Nov30, 1946

INDEX

Of

## WITNESSES

Prosecution's Witnesses	Page
Ballantine, Joseph W. (resumed)	10904
Cross by Mr. Blakeney (continued)	10904

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

No.	No.	No.	Description	Ident.	Evidence
92		1246	Excerpt from the Department of State's publication "Foreign Relations" Vol. I, (pp.709-710): "Disposition of Japanese Forces" and the document headed "From Japanese Ambassador NOMURA to the Secretary of State dated 7 November 1941"	10914	10918

1 Wednesday, 20 November, 1946 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 the HONORABLE R. B. PAL, Member from 14 India, not sitting. 15 For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 16 For the Defense Section, same as before. 17 The Accused: 18 All present except OKAWA, Shumei, who is 19 represented by his counsel. 20 21 (English to Japanese and Japanese 22 to English interpretation was made by the 23 Language Section, IMTFE.) 24

25

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

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

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BLAKENEY (Continued):

Q At yesterday's recess, we were just starting to discuss the China question. I was commencing a question which I will ask the reporter to repeat.

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

"Q Now, in order to attempt to define clearly the problem involved, I call your attention to the following language on page 14 of your affidavit, paragraph 3, that: 'The immutable policy of the Japanese Government to ensure the stability of East Asia was predicated upon establishing at the outset a complete Japanese military and economic stranglehold over China, calling for Japanese control over strategic Chinese industries and facilities, referred to euphemistically in terms such as 'economic cooperation with China,' and retention in large areas of China

)

for an indefinite period of large Japanese garrisons to protect Japan's holdings. \*\*\*

Q (Continuing) Now, you refer in your affidavit on a number of occasions to the fact that this
policy, as you say, was immutable, that from it the
Japanese never budged, and that for them to speak of
making the utmost concessions from it is monstrous.
Am I correct so far?

A That is correct.

Q Now, first as to the question of Japanese control of Chinese industries: This actually merged, did it not, in the conversations into the discussion of non-discrimination in international trade in general?

A Well, it merged in the sense it is all part of the large question. The fact of the matter was that these controls that Japan exercised -- these special companies with monopolistic rights which were given title under the regime -- Japanese sponsored regimes -- had monopolized industry. Those operations in that way frustrated the operation of free enterprise -- competitive enterprise. As a result, American trade and enterprise in those areas were stifled and could only operate in very very narrow grooves, if at all.

3

4

5 6

7

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

Yes. Well, all I am asking you now is whether that question was not discussed as one of the aspects of unrestricted commercial intercourse in general.

The best explanation of the American Government's position on that is contained in a memorandum handed to the Japanese Ambassador on November 15, 1941. The whole story is there.

Well, I am afraid we do not quite understand each other. I am not asking you for the American position; I am asking you whether, as a mechanical thing in these conversations, this was not discussed as one of the aspects, perhaps the most important aspect, of the question of unrestricted international trade in general -- mechanically speaking, I mean.

In the memorandum in question, the clear relationship of the subject as a whole -- the parts are given in that memorandum.

Yes. Well, I think we are in agreement there, and we will come back to that. I want to set that aside for now and return to it.

The other question in connection with China is that of stationing of Japanese troops there, is it not?

That question, also the demand that the

,

Japanese made that we withdraw aid from Chiang Kai-shek.

Q Yes. Now, on the question of stationing of Japanese troops in China, had the Department of State any objection on principle to the stationing of foreign troops in certain parts of China for protecting foreign interests and maintaining order?

A There were certain treaty rights that foreign powers had acquired, Boxer Protocol, for example. We were trying to get gradually away from all of that. In our proposal of November 26 we referred to getting away from that.

Q As a matter of fact, was not the United States one of the nations which was maintaining troops in China under the Boxer Protocol?

A That is correct. We maintained about -Legation Guards to the extent of about a thousand -between a thousand and, at a maximum, two thousand,
I believe.

Q But, if I understand correctly, the objection to the Japanese proposal in regard to stationing of troops in China was on the grounds of the number of troops, the extent of the area in which they were to be stationed, and the duration of their stay.

A The objection was that ever since 1936

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

Japan had made this demand, and it is one of the causes that brought on the extended hostilities. we were going to have a stabilizing peace in the Far East, it was necessary to have such arrangements as Japan made entered into by amicable negotiations with China.

Q Well, did the Department of State object to the Japanese making an amicable arrangement with China for the stationing of troops to protect their legitimate interests in China?

There were two points there: One was the very great vagueness of the Japanese as to what they wanted. The areas were indeterminate; the number of troops were indeterminate; the length of time was indeterminate; there was no clear-cut expression of what they wanted. It was a blank check.

THE PRESIDENT: Do pause at the end of each sentence, Mr. Ballantine. Even if the interpreters do succeed in repeating what you say without any interruption, it does impose a great strain on them, and they get tired quickly under those conditions.

(Continuing) The second point was the well known fact that the Chinese Government had shown itself opposed to accepting any such provision.

All right. Now, that vagueness about

3

5

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

details is what I was asking you about. Is it true that, so far as these conversations were concerned, your first official intimation of the extent of the Japanese claims was given you by Colonel IWAKURO; that is, the explanation by him referred to on page 8, paragraph 2 of your affidavit?

A That is correct. But, two or three days later the Japanese Ambassador had a talk with the Secretary of State.

Q Yes, I understand that... But, now, what I want to ask you is, is it these terms explained by Colonel IWAKURO from which you say the Japanese never budged?

A Certainly, what Colonel IWAKURO said to me was never withdrawn.

Q I am not asking you whether his words were withdrawn; I am asking you whether the Japanese in any subsequent proposals receded from the position there stated by him.

A To the best of my knowledge, they did not.

Q Well, let us see a moment: One of Colonel IWAKURO's points, I believe, was that Japanese troops were to remain in North China and Inner Mongolia to defend against a communist menace; is that correct?

A That is correct.

4			
3	Ľ		

3

4 5

6

,

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

Q And for the additional purpose of maintaining order in areas adjacent to Japan in the sense of geographical propinquity.

A That's what he said.

Q It was a fact, was it not, that communistic activities did exist in those areas and that the Central Government of China was unable to maintain order?

A It is true that communistic activities did exist. I would not want to pass on whether the Chinese Government had an untrammeled opportunity to maintain order itself.

Q Well, with the knowledge which the State
Department possessed of the conditions as they then
were in that area, surely the principle of maintaining Japanese troops there to protect whatever legitimate interests the Japanese had must have been acceptable.

A There was a great deal of confusion as to what were legitimate interests and what were interests acquired as a result of the forcible occupation of North China.

Q Yes. That is why I used the word "legitimate." I mean legitimate according to the definition of the Department of State.

A That's a very difficult question to answer.
It is a question of whether you should maintain
troops for protecting interests. The Boxer Protocol
didn't make any provision for that other than main-
taining contact with the legations and protecting
the legations.

Q Well, let's come to the details of the problem: What was the United States position as expressed during these conversations on the time limit in connection with stationing of Japanese troops in China?

A Our position was that we expected to allow the Japanese to have a reasonable time under existing conditions to effect evacuation of the large forces in China.

Q Very good. Now, there was objection also, was there not, to the number of troops? Perhaps that is not very clear. I mean the number of troops which, as explained by Colonel IWAKURO, would probably be retained in China.

A We did not think that, if we had explained to Chiank Kai-shek what Colonel IWAKURO wanted, that Chiang Kai-shek -- the Chinese Government would be willing to accept any such terms as that.

Q The number of Japanese troops in China, of

course, was abnormally large at that time because there was a war in progress, was it not?

A Yes.

Q Now, did the Department of State recognize from the outset of these conversations that, owing to internal conditions in Japan, it was to be expected that the reaching of any agreement on this point would be very difficult?

A The Secretary of State explained time and again that he was prepared to be patient.

Q Therefore, I suppose it is fair to state that the Department would not have entered upon these conversations at all had it been determined to insist on immediate unconditional withdrawal of all troops.

A We entered upon the conversations because the Japanese Government had informed us that they wanted a peaceful settlement covering the entire Pacific area.

Q Yes. But I mean practically speaking -not discussing the rights or wrongs, but practically
speaking, the Department of State surely must have
recognized from the very beginning that it would be
impossible to get any agreement for immediate unconditional withdrawal of all troops. That you knew,
did you not?

A Japanese had told us at the outset of these difficulties, and you will note in our proposal of June 21 we had the terms under there, "Subject to Further Discussion." We were prepared to explore the subject with them thoroughly and reasonably.

