point of bankruptcy. The cabinet had 2 come to the point where it had to effect a change in 3 policy. The diplomatic question was also in a serious state following the outbreak of the Manchurian Incident 5 and the cabinet had come to the point where the cabinet alone could not settle the situation then prevailing. There was disunity of views and opinions within the 8 cabinet and even division of opinions within the support-9 ing party to such an extent that the cabinet under such 10 a situation or under such conditions could not long 11 continue in office -- could no longer continue in 12 office. There were various other reasons which brought about the fall of the WAKATSUKI Cabinet but the foremost reason is that it had lost its power to survive inasmuch as there was within the cabinet itself opposition to the idea of forming a coalition with the opposition party, and this was the foremost and the 18 most direct cause of the collapse of the WAKATEUKI Cabinet.

THE MONITOR: Addition: after the coalition with opposing party as proposed by the Home Minister.

I notice that you left until the last the naming of the Manchurian Incident as one of the causes for the fall of this cabinet, and you failed to mention

13

14

15

17

19

20

21

22 23

24

it in your examination in chief. Is that because you feel it is of relative unimportance? Correction: relatively unimportant?

A No. My last reason was in my estimation the foremost internal reason which brought about the collapse of the WAKATSUKI Cabinet and it was then thereafter that I mentioned the Manchurian Incident. The fact that I mention one before the other does not mean that it is more important than the other. During the course of the direct examination I didn't mention it because I just gave the final -- the conclusion which -- the final conclusion which brought about the fall of the cabinet of which this was one factor, and the statement from the cabinet, issued at that time, represented the final conclusion of all the factors involved.

1
2
4
_
3
2

3 4 5

6

8

10

11

13

14

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

Q However, you admit now that the Manchurian Incident was the main cause of the fall of the WAKATSUKI Cabinet? Is that true?

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, we object to that question as it is assuming something that the witness has never testified to.

A You have made a very great misinterpretation of my testimony. I do not recall ever having testified to that effect.

THE PRESIDENT: He didn't say it was a main cause, Mr. Tavenner.

Q Did you contend that it was a principal cause?

MR. LOGAN: I object to that, too, your Honor.

It is not a question of what the witness has contended.

It is a question what he has testified to. And he has made no such contention here.

THE PRESIDENT: Don't assume he said things that he didn't say, Mr. Tavenner. Of course, my construction may be wrong, but I don't think he said either of those things.

MR. TAVENNER: Possibly I misunderstood the witness' answer. I will now ask him that.

Q Do you consider the Manchurian Incident one of the principal causes for the fall of the WAKATSUKI Cabinet?

A I do not.

2

Q Do you consider that the attempt to form a coalition government arose from the disregarding

4

the Manchurian Incident?

5

A Yes, that might be one of the very minor reasons which brought about the fall of the cabinet. But the

7

foremost, direct cause which brought about the collapse

8

of the WAKATSUKI Cabinet was the fact that the nation

9

was on the brink of national bankruptcy and the

10

situation then required a complete change in economic

11

policy.

12

Q Then, according to your view, the Manchurian

13

Incident was merely a minor -- had merely a minor

14

influence upon the fall of the cabinet?

15

A Yes.

16

5

17

\*

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q I will read you what Mr. WAYATSUKI testified to in this court, as found in exhibit 162, on that point, and I will ask you whether or not you agree with his statement. Referring to September 1931, this statement is made:

"At this time it was the unanimous sense of the Cabinet that these operations in Manchuria must cease immediately and the aforesaid War Minister MINAMI agreed to put this Cabinet policy into effect with the Army at once. . . I tried everything I

could think of in an effort to control this situation but without success. My last move was to try to form a coalition Cabinet with the Seiyukai Party, hoping that with the combined strength of the Monseito and Seiyukai Parties I would be able to control the Army in Manchuria but various Cabinet members were unwilling to form such a coalition so this measure failed. . . . Further, the aforesaid War Minister MINAMI had failed to control the Army in Manchuria and had not carried out the unanimous policy of the Cabinet in this matter, therefore, I resigned as Prime Minister and my Cabinet with me."

