Nov. 14, 1946 Index Mit & Cx.

Page

INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

Prosecution's Witnesses

SHIRAO, Tateki					
Direct by Brigadier Nolan Cross by Dr. KIYOSE					
	INDEX				
	Of				
EXHIBITS					
Doc. Pros. Def. No. No. No.	<u>Description</u>	For In Ident. Evidence			
1532D(15) 1193	Telegram from Foreign Minister TOGO to Am- bassador NOMURA dated 28 November 1941	10442			
15 - H 1194	Telegram dated 29 November 1941 from Tokyo to Washington	er 10444			
1532(10) 1195	Telegram from NOMURA to Foreign Minister TOGO dated 30 November 1941	10449			
1632W(86) 1196	Extract from Entry of Man KIDO's Diary dated 29 November 1941	equis 10452			
2496 1197	Parent document of Inter- rogation of Defendant NAGANO on 26 March 1946				
2496-A 1197-A	Extract therefrom	10461			
1632N(87) 1198	Entry from KIDO's Diary dated 30 November 1941	10468			
2593D(22) 1199	Telegram of 30 November 1 from Tokyo to OSHIMA	10469			
2593D(23) 1200	Telephone conversation between KURUSU and YAMAMOTO on 30 November 1941	10473			
2505 1201	Parent document from the TOJO interrogation of 20 February 1946	10479			

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(Cont'd)

Doc.	Pros. Def.	<u>Description</u>	For In dent. Fvidence
2505A	1201-A	Extract therefrom	10480
2513	1202	Parent document from the TOJO interrogation of 18 March 1946	10481
25134	1202-A	Extract therefrom (~p.1-	-4) 10482
2506	1203	Parent document TOJO's interrogation of 21 February 1941	10487
2506-A	1203-A	Extract therefrom	10487
2504	1204	Parent document - TOJOIs interrogation dated 19 February 1946	10491
2504A	1204-A	Extract therefrom	10492
2503	1205	Parent document - TOJO's interrogation dated 18 February 1946	10501
2503A	1205-A	Extract therefrom	10501
4119	1206	Parent document - TOJO's interrogation dated 26 March 1946	10505
4119A	1206-A	Extract therefrom	10505

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

	Doc.	Pros.	Def: No.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
	4115	1207		Parent document of TOGO's interrogation dated 11 March 1946	10508	
*	4115A	1207-A		Extract therefrom		10509
	2593D(26)	1208		Telegram dated 1 December 1941 from Tokyo to Washington		10516
	2500	1209		Parent document of TOJO's interrogation dated 8 February 1946	10519	
	2500A	1209-A		Extract therefrom		10520
	1632W(88)	1210		Extract from Entry from Marquis KIDO's Diary dated 1 December 1941		10523
•	2593D(30)	1211		Telegram from TOGO to NOMURA (Havana) dated 2 December 1941		10524
	1532D(11)	1212		Telegram dated 3 December 1941 to NOMURA to TOGO		10526
	2593D(34)	1213		Telegram from NOMURA in reply to TOGO's telegram dated 3 December 1941		10528
	2593D(35)	1214		Telegram from Tokyo to Hsinking dated 4 December 1941		10530
	220 - J	1215		Extract from Foreign Relations of the U.SJapan 1931-1941 Vol. II (p. 784) "Statement handed by the Japanese Ambassador NOMURA to the Secreta of State on 5 December 1941"	ry	10532

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Doc. Pros. Def. No. No. No.	Description	For In Ident. Evidence
1532D(12) 1216	Telegram from TOGO to NOMURA dated 6 December 1941	10534
1532D(13) 1217	Telegram from TOGO to NOMURA dated 6 December 1941	10536
2593D(39) 1218	Telegram of 7 December 1941 to NOMURA from TOGO	10537
2593D(38) 1219	Telegram from the Tokyo Foreign Office dated 7 December 1941	10538
1632\(0) 1220	Extract from Entry from Marquis KIDO's Diary dated 7 December 1941	10541
200-I 1221	Cable sent by President Roosevel to the Secretary of State Hull dated 6 December 1941	
2665 1222	Synchronized Time Chart for 6, 7 and 8 December 1941	, 10544
2581 1223	Comparative Time Table Based on Tokyo Proceeding Eastward on 7 and 8 December 1941	10549
2405 1224	Affidavit of Ambassador Joseph Clark Grew dated 23 June 1946	10551
2597 1225	Affidavit of SHIRAO, Tateki	10562

Thursday, 14 November, 1946 2 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST 5 Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan 6 8 The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, 9 at 0935. 10 11 12 13 Appearances: 14 For the Tribunal, same as before with the 15 exception of the HONORABLE R. B. PAL, Member from 16 India, not sitting. 17 For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 18 For the Defense Section, same as before. 19 20 21 22 (English to Japanese and Japanese 23 to English interpretation was made by the 24 Longuage Section, IMTFE.)

3

4

5

7

8

9

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

THE PRESIDENT: All the accused are present except OKAWA and HIRANUMA, who are represented by their respective counsel.

We have a certificate of illness of HIRANUMA from the Medical Superintendent of Sugamo Prison.
He is unable to attend today.

Dr. KIYOSE.

DR. KIYOSE: Yesterday afternoon I made a remark on the words "Minister of the Navy" appearing on page 2 of exhibit 1189. May we have this term excluded? The defense counsel was able to obtain the correct wording of this telegram, and later I will be able to prove that my wording was correct.

THE PRESIDENT: Your explanation yesterday was accepted. There is no need for any further action.

Mr. Fihelly.

MR. FIHELLY: Mr. President and Members of the Tribunal, we are now up to the date November 28, 1941.

As tending to show that Japan had decided to go to war with the United States and was using her

10

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

negotiations to assist her, as shown by International Prosecution document 1532-D(15), a wire of November 28 from Tokyo to Washington, which we now offer in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 1532-D(15) will receive exhibit No. 1193.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1193 and received in evidence.)

MR. FIHELLY: I now read prosecution's exhibit No. 1193:

"To: Ambassador NOMURA

"From: Foreign Minister TOGO

"Dispatched: 28 November 1941 8:05 P.M.

"Subject: Japan - United States Negotiation

"Telegram No. 844 (Ambassador's Code)

"Your telegram No. 1189 and others have been received. In spite of the efforts you two ambassadors have made, it is surprising and regrettable that such a proposal as the recent one had been made toward Japan by the United States. It is impossible for us to negotiate on the basis of their proposal. With the submission of the Imperial government's opinion of the American proposal (which will be

telegramed in two or three days), the situation will be such that there will be nothing left but to practically drop the negotiation. But we wish you to refrain from giving the impression to the United States government that the negotiation is broken off. Tell them that you are waiting instructions from the home government and while not making clear to them the intentions of the government, explain to them, as your personal opinion, that Japanese claims have been just and especially that although Japan has made intolerable concessions and has taken a conciliatory attitude in maintaining peace in the Pacific area, the United States government has not reacted to cooperate and has made the solution of the negotiation extremely difficult.

"Furthermore, because of the aforementioned situation, the measures which you have suggested in your telegram No. 11.80 have all been considered improper at this time, although they had been referred to the parties you mentioned. Please acknowledge the above-mentioned situation.

"/end/"

For the same purpose we offer in evidence 1 International Prosecution document No. 15-H, a wire 2 of November 29th from Tokyo to Washington. 3 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 5 6 No. 15-H will receive exhibit No. 1194. 7 (Whereupon, the document above re-8 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1194 and received in evidence. 10 MR. FIHELLY: I will now read prosecution's 11 exhibit No. 1194, and I ask the Tribunal to pay 12 particular attention to the last paragraph, as it 13 has a connection with the following document which 14 will be introduced. 15 (Reading): 16 "(Secret)" 17 "FROM: Tokyo 18 "TO: Washington 19 "29 November 1941 20 ##857 21 "Re my ="844. 22 Mule wish you would make one more attempt 23 verbally along the following lines: 24 "The United States government has (always?) 25 taken a fair and judicial position and has formu-

lated its policies after full consideration of the claims of both sides.

"However, the Imperial Government is at a loss to understand why it has now taken the attitude that the new proposals we have made cannot be made the basis of discussion, but instead has made new proposals which ignore actual conditions in East Isia and would greatly injure the prestige of the Imperial Government.

"Tith such a change of front in their attitude toward the China problem, what has become of the basic objectives that the U. S. government has made the basis of our negotiations during these seven months? On these points we would request careful self-reflection on the part of the United States government."

MR. FIHMLY: Now we come to the particular phrase I mentioned.

"(In carrying out this instruction, please be careful that this does not lead to anything like a breaking off of negotiations.)"

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, may I inquire of the prosecution if exhibit 1193 is an intercepted message?

MR. FIHELLY: Mr. President, I will have the book checked. I can't tell by just looking at it. We have the intercepted book here, and we will check it, and will inform Mr. Logan.

For such assistance as it may give the Tribunal, we now offer in evidence International Prosecution document No. 1532-D(10), a document which was found in the Foreign Ministry which appears to be the official copy of either that same wire which has just been read or one substantially like it. Strangely, the last line we have just referred to is missing from the Japanese text, but the Japanese document shows that there was some additional writing at one time at the end of that document, and that an attempt has been made to cross out and cover up that particular writing. I will first offer the Japanese text from 1532-D(10) and read the document.

THE PRESIDENT: You will give evidence of that attempt to which you refer, I take it.

MR. FIHELLY: Just by showing the Court the physical Japanese document.

THE PRESIDENT: Expert evidence could be

4 5

given on such matters. That is quite frequent where erasures have been made in documents.

MR. LOGAN: May we have a direction at this time, if your Honor please, to the prosecution to refrain from making such statements in the future when he is introducing documents. There is a proper way of doing that, as your Honor just suggested, by calling experts to show it.

MR. FIHELLY: We have offered the document and ask that it be marked, Mr. President and Members of the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: I have got a note:

If the document shows it, why should we need the expert to depose?

By the use of acids and that type of thing you can now very often bring up the original writing. That is my experience as a Judge of the Supreme Court of Queensland.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, if the prosecution has any evidence as to who made any change in that document, if there has been a change made in it, we ask that they produce evidence to that effect.

MR. FIHELLY: This was a document, as I told the Tribunal before, all this series of 1532-documents were found at the Japanese Foreign Ministry.

We have no evidence at this time as to who made that chliteration, but I believe we have a right, Mr. President and Members of the Tribunal, to introduce this document which was an official document of the Japanese Covernment and let it speak for itself.

THE PRESIDENT: You will save time, I think, and reduce the number of protests from the defense if you are satisfied, Mr. Fihelly, simply to say that on this document there appears to be an erasure and invite the Court's consideration of it or inspection of it.

Apparently, it is not an erasure. It is not an erasure; it is an obliteration, and you should have no difficulty in restoring the original writing by the use of acids or infra-rays or whatever is used on those occasions; and we expect you to do it.