Q Yes. Well, I think we are in agreement. You say you were prepared to explore the subject of terms of withdrawal, and that's what I mean, if you were not insisting on unconditional, immediate, total withdrawal. That is correct, is it not?

A That's right.

Q Now, as I understand it, little progress was made on this point down to the beginning of November, approximately.

A That is correct.

affidavit, paragraph 4, that "a new draft of proposals presented by the Japanese on the 6th of September was much narrower than the last preceding document." Inasmuch, however, as that last preceding document was the assurance of the 27th of August which does not mention this question, I assume that you do not mean that the September proposal narrowed the Japanese position on this point.

A I was considering the two documents as a

whole. 1 Yes. Now, westerday we discussed the pro-2 posal handed by the Japanese Ambassador to the 3 Secretary of State on the 7th of November, 1941. 4 A I don't recall that we did. I thought we 5 discussed the proposal that he made to the President 6 on November 10. Yes. But, on the 10th of November, did not the Ambassador discuss with the President the same 9 proposal which he had presented to the Secretary of 10 State on the 7th of November? 11 12 A I would have to refresh my memory on the 13 November 7 proposal. 14 MR. BLAKENEY: I now tender for identifica-15 tion an excerpt from the Department of State's publi-16 cation "Foreign Relations," Volume I, pages 709 - 710. 17 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense's document. 18 entitled "Disposition of Japanese Forces," and the 19 document headed "From Japanese Ambassador NOMURA to 20 Secretary of State, November 7, 1941," is given 21 exhibit No. 1246 for identification only. 22 (Whereupon, the document above re-23

ferred to was marked defense's exhibit No.

1246 for identification.)

25

24

24

25

	1	Q I now ask that you be handed exhibit 1246,
,	2	Mr. Witness, and that you examine it and state if
3	3	you can whether this is the document under discussion.
'n	4	(Whereupon, exhibit No. 1246 was
	5	handed to the witness.)
3	6	A Yes, that is correct.
n	7	Q You testified yesterday that no mention of
	8	this proposal was made in your affidavit for certain
	9	reasons, and I think particularly because you felt it
	10	of no particular importance in the sum total of the
	11	conversations.
	12	A If I recall correctly, I was referring to
	13	the November 10 document.
	14	Q Perhaps I misunderstood you. I thought you
	15	just told me that this document handed to the
	16	Secretary of State on the 7th of November was the
	17	same as the one handed to the President on the 10th
	18	of November.
	19	A I didn't mean to say that. I meant to say
	21	I understood you to say that the November 10th docu-
	22	ment was the same as that referred was referred to
	23	on the memorandum given to the Secretary of State on
		November 7th.

Well, tell me then, if you will, why you omit mention of this document, exhibit 1246, from

your affidavit.

Were giving consideration to this document, this intercept of the Japanese Government of November 5 -- about November 5, I don't remember the exact date -- came in. That intercept made it clear that the representations being made to us on the troop question were not being made in good faith. The second reason is that you will note that in this proposal they injected in the Island of Hainan, which was entirely a new question, so instead of bringing us nearer it injected a new question which left us just where we were.

MR: BLAKEREY: Yes. Well, I think this proposal is of some interest on this question and I now tender in evidence exhibit No. 1246, identified by the witness.

MR. HIGGINS: I object to the offering of evidence on the part of the defense at this time, because the prosecution has not finished presenting its case.

THE PRESILENT: You overlooked for the time being, I think, Mr. Higgins, that the defense counsel is at the lectern cross-examining. He is not interrupting you to put in evidence. In any national

-,

court he would be completely within his rights and I do not see why he is not within them here.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. President, I don't have before me the Charter, but as I recall the Charter sets out the order for the procedure here, and at the conclusion of the prosecution's case then the defense may present evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: The Charter, of course, does not bear on this at all. It is the general practice in every national court that I am aware of for the defense to cross-examine and in the course of so doing draw attention to documents. If the witness being cross-examined acknowledges the document it is tendered as a matter of course.

I have a note from a colleague from a

British Dominion, "if the cross-examination is
relevant, and this is, then documents may be tendered to the witness and through him to the Court."

I completely agree. However, this is not a British
court or an American court and I will take the view
of my colleagues and, of course, carry it out.

MR. HIGGINS: May I say this, Mr. President, we recognize the right of the defense to cross-examine and have before the witness any document whether it is in evidence before or not. For that reason I

made no objection to the offering of the document for identification and the subsequent cross-examination 2 of the witness on the basis of that document, but 3 the defense goes further than that and offers the document itself in evidence. THE PRESIDENT: We have the view in any 6 Australian or New Zealand court. I will confine it 7 8 to that --9 MA. HIGGINS: Or American. 10 THE PRESIDENT: The document is admitted 11 on the usual terms. 12 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document here-13 tofore described is given exhibit No. 1246 and ad-14 mitted according to order of Court. 15 (Whereupon, the document previously 16 marked defense exhibit No. 1246 for identifi-17 cation was received in evidence.) 18 MA. BLAKENEY: I do not desire to read it 19 at this time unless the Tribunal desires to hear it. 20 THE PRESIDENT: Well, it should go into the 21 transcript for our convenience. This is the time. 22 Mr. BLAKENEY: I am sorry, sir, I do not 23 understand whether you mean to read it into the 24 transcript. 25

THE PRESIDENT: Read it, yes.

MR. BLAKENEY: (Reading):

"Document Handed by the Japanese Ambassador (NOMURA) to the Secretary of State on November 7, 1941. (Tentative translation).

"DISPOSITION OF JAPANESE FORCES.

"(a) Stationing of Japanese forces in China and the withdrawal thereof:"

THE PRESIDENT: Let me make sure. The witness acknowledges that this was handed by NOMURA to the Secretary of State on that date? That is the fact that makes it admissible.

MM. BLAKENEY: That is correct, is it not? THE WITNESS: That is correct.

MR. BLAKENEY: I continue the reading:

"With regard to the Japanese forces that have been despatched to China in connection with the China Affair, those forces in specified areas in North China and Mengchiang (Inner Mongolia) as well as in Hainan-tao (Hainan Island) will remain to be stationed for a certain required duration after the restoration of peaceful relations between Japan and China. All the rest of such forces will commence withdrawal as soon as general peace is restored between Japan and China, and the withdrawal will proceed according to separate arrangements between

Japan and China and will be completed within two years with the firm establishment of peace and order.

"(B) Stationing of Japanese forces in French Indo-China and the withdrawal thereof:

"The Japanese Government undertakes to guarantee the territorial sovereignty of French Indo-China. The Japanese forces at present stationed there will be withdrawn as soon as the China Affair is settled or an equitable peace is established in East Asia.

"PRINCIPLE OF NON-DISCRIMINATION.

"The Japanese Government recognizes the principle of non-discrimination in international commercial relations to be applied to all the Pacific areas, inclusive of China, on the understanding that the principle in question is to be applied uniformly to the rest of the entire world as well."

BY MA. BLAKENEY: (Continued)

Q Now, Mr. Witness, is this the proposal which you referred to on page -- I am sorry, I withdraw that question.

Now, in this proposal also there is again no specific mention of the time of withdrawal of troops, the number of troops to remain, and the other points which were giving concern in the conversations, is there?

1	A That is correct.
2	Q But were these points explained in the
3	conversations by the two Japanese Ambassadors?
4	A We had to read all their explanations in
5	the light of the instruction that was sent to Am-
6	bassador NOMURA.
7	Well, then, there were explanations given?
8	A Such explanations as were given are fully
9	there in the record. I don't recall exactly what
10	was said.
11	Well, do you recall, for example, that in
12	this conversation on the 18th of November with
13	Secretary Hull Ambassador NOMUBA stated as follows:
14	In answer to the question of the Secretary how many
15	soldiers the Japanese wanted to retain in China the
16	Ambassador replied that possibly 90 per cent would
17	be withdrawn. Do you remember that?
18	A I recall that.
19	Secretary Hull then asked, did he not, how
21	long the remaining 10 per cent of the troops would
22	be stationed in China?
23	A I recall that too.
24	Q Do you recall the Ambassador's answer to
25	that?
	A I would have to have my memory refreshed

on what he said.

Q I ask you whether you remember that the Imbassador gave no definite answer to that? Such, I assure you, is the record.

A Well, that is correct, then.

did know, did you not, what answer ambassador NOMURA would have given if he had been pressed on the point? You knew what his instructions were from his home government, did you not?

A That is correct.

And in connection with these intercepts of Japanese diplomatic correspondence, let me ask you a question or two. From what time had the Department of State had access to such intercepted, decryptographed and translated messages?