Do you agree with that statement?

A I do not.

Q Do you know whether Minister ADACHI was connected with army groups and was using his influence in this cabinet for the promotion of the army views?

A To the extent I know of this whole situation, there was not any such effect.

Q Let me read you what Mr. KIDO, in his diary item of November 17, 1931, says on that subject. I read from page 16. This is not in evidence, but the prosecution proposes to have it reproduced and served upon counsel. Its present use is for cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: This question arose at

22 23

Nuernberg, and if you are not allowed to do it your surprise will be defeated in some cases.

MR. LOGAN: We object to the use of this diary, your Honor. Do you wish me to state the grounds for it?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

MR. LOGAN: In the first place, this is a document which is not in evidence before the Court; and, furthermore, I don't think it would have any probative value whatsoever for the prosecution to produce statements and declarations by other people and ask this witness whether or not he agrees with them. I think they should be confined to what is in evidence already.

I might also point out, at that time Marquis KIDO was not a member of any cabinet, and, furthermore, it is an attempt of the prosecution to get something into evidence on our case which they failed to do on theirs.

24

25

MR. TAVENNER: We submit the defense has 1 announced a most unusual rule governing cross-2 examination. 3 THE PRESILENT: We allowed the defense to do this. 5 Mr. TAVENNER: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: And there is no reason why 7 you should disclose everything that you intend to 8 cross-examine about. If you do that, as I have already 9 said and as they indicated at Nuernberg, the advantage. 10 11 of surprise will be lost. And surprise frequently 12 plays a big part in effective cross-examination. 13 Mh. LOGAN: May I also state. if the Tribunal 14 please, that before the defense were permitted to do 15 what the prosecution is intending to do here we had to 16 process our document and serve it before we were per-17 mitted to use it. 18 THE PRESIDENT: Well, I do not think that 19 applied to Pu-Yi's letter, among other documents, did 20 it? 21 Mr. TAVENNER: Certainly the defense will 22

recall that they examined on those documents first and processed them later just as I have suggested doing in this instance.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

4 5

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, I think
I can speak on authority for this because I remember
very well submitting certain messages to Baron
SHIDEHAKA and the Court excluding them because I had
not served copies upon the prosecution. I later got
them into evidence after having processed the required
number of copies and having made the proper translations, and they were admitted, as I remember, upon
that basis, and admission refused before that was done.
I was not even allowed to read it or show it to the
witness prior to that being done.

I believe that the record will show that Mr. Comyns Carr objected on the ground that I was trying to introduce evidence on the prosecution's case without having complied with the rules requiring numbers of copies and translations.

MR. TAVENNER: Baron SHIDEHARA was one of the first witnesses in the trial of the case. It may be that rule was followed at that time. It is certain that the rule was changed later when we arrived at the testimony relating to Henry Pu-Yi.

THE PRESIDENT: We did not change any rule,
I am sure of that.

We acknowledged the element of surprise.

MR. LOGAN: That Pu-Yi situation is entirely

different, your Honor. There the witness was being confronted with a document which it was alleged that he himself had signed. That had nothing to do with this situation.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I am reminded in the case of Baron ShIDEHARA there was an attempt to get in substantive evidence, and later there was an attempt to refresh the witness' memory. But here this could be used by way of surprise as was Pu-Yi's letter. We admitted Pu Yi's letter under the same circumstances as exist here.

The objection is overruled.

BY MR. TAVENNER (Continued):

Q Reading from KIDO's Diary: "ADACHI has the confidence of a group of army men, and has been in constant contact with the army. It was reported at the cabinet meeting that ADACHI acted as mediator when the Foreign Minister demanded an explanation on the matter of the Korean expedition from the army."

Mr. MITARAI, do you still contend that ADACHI had no connection with the army group?