MR. FIHELLY: Mr. President, I do not think
I used the word "erasure." I did use the word
"obliteration." I am sorry if the Court was misled.

THE FRESIDENT: Perhaps I assumed that it was an erasure because you had made no attempt to bring up the writing. You are dealing now with the most important documents in the whole of this trial. I do not think it is too much to say that.

MR. FIHELLY: We will be glad to use every

means within our nower to see what can be done to bring that cut. We had given it to different translators to see if they could mick up any word, and were unable to get any satisfactory answer. We will be glad to see what further can be done, as the Court instructs. Also, in view of what your Honor has said, would it not be better to have this document marked as a court exhibit so that it remains in custodia legis 10 in the custody of the Court. 11 THE PRESIDENT: It is already marked as an 12 exhibit. It is admitted on the usual terms, if I have 13 not already said so. 14 IR. FIHLLY: What was the number of that, 15 Mr. Mantz? 16 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 17 No. 1532-D(10), exhibit No. 1195. 18 (Whereupon, the document above referred 19 to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1195 20 and received in evidence.) 21 MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, the 22 other message concerning which we were just talking, 23 prosecution's exhibit 1194, is an intercepted message, 24

but it has not the date that it was translated on it.

May we have that from the prosecution?

MR. FIHELLY: If our intercepted books have 1 any such data, we will be plad to give it to Mr. Logen. 2 Mr. President, may exhibit 1795 now he read? 3 THE FRESIDENT: It mey. 5 MR. FIHLLY: I now read from prosecution 6 exhibit No. 1195: 7 Ambassador NOLURI in U.S.A. "TC: 8 "From: Foreign Minister TOGO 9 "Subject: U.S.-Jaranese Negotiations 10 "Dispatched 30 November 1941 4:20 A.M. 11 "Telegram No. 657 (Ambassador Code) 12 "Re my telegram No. 844 /Explanation of the 13 telegram missing in English/ 14 "We wish you would make on more attempt 15 verbally along the following lines: 16 "The U. F. Government considers that it 17 is difficult for them to base discussion on our new 18 proposal of the 20th, which was drawn un after con-19 siderable deliberation bearing in mind the claims 20 of both sides and based on our just standpoint. 21 "The Imperial Government is at a loss to 22 understand the new proposal of the 26th which has 23 ignored actual conditions in Fast Asia and would 24 greatly injure the prestige of the Immerial Govern-25 ment."

"We cannot but hold a doubtful attitude towards the fundamental rlans of the American Government in the negotiations during the most seven months. /Sentence in the mergin not translated/ On these points we request careful self-reflection on the part of the United States Government. "(S-TT)"

We next offer in evidence International Prosecution document No. 1632-W(86), which is an extract from the KIDO Diary of November 29, to show that a meeting of Senior Statesmen was held on that date in connection with the matter of war with the United States.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 1632-W(86) will receive exhibit No. 1196.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 1196 and received in evidence.)

MR. FIHELLY: I now read from prosecution's exhibit No. 1196, the extract from the KIDO Diary, November 29, 1941:

"From 2 p.m. to 3 p.m. the Emperor asked Senior Statesmen's opinions concerning the present political situation.

"The Emperor remarked on the difficult times we were going through.

"Baron WAKATSUKI said that we were equal to a prolonged war with the U.S.A. in spiritual power, but regarding material power we must make a careful study.

"Admiral OKADA said that he had grave doubts

4 5

7 8

as to our supply cpacity in regard to war materials, and thought the Government's statement about this matter to date was quite incomplete.

"Baron HIRANUMA agreed with Mr. WAKATSUKI's opinion as regards the spiritual strength of the Japanese nation, and urged further measures to awaken patroitic sentiment.

"Prince KONOYE stated that it was quite regrettable that our negotiations were going to be a failure in spite of our strenuous efforts since last April. But he was of the opinion that there would be no need to resort to a hasty war just because of the rupture of the negotiations as we might be able to reach a wise solution in some way or other, while continuing our struggle against difficulties.

"Admiral YONAI said that he could not base his opinion on definite data, but it was his desire that we should be careful not to lose what little we posses by trying to avoid becoming poorer by inches.

"Mr. HIROTA said that although our policy had been to prevent Anglo-American interference in the China Incident, things had reached their present situation. "e should be able to seize an opportunity to solve the pending problems between the two coun-

tries even after the commencement of hostilities, if we were sincere enough in our diplomatic efforts.

"Ceneral HAVAS I stated that as he had no data for his opinion, he could do nothing but believe the decisions of the Imperial Headquarters and the Government.

"General ABE said that according to the Government statement the negotiations had come to a deadlock in spite of strenuous efforts on our part. He was sure that the Government had studied the world political situation from various angles with laborious minuteness, for which we were thankful. But it would be quite necessary to ray much more attention to the attitude of the Chinese people than to the wer with the U.S.A., otherwise we would lose the fruits of victory in the Chinese Incident.

"Mr. TAKATSUKI said that the war should be fought to the last, even if there was no chance to win, if it was a defensive one for the cause of our national existence and self-defense, but we should avoid the war if we intended to realise our ideals such as 'the Asiatic Co-prosperity Sphere' or 'the stabilising of power in Asia', because such a war would be very dangerous."

fully your decision on reference of these excerpts to the Language Section, but here is a meeting that was held on November 29, 1941, and as read by the prosecution it is more or less of a summary of what took place. I might say that the summary here is practically identical with what the prosecution has admitted is a rough translation of the Diary. The translation we have is in the first person, and not in the third person; it covers two and one-half pages and not one and one-half pages; and it is more explicit and explains fully what these various people said at this meeting.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, I realize

refer the matter to Major Moore, Mr. Logan, and abide by his decision, you then must be satisfied to give this as part of the defense evidence. As I said before, we can never agree to allow two translations to be given in the course of the prosecution's cases one by the prosecution, and the other by the defense. The defense translation will be received during the course of the evidence for the defense, if it is offered. We cannot prevent you from contesting a translation at the proper time.

MR. LOGAN: My point is this, your Honor:

That here is an important conference in which
Marquis KIDO quotes what was said by two of the
accused here, and I think the Tribunal would be interested in hearing our translation of this particular conference. I should think that they would want
to find out what our translation says. I do not
think it is exactly fair, your Honor, for the prosecution to be presenting rough translations of a document they have had for practically a year, particularly when it refers to this stage of the case.

THE PRESIDENT: Until the contrary appears, we will assume that they are presenting the best translation they have. You will be able to show the contrary, perhaps, in the course of giving evidence for the defense.

I have got a note here to this effect:
We do not want a partisan translation if there be a
dispute. In such case we should have one only, and
that is from our own Language Referee.

I have already said that you may approach the Referee, and if he says the translation should be a certain thing, then you must accept it. But, as I just said, if the defense do not accept it in the course of the prosecution's case, they can give evidence of their translation when they are giving

evidence later. I hope that if any counsel is under misapprehension, will he come to the lectern and tell me what it is so that I may clear it up. Mr. Smith. £ 23

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SMITH: If your Honor please, in a good many documents there were minor errors. We can well understand how your Honor would not want to be bothered with it frequently and have it referred to the Language Section as a matter of course. But, as we understand it, practically everything in this exhibit 1195 is in error so far as the translation goes; and I would like to ask your Honor, when serious mistranslations occur such as this and that deal with a matter of this importance, that the Translation Section of the Court should give priority to the correction of these documents and come in as soon as it is completed and reread the matter to the Court as the Court's own section translates it.

It may be four or five months before we have reached this subject in our own case; and, where we are dealing with thousands of documents and counsel are swamped with all these things, I submit, your Honor, it is only fair that we clear as much of this confusion away as we go along and as is possible in the case.

THE PRESIDENT: Do not leave the lectern, please.

I have already directed to be done what you ask me to do now. If the defense question a trans-

lation when they receive it they are at liberty to go to the head of the Translation Section and put their representations before him. If he agrees with them, he will see the prosecution, and the correction will be made at the lectern by the counsel presenting the document or reading it. If he does not agree with them, the defense then will be able to give their version in the course of giving evidence for the defense.

As I am reminded by a colleague, I have already told you that twice within the last four days.

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, since the blanket ruling, an automatic referring was made about a week ago; and counsel have referred a number of documents to the Translation Section, and so far none of them have come back corrected.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Moore spoke to me about this matter this morning, and it appears that he is asked to make a choice between the use of these two words, "hastening" and "expediting." He was quite reasonable about it and, in all seriousness, wanted to know whether it was worth correcting.

Sannad to him

S

20,

will be overworked. He will never be able to complete his work, I should say.

MR. SMITH: I am sure, your Honor, that none of the defense counsel are taking any captious attitude. All we are begging for is the substance. The whole point of what I said this morning is that in a document of this extreme importance, on the eve of Pearl Harbor, that the matter ought to have priority and that the Court direct the Translation Section to take this matter up immediately and to come back as soon as possible with the corrections.

THE PRESIDENT: A colleague questions the right of the defense to give evidence of their translation if it is not accepted by Major Moore.

I will say no more about it. I will take the decision of the whole Tribunal and abide by it faithfully.

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

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Fihelly.

MR. FIHELLY: To show that important Liaison Conferences were held in these late days of November 1941, and for other pertinent information contained therein, we now offer in evidence International

Prosecution document No. 2496-A, which is an extract 1 from the interrogation of the defendant NAGANO on 2 March 26, 1946, pages 11 to 13; and we ask that the 3 parent document be marked for identification. 4 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 5 No. 2496 will receive exhibit No. 1197 for identifi-6 cation only. 7 8 (Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 10 No. 1197 for identification.) 11 THE PRESIDENT: The excerpt is admitted on 12 the usual terms. 13 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 14 No. 2496-A will receive exhibit No. 1197-A. 15 (Whereupon, the document above re-16 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 17 No. 1197-A and received in evidence.) 18 MR. FIHELLY: I now read the questions and 19 answers on pages 1 and 2 of the exhibit with respect 20 to the Liaison Conferences, being near the end of 21 page 2; 22 About when, Admiral, did you place your ap-23 proval upon the plan to attack Pearl Harbor? 24 MA. Either in the end of October or the beginning 25 of November. There was considerable argument between

the Fleets and the Naval Operational Bureau. The Fleets were in favor of attacking Pearl Harbor, whereas the Naval Affairs Bureau considered it too much of a speculation and preferred the more conservative method of waiting for the American Fleet in the Scuth Pacific Islands. Admiral YAMAMOTO was very adamant in his belief in his plan to attack Pearl Harbor and he threatened to resign along with his staff if that plan were not carried out.

"Q. Prier to this time the plan had been perfected by preliminary maneuvers at sea and also on paper at the Naval Headquarters, had it not, Admiral?

"A. Yes, the Fleet studied it very greatly.