A I don't recall definitely, but probably at least as early as the spring of 1941.

Q That is to say, then, that throughout the entire or substantially the entire course of these conversations you had access to that material?

A I am not positive, but I think so.

Q So that during this period, or at all events the latter part of it, you knew not only what the Japanese Ambassador was saying to you, but you knew

7

9

8

10

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

what his government was authorizing or instructing him to say, did you not?

A Well, in so far as we got intercepts. We don't know what messages failed to be intercepted; we don't know what messages he received by mail.

Other sources we don't know.

Q Then, in conducting the conversations on your side, the Department of State's side, did you take into account not only the formal conversations but also your knowledge of the intercepted messages at all times?

A The intercepted messages in general were corroboratory evidence of what we generally knew from other sources. Naturally, we had to take them into consideration.

O Did you yourself or other members of the Department staff able to read them see the Japanese texts of these messages, or did they come to you only in English?

A They came to us only in English.

Q Then, to be quite specific, may I understand that so far as you know no member of the Department of State staff did read these messages in Japanese.

THE PRESIDENT: Didn't he say they were

tendered in English? 1 MR. BLAKENEY: He said they came to them 2 in English, but I wish, sir, to be quite specific that 3 in no other way were they read in Japanese. 4 THE PRESIDENT: They may never have been 5 6 in Japanese. 7 Do you know whether they were in Japanese 8 originally? 9 Some of them were in Japanese I know. 10 And I repeat, if I may, so far as concerns 11 those which were in Japanese is it quite definite 12 that no member of the Department of State read them 13 and understood them in Japanese? 14 Well, I can only speak to the best of my 15 knowledge and belief that at that time, during 1941, 16 there was no member of the Department of State that 17 was reading them, or did read any of them in Japanese. 18 THE PRESIDENT: Do you read Japanese? 19 THE WITNESS: I do. 20 THE PRESIDENT: Did you see any of them in 21 Japanese? 22 THE WITNESS: Not at that time. 23 THE PRESIDENT: But you didn't read them 24 in Japanese? 25 THE WITNESS: No.

Mh. BLAKENEY: (continued)

. 7

Q Then to return to the question of stationing of troops in China, from which we divaricated momentarily, what, if you remember, did the Department of State know at the time from the intercepted correspondence was the instruction which Tokyo had given Imbassador NOMURA with regard to what he should say would be the period for which Japanese troops should be stationed in China?

A It is a long time since I have refreshed my memory on that particular telegram, but I think he was told to give some agreeable explanation, some reference to a vague period of years, but I don't recall definitely at this moment.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

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

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

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

BY MR. BLAKENEY: (Continued)

Would it refresh your memory, Mr. Witness, if I told you that the United States Government print of the intercepted message, 4th of November, shows that Ambassador NOMURA was instructed to answer that such a period should encompass 25 years?

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief of Counsel.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, solely for the purpose of complying with the Charter for a speedy trial. I object to this as being an attempt at this time for the defense to untimely assert its defense and invade the proper province of cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: What is the purpose of crossexamination if it is not to invade the province of the prosecution to the extent that the cross-examiner is allowed to do so? Objections must be taken on specific grounds. That is not one. It is overruled.

- (Continuing) Please answer the question.
- It refreshes my memory to that extent.
- When the explanation was given by Ambassador NOMURA to Secretary Hull on this point, did Secretary Hull consider it of insufficient interest to ask the

Ambassador what the period would be?

A I do not know what is in the mind of the Secretary, but I think that that intercepted message, to understand the spirit of it, should be read as a whole.

Q Well, leaving aside the question of bad faith, as shown by the intercepted message which I am coming to in a moment; was the period of 25 years considered in itself unreasonable by the Department?

A We didn't consider each of these small points individually. We considered the proposition as a whole.

Q I do not quite understand how you consider it as a whole without considering details; but considering it as a whole, did you consider the 25-year period to be unreasonable?

A That would have to be taken into consideration with the other elements in the situation -- the total number of troops and the places where they are to be stationed, and so forth.

Q Well, it is those factors that I am trying to consider and we have considered some of them. Now, this factor alone, if I understand you correctly, this proposal alone was not unreasonable -- considered by itself?

A	So fa	er as I	kno	ow, no	one o	f us	reached	any
conclusi	on in	regard	to	this	poin	t by	itself,	or any
other po	int by	itseli	٤.					

Q Now, let me ask you whether in fact this was not the first time during the conversations that the Japanese side had made any mention of even accepting the principle of eventual withdrawal of all troops from China?

A I do not recall that. So far as I recall, the principle of withdrawal of troops except for those to be stationed for joint defense against communism was accepted from the beginning.

Q Yes, but was this not the first time during the conversations that the principle of eventual withdrawal of the remaining troops had been stated by the Japanese?

A Possibly so.

Q Certainly then, this represented a concession from the original view-point of Colonel IWAKURO; did it not?

A Yes, but you have to balance that against the new element of putting in troops for the same purpose in Hainan Island.

Q Did Secretary Hull or other officials of the Department raise the question of the stationing of

troops in Hainan in conversations with the Japanese Ambassador at this time?

3

I do not recall that he did.

4 5

Then, apparently the question of stationing of troops in Hainan was not, after all, so seriously regarded by the Department of State?

6

That doesn't follow at all.

8

9

The other points of difference were raised by the Secretary, were they not, in conversations?

10

He raised points about the general proposition, yes.

11

Certainly this mass of conversations was about particulars, was it not?

12 13

I am talking about after November 7.

14

Let me ask you in passing; on this point of stationing of troops in China by the Japanese, what concessions, if any, did the United States ever offer to make?

ment from Japan. We thought existing agreements would

take care of the situation if they were lived up to

by Japan. We adhered to our principles.

The United States did not ask for any agree-

16

17

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Here is a subsidiary question, that of the stationing of Japanese troops in Indo-China. The original Japanese position which was maintained until September was that the troops would be withdrawn from Indo-China upon the conclusion of the China Affair, was it not?

A That is right.

Meanwhile, however, the Japanese advance into southern Indo-China occurred in July, and the question of troops in southern Indo-China thereafter was one of the most serious concerns in the conversations, was it not?

A That is correct.

Q The stationing of troops in northern Indo-China, in and of itself, caused far less alarm than the stationing of troops in southern Indo-China, did it not?

A Well, the stationing of troops in Indo-China, taking in conjunction all the circumstances and the position where Japan was in a position to threaten the Philippines and the other neighboring countries, made it a much more serious matter.

Q Are we to understand that the Japanese never made any concessions on the question of the stationing of troops in Indo-China?

I think that is correct. 1 Did they not offer, by their proposal of the 2 27th of September, that they would not advance from 3 Indo-China except against China? 4 Are you referring to the proposal of Septem-5 ber 25, or September 6? 6 Yes, I am sorry, it is the 25th of September. 7 THE PRESIDENT: Well, don't get him to repeat 8 the evidence already given unless you are testing his 9 credibility. 10 MR. BLAKENEY: Well, sir, I am testing his 11 credibility. I suppose, because he said there were no 12 13 concessions and I am trying to point out in his own 14 evidence some things I think he will have to admit are 15 concessions, and perhaps he won't admit it. 16 THE WITNESS: Will you please repeat your 17 question? 18 Q Well, let's pass that one by and I will ask 19 you another one. I will ask you this, whether the 20 25th of September proposal by the Japanese did not 21 contain the new offer, now first made, to withdraw all 22 troops from China -- from Indo-China upon either the 23 settlement of the China Affair or the establishment 24

of an equitable peace in the Pacific?

25

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, the prosecution

objects on the ground that obviously this document speaks for itself if we are to keep these proceedings within the bounds of reason.

THE PRESIDENT: We wish you to avoid reading evidence already given. At the same time, although we are bound to conduct a speedy trial, it is subject always to conducting a just one. There can be no more important witness in that box than a man who purports to tell us the attitude of America on peace and war at a critical period. If you confine your cross-examination to getting from him what he knows as to that attitude, we will not interfere.

Q The important word in my last question was "new."

A What?

Q New.

A The new point there was an equitable peace in the Far East. I don't think that adds anything whatsoever to the other thing, because you couldn't have an equitable peace in the Far East without a settlement of the China Affair. Also, the term "equitable" -- who is to decide which is to be equitable? Itwas clearly implication that that was to be unilaterally determined by Japan.

Q Was it not understood by the Department of

State that the conclusion of this agreement which was then under discussion would be considered by the Japanese to be an equitable peace in the Pacific?