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, may I also be permitted to point this out: Apparently this is another one of those scanned, rough translations that the prosecution is using. It has not been

submitted to us or to the language section. We do not know if this is exactly what Marquis KIDO said in his diary. It is just complicating the entire procedure.

I should think, your Honor, with the experience we have had with the large, large number of excerpts from KIDO's Diary the prosecution used which had to be referred to the language section, and which came back here with entirely different meanings than what the prosecution presented, that they should be prohibited from taking this course on cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I can only assume, or we can only assume that that is a correct translation until the contrary is indicated. The defense have had no opportunity of testing it, of course. However, let him answer the question.

A I know that Home Minister ADACHI had friendly relations with individual army men, or military men.

That is not limited to Home Minister ADACHI alone; other members of the cabinet also had friendly relations with some members of the military services.

Your question, Mr. Prosecutor, was whether it seemed to imply that he was a member of some army group or clique, that ADACHI had some relation with some army clique or group; is there anything mentioned in the diary to that effect?

THE PRESIDENT: Just answer questions, please. Do not ask them. Q Do you state that there were other members of the ministry who had the confidence of army groups? A I do not understand what you mean by group, army groups, or cliques. 

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

	G	You	unde	erstand	at	tl	nis	time	tha	t the	army	
in	Manch	uria	was	refusir	ng	to	obe	y th	e di	ctates	s of	the
cal	oinet,	do y	ou i	not?								

A It is not my understanding that the cabinet is empowered to give orders to armies in the field.

Q You understand then that War Minister
MINAMI was under no obligation to carry out the
directions of the cabinet with relation to the movements of the army in Manchuria?

A I think he had the obligation of transmitting the cabinet decision to the proper competent army branch -- branch of the army -- to carry out the policy. This is outside of my special field and so I should not like to be pressed on this matter, but it is the common knowledge of Japanese that the army in the field is under the command of the supreme command and is outside of the jurisdiction of the government.

Q Mr. MITARAI, I believe you read into evidence a part of the declaration made by the cabinet at the time of its dissolution or resignation. Will you produce it for our examination?

A If permitted by the President of the Tribunal I shall be glad to present this document.

MR. TAVENNER: I ask for the production of

18 19

20

21

22

23

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

24

25

23

the document from which the witness read for our examination.

THE PRESIDENT: A Member of the Court thought this morning that should have been done. Let him produce it, but until the prosecution questions these things, we do not.

MR. TAVENNER: Yes.

Mr. Witness, the Tribunal has ruled that we are entitled to see the document from which you read.

> (Whereupon, the witness produced a document.)

I would now like to ask you a few questions regarding the INUKAI cabinet. You spoke of the cabinet coming to an end because of the murder of the Prime Minister. You have not told us anything of the attitude of the Prime Minister toward the army proceedings in Manchuria or the Manchurian Incident. Was the army opposed to Prime Minister INUKAI?

That point has never been cleared; that point has never been made clear.

Do you not know that the Prime Minister was opposed to the extension of the Manchurian Incident and was in favor of having the Japanese army withdraw from Manchuria?

I do. A

Did you also know that for several months after the Manchurian Incident took place the Prime Minister recommended to the Emperor that the army be withdrawn from Manchuria by an Imperial Rescript?

Yes, I know of that as a report but not as a fact.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A I do not.

Q And did you also know that it was the policy of the Prime Minister to oppose the recognition of the puppet state of Manchukuo, and that he considered such recognition a violation of the sovereignty of China? A That I do not know. However, I am aware of the fact that Prime Minister INUKAI, long before the outbreak of the Manchurian Incident, had been a strong advocate of a policy of respect for China's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Q Did you know that the Prime Minister sent a secret delegate or delegation to Nanking to talk with General Chiang Kai-shek with a view to settling that problem? A Of course I know of that as reported by persons connected with the matter, but I do not know it as an official fact. Q Did you know that it was the policy of the INUKAI Cabinet to reduce the army budget? A I do not think that such a situation existed. Q Did you know that one week prior to the assassination of the Premier that he delivered an anti-militaristic speech at Yokohama?