"Q. And when, Admiral, was it that you decided the conflict between the Navy Affairs Bureau and Admiral YAMAMOTO in favor of the attack upon Pearl Harbor?

"A. I originally agreed with the Naval Operational Department but as YAMAMOTO was so avid in about the end of October or early part of November, as I previously stated, I agreed with the plan to attack Pearl Harbor. The Naval Affairs Bureau were in favor of using the plan that they had held for many years of waiting for the American Navy in the South Pacific Islands.

"Q. Nevertheless, Admiral, as I understand it,

notwithstanding the desires of the Naval Affairs

Bureau to adhere to the plan which had been in effect
for many years, you came to the conclusion that the
plan to attack Pearl Harbor was best and settled the
conflict by giving your approval to the Pearl Harbor
Plan, is that not correct, Admiral?

"A. I was for the Plan of the Naval Affairs
Department as that seemed to be the more logical but
not to have the Commander of the Fleets resign, as he
would have, if his plan did not go through, I thought
the best thing to do was to approve.

"Q. And you did approve, is that correct, the Plan for the Pearl Harbor attack?

"A. Yes.

"Q. As I understand the situation, Admiral, your approval of the same was the decisive factor in corrying through the attack on Pearl Harbor, is that not right?

"A. Yes.

"Q. And as I understand it, Admiral, I assume that in the light of that fact, you are willing to assume responsibility for the same. Is that correct, Admiral?

"A. Naturally.

"Q. Admiral, about when was the fleet first

ordered to take position in order to carry through the Pearl Harbor attack?

"A. The Fleets were assembled at Chiahina in the middle of Nevember. On Nevember 26 or 27 they started out for Pearl Harbor. . . .

"Q. Admiral, as a matter of fact, there was a limison conference held on or about November 28 or 29, 1941, was there not, at which there were present Premier TOJO, Foreign Minister TOGO, Finance Minister KAYA, President of the Cabinet Planning Board SUZUKI, Army Chief of Staff SUGIYAMA, Army Vice Chief of Staff General TANABE, yourself as Navy Chief of Staff, Navy Vice Chief of Staff Rear Admiral ITO, Communications Minister TERASHIMA, Agriculture Minister INO, the Cabinet Secretary HOSHINO, General MUTO as Head of the Military Affairs Section for the Army and Head of the Navy General Affairs Section Vice Admiral OKA to complete the determination for war upon the United States, is that not correct?

"A. I am not sure of the date but I believe you are correct on that. However, until the very last we were haping that peace could be established and were presented to abandon the Plan until the very last, for the attack on Pearl Harbor. You can add to the list the Navy Minister Admiral SHIMADA."

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon.

MR. BRANNON: If the Tribunal please, many objections to these interrogations will probably be presented at the time of our defense, but the accused NAGANO has specifically requested me to inform the Court that all through this particular interrogation the use of the words "Naval Affairs Bureau" is incorrect. Since the prosecution, I believe, is not particularly stressing the usage of those words, I would like to call to the Court's attention that, there being no such thing as a "Naval Affairs Bureau of the Navy Ministry," this document may tend to implicate another one of the accused who was actually the head of the Military Affairs Bureau of the Navy Ministry.

If I may, I would also like to inform the Court that this interrogation and, I understand, many others taken by the prosecution were not submitted to the defendants for these technical corrections after they were taken. Consequently, on matters of this kind which, while they are technical in nature, may have a more forceful effect upon the reading thereof, I believe they should be called to the Court's attention at the time they are introduced.

Mr. President, some of the defense coursel have been in doubt as to the proper procedure to take in reference to the question and answer form of these interrogations, that is, whether to object to the type of question asked as being leading or argumentative or assuming facts or whether to treat this as an entire document and to make no objection to the specific question as asked. May we request an expression of the President in that regard?

THE PRESIDENT: Whether or not the Tribunal is prepared to scan these interrogatories I cannot say until I consult them. I will give no decision on the matter until consulting all the Members. The question is raised rather late.

The other matters mentioned by Mr. Brannon are noted.

MR. OKUYAMA: I am counsel for the defendant NAGANO. As there was a serious mistake in the interrogation, I would like to point it out to the Tribunal. As it is well known, NAGANO was Chief of the Naval General Staff at the time of the Pearl Harbor incident -- at the time of the outbreak of war. When NAGANO was replying to the questions of the prosecutor, it goes without saying that he was well aware that the Naval General Staff of which he was

Chief was different from the Military Affairs Bureau of the Navy, and he, himself, will never say "Military Affairs Bureau."

In spite of this, the translator has translated the "Naval General Staff" of which he was Chief
as the "Naval Affairs Bureau." This illustrated how
little the interpreter knew of Japanese and how
little he knew of the system of organization of the
Japanese Government. Therefore, I wish to call the
attention of the Court to the fact that this interrogation was interpreted by an interpreter who was not
very familiar with the Japanese language and also was
not familiar with the Japanese system of government.

THE PRESIDENT: The right time at which to give that information is in the course of giving evidence for the defense. I repeat that ad nauseam, perhaps, but apparently it is necessary.

MR. FIHELLY: May I proceed? THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Fihelly.

MR. FIHELLY: We next offer in evidence International Prosecution document No. 1632W (87), an entry from the KIDO Diary of November 30, as tending to show that the plans for war with the United States were still being made despite the fact that some wished to avoid war.

No. 1632W (87) will receive exhibit No. 1198.

(Whereupon, the document above re-

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit
1198 and received in evidence.)

MR. FIHELLY: I now read from prosecution exhibit No. 1998, the extract from the KIDO Diary entry of November 30, '41:

"I visited the Emperor at 3:30 p.m. in response to his request. He said that Prince TAKAMATSU had told him that the Navy's hands were full, and it appeared that he wished to avoid war, but did not know what to do. I advised the Emperor to ask the opinions of the Navy Minister, the Chief of the Naval General Staff, and the Premier, for the situation was really grave. We could not be too prudent in the matter. At 6:35 p.m. I again visited the Emperor in response to his request. He said that he had ordered the Premier to act according to program on account of the affirmative answers of the Navy Minister and the Chief of the Navy General Staff concerning the question as to the success of the war."

To show the feeling of Japan at this time and to show the part that the Tripartite Pact was

playing in the negotiations, we now offer in evidence 1 International Prosecution document 2593D 22, the wire of November 30, 1941 from Tokyo to OSHIMA. 3 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 4 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 5 No. 2593D 22 will receive exhibit No. 1199. 6 (Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit S 9 1199 and received in evidence.) 10 MR. FIHELLY: I now read prosecution ex-11 hibit No. 1199: 12 "From: Tokyo 13 "To : Berlin 14 "November 30, 1941 15 "Purple 16 "#986 (Strictly Secret) (To be handled 17 in Government Code) (Part 1 of 2) (Secret outside 13 the Department) 19 "1. Japan-American negotiations were 20 commenced the middle of April of this year. Over 21 a period of half a year they have been continued. 22 Within that period the Imperial Government adamantly 23 * stuck to the Tri-Partite Alliance as the cornerstone 24 of its national policy regardless of the vicissi-25 tudes of the international situation, In the

adjustment of diplomatic relations between Japan and the United States, she has based her hopes for a solution definitely within the scope of that alliance. With the intent of restraining the United States from participating in the war, she boldly assumed the attitude of carrying through these negotiations.

"2. Therefore, the present Cabinet, in line with your message, with the view of defending the Empire's existence and integrity on a just and equitable basis, has continued the negotiations carried on in the past. However, their views and ours on the question of the evacuation of troops, upon which the negotiations rested, (they demanded the evacuation of Imperial troops from China and French Indo-China), were completely in opposition to each other.

"Judging from the course of the negotiatins that have been going on, we first came to logger-heads when the United States, in keeping with its traditional ideological tendency of managing international relations, re-emphasized her fundamental reliance upon this traditional policy in the conversations carried on between the United States and England in the Atlantic Ocean. The motive

of the United States in all this was brought out by her desire to prevent the establishment of a new order by Japan, Germany, and Italy in Europe and in the Far East, that is to say, the aims of the Tri-Partite Alliance. As long as the Empire of Japan was in alliance with Germany and Italy, there could be no maintenance of friendly relations between Japan and the United States was the stand they took. From this point of view, they began to demonstrate a tendency to demand the divorce of the Imperial Government from the Tri-Partite Alliance. This was brought out at the last meeting. That is to say that it has only been in the negotiations of the last few days that it has become gradually more and more clear that the Imperial Government could no longer continue negotiations with the United States. became clear, too, that a continuation of negotiations "ould inevitably be detrimental to our cause."

"(Part 2 of 2)

"3. The promosal presented by the United
States on the 26th made this attitude of theirs
clearer than ever. In it there is one insulting
clause which says that no matter what treaty either
party enters into with a third power it will not be

2324

22

11

13

14

15

16

17

interpreted as having any bearing upon the basic object of this treaty, namely the maintenance of peace in the Pacific. This means specifically the Three-Power Pact. It means that in case the United States enters the European war at any time the Japanese Empire will not be allowed to give assistance to Germany and Italy. It is clearly a This clause alone, let alone others, makes it impossible to find any basis in the American proposal for negotiations. What is more, before the United States brought forth this plan, they conferred with England, Australia, the Netherlands, and China -- they do so repeatedly. Therefore, it is clear that the United States is now in collusion with those nations and has decided to regard Japan, along with Germany and Italy, as an enemy."

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

The translation date appearing on the first 1 page is "Trans. 12/1/41 (NR)"; on the second page, 2 the page I just read, "Trans. 12-1-41 (NR)." 3 4 We next offer in evidence International 5 Prosecution document No. 2593-D-23 which relates to 6 a telephone conversation from KURUSU to Tokyo on 7 November 30, 1941. 8 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 9 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 10 No. 2593-D-23 will receive exhibit No. 1200. 11 (Whereupon, the document above re-12 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 13 No. 1200 and received in evidence.) 14 MR. FIHELLY: I now read prosecution's 15 exhibit No. 1200: 16 "Brom: Washington 17 "To: Tokyo 18 "30 November 1941 (2230 to 2238 EST) 19 "Telephone Code" 20 THE PRESIDENT: You will read it after the 21 recess, Mr. Fihelly. We will recess now for fifteen 22 minutes. 23 (Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was 24 taken until 1100, after which the proceed-25

ings were resumed as follows:)

Morse & Abram

1

3

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. Fihelly, before you proceed I will give the decision of the Tribunal on the language question. I cannot do better than repeat what appears in a note drafted by one of my colleagues who was fully aware of the situation. It reads: "Mr. President, while you were in Australia we were told on all hands that we would be faced throughout the trial with competing translations. We came to the conclusion that the only way to solve such questions was to sat up a board of referees. The Supreme Commander Allied Powers appointed one member of the board -- nominated one member of the board -- the Japanese Government nominated another, and a third was nominated by the prosecution. All three were appointed by the Court. The idea was to appoint an authoritative and impartial board of experts because it was understood if we allowed competing evidence and competing translations the trial would be prolonged indefinitely and the Judges would have no means of deciding between them and would still have to rely on the decision of the board of experts."