A We hadn't reached any meeting of minds at all on the fundamental principles which were to govern the peace in the Far East.

Q I understand that perfectly. But my question is not that. Was it not the clear understanding throughout these conversations, on both sides, that if the conversations eventuated in an agreement, that agreement would constitute the consummation of the equitable peace in the Pacific?

A Of course, that is true; but that phrase, that additional clause, added nothing to the situation. It would have been the same whether that clause had been added or not.

Q Well, I think we can leave that question to be decided by the Tribunal.

Now, thereafter, on the 20th of November, the Japanese presented their proposal for a modus vivendi to which you refer in your affidavit on page 12, paragraph 5, as being a proposal which on its face was extreme. I want to ask you whether the offer in that document, which is in evidence here as exhibit 1245-H, to withdraw, upon the conclusion of

the present agreement, all troops now stationed in southern Indo-China, was not a totally new concession from the Japanese side never before mentioned?

A If you can call it a concession; it is perfectly meaningless.

-	
G	
I	
_	
0	
U	
7	
1	
-	
-	
d	
d	
b	
e	
C:	
r	
1.	
_	
C	
g	
0	
•	
20	
&	
&	
&	
&	
&	
& S	
S	
S	
SP	
S	
SPria	
SPria	
SP	
SPrat	
SPrat	
SPria	
SPrat	
SPrat	
SPrat	

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Will you tell me why if, as you say, the
stationing of Japanese troops in southern Indo China
was a matter of such grave concern the Japanese
agreement to withdraw them forthwith upon the con-
clusion of the agreement was meaningless?

A I don't quite understand your question.

Why was it meaningless? 0

Because there was no limit placed on the number of Japanese troops that they could bring into If they withdrew them from Southern Indo-China to Northern Indo China, they could have brought a 100,000 into northern Indo-China and brought those troops back to southern Indo-China within a few days.

THE PRESIDENT: That appears in his affidavit.

Did not the Department of State consider that the agreement to withdraw from southern Indo-China included the agreement not to return there?

There was no limit on the total number of troops that Japan could put in Indo-China. They could, if they were in a position to get back to Southern Indo-China to threaten us.

THE PRESIDENT: Did I understand you to say you treated this offer as insincere for two reasons, the occupation of Hainan Island and the intercepted messages?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

2 3

4

Was the question of the number of troops

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

to be stationed in northern Indo-China even mentioned by the Department of State to the Japanese Ambassadors at the time of this proposal?

I recall definitely that the point that the troops could be brought back into southern Indo-China in a day or two was mentioned, but I don't recall the fact whether there was no limit placed on the number of troops stationed in northern Indo-China was brought to their attention. The record will show that, whether it was so or not.

Now, turning to the question of the proposed insingerity of the Japanese proposal, as I understand, the Department of State felt that the Japanese offer was not made in good faith and that, therefore, any agreement which might be made would have no value; is that correct?

To which offer are you now referring?

We are speaking of the 20th of November proposal.

Well, I had made no statement in regard to that. I spoke about the November 7th.

> I am sorry. I did not mean to misquote you. Let me ask from what time did the Department

I

2

4

6

7 8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

23

24

25

of State feel that the Japanese were insincere on their side of the conversations, from what time?

A It depends upon to what you are referring.

We certainly felt they were insincere in regard to
the question of withdrawal of troops as from November
7th. I don't recall that the question ever arose
specifically in regard to this November 20th proposal.

Q Well, as I understand, the thing which has occurred to vitiate your Belief in the Japaneso sincerity was knowledge of the intercepted message of the 4th of November, that is, message 726, which we have mentioned before; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Then may we assume that from that time forward the Department of State had no confidence in the Japanese sincerity?

A Naturally, we were on our guard from that point on.

Q Would I then be correct if I said that from that time on as far as the Department of State was concerned you were not really negotiating because you had no confidence that any agreement obtained would be of any value?

A I don't think that is correct. We were on our guard. We naturally wanted to have things,

1	
1	
	1
2	i
-	ı
	ı
	1
3	ı
)	ı
	ı
4	
-	
5	
6	
7	
-	
0	
8	
_	
9	
	ı
	ı
	Į
10	I
	ĺ
	ı
11	
10	
12	
13	
13	
14	
14	
	ı
15	
1)	
16	
10	
17	
11	
18	
19	١
	١
	١
20	١
20	١
	١
	١
21	١
21	١
	١
22	۱
77	۱
	١
	١
23	١
20	١
	١
	١
24	١
7.1	ĺ
	l

commitments provided, and we were unwilling to accept vague expressions, and we wanted dependable commitments.

THE PRESIDENT: It was still possible for the Japanese to give you evidence of good faith?

THE WITNESS: I think it would have been still possible.

THE PRESIDENT: By withdrawing troops?

THE WITNESS: By withdrawing troops or any other practical evidence of an intention to follow peaceful courses.

Q Have you ever had occasion since that time to see the Japanese original of this message No. 726?

A Is that the intercept to which you are referring?

Q Yes, it is.

A Yes, I did.

Q When did you see the Japanese, the copy?

A Some years later.

Q When you saw the Japanese copy did you discover that numerous mistakes had been made in either decryptographing or translating?

A As I recall now, I don't think I saw the whole of the Japanese. I saw the first part that related to, "This is our revised ultimatum."

7		
-	۰	
-	,	

Q The message actually was in four parts, was it not?

3

A Well, I don't recall now.

4 5

Q Then you did not read enough of the Japanese copy so that you can confirm or deny that the original Japanese is, in effect, a totally different document from the intercept as it came to you in November, 1941?

7

6

A That is correct.

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

Now, let us turn briefly to the question of non-discriminatory commercial intercourse throughout the Pacific area, this being the third of the major points of difference between the two nations. In order to pass rapidly over the earlier stages of the conversation on this point, may I correctly state that at various times a number of American suggestions for amendment to the various Japanese proposals were accepted -- accepted, I mean, in the sense of being embodied by the Japanese themselves in later draft proposals?

A Some of the wordings were embodied, but they were largely, in effect, nullified by the various qualifications the Japanese put in; for example, the applicability of the mutual guarantees of carrying on economic activity by peaceful means was at first limited in both the Japanese and American versions,

2

3

4

5

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

Well, I haven't got the May 1931 draft be-

was it not, to the Southwest Pacific area?

fore me. I don't recall definitely what our wording was in our paper.

In any event, in the American draft of the 21st of June were not these guarantees for the first time expressed as to be extended to the Pacific area instead of the Southwest Pacific area? I refer to exhibit 1092 in evidence.

Yes, there the provision is for -- covers the Pacific area.

Finally, after this question had remained unsettled for some time, did not the Japanese Government by this preposal of the 10th of November make the following statement: "That the Japanese Government recognizes the principle of non-discrimination in international commercial relations to be applied to all of the Pacific areas, inclusive of China, on the understanding that the principle in question is to be applied uniformly to the rest of the entire world as well." This is quoted from exhibit 1246 in evidence.

That is correct. A

On the same day, in conversation with President Roosevelt, did not Ambassador NOMURA point out to the President that -- I quote -- "The Secretary of State has repeatedly pointed out to me that it has been his

long-cherished scheme to see the application of the principle throughout the whole world.

- Q. Do you recall that?
- A Yes, now that you recall it to my mind.
- Q Do you know whether that had or had not been the position of Secretary Hull as alleged by Ambassador NOMURA?

A Would you mind reading that passage again for me, please?

Q "The Secretary of State has repeatedly pointed out that it has been his long-cherished scheme to see the application of the principle throughout the whole world."

A Yes, that was a consistent position of the Secretary of State.

Q Nevertheless, do you remember that in his oral statement handed to the Japanese Ambassador on the 15th of November Secretary Hull pointed out that the last sentence of the Japanese proposal sets forth a condition the meaning of which is not entirely clear?

The oral statement is to be found on page 734, Volume II, Foreign Relations.

A That is correct.

Q "Which principle," he went on to say, "I assumed was not meant to bind the United States to responsibility

7

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

for practices outside of its jurisdiction, or practices by other nations?

That is correct.

Now, had not Japanese Minister WAKASUGI already confirmed to you in a conversation held on the 13th of November that this assumption of Secretary Hull was correct?

Well, I would have to have my memory refreshed on that. If it is in the record it is correct.

Let me try to refresh your memory by reading you the excerpt from the memorandum of this conversation at page 730 of Volume II of Foreign Relations.

"Mr. WAKASUGI said that what the Japanese Government meant" by this phrase in question "was that the principle would be applied by the United States and by Japan, and did not refer to the universal application of those principles by all countries. Mr. Ballantine asked whether this was not a very important point to be brought out clearly and authoritatively."