Q Are you prepared to state without reservation

21 22

that in your opinion the INUMAI Cabinet was opposed to the army plans in Manchuria and the Manchurian Incident?

A The manner in which that question is put makes it extremely difficult for me to reply, but I can say that the iNUKAI Cabinet was not necessarily opposed to the Manchurian Incident.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner, have you many more documents upon which you propose to cross-examine and which have not been processed and served?

to anticipate what may happen in the future as to other witnesses, but I can say that we have no other document in mind at the moment. As to this particular document, we did not determine upon its use until in the middle of the examination in chief of the present witness.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

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

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, may we have that page of KIDO's Diary which the prosecution read marked for identification?

THE PRESIDENT: The whole diary is in and marked for identification.

MR. LOGAN: But the diary is in Japanese. This is in English.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the English version should be tendered and marked for identification.

It has been read into this transcript as it appears in the paper in your hand, Mr. Tavenner.

of what I read. The original has been sent to our processing room for processing and distribution. It is agreed that we submit the copy in my hands to be marked for identification.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document not numbered intitled "Additional notes to the 1931 Diary of Marquis KIDO" will receive exhibit No. 2345 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2345 for identification.)

4

8

10

12 13

14

15

16

1.7 18

19

20

21

22

24

25

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. TAVENNER (Continued):

Q Mr. MITARAI, I will now ask you a few questions regarding the HIROTA Cabinet.

You testified in chief that the resignation of the Cabinet occurred because of a disagreement regarding dissolution of the Diet. Is that a correct statement of your testimony?

- A You are correct.
- Q Did you state the cause of the disagreement regarding the dissolution of the Diet?
  - A No, I have not stated the cause.
  - Q Do you know the cause?
  - A Not -- I do not know well.
  - Q You do not know well?

A All that I do know is that on the one hand there were cabinet ministers who were in favor of a Diet dissolution and another group opposed to Diet dissolution.

Q Your investigation of the inside story of political circles did not extend, then, to an inquiry regarding the cause of the fall of the HIROTA Cabinet?

A Yes, there are various reports, but I do not have the confidence in speaking of these under

an oath.

Q Do you recall a speech made by War Minister TERAUCHI on the day after his resignation from the

cabinet?

A I do not know of a speech, but I know that a statement was issued as War Minister. It was printed and distributed.

Q Before I ask you any questions regarding that, I would like to ask if you did not make the statement in your examination in chief that a violent debate had occurred in the Diet.

A I stated that there was a violent debate in the Diet, but because there was no question, I did not say that a War Minister's statement was issued the day after the resignation.

Q I am asking you now about the debate in the Diet and not the statement with regard to resignation by the War Minister. Who was the person named by you who took the lead in the debate?

A The debate took place between member of the Lower House HOMADA Kunimatsu and War Minister TERAUCHI.

Q In your opinion did HOMADA's speech have anything to do with the question of the dissolution of the Diet?

t

1	A Yes, of course.
2	Q Did it have enything to do with the
3	resignation of the Cabinet?
4	A Inasmuch as the Cabinet resigned as a resul
5	of that incident, it at least is one of the main
6	causes which brought about the fall of the Cabinet.
7	Q What was the character of the debate which
8	caused this Cabinet crisis?
9	A Do you mean the contents of the speeches?
10	Q No, merely the subject matter.
11	A It was a debate which took place around
12	the question the proposition that a very dictator
13	iel type of thought had recently come to prevail.
14	Q A dictatorial type of thought by what
15	group?
16	A I just have heard on two or three occa-
17	sions the word "group." I do not understand that
18	meaning very clearly.
19	Q Was it not a charge that the Army group
20	was acting in a dictatorial way and depriving the
21	people of their constitutional rights?
22	A It is a fact that a debate to that effect
23	
24	actually took place. However, such words cannot be
25	found in the speech made by representative HOMADA.