In view of that decision, I withdraw what I said as to the right of the defense to give evidence

of competing translations. The defense will be con-1 fined to an appeal to the board of referees, whose 2 decision will be final. They will go directly to the 3 board of referees instead of making application to 4 the Court for a reference thereto. In other words, 5 they will follow the procedure that I have already out-6 lined on more than one occasion. 7 Mr. Fihelly. 8 MR. FIHELLY: I will read prosecution exhibit 9 No. 1200: 10 "From: Washington 11 "To: Tokyo 12 "30 November 1941 (2230 to 2238 EST) 13 14 "Telephone Code. "TransPacific 15 16 "Radio Telephone. 17 "(NOTE: Following is a preliminary condensed version of conversation between Ambassador KURUSU and 13 19 the Japanese Foreign Office American Division Chief YA MAMOTO on Sunday night) 20 "KURUSU: 'It is all arranged for us to meet 21 Hull tomorrow. We received a short one from you, 22 didn't we? Well, we will meet him in regard to that. 23 There is a longer one coming isn't there? In any case 24

we are going to see him about the short one.' (i.e.

telegram. The longer one is probably Tokyo's reply to Mr. Hull's proposals.) "YAMAMOTO: 'Yes, I see.' 3 "KURUSU: 'The President is returning tomorrow. 4 He is hurrying home.' "YAMAMOTO: 'Is there any special significance 6 7 to this?' "KURUSU: !The newspapaers have made much of 8 9 the Premier's speech, and it is having strong reper-10 cussions here.' 11 "YAMAMOTO: 'Is that so.' 12 "KURUSU: 'Yes. It was a drastic statement 13 he made. The newspapers carried large headlines over 14 it: and the President seems to be returning because 15 of it. There no doubt are other reasons, but this is 16 the reason the newspapers are giving. 17 "(Pause) 18 "'Unless greater caution is exercised in 19 speeches by the Premier and others, it buts us in a 20 very difficult position. All of you over there must 21 watch out about those ill-advised statements. Please 22 tell Mr. TANI.' 23 "YAMAMOTO: 'We are being careful.' 24 "KURUSU: 'We here are doing our best, but these 25 reports are seized upon by the correspondents and the

```
worst features enlarged upon. Please caution the
   Premier, the Foreign Minister, and others. Tell the
   Foreign Minister that we had expected to hear something
3
   different, some good word, but instead " ("instead" it
   is; it may be typographical) "'but instead we got this.'
   (i.e. Premier's speech)
             "(After a pause, KURUSU continues, using voice
7
   code)
8
             "KURUSU: 'That about the internal situation?'
9
10
   (In Japan)
             "YAMAMOTO: 'No particular - - (one or two
11
12
   words faded out) - -. '
13
             "KURUSU: 'Are the Japanese-American negoti-
14
   ations to continue?'
15
             "YAMAMOTO: 'Yes.'
16
             "KURUSU: 'You were very urgent about them
17
   before, weren't you; but now you want them to stretch
18
   out. We will need your help. Both the Premier and
19
   the Foreign Minister will need to change the tone of
20
   their speeches!!!! Do you understand? Please all
21
   use more discretion.'
22
             "YAMAMOTO: 'When will you see them.
23
   2nd?
24
             "KURUSU: 'Let's see...this is Sunday midnight
25
          Tomorrow morning at ten. That will be Monday
   here.
```

morning here.' "(Pause) "'Actually the real problem we are up against is the effects of happenings in the South. You under-stand don't you?' "YAMAMOTO: 'Yes. Yes. How long will it be before the President gets back?' "KURUSU: 'I don't know exactly. According to news reports he started at 4:00 this afternoon. He sould be here tomorrow morning sometime.' "YAMAMOTO: 'Well then -- Goodbye.'" Certain symbols at the left bottom of the page, the word "secret (M) Navy trans. 30 Nov. 1941 (R-5)"

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. FIHELLY: As further showing the events which transpired in Japan just prior to the Pearl Harbor attack, and particularly in connection with the sending and timing of the last note to the United States and to indicate the part that certain of the defendants played in them, we will now offer in evidence a series of extracts from the interrogation of the defendant TOJO.

We first offer in evidence International Prosecution document 2505-A, which is an extract from the TOJO interrogation of February 20, 1946, pages 2, 4, and 5, and we ask that the parent document be marked for identification.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 2505 will receive exhibit No. 1201 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1201 for identification.)

THE PRESIDENT: The excerpt is admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 2505-A, an excerpt from the foregoing, will receive exhibit No. 1201-A.

(Whereupon, the document above

24

referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 1 No. 1201-A and received in evidence.) 2 MR. FIHELLY: I now read from prosecution 3 exhibit 1201-A, extract from the TOJO interrogation 4 February 20, 1946, pages 2, 4, and 5: 110 What was the date of that last Liaison 6 Conference before the Imperial Conference of 1st or 7 2nd of December? 8 I think that last Liaison Conference be-9 fore the Imperial Conference was on the 30th of 10 November. However, as I have said before, I am not 11 sure of the date of the Imperial Conference. I 12 rather think it was the 1st, but it may have been 13 the 2nd. 14 "(pp. 4-5) 15 16 "Q How many times did the Emperor ask you to 17 be certain that the note was to be delivered before 18 the attack? 19 11 A Repeatedly. 20 Can you give us any idea of the number of 21 Was it three times, six, a dozen? times? 22 "A I was going to the Emperor about every 23 other day and he warned me many times about it. 24 What was the earliest date he warned you, 25 as you recall?

11 A He was always warning me about matters 1 having to do with foreign relations, but I think 2 the first time he warned about the delivery of the 3 final note was just after the Imperial Conference of the 1st or 2nd of December 1941. 5 "Q Was not the Emperor afraid that the actual 6 attack might take place before the note was delivered? 7 "A Yes, he was afraid of it. He said to be 8 careful to see that it did not happen." For the same purpose we now offer in evi-10 dence International Prosecution document 2513-4, which 11 is an extract from the TOJO interrogation of March 12 18, 1946, pages 1 to 4. We ask that the parent 13 document be marked for identification. 14 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 15 16 No. 2513 will be given exhibit No. 1202 for identi-17 fication only. 18 (Whereupon, the document above re-19 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 20 No. 1202 for identification.) 21 THE PRESIDENT: The extract is admitted on 22 the usual terms. 23 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 2513-A, an excerpt from the foregoing, will be

given exhibit No. 1202-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1202-A and received in evidence.)

MR. FIHELLY: I now read both pages of prosecution exhibit 1202-A from the TOJO interrogation of March 18, 1946, pages 1 to 4:

"Q The text of the final note to America was approved, first by the Liaison Conference, and later by the Cabinet, was it not?

"A The gist of it was approved by the Cabinet, but the final text was the responsibility of the Foreign Minister. Of course, it is my responsibility, too.

"Q Did not also the Liaison Conference first approve the gist of it?

"A Yes, of course. They did.

"Q TOGO says that he composed the text of that note on a basis of the views furnished by the Liaison Conference and that the text, after being written, was presented to and approved by the Liaison Conference. Is this correct?

"A Yes.

"Q After this had happened, the cabinet also approved it, did it not?

"A As I recall it, after the Liaison

to the Cabinet by the Foreign Minister, after which they approved it. In any case, if my memory is correct, I do not believe that the text was distributed to all the members of the Cabinet.

"Q After TOGO and the two Chiefs of Staff

Conference had approved it, the gist of it was given

"Q After TOGO and the two Chiefs of Staff had decided that 1:00 P.M., 7 December 1941, Washington time, was to be the time for the delivery of the final note, this fact was reported to and approved by the Liaison Conference, was it not?

"A No. The Liaison Conference, which I was, you might say, head of, delegated to the two Chiefs of Staff and the Foreign Minister the task of setting a time prior to the attack. The three-man committee did not report back to the Liaison Conference. I don't remember that the three-man committee reported back to the Liaison Conference on the time. I am reporting to you the facts, but the results of those facts are my responsibility.

"(p. 3)

"Q Did the Foreign Minister know of the time and the day set for the attack? /Referring to the Pearl Harbor attack./

"A Yes, the Foreign Minister knew it, too. The President of the Planning Board also knew."

"Q As you recall it, the Liaison Conference did not approve the time set for the delivery of the note nor approve of the length of time between the delivery of the note and the attack?

"A The Liaison Conference delegated the carrying out of this matter to the Foreign Minister and the two Chiefs of Staff and, in that sense only, approved.

"(p.4)

"Q In addition to the Minister of War and Foreign Minister, were there any other cabinet members present at the Liaison Conferences immediately preceding the Imperial Conference of 1 December 1941?

"A I do not remember exactly, but I suppose that the Commerce and Industry Minister and the Communications Minister attended because raw materials were involved for factories and shipping was involved. Of course, the President of the Planning Board and the Navy Minister were also there.

"Q Was the Minister of Finance there?

"A Yes, he was always at Liaison Conference meetings. Those five were always there - War, Navy, Planning Board, Foreign, and Finance Ministers."

1 MR. FIHELLY: On the same general subject, we 2 next refer to prosecution exhibit 1158A which is a further extract from the TOJO interrogation of March 12. 1946, and read from pages 3 and 4 of the exhibit, which will be pages 9 and 10 of the interrogation extract: 6 "Q Were there any differences between TOGO and the others relative to this? (Referring to the 8 delivery of the final note to the United States.) 9 "A No, there were not. They were the same --10 to deliver it before the attack. 11 "Q Was any decision arrived at in the Liaison 12 Conference as to how long it was to be delivered before 13 the attack? 14 "A I have explained this before. The decision 15 as to the time was not made at the Liaison Conference. 16 The Supreme Command and the Foreign Minister were to meet together and decide the time which would comply 18 with the diplomatic and also the strategic requirements. 19 "Q Was this delegation of authority decided 20 upon at this same final Liaison Conference? 21 "A Yes. 22 Do you know that such meeting or meetings 23 were held pursuant to this delegation of authority?

"A No, I don't know.

Did you learn what decision had been

11 Q

24

arrived at in regard to timing by these men to whom the authority had been delegated?

"A I did not learn precisely the time set,
but it was decided that the Chiefs of Staff and the
Foreign Minister would settle that so as to comply with
both the diplomatic and military requirements. It
was settled at the Liaison Conference that the delivery
of the final note would precede the attack. (Last
sentence of this answer read back to the witness who
agreed as to its correctness.)"

That is all I intend to read from the interrogation.

1

2

6

8

10

11

13

12

1415

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

We next offer in evidence International Prosecution document No. 2506-A, which is an extract from the TOJO Interrogation of February 21, 1946, pages two, three and four and we ask that parent document be marked for identification.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document
No. 2506 will receive exhibit No. 1203 for identification
only.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1203 for identification.)