Do you recall that conversation?

I da. A

Now, in view of those proposals and conversations, did not the Department of State consider that there had been a meeting of minds on this point subject only to securing the authoritative, that is to say, the

written provisions to that effect from the Japanese Government?

A The fact of the matter is we never got a reply to our memorandum of November 15, and KURUSU, on November 18, made statements to the Secretary which threw doubt on how far the Japanese Government could ever go in the matter.

Q Will you tell us as well as you are able to remember what those statements of Mr. KURUSC were?

A That statement is in the record of the memorandum of conversation. My recollection is that he said that at the present time the Japanese Government couldn't do anything about exchange controls that they had imposed in China, that he could make no promises as to what the Japanese Government could do after the war, and that he made no definite reply when the Secretary of State asked whether the Japanese Government could commit itself in principle to those points.

I should prefer to have that taken directly from the record, for I am not sure of my memory always.

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

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

THE PRESIDENT: It is not a technical term

even in diplomatic negotiations. We do not want him to tell us what it means.

The Japanese proposed modus vivendi of the 26th of November was given consideration by the State Department or not? I mean, of course, the 20th of November.

A Of course, it was given consideration. We studied it very carefully.

Q Did it seem to offer to the State Department any possibility of settlement of the current issues?

A It did not. Our observations on it are contained in my affidavit.

I should like to have your explanation, is that this proposal on its face was extreme. That is, in saying that it was extreme, do you mean what you have gone on to say in your next paragraph, that is, your top paragraph on page 13?

A Yes. I think that that statement on the top of page 13 describes considerations that compelled us to feel it was extreme.

Q Aside from those considerations, did you feel that the Japanese, in presenting this modus vivendi, were insincere as you did feel that they were in presenting their immediately preceding

proposal?

A This proposal acceptance by us would, we thought, give Japan just what they wanted, what they were seeking. It showed their position. It showed their position. We had no reason to believe that that would be unacceptable to them.

Q Was there objection on the part of the Department of State to the principle or idea of a modus vivendi at that time?

A No. If there was something that we could have done that would have been practically possible, that from our own consideration and the consideration of other powers affected could have helped brought -- bring Japan into line and bring support in Japan to a more peaceful course, we would have been very glad to consider what we could have done. The record shows that the Secretary of State told the Japanese that.

Q The United States Department had been making it clear throughout the conversations, had it not, that it would consult other interested governments when, in its judgment, the time had come when that would be profitable?

A We had made it clear to the Japanese representatives that, when we thought there was a basis for an agreement, then we would consult with the other

1 2

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

23

24

25

powers.

Q In fact, had the other interested powers been consulted prior to, say, the middle of November?

A They had not been consulted in regard to the contents of any proposed agreement. They knew that conversations were taking place, but they had not been consulted in regard to the contents of anything, as far as I recall.

Q After receipt of the Japanese proposal of the 20th of November, did not Secretary Hull on the 22nd meet with the Ambassadors of Great Britain, China and the Netherlands and discuss the situation?

A I don't remember the exact date, but between -- somewhere between the 22nd and the 24th, including the 24th, he did consult with them.

Q Was the Japanese modus vivendi proposal of the 20th discussed at that time?

A I wasn't present at the conversations, and I don't know -- with the other representatives, and I do not know just what exactly was discussed; but it will be in the record what the contents of those discussions were.

- Where does one find that record?
- A That's all published in "Foreign Relations

	1	-
	7	
	i	
7		
1	ı	
	8	
	ı	
2	ı	
4	ı	
	ı	
	ı	
2	ı	
,	ı	
	۱	
	ı	
4	ı	
	ı	
	ì	
_	ı	
)	ı	
	ı	
	ı	
1	ı	
0	1	
	H	
	1	
7		
7	d	
	ı	
	ı	
8	۱	
0	ı	
	ı	
	ı	
9	ı	
-	ı	
	ı	
	ı	
01		
	1	
	1	
11	1	
	1	
	1	
10	1	
12	1	
	1	
13	1	
10	ı	
	1	
14	1	
LT	1	
	1	
15	1	
	1	
	1	
. ,	1	
16	1	
	ı	
	1	
17	ı	
10		
18		
19		
17		
20		
21		

23

24

25

of the United States and Japan, 1931 - 1941,"

Volume II. I beg your pardon. I'd like to correct
that. It is in the Pearl Harbor record. I don't
think that those conversations with the other powers
were published at that time.

Q After that meeting of whatever date it may have been, did the Department of State consider presenting a modus vivendi of its own to Japan?

A Yes. Consideration was given in the Department of State to the presentation of a modus vivendi.

Q Was it felt in the Department that a <u>modus</u>

<u>vivendi</u> plan could be drawn which might be acceptable
to Japan?

A No. We tried out the best we could do, but we felt all along it was very short of what Japan had been asking. The Japanese had indicated very clearly that the November 20 proposal was their last word, and they wouldn't take anything less than that; and we thought it was extremely unlikely that they would accept even the maximum that it might be possible for us to offer.

Q Nevertheless, did not the Department go so far as to draft a proposal for such a modus vivendi?

A They made successive drafts of such a proposal -- three successive drafts.

1.

3

5

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

1516

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

	Q	Do :	you kr	NOI	whe	ther	the	ese	suc	ces	sive	draf	ts
were	disc	cuss	ed and	ong	the	Pre	side	ent,	th	e S	ecret	carie	S
of S	state	, Wa:	r and	Nav	у,	and	the	Chi	ef	of	Staff	of	
the	Army	and	Chief	of	Na:	val	Oper	rati	ons	?			

A Yes. The whole plan of the proposed <u>modus</u> vivendi was discussed.

Q Up until what date was it still not decided whether the modus vivendi proposal would be presented?

A Certainly up to November 25.

Q Was it not, in fact, generally understood in Washington among these officials whom I have mentioned, as late as the 25th and, perhaps, even on the morning of the 26th, that the modus vivendi proposal would probably be offered to Japan?

A I don't know definitely what their understanding was and how long they understood that, but they knew that we were considering it.

Q Do you know whether any of the drafts of that modus vivendi proposal are published?

A They were all made public in the Pearl Harbor Inquiry conducted by the Joint Committee.

Q If the Department of State considered the Japanese proposal of the 20th an ultimatum, as I believe you said it did, this was considered as a reply to the ultimatum, was it not? That is not

very clear. Let me add: In saying "this was the reply," I mean, whatever was next presented to the Japanese would be the reply.

A Yes. Our November 26th proposal was a reply.

Q As a reply rejecting the ultimatum, which you regarded the note of the 20th to be, it was, in effect, the termination of the conversations, was it not?

A I can't agree with that conclusion.

Q Well, let's investigate it a little: You state on page 13, paragraph 3 of your affidavit that "it subsequently appeared, the Japanese treated the November 26 proposal as finally disposing of the question of negotiating for a peaceful settlement." How long subsequently did that appear so far as the Department of State was advised?

A Well, we knew from the intercepts that the Japanese Government regarded the conversations for a peaceful settlement was over, but the Japanese were told to keep up appearances as if the conversations were still going on.

Q Then, from the date of receipt by the Department of State of the intercepted message
No. 844 from Tokyo to Washington, dated the 28th of

November, you had that information.

A That is correct.

)

Q As a rule, how long after transmission did the Department of State receive these diplomatic messages?

A I believe, on the face of those messages it indicates the date of translation. We usually got them within a day or two of the date of translation.

Q Well, now, however the Japanese treated the United States message of the 26th of November, certainly the State Department knew that it did constitute a rupture of negotiations or conversations, did it not?

A You mean at what time?

Q I mean at the time of delivery of that note.

A No, I cannot agree with your conclusion there.

Q Let me rephrase it. Perhaps I didn't make it clear: Against the background of those months of conversations, was not the inevitable effect of the note of the 26th of November to terminate the negotiations?

THE PRESIDENT: You are in the realm of opinion again, Major Blakeney. What was the natural

effect is for us, really.

2

3

-

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

MR. BLAKENEY: The original question was prefaced by the words, "Was it not the belief of the Department of State that." That is what I am asking him. Not "what was the natural effect?" but "what did the Department of State consider to be the effect?"

THE PRESIDENT: You may ask him what the Department thought or did.

BY MR. BLAKENEY (Continued):

Q Will you, then, state what the Department thought on that question?

A The Department thought, as a result of the months of conversation, that it was unlikely that the Japanese Government would accept our proposal of November 26; but there was always a chance, and the proposal seemed to us of a character which any peaceloving nation would have been glad to accept.