1	
2	i
3	C
4	7
5	5
6	
7	
8	b
9	
10	C
11	9
12	
13	J

Q Do you recall whether War Minister TERAUCHI in assigning the reasons for his resignation from the Cabinet referred to the declarations made by the political parties before the opening of the Diet session?

A Yes, I do. I do recall it.

Q Do you recall the nature of that declaration by the Seyukai Party rade on the 20th of January, 1937?

A I do not remember in detail. I remember, of course, in general, remember that declaration in general.

Q Do you recall that they complained about a Japan-German Pact that had been negotiated?

A I do not have such a recollection.

Q Do you recall that they complained that the government had formulated many plans dogmatically concluding that a semi-wartime organization is necessary?

A Of course, such expression could have a multitude of interpretations, but the word "emergency", as it was then called, was not favorably accepted by the political parties.

Q Do you recall that the political party asserted that it expected to clarify these matters in the Diet that was about to convene?

14

16

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

A Yes.

Q Do you also recall that on the following day, January 21st, that the Army issued a statement in reply to the party declaration?

A I do not recall positively, but I feel that there was.

Q Let me read to you a part of prosecution's exhibit 2208.

"Has not a positive wholesale administrative reform aimed at the existence and expansion of our people with the Empire as the stabilizing power of East Asia always been the very cry of our one hundred million compatriots? Would not the abandonment of a resitive policy imply being cramped up within insular Japan? Could we thereby ever fulfil the Heaven-ordained mission of the YAMAMOTO race?"

Does that refresh your recollection?

A That is too much to ask. I could not positively remember such details.

Q I continue to read: "What was expected to come has come. That is the collision between the advocates of the status quo and the advocates of the destruction of the status quo. Japan stands now at the turning point where she should realize a positive all out administrative policy in order to overcome

the present difficulties and tide over the existing international crisis."

Does that not convey the meaning to you that opposition existed toward the Army's plans in China?

A It seems that you have quoted from an announcement issued by the Army. Now official documents are written in a certain rhetorical form, and if I am permitted to see the original, then perhaps I might be able to recall. It is impossible for me to refresh my memory on the basis of those words as given through translation.

Q I was not asking to refresh your memory.

I was asking you if the language I read did not mean to you that there was opposition to the Army's plan in China?

MR. LCGAN: Since the witness has requested the document, your Honor, may we have it referred to him?

THE PRESIDENT: He says he needs the original Japanese. Let him see it.

MR. TAVENNER: It will be necessary to call upon the Clerk to produce it. It will be exhibit 2208.

THE PRESIDENT: And you did ask him whether

it refreshed his memory, Mr. Tavenner.

Who wrote what you read?

MR. TAVENNER: What I read is taken from

Details Regarding Movements of Rightist Bodies in

Connection with Change of Government, Police Section,

Police Bureau, Home Ministry, entitled "Views

Expressed by Army Authorities."

THE FRESIDENT: Unless you are pressing for an answer, we need not get that original.

He did not write the article.

BY MR. TAVENNER (Continued):

Q The dispute that existed between the political parties in the Army, would you say was the basis for the disagreement regarding the dissolution of the Diet?

A I cannot irresponsibly say that there was opposition between the Army and the political parties because there were many different views and opinions within and among the political parties and the Army was on its part in no position to give expression to its political views.

Q Is it not a fact that the political views of the Army were expressed frequently by the War Minister?

A Yes.

3

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

	Ó	Did	the M	ar Mi	iniste	er ex	press	the	ATOM	that
the	Diet	shou	ld be	diss	olved	d	that	the (	Cabine	t
cor	recti	on	that	the	Cabir	net s	hould	be:	resign	ed
beca	ause	of th	e dis	agree	ement	over	the	disso	olutio	n of
the	Diet	?								

A I don't know anything definitely as to the meeting of the Cabinet Council, but it is a fact that the War Minister favored the dissolution of the Diet.

I also understand that there were other ministers beside the War Minister who advocated dissolution of the Diet.