THE PRESIDENT: The extract is admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: And prosecution's document No. 2506-A, an extract therefrom, will receive exhibit No. 1203-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1203-A and received in evidence.)

MR. FIHELLY: I now read the entire excerpt consisting of an extract from the TOJO Interrogation of February 21, 1946, pages two, three and four:

"Q You and the Cabinet realized, did you not, that the shorter the notice given the United States, the more probability there was of a mishap?

It can be said so, theoretically.

Did you and the cabinet not recognize that as a practical possibility?

Yes, from the practical point of view, it is also true that the shorter the time allowed, the more chance of a hitch, but it is not enough to leave it at that. Ambassador NOMURA was a very responsible official and we relied upon his carrying out so grave a responsibility perfectly. Also, the Foreign Office had time to study and perfect all phases of the procedure in the light of its great

Why was not the message itself sent sooner to Ambassador NOMURA so that there would be sufficient

I can't answer such a question as that. It is a problem for the Foreign Minister. The orders were that the final note was to be surely delivered. Since the Foreign Ministry had such an order, the question of how or why it was not carried out is a technical one which is the responsibility of the

Did not you and the members of the cabinet see the contents of the note before it was sent?

> 11 A I heard the gist of it. The cabinet all

heard it at the Liaison Conference just preceding the 1 Imperial Conference. 2 II Q Did not you and the cabinet agree with 3 the contents of that message? Yes, we did agree. The gist of the note 5 was explained by the Foreign Minister at the Liaison Conference meeting. The whole text was not read and passed about. After the meeting, the matter became the responsibility of the Foreign Ministry. This Liaison Conference, at which the 10 gist of the final note was read, was the last one 11 12 before the Imperial Conference of December 1st or 13 2nd, was it not? 14 II A Yes. 15 And all members present agreed with the 16 substance of the message as it was read to them? 17 A II Yes. 18 Why was it that that message was not 19 sent to NOMURA until practically a week later? 20 "A I can't help it if you keep asking me 21 questions about specific matters like that that were the responsibility of the Foreign Minister. I 23 can't answer them." 24 I read the last page, page three, of the 25 exhibit for identification:

110 You knew the attack was going to be made 1 and approved it, did you not? 2 I knew that it was to take place, but 3 I did not approve it because, under the Japanese system, approval by the Premier or Minister of War is not called for in a problem of command. Regardless of approval, you were in favor of such an attack being made, were you not? 8 I thought it would be good if it was 9 successful. I thought that if the Supreme Command 10 was confident of success that it was a good idea. 11 "Q You knew for a month or more previous to 12 the attack that Admiral YAMAMOTO's plan for a sur-13 prise attack on Pearl Harbor had been decided on in 14 15 case of war with America? 16 No, I didn't know about it. In Japan 17 those matters are matters of command. It was a 18 strategic plan. 19 "Neither the government nor the War Minister 20 would know about a Navy operating plan. That is 21 positively the case. Command matters were kept highly 22 secret: They were the most important secrets of all. 23 When did you first know that, in case 24 of war with the United States, Pearl Harbor was to

25

be attacked?

"A I learned at the Liaison Conference just before the Imperial Conference. Before that, it was very secret."

We next offer in evidence International Prosecution document No. 2504A, containing extracts from the TOJO interrogation of February 19, 1946, pages one, two, four, five, six, seven, eight and 11. I intend to read it all with the exception of page five which refers to a later matter and will be read at that time.

I ask that the parent document be marked for identification.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document
No. 2504 will be marked exhibit No. 1204 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1204 for identification.)

THE PRESIDENT: The extract is admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 2504A, an extract from the foregoing, will be given exhibit No. 1204-A

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

No. 1204-A and received in evidence.) MR. FIHELLY: I will now read the extract from 1204-A; all with the exception, as I mentioned of page five, which will be read later. Questions from pages one and two extracts;

"Q You stated at the last interrogation that

Japan felt that, by her final note breaking off diplomatic relations, she acquired freedom of action from
the standpoint of international treaties. Did she acquire the same freedom from the standpoint of international law?

"A I think so.

"Q Prior to making the attacks on the United States and Great Britain, this whole matter of the responsibility under treaties and under international law had been considered by you and the cabinet?

"A Of course, they were. It is important to remember that this matter was the grave responsibility of the Foreign Ministry.

"Q What did the Foreign Ministry report to the cabinet on the matters of treaties and inter-national law prior to the cabinet making its decision?

"A The Foreign Minister reported only the gist of it to the cabinet. What was done afterwards was the sole responsibility of the Foreign Minister.

"Q And the gist of what was reported by the Foreign Minister to the cabinet was that there was nothing in the treaties or international law that prevented the attacks on the United States and Great Britain after the last note had been delivered?"

"A The whole cabinet attended the Imperial Conference on the 1st or 2nd which made the decision for war. Hence, the whole cabinet knew, generally speaking, that that decision had been made, since everyone attended, but the problem of how the final note was to be dispatched was a technical question which was handled by the Foreign Minister.

"Q Who informed you and the cabinet that there was nothing in any treaty or in international law that would preclude the attack being made on the United States and Great Britain?

"A It was the result of my research. We had been challenged and were acting in self-defense. Therefore, I thought that we were not impeded from the standpoint of international law or treaties.

"Q Did the cabinet agree with you?

"A Yes. They all agreed.

"Q Did the Foreign Ministry agree?

"A Yes. They also studied the question and agreed.

"Q We will read all that back to you to make sure there is no mistake as to the questions and your answers.

"/This was done and the witness agreed as to its correctness./"

On Page 3:

2

"Q At this last Liaison Conference preceding the Imperial Conference of December 1st or 2nd, you expressed the same views on international laws and treaties which you arrived at as a result of your studies?

6

5

"A Yes.

7 8

9

"Q So that when the Liaison Conference arrived at a final decision to attack America and Great Britain, they had accepted your views on these matters?

10 11

"A Yes, of course, they had.

12

"Q Who, in addition to yourself, spoke at that conference, expressing similar views in

14 15

13

regard to international laws and treaties?

16

"A The Foreign Minister spoke on this point since he was the one chiefly responsible, 17

18

and my researches resulted in my agreement with his

19

views. There was no question raised by any other

20

member present since the responsible officials had made that decision.

21 22

"Q Prior to the attacks on Great Britain and the United States, why was not a declaration of

23 24

war made to either?

25

"A We thought that when the final note,

implying a rupture in diplomatic relations, was delivered, that treaty procedure was finished and that we acquired freedom of action. Especially on the assumption of acting in self-defense in response to the challenge from the Anglo-American side, we thought that it was particularly appropriate."

21 22

"Q How long before the actual attack was the note to be delivered?

"A There were various opinions advanced and argued about between the Chiefs of Staff and the Foreign Minister. There was one idea that the delivery of the note should precede the attack by an hour and a half; another, that it should precede it by an hour, another, by thirty minutes, and so forth. I do not clearly remember what was the final decision.

"Q But all views were to the effect that the hour set for the time of the delivery of the note was to be one that would not interfere with the success of the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor?

"A It should not interfere with the success
of the surprise attack, but also, from the Foreign
Minister's point of view, the note had to be delivered before the attack.

"Q But the primary matter was to have the attack a successful one, was it not?

"A Since it was a matter of war, the success of the surprise attack was very important, but also the diplomatic procedures were of great importance. It was not a question of which was most important - they were both extremely important. Especially

since the Emperor had cautioned us in regard to it, the latter point was important.

"Q If the diplomatic procedure was so important and the Emperor had specifically cautioned you about it, why was it not arranged so that more notice would be given to the United States?

"A From the standpoint of strategy, since it was war, the necessity for victory had to be considered also, and the possibility of victory was intimately related to the question of time. I was extremely anxious as to the success of this surprise attack. That also was a grave matter.

"Q We will read the answers back to you so there will be no misunderstandings.

"/This was done and the witness agreed that they were correct/."

Now skipping page 5 and going to page 6:

"Q You and the cabinet intended four surprise attacks to be executed at the same time against possessions of the United States and Great Britain?

"A The cabinet did not know. I knew, in my capacity as War Minister.

"Q The cabinet did know that America and Great Britain were going to be attacked without warning?"

"A No. At that time they and I thought that Ambassador NOMURA would have delivered the note before the attack. "Q How much notice did you and the cabinet believe that either the United States or Great Britain was going to get in this connection? "A As I explained before, there were various theories as to the amount of time - an hour and a half, one hour, thirty minutes. I thought that there would be at least thirty minutes."

We next offer in evidence International Prosecution document No. 2503, which is an extract from the TOJO Interrogation of February 18, 1946, pages one to four, and we ask that the parent document be marked for identification. CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 2503 will be given exhibit No. 1205 for identification only. (Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1205 for identification.) THE PRESIDENT: The extract is admitted on the usual terms.

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

22

23

24

25

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 2503-A, an extract from the foregoing will be given exhibit No. 1205-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1205-A and received in evidence.)

MR. FIHELLY: I now read prosecution exhibit No. 1205, an extract from the TOJO Interrogation of February 18, 1946, and read the entire amount of extracts contained on page one and two of the exhibit.

> 110 Last week I was talking to Admiral

7 8

NOMURA and asked him if he considered the final note sent by Japan to the United States a declaration of war. He said that he absolutely did not. Do you agree that it was not?

"A I think it was a final note. It was a final note breaking off diplomatic relations.

"Q You have not answered the question.

Do you agree with him that it was not a declaration of war?

"A It was a note breaking off diplomatic relations but it was different from a direct declaration of war. It was a note breaking off diplomatic relations and, hence, making possible freedom of action. That point is in reference to international treaties. This is an important matter though and this next point also applies. Japan had been challenged militarily and economically by various countries, especially England and America, and her existence was threatened. She exercised the right of self-defense."

Three and four extracts:

"Q Was not everything connected with this note your responsibility and the responsibility of the Cabinet?