Q Did Secretary Hull state on the morning of the 27th of November to Secretary of War Stimson that "I have broken it off. Matters are now in the hands of the Army and the Navy"?

A I think that's in the record. I'm not sure of the exact wording he used, but he used wording to indicate that he thought that the situation had

	become very serious.
1	Q Then do you know that Secretary Hull made
2	
3	substantially similar statements on the following day
4	or days to the British Ambassador and to the American
5	War Council?
6	A Well, he made statements to the War Council
7	and to the British Ambassador on the following day
8	that he thought that Japan might break out at any
9	moment in some surprise attack at any point.
10	Q Yes. But, more specifically, do you know
11	that he made the statements on those days, in effect,
12	"I have washed my hands of the matter. It is in the
13	hands of the Army and the Navy."?
14	A I recall very clearly Mr. Hull saying to
15	me "within this present year," that he never used the
16	expression, "I have washed my hands of it."
17	Q Then, if Secretary Stimson testified that
18	he did, Secretary Stimson was mistaken, wasn't he?
19	MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, the prosecution
20	objects to that question as being improper.
21	THE PRESIDENT: To whom do you suggest Mr.
22	Hull made that statement?
23	MR. BLAKENEY: I suggest that the record

shows that he made it to Mr. Stimson.

THE PRESIDENT: You do not suggest he made

25

24

it to the Japanese, do you?

MR. BLAKENEY: No, sir. That is not the point at all. I was trying to determine the belief of official Washington of the effect of the note of the 26th. However, I do not think it worthwhile to dispute over the exact word because there will be abundant evidence later of what words were used.

THE PRESIDENT: You can ask him anything he knows was said to Mr. Stimson or anything he heard was said to him.

BY MR. BLAKEMEY (Continued):

Q May I ask it this way, since I am not trying to test your memory but just to get the facts:

Do you not know that it was the general viewpoint among these high officials in Washington that the note of the 26th of December -- of November could only have the effect of breaking off negotiations with Japan?

A I can be specific on one point. Mr. Hull did say, "The matter is now in the hands of the Army and Navy."

THE PRESIDENT: To whom did he say it?

THE WITNESS: He said that to a number of high officials. He said it, I believe, to Mr.

Stimson, but he said it in the meeting of the War

Council. Mr. Hull's best recollection of what he said is contained in a letter that he wrote to Justice Roberts on December 30, 1941, which is just a few days after the event.

G	
0	
1	
d	
b	3
е	
r	4
g	
&	
$\alpha$	(
S	,
p	7
r	
a	8
t	
att	9
	10

Q During the months of August and September, 1941, was there not a discussion between the Japanese and American negotiators concerned of a proposed meeting between President Roosevelt and Premier KONOYE?

A That is correct.

Q President Roosevelt regarded this proposal for a meeting as, in his words, "a step forward," did he not?

A I don't recall that statement, but it probably may be in the record.

Q Would it refresh your recollection if I told you that on the 28th of August, when the original suggestion was delivered by the Ambassador of Japan to the President for such a meeting, that that was the President's reaction to it?

A I think that probably was his reaction because even as late as 15th of December he told Congress that he would have been glad to have traveled thousands of miles to have effected an agreement with Japan.

Q The meeting never finally took place, did it?

A That is right. That is correct.

In explaining in your affidavit, page 11, the American reasons for inability to adopt this proposal, you dwell on the effects which might have been expected to result from the failure of the

15

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

proposed meeting. I am quite sure, however, that equal consideration must have been given to the prospec s of success of such an extraordinary meeting between the President and the Premier?

A We had given careful consideration to that, but we had concluded that unless we reached an agreement in advance on essential principles and their application, that the meeting would result -- would not be productive of results.

Q Especially since you say months of close-up conversations with the Japanese Ambassador had failed to produce results?

A- That is correct.

Q Now I ask you whether this very fact was not so much the more reason for making the effort through this meeting of the highest responsible officials to secure the concrete and clear-cut commitments from Japan which were desired?

A The chances, in the light of the circumstances, of getting anywhere when the Japanese had so clearly failed to move on these fundamental points were so dim that naturally we had to give important consideration to what the effects would be if no agreement resulted, and those effects seemed very certain.

Q Prince KONOYE was Premier at that time?

A That is correct.

for achieving the peace desired?

2

3

4

)

6

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

Q In fact, such a meeting had been one of the ingredients in the original draft of the 16th of April,

Q Was there a feeling in the State Department that Prince KONOYE was a representative of a liberal -- moderate group in Japan which might be the best hope

A What loomed largest in the consideration of the Department of State was that the military party was dominant in Japan.

Q Was the Department at that time aware of the line of thought that the best way to destroy the dominance of the military party was to encourage the moderate party in some way?

A Yes, we had heard that before.

Q And the further suggestion that a measure of agreement with the United States would probably be the best means of establishing the moderates firmly in control of Japan?

A That argument had also been brought up in April by these friends, unofficial Japanese and American friends, when these proposals were first brought to us; but the proposals they brought did not seem to, without considerable revision, to offer a prospect for agreement.

had it not?

2

A That is correct.

3

Q So far as concerns the desirability of such a meeting between the President and the Premier,
Ambassador Grew in Tokyo expressed to the Department,
did he not, a great enthusiasm for and hopefulness

6

5

concerning such a meeting?

7.

A That is so; but he was only reporting from

9

the viewpoint of Tokyo as he himself stated.

O And from the viewpoint of Tokyo did he not

10

feel that, in his own words: "The good which might

12

flow from such a meeting is incalculable"?

13

A There is no question about what Mr. Grew reported in his telegram. It has been published.

14 15

It is in the record.

16

10

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Department took into consideration this further suggestion of Ambassador Grew contained in his long telegram to the Department of the 29th of September reviewing the whole situation, wherein, speaking of the proposed meeting, he says this: He raises the questions whether the United States is not now given the opportunity to halt Japan's program without war or an immediate risk of war; and, further, whether through failure to use the present opportunity, the

3

4 5

6

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

2425

United States will not face a greatly increased risk of war. The Ambassador states his firm belief in an affirmative answer to these two questions?

A We gave capital consideration to that as well as all other suggestions of Ambassador Grew.

Q Did the Department consider further at that time the likelihood also referred to by Ambassador Grew that Prince KONOYE would be in a position to give to the President more directly explicit and satisfactory engagements than his Ambassador could do?

A We did not see how -- what explicit commitments that would be of a satisfactory character could
be given in the light of the failure to reach an
agreement on so many fundamental points during all
those months of conversation.

Q In any event, the meeting did not occur because of the facts which you have stated in your affidavit?

A And also for the many considerations stated in our communication of October 2nd and in further explanations made in the published record.

O Then with the closing of the question of a meeting between the President and Premier, the conversations were thrown back to the same state approximately in which they started, were they not?

1 with the Premier. 2 3 5 6 7 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 That is correct. A 17 18 19 negotiations? 20 21 We know the difference. 22 23 proposals of any nature? 24

25

We never closed the question of a meeting

Well, perhaps I should have said, with the final decision by the State Department to send its answer to the proposal for a meeting?

In our communication of October 2nd, we indicated that we were still willing to have the meeting, and we asked for further consideration to be given to certain points that we mention in that communication. We never got anything further back on that point from the Japanese.

Now, returning to the 26th of November, you say that despite the Japanese construction of the note of that day, they kept up the appearance of continuing negotiations right down to December 7th?

In what way does your keeping up the appearance of continuing negotiations differ from continuing

THE PRESIDENT: That answer will not help.

Well, did the Japanese present additional

There was a conversation on December 21st between -- well, there were conversations. I do not

remember the exact dates, following November 26th. At those conversations were additional 2 proposal: of any nature presented by the Japanese? There was a proposal outstanding by us on 4 November 26th, and they intimated to us that a reply would be received in due course. 6 Well, what in general was the subject matter of the conversations after that date? 8 A Well, that is clearly recorded in the record. I do not want to undertake to give a resume of that 10 thing offhand without reading over the record. 11 O Well, I am not making any such demands on you. I am just trying to find out in a general way what went on, which you refer to as "keeping up the appearance of continuing negotiations." THE PRESIDENT: Were you influenced by their 17 demeanor or by the intercepted messages or by what they were doing at Hainan? THE WITNESS: We were influenced by the intercepted messages. Q Did any of those intercepted messages show that additional proposals or propositions were received

from Tokyo to be delivered in the effort to conclude negotiations? I do not recall definitely, but I am inclined

1

BALLANTINE

3

5

7

9

12

13

15

16

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

to think not.