After the dissolution of the Diet, did the War Minister TERAUCHI continue to influence the -- correction did he influence the formation of a new Cabinet?

I would like to reframe that question.

After the resignation of the Cabinet, did War Minister TERAUCHI influence the formation of a new Cabinet?

MR. LOGAN: I object to that, if the Tribunal please, on the ground that it is beyond the scope of the direct examination and this witness has only testified as to the fall of cabinets. He has not testified as to the formation of new ones and we propose to show that by other evidence.

MR. TAVENNER: If your Honor please, it cannot well be a fall of the Cabinet without an arrangement

3

4

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

for a new Cabinet and vice versa. It is all one and the same problem.

MR. LOGAN: The propositions are entirely different, your Honor, and we seek to treat them differently in the presentation of our case, and this witness has not testified to the formation of new cabinets or the lack of any influence by any person charged in this Indictment with respect to the formation of new cabinets.

THE PRESIDENT: The factors that destroy one cabinet generally produce the next.

MR. LOGAN: That is quite true, if the Tribunal please; and necessarily there has to be a new cabinet, but the factors in the formation of a new cabinet involve facts and evidence entirely different than what this witness has testified to. He hasn't said a word about the formation of new cabinets. His entire testimony has been directed to the fall of the old ones.

As I said before, we will produce other evidence with respect to the formation of new cabinets. We didn't intend to go into that subject with this witness.

MR. TAVENNER: May I --

THE PRESIDENT: The majority of the Court think the question should be allowed. The objection is overruled.

4

9 7

8

,

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

o "ill you answer the question, please?

A It can be said as a fact that TERAUCHI, as "ar Minister, has influenced -- has shown his influence in the formation of the succeeding cabinet to a certain extent.

O You would say then that the "ar Minister both influenced the fall of one cabinet and the creation of its successor.

A Yes.

O In what way did he influence the creation of the succeeding cabinet?

MR. LOGAN: I must again object, if the Tribunal please. This is entirely beyond the scope of this witness' direct examination. It is going into a new subject, a new field entirely.

THE PRESIDENT: The decision on the last question covers this. Objection overruled.

O Please answer the question.

A Yes, it is a fact that he exercised influence both in the fall of the Cabinet and in the formation of the succeeding one.

O My last question was: In what manner did he influence the creation or formation of the succeeding Cabinet?

A In line with custom, the Government asked the

1	War Minister in office to recommend his successor, and,
2	in the light of the situation then prevailing in the
3	Army, the War Minister would make his recommendation.
4	In that sense, he has influenced the formation of the
5	Cabinet.
6	O Describe what the War Minister did to influence
7	the Cabinet in that regard.
8	MR. LOGAN: He has already answered that question
9	your Honor. He said he recommended a successor.
10	THE PRESIDENT: Is that all he did?
11	THE WITNESS: It was a customary act for
12	War Ministers to recommend his successor and TERAUCHI
13	merely followed that custom in recommending his successor
14	n "ho did he recommend?
15	A I cannot recall offhand. It was after the
16	next Cabinet would be the HAYASHI Cabinet, and the
17	next War Minister would be but I cannot recall off-
l8	hand.
19	As a matter of fact, do you not know that
20	General UGAKI was given the Imperial Mandate on the
21	
22	24th day of January to form a new cabinet?
23	MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, that is
24	a different matter. He is talking about a War Minister
25	that he recommended as his successor. UGAKI now is the

one who was put up as Prime Minister. It is not the

same situation.

R

THE PRESIDENT: It bears on cabinet breaking and cabinet making. The objection is overruled.

MR. TAVENNER: I had not completed my question, your Honor. Possibly, for the sake of clearness, I should repeat it.

O Is it not a fact that General UGAKI received the Imperial Mandate on the 24th day of January to form a new cabinet and that War Minister TERAUCHI, when requested by General UGAKI to make a recommendation to fill the post of Foreign Minister, did not do so -- of War Minister -- did not do so?