"A It was my responsibility and also that

of the Foreign Minister. 110 Didn't the cabinet know that the note 2 was to be sent and approve it? 3 4 tt A Yes. They knew about it and of course 5 they approved it. 110 6 What international treaties were you speaking of in connection with sending the note? 7 II A I am not just sure of the names now, 9 At the time, of course I knew them, but I am not so 10 sure now. Isn't there a Hague Treaty, or something, 11 that applies to these matters? 12 Did not the Hague Convention call for 13 a declaration of war prior to an actual attack? 14 II A I think that if a nation is challenged, 15 it is not restrained from exercising the right of 16 self-defense. You still have not answered the question. 18 I repeat: Did not the Hague Convention call for a 19 declaration of war prior to an actual attack? This is a question that can be answered 'yes', or 'no', 21 or 'I don't know.' 22 At that time I studied this matter 23 carefully, but now it is five years later and I have not the treaty here and I don't remember too well about it. but I believe that we had freedom of action

17

20

24

under international treaties. In connection with the attack on America 2 and Great Britain did you or the members of the cabinet 3 give any thought to the Kellogg-Briand Pact being 4 violated by Japan? 5 Of course, we did. 6 So that you and the members of your 7 cabinet felt that it was necessary to disregard 8 treaty provisions and make the attack on America and 9 Great Britain? 10 "A No, we had regard for them, but we did 11 not feel that we were bound because of the reasons 12 I have mentioned. That applies to the Kellogg-Briand 13 14 Pact, too. 15 110 So that you and the members of the cabinet, 16 because of the reasons given, felt that Japan was not 17 bound by any treaty provisions in connection with the 18 attack on the United States and Great Britain? 19 A II Yes." 20 21

22

23

24

To show the views of the defendant TOGO on these same vital matters, we next offer in evidence International Prosecution document 4119, an extract from the TOGO interrogation of March 26, 1946, pages 4 and 7.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

MR. FIHELLY: And the parent document I kindly ask be marked for identification.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document
No. 4119 will receive exhibit No. 1206 for identification only; and the excerpt therefrom, bearing the
same document number, will receive exhibit No. 1206-A.

(Whereupon, prosecution's document No. 4119 was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1206 for identification. The excerpt therefrom, bearing the same document number, was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1206-A, and was received in evidence.)

MR. FIHELLY: I now read from prosecution exhibit 1206-A, excerpt from the TOGO interrogation of March 26, and read the entire exhibit, pages 1 and 2.

(Reading) "Q Did you have the prime responsibility for the contents of the final note delivered by KURUSU and NOMURA on December 7, Washington time, to Hull?"

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

2324

25

II A The note was written by the Foreign Office but in accordance with the views expressed in the discussions in the liaison and other conferences and the note was a general summary of those views. Therefore, the Foreign Office and I, as Foreign Minister, cannot take the responsibility. Furthermore, as the matter was related to the question of war, the high command naturally had to be consulted and various matters discussed with them in regard to the note. Such being the case, the government alone cannot take the responsibility, for the high command is also connected with the matter. And that being the case, even within the government, I alone as Foreign Minister cannot take sole responsibility on a matter of such supreme or major importance.

"Q Would you name the individuals who you would consider as equally responsible with you for the contents of the note.

"A All members of the liaison conference and even some members of the Cabinet who were familiar with this question."

The first question on page 2 is this:

"Q Did you say anything to the Emperor concerning the telegram from KURUSU and NOMURA with respect to President Roosevelt?"

1.1

Before reading the answer to that question,
I would like to refer to prosecution exhibit 1189,
which shows that very wire, in which there is this
pertinent part.

"We might suggest one thing for saving the situation. Although we have grave misgivings, we might propose, first, that President Roosevelt wire you that for the sake of posterity he hopes that Japan and the United States will cooperate for the maintenance of peace in the Pacific (just as soon as you wire us what you think of this, we will negotiate for this sort of an arrangement with all we have in us), and that you in return reply with a cordial message, thereby not only clearing the atmosphere, but also gaining a little time."

I repeat the question for elarity:

"Q Did you say anything to the Emperor concerning the telegram from KURUSU and NOMURA with respect to President Roosevelt?

"A As I recall, I did not mention that telegram to the Emperor in that the matter had previously been discussed with both KIDO and TOJO, at which time the opinion was that such a step would not contribute toward the satisfactory settlement of negotiations between the two countries, therefore,

the matter was not reported to the Throne.

"Q Don't you think that the Emperor was entitled to know of such a proposal?

"A The Emperor actually was entitled to ask questions on any or all subjects, but in so far as this particular telegram was concerned the general view within the government was that it was not of a nature that would contribute to a settlement and that, such being the case, it was not worth putting so much weight to and so it was not brought up to the Emperor."

For the same purpose, we now offer in evidence International Prosecution document 4115, an extract from the TOGO interrogation of March 11, 1946, pages 1 to 6. We ask that the parent document be marked for identification.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document
No. 4115 will be given exhibit No. 1207 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1207 for identification.)

THE PRESIDENT: The extract is admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: The excerpt therefrom, bearing the same document number, will receive

exhibit No. 1207-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1207-A, and was received in evidence.)

MR. FIHELLY: I now read prosecution exhibit 1207-A, extracts from the TOGO interrogation of March 11, 1946, and will read the entire exhibit.

"Q Who would be considered responsible, who would you consider responsible for the composition of that note?

sxplained, was a summation of the results of the studies and discussions which took place at the liaison conferences regarding negotiations with the United States. The note itself was written by the Foreign Office, but the responsibility for the composition rests with the participating members of the liaison conferences. The responsibility for the contents of the notification rests with the members of the liaison conferences. Furthermore, the matter was also reported to the Cabinet and passed the Cabinet without objection.

"Q Could you give me the names of the individuals at the liaison conferences and the Cabinet members who would be considered responsible for the

5

v

.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

```
ontents of the note?
            11 A
                As I have said at a previous meeting,
 2
 members of a liaison conference who were responsible
 Afor the study and discussions on the matter were TOJO,
 5 SHIMADA, SUGIYAMA, NAGANO, TSUKADA, ITO, KAYA, SUZUKI,
 6 and the three secretaries, HOSHINO, MUTO and OKA.
 7 As to the members of the Cabinet, under the constitu-
 8 tion they are responsible for decisions of the Cabinet,
 9 even on matters outside of the competence of their
10 respective offices.
            "Q I understood from you that the note was
11
12 composed by the Foreign Office after the contents of
13 what the note should contain had been decided upon at
14 the liaison conferences. I also understand that after
  the note was composed by the Foreign Office it was
16 presented for approval to the Cabinet on December 1,
17
  1941, at which time the Cabinet approved it. Is my
18
  understanding correct?
19
                 The first part of your understanding is
            II A
20
  correct, that is, that the writing of the note took
21
   place in accordance with the decision of the liaison
22
   conference as to its contents. However, I should
23
   like to make some correction as to the date.
24
  December 1 was the date of the Imperial Conference,
25
   at which the decision for war was made. However,
```

previous to the Imperial Conference the main points of the note to be sent were reported to the Cabinet; but as to the drafting of the note, that came afterwards, and at a later Cabinet meeting the main points were further explained and the continuation of the explanation that was made at the former Cabinet meeting.

I cannot recall definitely, but it seems to be around November 30, but I could have the date more definitely confirmed later.

"Q From what you have stated would you consider that the members of the Cabinet and members of the liaison conference, whose names you have mentioned, are equally responsible with you as regards to the contents of the note and its delivery?

"A As to the contents of the note, I think it is but natural that all the members of the liaison conference are responsible. As to the Cabinet, they would have at least a final responsibility in that they expressed no objection, that is, from the legal point of view. Of course, it all depends whether you view the matter superficially or formally, or whether you would like to view it more profoundly. But, practically speaking, in the light of actualities it might be said that there is a difference in the degree of responsibility by the liaison conference and

the Cabinet because not all the Cabinet members attended the liaison conference, but the situation was such that whatever was approved by the liaison conference was approved by the Cabinet. Although there may be a difference in degree of responsibility, the Cabinet might have at least a nominal responsibility. "Q Who knew and approved of the details con-7 cerning the manner of the delivery of the note? As to the delivery of the note, instruc-"A 9 tions were sent previously to the Embassy in Washington stating that it was to be delivered at 1:00 PM, 11 December 7, Washington time, as much as possible to 13 the Secretary of State, and that all preparations be made 14 for the purpose of delivering the note at the specified 15 time. The instructions themselves were dispatched by 16 the Chief of the Cable Section of the Foreign Office. 17 Regarding the sending of such instructions, all mem-18 bers of the liaison conference knew. It is naturally 19 a matter on which there should be no objections, and, 20 therefore, it was approved as a matter of course." 21 I will not read page 4. I see now it relates 22 to another matter. 23 THE PRESIDENT: This is a convenient break. 24 We will adjourn until half past one. 25 (Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

2

1

3

. 4

6

5

7

10

11

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23 24

25

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International

Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Fihelly.

figure de la constitución de la

MR. FIHELLY: We had reached, Mr. President and Members of the Tribunal, the date, December 1, 1941, just before lunch.

To show that there was a meeting of elder statesmen held just prior to December 1st, we next refer to Court exhibit 1158-A, which is an extract from the TOJO interrogation of March 11, 1946, and read pages 6: to 8 of the interrogation from pages 1 to 2 of this exhibit.

(Reading):

"Q. When and why was a meeting of ex-premiers held prior to the last Imperial Conference of 1 December 1941?

- "A. You mean the Senior Statesmen?
- "Q. Yes.
- "A. That was convened by the Emperor.
- "Q. When?
- "A. It was either on the 1st or the 31st.
- "Q. What was the purpose of calling that meeting?"

The Emperor was very anxicus about the question of war with America and he convened them in order to hear each man's opinion, 3 Who presided at that meeting? 4 Let's see - those were WAKATSUKI, OKADA, 5 Senjuro HAYASHI, YONAI, Nobuyuki ABE, KONOYE, HIRANUMA. You still have not answered who presided. 7 "A. I think perhaps WAKATSUKI presided. I don't 8 really know. Did you make any statements at that meeting? 10 Of course, I was there, too, as the Premier 11 at that time. Yes, I did. The Emperor was there and 12 13 heard each man's opinion in turn. I was there and from time to time spoke, giving the government's point of 14 view. 15 16 That did you state as the government's point 17 of view? 18 "h. I explained various things, but I don't re-19 member the details now. I explained the inevitableness 20 of war. 21 "Q. Did the Engerer make any statement at all at 22 that meeting? 23 "A. No, he only listened. This was not a con-24 ference. It was only that the Emperor wished to hear 25

the cpinion of each man."

"Q. Did you express your opinion before any of the others expressed theirs?

"A. It was this way: The Army, Navy and Foreign Ministers, President of the Cabinet Planning Board, and I, as Premier, net with the Senior Statesmen in the morning and explained the situation to them. Then after a Court dinner with the Emperor, the former Premiers and I net with the Emperor who heard each man's opinion in turn. The other cabinet members were not present at that time, only I from the government. There was one other former Premier present HIROTA."

The rest of the interrogation covers matters 1 2 which were generally covered this morning with respect to the final note and liaison conference. 3 4 I will not read it. 5 We next offer in evidence as tending to 6 show that Japan did not want the United States to 7 know the real status of the negotiations, Inter-8 national Prosecution Document No. 2593-D-26, the wire of December 1st from Tokyo to Washington. 10 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 11 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 12 No. 2593-D-26 will receive exhibit No. 1208. 13 (Whereupon, the document above re-14 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 15 No. 1208 and received in evidence.) 16 MR. FIHELLY: I now read prosecution ex-17 hibit No. 1208, headed "SECRET". 18 (Reading): "From: Tokyo, To: Washington. 19 "1 December 1941 20 "(Purple-CA) 21 "#865 22 "Re my #857. 23 "1. The date set in my message #812 has 24 come and gone, and the situation continues to be

increasingly critical. However, to prevent the

United States from becoming unduly suspicious we have been advising the press and others that though there are some wide differences between Japan and the United States, the negotiations are continuing. (The above is for only vour information.)