Q Did the Japanese Ambassador after that time call upon the Department of State with additional explanations of one point or another which had been under discussion, and which they stated they had been instructed by their Government to make?

A If I recall correctly, I think on December 2nd the Japanese Minister suggested to the Under Secretary of State that we go back to the original proposals and counter-proposals. I may be wrong about that; but, if I remember correctly, he made some such suggestion.

Q Did the Japanese Ambassador during that period on at least one occasion state to the Department that they had been instructed by Tokyo to request full reconsideration by the American Government because the state of affairs was so perilously close to disaster?

A I believe the Japanese Ambassador did say
he urged full reflection by the United States Government.
I do not recall the exact wording or the rest of it.

Q Were you aware from any of the intercepted correspondence that the Japanese had arranged that, in the event of a successful conclusion to the negotiations, their fleet should be recalled and emergency military measures canceled up to the actual moment of attack?

A I have no clear recollection of that.

Q I believe that in your affidavit you do not undertake to say why the Department of State considered that the Japanese were pretending to continue negotiations. Can you tell us what the Department's view of that was?

A First, we had the information of the intercepts; and secondly, by no positive act did the Japanese indicate that there was any change in the situation.

Q I am sorry. My question was not clear. The question is this: Can you tell us whether the Department of State formulated any belief as to the reason why the Japanese were pretending to continue negotiations, if they were only pretending?

A I think that that is one of the bases for the conclusion by the Secretary of State that the Japanese might break out in fresh acts of aggression at any point over widely separated areas.

Q I am sorry. We are still not talking about the same thing. The Department believed that the paparese were in bad faith, professing to be continuing negotiations, is that correct?

A That is correct.

Q Now, for what reason did the Department believe that the Japanese were doing that? What did they

believe was the reason for which the Japanese were doing it?

A I am sorry. I tried to make clear that they were doing that for reasons that they were contemplating fresh acts of aggression in their own chosen time.

Q And the negotiations, or the appearance of negotiations, were designed, did you think, to conceal the military preparations?

A Not to conceal military preparations. Those had been obvious since July, this tremendous forward movement from Japan southward into Indo-China to await some chosen time for some act.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

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

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

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

BY MR. BLAKENEY: (Continued)

Q After the decision was reached on the 25th or 26th of November not to present the modus vivendi proposal to Japan, but to present the note which was finally delivered -- I am sorry, not after that, but at the time your decision was reached, can you tell me very briefly what were the reasons and considerations underlying the American change of viewpoint as represented by that note?

A I don't know what you mean by change of viewpoint.

Q Did not the American note of the 26th of November represent a departure from some of the points of agreement which had been reached earlier in the course of the conversations?

THE PRESIDENT: If you are referring to earlier agreements in evidence, Major Blakeney, the answer is for us to give, not the witness.

MR. BLAKENEY: I refer to the entire preceding body of documents, some of which are in evidence, and conversations, very few, if any, of which are in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes?

2

MR. BLAKENEY: Shall he answer?

3

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

4

A I think the reasons given for our November 26th communication are fully set forth in the ex-

6

Q You refer. do you. to the oral statement

.

which is a part of exhibit "L" to your affidavit, that is Court exhibit 1245-I?

9

A That's correct.

10

11

Q Coming to the message sent by the President of the United States on the 6th of December to

12 13

the Emperor of Japan, you are doubtless familiar

14

with the evidence already introduced in this trial

15

concerning the delay in the delivery of that message,

16

are you not?

17

A Only to the extent that there was a delay.

I don't know the details.

18 19

20

Q Wes it the belief of the Department of
State that there would have been a difference in the
ultimate outcome if that message had been delivered

21

say ten hours earlier?

23

24

A So far as I know, there was no conclusion reached on that point by the Department of State.

25

Q Is it a fact that the only concrete request

or suggestion contained in that message was the request that the Emperor should give thought to ways of dispelling the dark clouds then prevailing?

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, the prosecution objects to this witness being asked to interpret for the Court. That message speaks for itself.

MR. BLAKENEY: I will withdraw the question. It is perhaps improper.

Q What did the Department of State consider this message to contain in the way of a new proposal designed to solve the differences between the two countries?

THE PRESIDENT: The Department is bound by its can words which we construe. Even the Department cannot give it a meaning different from that which it bears according to the words used.

MR. BLAKENEY: I point out, sir, that the message is not that of the Department, but of the President. I am trying to find out --

THE PRESIDENT: The same applies to him.

Q Did the Department draw this message, Mr. Witness?

A The message was partly drafted in the White House, partly in the State Department. There were contributions by both sides.

Q In contributing its advice, suggestions, or
whatever it did contribute to the drafting of the
message did the Department of State do so with con-
fidence that the message might have a chance of
achieving something towards settling the difference
between the two countries?

A We thought that the chances were very slim that it would accomplish anything, but in view of the desperate situation we did not want to overlook the slightest chance.

Q Was the situation considered notably more desperate on the 6th of December than on the 26th of November?

A The Japanese fleet had already sailed from that extreme southern part of Indo-China. We were in imminent danger. The situation was right then upon us.

C When was that information available in the Department of State?

A I believe it was about noon on the 6th.

Q At the time of the despatch of the President's message were the authorities of the Department of State and other departments already in possession of the Japanese -- in possession of information that the Japanese note which would constitute a de facto

Well, take one question at a time. Do you

rupture of relations was on the eay?

A Do you refer to the Japanese message of December 7th, which was delivered on December 7th?

Q Yes. I am asking whether at the time the President's message was despatched the Department of State was aware that that Japanese message later delivered on the 7th was on the way.

A I am sure that nobody in the State Department or in the White House knew that at the time. I think the Pearl Harbor record shows very conclusively that we did not know about it.

Q Perhaps I can refresh your recollection by suggesting to you that the record of the Pearl Har-bor Committee to which you refer shows that by three o'clock on the afternoon of the 6th the State Department had the so-called pilot message, announcing the imminent despatch of the final Japanese note -- of what we later came to know as the final Japanese note?

A That pilot message contained no hint of the content of the note that finally came, and even then the last part of the note, part 14, even that contained nothing indicating a <u>de facto</u> rupture of ciplomatic relations.

remember that the pilot message was available in the State Department by three o'clock in the afternoon of December 6th?

A I do not. I have no recollection of it, but I do have a recollection that the Pearl Harbor record indicated that it was received there at that time.

Q And the so-called pilot message told you, did it not, that a very long, the 14 part answer, to the last American proposal was being sent?

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, the prosecution objects to this question and asks that the pilot message be defined, especially in view of this last question.

THE PRESIDENT: What do you understand by it, Witness?

A I understand by a pilot message, was a message to the effect that the Japanese Government's answer was on its way.

Q And since reading the intercepted message No. 844 of the 28th of November, which you previously testified to, did not the Department of State know that when that answer came it would be as reported in message 844, a de facto rupture of relations?

9

11

12

14

15

17

18 19

20

22

2324

25

A	That would only be an assumption and yo	u
couldn't	take a chance on assumptions in a very	
critical	situation like this.	

Q I don't understand the assumption. I ask you whether after reading that Japanese message, stating that the answer would constitute a <u>de facto</u> rupture of relations, the State Department did not so understand it?

A Would you kindly read to me the text of that pilot message?

MR. BLAKENEY: May I do so.

THE PRESIDENT: I didn't catch his last enswer.

MR. BLAKENEY: He requested me to read the text of the pilot message and I will be glad to do so, if the Tribunal desires.

THE PRESIDENT: Is it a long message?

MR. BLAKENEY: No, sir. It is quite short.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, he should recollect what effect it had when they got it. It would be difficult for him to forget a message like that.

(Whereupon, the Marshal of the Court

handed a paper to the witness.)