A In my understanding, the War Minister requested
War Minister TERAUCHI to recommend his successor and
that War -- and that the War Minister had negotiated
within the Army to find such a successor, but nobody
would respond to the invitation. That is my understanding
of the situation. The fact is not that War Minister
TERAUCHI refused the Prime Minister Designate's request,
but that there were no candidates who would accept the
post. That is the fact.

THE MONITOR: The first word, ""ar Minister," should be corrected to read "Prime Minister Designate."

O And did not the War Minister TERAUCHI also take the position that all other army men would refuse

	likewise?
1	A That I have not heard.
2	A That I have not near a.
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Q This failure to recommend a successor to the
1	War Minister blocked General TCAKI's efforts to form
2	a cabinet and resulted in the giving of an Imperial
3	mandate to an entirely different person; isn't that
4	true?
5	A Yes.
6	Q Was the accused UMEZU the Vice Minister of
7	
8	War in the HIROTA Cabinet?
9	A He was.
	Q What position did he take in influencing the
10	making of the new Cabinet?
11	A In my understanding, that he acted as a sub-
12	ordinate to the War Minister by orders of the War Min-
13	ister.
14	Q Do you recall that on the 27th of January
15	1937 he made a public statement in regard to General
16	UGAKI?
17	
18	A Who do you mean by "he"?
19	Q General UMEZU.
20	A I do not remember.
21	Q Let me see if I can refresh your recollection
	on that, reading from exhibit 2208 of the prosecution.
22	THE PRESIDENT: That exhibit is in Court now.
23	You may use it if you so desire.
24	

## BY MR. TAVENNER:

Q In a talk by General UNEZU on the 27th of January this statement was made: "Rumor is circulating among the public that General UGAKI is persistently trying to continue the work of cabinet formation, even by resorting to drastic measures, and because of this the nation is feeling great unrest". Does that refresh your collection in any way?

A No, I have no recollection, but if I may be permitted to say a word on that, even if there was such a statement issued that would be by orders of the War Minister, because the Vice Minister had no power or authority to do that on his own; he would be doing that by order of the War Minister. Under the system prevailing he could not act on his own.

Q Then you state that the remarks made by the accused UMEZU were made at the direction of the then War Minister?

A If the statement as quoted by you is true I would presume that such a statement was issued, but I would not be able to say positively unless I knew what was in that statement, either before or after, or before and after the statement just quoted. Certainly the Vice Minister could not act on his own; he would be following instructions. I could not say defi-

4

3

6

5

8

9

11

12

14

15

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

nitely the nature of that statement unless I knew the text in the original.

Q I now desire to ask you a few questions regarding the HIRANUMA Cabinet. I believe you read in evidence the declaration, or part of the declaration made at the time of the resignation of the HIRANUMA Cabinet. Will you please produce it for our inspection?

A I shall be very glad to produce it if the President gives his permission.

THE PRESIDENT: Produce it.

(Whereupon witness produces a paper).

MR. LOGAN: The prosecution having called for its production may we have it marked for identification?

THE PRESIDENT: It is to be marked for identification only.

MR. TAVENNER: I call for the production of the document only for the purpose of inspection. I have not tendered it in evidence or even tendered it for identification. That was done by the defense.

CLERK OF THE COURT: The document, being a page in Japanese hand-writing will be marked exhibit No. 2346 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2346 for identification.)

BY MR. TAVENNER:

Q In your examination in chief you stated that the HIRANUMA Cabinet resigned because of the complicated European situation. What complication were you referring to?

A Such words as "complicated" or "complex" was not used by me. They were word seed by the HIRANUMA Cabinet at the time of its resignation.

Q Your only testimony then as to the cause of the fall of the HIRANUMA Cabinet was the official statement made by the HIRANUMA Cabinet at the time of its resignation; is that correct?

A Yes. I testified on the basis of that state-

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until half past nine to-morrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Thursday, 6 March 1947, at 0930.)

20

19

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

2223

24