- "2. We have decided to withhold submitting the note to the U.S. Ambassador to Tokyo as suggested by you at the end of your message #1124. Please make the necessary representations at your end only.
- "3. There are reports here that the President's sudden return to the capital is an effect of Premier TOJO's statement. We have an idea that the President did so because of his concern over the critical Far Eastern situation. Please make investigations into this matter."

Marked "SECRET" below.

In connection with translation data, "(D)
Navy Trans. 12-1-41 (S-TT)."

We next read from prosecution exhibit No. 1107, the data which appears at the end, page 5, as to the attendance at the Imperial Conference of December 1, 1941:

	"TOJO	Prime Minister and War Minister
1	1000	
2		Concurrently
3	TOGO	Foreign Minister
4	SHIMADA	Navy Minister
5	KAYA	Finance Minister
6	SUZUKI	President of Planning Board
7	IWAMURA	Justice Minister
8	HASHIDA	Education Minister
9	INO	Agriculture Minister
10	KISHI	Commerce Minister
11	TERASHIMA	Communication Minister
12	KOIZUMI	Welfere Minister
13	SUGIYAMA	Chief of Army General Staff
14	NAGANO	Chief of Naval General Staff
15	HOSHINO	Chief Secretary of the Cabinet
16	MUTO	Director of Military Affairs Bureau,
17		Wer Ministry
18	OKA	Director of Military Affairs Bureau,
19		Navy Ministry
20	TANABE	Vice-Chief of Army General Staff
21	ITO	Vice-Chief of Naval General Staff
22		
23	HARA	President of Privy Council"
24		
25		

7 8

We likewise refer to Court exhibit No. 588 in connection with the Imperial Conference of 1 December 1941, and read the last page of that document which relates to that particular Imperial Conference, page 8.

(Reading): "RESOLUTION adopted through the Imperial Conference on December 1, 1941.

"Our negotiations with the United States regarding the execution of our national policy adopted on November 5 have finally failed. Japan will declare war on the United States, Britain, and the Netherlands."

To give the defendant TOJO's version of who attended the Imperial Conference of December 1, 1941, we next offer in evidence International Prosecution Document No. 2500-A, which is an extract from the TOJO interrogation of February 8, 1946, page 2; and we ask that the parent document be marked for identification.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 2500 will be given exhibit No. 1209 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above mentioned was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1209 for identification only.)

4 5

THE PRESIDENT: The extract is admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 2500-A, the excerpt therefrom, will be given exhibit No. 1209-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 1209-A and received in evidence.)

MR. FIHELLY: I now read prosecution exhibit No. 1209-A, extract from the TOJO interrogation of February 8, 1946, page 2, which appears on page 1 of the exhibit:

"Q Who attended the Imperial Conference on December 1st or 2nd, 1941?

"A I was there as Premier; the President of the Privy Council was there, and all or nearly all of the other Cabinet Ministers, as I recall. The two Chiefs of Staff were there. I am not sure whether the Assistant Chiefs of Staff were there or not, but the Cabinet would know. Those were the responsible people that were there. There were also probably three other persons in the capacity of secretaries for these three usually came to Imperial Conferences. The three were the Chief Cabinet Secretary, Mr. HOSHINO; the Chief of the Military

Affairs Section of the War Ministry, Mr. Sho MUTO, who was then a Major General, I believe. (At the end of the war, he was General YAMASHITA's Chief of Staff); and the Chief of the Military Affairs Section of the Navy Ministry, Vice Admiral OKA. These last three are according to my recollection. I am not positive that they were there..."

To give the accused TOJO's version of who presided at that Imperial Conference and the purpose for which it was called, we now quote from prosecution exhibit No. 1153-A, pages 2 and 3 of the interrogation, page 1 of the exhibit:

"Q Who presided at the Imperial Conference of December 1st or 2nd, 1941?

"A I did, as Prime Minister. The others were seated down both sides of the table in accordance with their court rank.

"Q Did you state the purpose of the meeting or was it known by them before they came to the meeting?

"A Of course, I explained the purpose of the meeting at the very first. After I had explained the purpose of the meeting, each of the ministers and the two Chiefs of Staff discussed the question from the standpoint of his own responsibilities."

To again show that war with the United States was definitely decided on at this Imperial Conference although the fleet had sailed on November 26th, we next offer in evidence an entry from the KIDO Diary of December 1, 1941, International Prosecution Document No. 1632-W-88.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 1632-W-88 will receive exhibit No. 1210.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 1210 and received in evidence.)

MR. FIHELLY: I now read from prosecution's exhibit No. 1210, extract from KIDO's Diary, 1 December 1941:

"...At 2 p.m. the Council in the presence of the Emperor was held and at last the war between Japan and the U.S.A. was decided upon. At 4:30 p.m. the Premier visited me to consult about the Imperial Proclamation of Var."

We next offer in evidence International Prosecution Document No. 2593-D-30, the wire of December 2nd from TOGO to NOMURA to show the last-minute steps taken by TOGO and the Foreign Office preparatory to going to war.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 1 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 2 No. 2593-D-30 will be given exhibit No. 1211. (Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 5 No. 1201 and received in evidence.) MR. FIHELLY: I now read prosecution's exhibit 7 No. 1211: Tokyo (TOGO), "From: 10 "To : Havana 11 "December 2, 1941 12 "J19-K9 13 "Circular #2445 14 "Strictly Secret. 15 "Take great pains that this does not leak out. 16 You are to take the following measures immedia-17 tely: 18 "l. With the exception of one copy of the Oa 19 and Lb code, you are to burn all telegraph codes (this 20 includes the code books for communication between the 21 three departments and the code books for Army and Navy 22 communication. 23 "2. As soon as you have completed this operation, 24 wire the one word Haruna. 25 "3. Burn all secret documents and the work

sheets on this message. "4. Be especially careful not to arouse the suspicion of those on the outside. Confidential docu-ments are all to be given the same handling. "The above is preparatory to an emergency situation and is for your information alone. Remain calm --- ---. "Also sent to Ottawa, Vancouver, Panama, Los Angeles, Henolulu, Seattle and Portland. Marked "SECRET" at the bottom. "Trans. 12/8/41 (3)"

To show other steps taken by the accused 1 TOGO, at this time we now offer in evidence 2 International Prosecution Section Document No. 1532-D-11, a wire of December 3rd to NOMURA from TOGO. THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLEAK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 1532-D-11 will be given exhibit No. 1212. (Whereupon, the document above re-9 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 10 No. 1212 and received in evidence.) 11 MR. FIHELLY: I now read prosecution's 12 exhibit No. 1212: 13 "Telegram No. 87--" looks like "5" or "6", 14 I can't make out the last number -- "(Ambassador Code) 15 "To: Ambassador NONURA (Washington, U.S.A.) 16 "From: Foreign Minister TOGO 17 18 "Despatched 3 Dec. 1941, 9:00 P.M. 19 "Most Urgent. 20 "Re: - American - Japanese Negotiations. 21 "Referring to your telegram No. 1232, we 22 request that you will respond to the American side 23 with the following purport: 24 "We consider the rumor concerning the increase 25 and strengthening of our troops in French Indo-China

to be caused from reports exaggerating the facts of our increasing and strengthening of troops, in parts of northern French Indo-China, providing against Chinese troops which have been carrying on repeated activities recently on the French Indo-China and China borders; and, that in connection with this, of the troop movements of the southern area which was just natural.

"We have never crossed the limits of the Franco-Japanese Joint Defense Protocol."

THE PRESIDENT: That telegram number is 875 according to my copy.

We next offer in evidence International 1 Prosecution document No. 2593-D(34), a telegram 2 of December 3rd from NOMURA to TOGO answering the 3 last TOGO wire. NOMURA, in this document, expresses 4 strong satisfaction with the wire and asks for a reply 5 which would give some indication of Japan's peaceful 6 intentions. 7 8 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 9 No. 2593-D(34) will receive exhibit No. 1213. 10 11 (Whereupon, the document above re-12 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 13 No. 1213 and received in evidence.) 14 MR. FIHELLY: I now read prosecution's 15 exhibit No. 1213: 16 "SECRET" at top 17 Washington (Nomura) "From: 18 "To: Tokyo 19 "December 3, 1941 20 "Purple (Urgent) 21 "#1256 "Re your 875a. "I received your reply immediately. 23 I presume, of course, that this reply was a result 24 of consultations and profound consideration. The 25 United States Government is attaching a great deal

of importance on this reply. Especially since the President issued his statement yesterday, it is being rumored among the journalists that this reply is to be the key deciding whether there will be war or peace between Japan and the United States. There is no saying but what the United States Government will take a bold step depending upon how our reply is made. If it is really the intention of our government to arrive at a settlement, the explanation you give, I am afraid, would neither satisfy them nor prevent them taking the bold step referred to - even if your reply is made for the mere purpose of keeping the negotiations' going. Therefore, in view of what has been elucidated in our proposal which I submitted to the President on November 10th, I would like to get a reply which gives a clearer impression of our peaceful intentions. Will you, therefore, reconsider this question with this in mind and wire me at once."

Footnote, -"Explanation of Japan's increase of their forces in French Indo-China."

"SECRET"

At the bottom

"Trans. 12/7/41 (1)."

23 24

20

21

22

We next offer in evidence International 1 Prosecution Document No. 2593-D-35, a wire from Tokyo to Hsinking of December 4th to show at this 3 time the Manchoukuo Government was being controlled and directed by Japan. THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 6 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 7 No. 2593-D-35 will be given exhibit No. 1214. (Whereupon, the document above re-9 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 10 No. 1214 and received in evidence.) 11 MR. FIHELLY: I now read from prosecution's 12 exhibit No. 1214: 13 "From: Tokyo 14 "To: Hsinking 15 "December 4, 1941 16 "Purple 17 "#909 18 "(Strictly Secret.) 19 "Re my #892.a 20 "On the fourth, in a joint conference with 21 the Government Control Board, we decided upon steps 22 which we will have Manchukuo take in case the inter-23 24 national situation turns critical. Differing from what I said in my #873 our policy was changed as follows:

4 5

"'When the Japanese Empire commences hostilities, for the time being Manchukuo will not participate. Because Manchukuo is closely bound up with the Japanese Empire and because England and the United States and the Netherlands have not recognized the Government of Manchukuo, as a matter of fact, Hsinking will regard those three nations as de facto enemies and treat them accordingly.'