THE WITNESS: I don't see anything in that message about a <u>de facto</u> rupture of relations with the

25

United States. THE PRESIDENT: Was that the message sent? 2 Mk. BLAKENEY: I quoted that phrase from 3 message No. 844 of the 28th of November. 4 5 MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, is it clear to 6 the Court that there were two messages, one, I be-7 lieve, a short message, that a message was coming 8 and secondly, the final note? 9 10 11 12 13 14 I will tender it tomorrow. 15 THE PRESIDENT: Read it. 16 17 18 bor, page 433: 19 "(1) 20 21 22 23 902 (in English.) 24

THE PRESIDENT: Clear as day, but Mr. Blakeney should tender that pilot message if the witness says that was the message received. MR. BLAKENEY: I will be very glad to do so. sir, except Thaven't it abstracted for introduction. MA. BLAKENEY: Leading from the Report of the Congressional Committee Investigating Pearl Har-The government has deliberated deeply on the American proposal of the 26th of November, and as a result we have drawn up a memorandum for the United States contained in my separate message No. "(2) This separate message is a very long one. I will send it in 14 parts and I imagine you will

1 receive it tomorrow. However, I am not sure. The situation is extremely delicate and when you re-3 coive it I want you to please keep it secret for the 4 time being. 5 "(3) Concerning the time of presenting this 6 memorandum to the United States I will wire you in 7 a separate message." 8 THE PRESIDENT: That sounds familiar. It 9 may be already in evidence. 10 MR. BLAKENEY: Shall I read the remaining 11 one sentence. 12 THE PRESIDENT: Read the rest. 13 Mr. BLAKENEY: (Reading) 14 "However, I want you in the meantime to put it 15 in nicely drafted form and make every preparation to 16 present it to the Imericans just as soon as you re-17 ceive instructions." 18 THE PRESIDENT: That message was to whom 19 from whom? 20 MR. BLAKENEY: Although it isn't shown in 21 the place from which I read it, I can state that it 22 was from Tokyo to the Ambassador in Washington. 23 THE PRESIDENT: My colleague tells me it 24 is exhibit 1216. 25

MR. BLAKENEY: I am informed also that the

製

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

Q Now, Mr. Vitness, my question was:	The
President's message to the Japanese Emperor	was sent,
was it not, some hours after this so-called	pilot
message, exhibit 1216, was available in the	Department
of State?	

A Although the record apparently shows that that pilot message was delivered to the Department of State at 3 p.m. on the 6th, so far as I was able to check up at the time of the Pearl Harbor inquiry, no one of us had any definite recollection of having seen it at that hour or at that time, nor have we any definite recollection of when that message was received—was seen by us.

Q Do you happen to know when the President's message was sent?

A Message to the Emperor?

Q Yes.

A At nine o'clock.

Q Nine o'clock of the evening?

A That is in the affidavit.

Q Is it a fact that neither Secretary Hull, Secretary Stimson, nor Secretary Knox had any confidence in the prospect of achieving anything by that message and attempted to dissuade the President from sending it?

15 16

17

18

19

21

22 23

24

25

8 9

THE PRESIDENT: How is that relevant or material, Major Blakeney?

MR. BLAKENEY: There has been a great deal made here in the prosecution's evidence of the question of delay in delivery of the message. In the opening statement of this phase of the case it was stated that prompt delivery might have changed the course of history. I think the intention with which the message was drafted and sent and the belief or lack of belief in its efficacy by those who were responsible for it is quite material in view of that statement.

If the Tribunal is inclined to consider the question of delay in delivery of the message as of no importance, I have no further interest.

THE PRESIDENT: We are completely at a loss to know how the delay in the Japanese post office in Tokyo has any light thrown upon it by the opinions of the three Cabinet Ministers you name.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, since there has been interjected into this conversation the question of the sincerity of the sender, who was the late President of the United States, we respectfully ask the Tribunal, irrespective of the exact materiality, not to shut off any comment from the witness on this point.

4 5

THE PRESIDENT: We could only do that by the agreement of both parties. We are confined to the evidence which is relevant and material.

MR. KEENAN: I assume, Mr. President, there is a purpose in the question -- if it is to challenge the sincerity or the integrity of the President of the United States, by whomever made or where, I respectfully request the Court to permit the question to be answered.

THE PRESIDENT: The genuineness of the message certainly is material. You may ask any question tending to show that it was not genuine.

But the real point about the delay is as stated in a memorandum received from a colleague: "If it was intentionally delayed, then it is suggested that he who delayed it feared it might avert a war on which he was determined."

I cannot see how the attitude of the three Cabinet Ministers named bears on the sincerity of the President or on the cause of the delay in Tokyo.

is that whoever delayed the message thought that he was averting a war, I have no interest. But I have been attempting to elicit evidence from those best placed, I should think, to know as to whether there was actually any prospect that the delivery of this

message at any time would have changed the course of history. That is the charge we are trying to meet.

THE PRESIDENT: In other words, you are asking him for an opinion which we think is beyond his province.

MR. BLAKENEY: Very well.

Q Coming to the final Japanese note delivered in Washington on the 7th of December, you say that it was not a declaration of war with reasons or an ultimatum, and so forth. Upon first reading that note in intercepted form at the White House on the night of the 6th of December, do you know, did President Roosevelt say, "This means war"?

A I know that one officer testified to that effect.

	Q	Do	you	know	whethe	r all	high-	ranking	official
in	Washi	ngto	n co	nceri	ned in	the m	atter,	specif	ically
the	Secre	etar	es	of S	tate, W	ar, N	avy an	d the Ch	niefs
of	Staff	, up	on f	irst	readin	g this	s inte	rcepted	message
wer	e of	the	same	opin	nion.				

A I do not know. Things were moving so fast at that time. Many of the higher offices of the Government didn't receive the intercepts in time. By the time that we received the message from the Japanese Pearl Harbor had already happened.

- Q When did the Department of State first receive the intercepted copy of that message?
- A Well, Part 14 I would say somewhere around ten o'clock. I didn't see any of it before that time.
  - Q Ten o'clock a.m. or p.m. of what day?
  - A Ten o'clock a.m. on the 7th.
- Q Did the intercepted message which was delivered to the White House on the evening of the 6th of December include Part 14?
- A I think that the record will show that Part 14 wasn't even received or decoded until the early morning hours of the 7th.
- Q Then, if the President of the United States formed his judgement of the effect of the note without seeing Part 14, is it correct to say that the first

7 8

13 parts of the note in effect -- the first 13 parts of the note gave the impression that war was inevitable?

A It would be difficult for me to answer that.

I mean, I can only speak for myself, because I didn't compare notes. I can only give my own opinion, if that is of any use.

Q Did you know that even before the delivery to the Japanese of the United States note of the 26th of November that the President and other high officials in Washington sere expecting hostilities with Japan, perhaps as early as the first of December?

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, the prosecution objects to that question. It might be that the people in the United States expected to be attacked by Japan for many, many years before, but that is not the issue before this Court.

THE PRESIDENT: He is asked whether he knew whether the President and others expected an attack. He may answer.

A All I know is what the Secretary of State said; that Japan might be -- was apt to break out in an attack in any direction.

Q As you and the State Department read intercepted Japanese diplomatic messages from about the 28th of November, did it not become increasingly clear that

,

whatever note might eventually be delivered by Japan would probably be the last and would mean war?

A Not necessarily. I mean it was a very strong likelihood of that, but it was not one hundred per cent conclusions. I'd like to explain that it wouldn't be the note that would mean war, it was the general situation, the forward movement that was going on — the heavy troop movement down southward, all those signs. It wasn't a question of a note, it was the question of a situation.

Q Nevertheless, when you knew that a note was coming which would have the effect of rupturing negotiations, was not the appearance of that note considered of especial significance?

A Characteristics of that note were very well described by the Secretary of State to the Japanese Ambassadors.

Q Now, I am not asking you about the characteristics of it, I am asking you whether in the situation as it then stood, the arrival of a note of that character breaking off negotiations certainly did not indicate war?

THE PRESIDENT: He can tell us only what the American authorities thought, not what he personally thinks.

I think in the minds of many of the American authorities the note was connected with the dispatch of this large Japanese armada which had sailed 3 a day previous and of which we had gotten word on the 4 noon of the 6th -- this huge armada which was sailing southward or westward in the general direction towards British or American or Dutch territories. I am sure that Mr. Hull has testified to that effect.

Well, that is just what I mean, that in the situation as it had then developed, the Japanese note intercepted and available some time on the 6th, regardless of its wording, actually constituted, and was understood by the American high authorities to constitute a declaration of war, did it not?

I don't know that any American officials expressed the opinion that it constituted a declaration of war. Things were happening so fast at that time; this armada had already sailed.

Now, as to the delivery of that note to the Department of State, you have made the point in your affidavit that it was delivered to Secretary Hull at a time which was after the attack on Pearl Harbor. Are you aware of the fact from reading intercepted diplomatic correspondence that it was the direction of the Japanese Foreign Office to Ambassador NOMURA that the note should

14 15

9

10

11

17

16

19

18

20 21

22

23

24 25

be delivered at 1 p.m. in Washington? A Yes, we saw the intercept on the morning of the 7th that the direction said it should be delivered at 1 p.m. THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until half past nine tomorrow morning. (Whereupon, at 1600 the proceedings were adjourned until Thursday, 21 November 1946 at 0930.)