"Wherever 'England and the United States' and 'English and Americans' occur in the text, we changed them to 'England, the United States, and the Netherlands' and 'English, Americans and Netherlanders.' "

Footnote "Not available," the word "Japanese" in parentheses, "Trans. 12/11/41 (5)."

We next offer in evidence International
Prosecution Document No. 220-J, a statement handed
to the Secretary of State on December 5th by
NOMURA to show that Foreign Minister TOGO's former
instructions, just read to the Court within a few
minutes, were carried out in Washington.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 220-J will be given exhibit No. 1215.

(Whereupon, the document above

r*ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 1215 and received in evidence.)

MR. FIHELLY: I now read prosecution's exhibit No. 1215, extract from Foreign Relations of the United States-Japan, 1931-1941, Volume II, page 784:

"Statement handed by the Japanese Ambassa-dor ('NOMURA) to the Secretary of State on December 5, 1941.

"Reference is made to your enquiry about the intention of the Japanese Government with regard to the reported movements of Japanese troops in French Indo-China. Under instructions from Tokyo I wish to inform you as follows:

"As Chinese troops have recently shown frequent signs of movements along the northern frontier of French Indo-China bordering on China, Japanese troops, with the object of mainly taking precautionary measures, have been reinforced to a certain extent in the northern part of French Indo-China. As a natural sequence of this step, certain movements have been made among the troops stationed in the southern part of the said territory. It seems that an exaggerated report has been made of these movements. It should be added that no measure has been

1 2

taken on the part of the Japanese Government that may transgress the stipulations of the Protocol of Joint Defense between Japan and France."

1 We next offer in evidence International Prosecution Document No. 1532-D-12, a telegram of December 6th from TOGO to NOMURA to show the detailed 3 steps which were taken by the Japanese Government in connection with transmitting its final and last note 6 to the United States. 7 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 8 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 1532-D-12 will receive exhibit No. 1216. 10 (Whereupon, the document above re-11 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 12 No. 1216 and received in evidence.) 13 MR. FIHELLY: I now read prosecution's 14 exhibit No. 1216: 15 "Cipher Telegram No. 901 (Ambassador's Code) 16 "Sent: December 6, 1941 8:30 p.m. 17 "To: Ambassador NOMURA in U. S. A. 18 "From: Foreign Minister TOGO (6th of Dec. 1941) 19 "In reference to: Outgoing Telegram No. 844 20 "1) The government has given careful delibera-21 tion in the Imperial presence to the proposal of the 22 U.S. of the 26th of NOV. and has decided upon the 23 memorandum to America (in English) as per telegram 24 No. 902. 25 112) It is possible that the receipt of the said

memorandum in its entirety (to be telegraphed in 14 parts), will be delayed till tomorrow as it is long. However, as the situation at present is exceedingly delicate, it is hoped that the receipt of it will be kept strictly confidential for the time being.

"3) Although the exact time for presenting the said memorandum to America will be telegraphed later, all necessary preparations, such as arranging documents, etc., should be made, upon receipt of the said memorandum, for presentation to America, so that it can be carried out as soon as instructions for such action is received."

For the same purpose we now offer in evi-1 dence International Prosecution Document No. 1532-D-13, a wire of December 6th, 1941 from TOGO to 3 NOMURA. THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 5 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 6 No. 1532-D-13 will receive exhibit No. 1217. (Whereupon, the document above re-8 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 9 No. 1217 and received in evidence.) 10 MR. FIHELLY: I will now read prosecution's 11 12 exhibit No. 1217: 13 "Cipher Telegram No. 904 (Ambassador's Code) "Sent: December 6, 1941. 11:00 p.m. 14 15 "To: Ambassador NOMURA in U. S. A. 16 "From: Foreign Minister TOGO (6th of Dec. 17 1941) 18 "In reference to: Outgoing telegram No. 902 19 "Although it is not necessary to give this 20 caution, we trust that you will leave nothing to be 21 desired in keeping the memorandum strictly confi-22 dential, by absolutely avoiding the use of 'typists' 23 etc. in its preparation." 24 We now offer in evidence International 25 Prosecution Document No. 2593-D-39, being a telegram

1 of December 7th from TOGO to NOMURA to show the timing of the delivery of the last note as it related 3 to Pearl Harbor attack. THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 5 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 6 No. 2593-D-39 will be given exhibit No. 1218. 7 (Whereupon, the document above re-8 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 9 No. 1218 and received in evidence.) 10 MR. FIHELLY: We now read prosecution's 11 exhibit No. 1218: 12 "TOP SECRET 13 "From: Tokyo 14 "To: Washington 15 "December 7, 1941 16 "Purple (Urgent - Very Important) 17 "#907. To be handled in government code. 18 "Re my #902. 19 "Will the Ambassador please submit to the 20 United States Government (if possible to the Secretary 21 of State) our reply to the United States at 1:00 p.m. 22 on the 7th, your time." 23 Note below "TOP SECRET, Trans. 12/7/41 (s)" 24

We next offer in evidence International 1 Prosecution document No. 2593-D(38), with respect to 2 wire of December 7th sent from the Tokyo Foreign 3 Office tending to show the preparations which had 4 been made and orders given to take over British and 5 other properties in China on the opening of hostili-6 ties and particularly indicating that the Nanking 7 Government was being directed and given vital orders 8 by the Japanese Government. 9 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 10 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 11 12 No. 2593-D(38) will receive exhibit No. 1219. (Whereupon, the document above re-13 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 14 15 No. 1219 and received in evidence.) 16 MR. FIHELLY: I now read prosecution's 17 exhibit No. 1219: 18 "From Tokyo. 19 "To: (Circular) 20 "7 December - 1941 21 "(Purple) 22 "Circular #2499 (Part 1 of 3) (Part 2 not 23 available). 24 "In the event of international crisis 25 following upon our pursuance of our national policy

regarding the China affair, which was decided on at the liaison conference held on November 13th, the following steps will be taken in China:

- "(1) British concessions upon issuance of orders, the present force will occupy and take over these areas. However, every effort will be made to accomplish this and through the instrumentality of existing set-ups.
- "(2) Shanghai International Settlement and the Peking Legation compounds: Upon issuance of orders, our troops will take over these grounds; however, without exceeding their present strength they will make every effort to maintain order and awoid causing confusion.

"Also this will be accomplished by the aid of the existing set-ups and their staffs as well as that of various important Chinese agencies.

"(3) Amoy settlement: The same procedure as the above will be employed."

Bottom of page, the word "SECRET."

With respect to translation, "(A) Navy
Trans. 12-8-41 (6-AR)."

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Part 2 reads as follows, the same heading as has been read for Part 1:

"Upon declaration of war by Japan, the Nanking government will not be directed to participate in war but will be directed to maintain close relations and absolute cooperation with Japan.

"(10) In maintaining close relations with our country the Nanking Government will be directed and guided in strengthening its morale and organization so that it may help alleviate Japan's burden in participating in a protrected world war.

"(11) Steps will be taken to propagate among the people through the cooperation of the Nan-king Government, the true meaning of the present war, and to issue orders to maintain quiet and order among the general public.

"(12) Regarding economic plans in China, with a view to retaining and increasing mutual economic self-sufficiency, the emphasis will be placed on the utilization of productive powers, solicitation of local capital and investments, increased production of commodities. For this purpose efforts of every department will be made use of.

"Note: Those departments in the above category which are connected with the Nanking Govern-

ment will continue to maintain even closer contact 1 with that government." 2 At the bottom: "SECRET (A) Navy Trans. 3 12-8-41 (6-AR)." 4 THE PRESIDENT: That is headed "Part 3 of 5 3, Part 2 not available." 6 MR. FIHELLY: It was just called to my atten-7 tion. The heading on page 2 is: "Circular #2499 8 (Part 3 of 3) (Part 2 not available)." 9 International Prosecution document 1632-W-89. 10 an entry of December 7 from the KIDO Diary, is next 11 offered in evidence as additional evidence of the 12 part that the defendants KIDO and HOSHINO were play-13 ing in the fateful events of these days. 14 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 15 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 16 No. 1632-W-89 will be given exhibit No. 1220. 17 (Whereupon, the document above re-18 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 19 No. 1220 and received in evidence.) 20 21 MR. FIHELLY: I now read prosecution exhibit No. 1220: 22 23 "Extract from Entry from Marquis KIDO's 24 Diary, 7 December '41. 25 "December 7th, 1941 (Extract)

"At 9:30 p.m. HOSHINO, Chief Secretary of 1 the Cabinet, visited me to consult about the war 2 with the U.S.A. and England." 3 In a final move to avoid war, President 4 Roosevelt on December 6 cabled a personal appeal for 5 peace to the Emperor of Japan. That message will be 6 7 treated in detail in the testimony of Mr. Ballantine. 8 As showing the exact manner in which this particular cable was sent by President Roosevelt, we 10 offer in evidence International Prosecution document 11 No. 220-I, a brief message of December 6 from Presi-12 dent Roosevelt to Secretary of State Hull. 13 THE TRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 14 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 15 No. 220-I will receive exhibit No. 1221. 16 (Whereupon, the document above re-17 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 18 No. 1221 and received in evidence.) 19 MR. FIHELLY: I now read prosecution exhibit 20 No. 1221: 21 "Extract from Foreign Relations of the 22 United States - Japan 1931-41, Vol. 11, page 784: 23 "President Roosevelt to the Secretary of 24 State. The White House, Washington (December 6, 1941). 25

Dear Cordell: Shoot this to Grew - I think it can go

in gray code - saves time - I don't mind if it gets picked up.

"F.D.R."

Mr. President, at this time there are a series of documents which will be introduced in evidence by Brigadier Nolan.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

bunal, at this point the precise timing of events becomes of such importance, and the confusion due to the difference in nominal times at different places so great that we have prepared a synchronized time chart. This document has not in itself any evidentiary value, except in so far as each item of it is separately proved by the prosecution. It is a convenient summary of the whole, is IPS document No. 2665, which I now offer in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, this document might more properly be used on a summation of the case, but I do not think it should be introduced as having any evidentiary value at this time. It also contains some conclusions of events, for example, No. 6, which I do not think is proper.

THE PRESIDENT: You said this would have no

1	value unless every item was proved as to particulars.
2	BRIGADIER NOLAN: Yes.
3	THE PRESIDENT: There is no objection to it
4	in those circumstances.
5	Admitted on the usual terms.
6	CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document
7	No. 2665 will receive exhibit No. 1222.
8	(Whereupon, the document above re-
9	ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit
10	No. 1222 and received in evidence.)
11	BRIGADIER NOLAN: I now read from exhibit
12	1222. It is entitled
13	"TIME CHART
14	"for December 6, 7, 8, 1941."
15	It is divided under headings:
16	"TOKYO TIME PLACE LOCAL TIME EVENTS
17	December
18	"1. 7th 0940 Washington 1940 - 6th American
19	Press told telegram going to Emperor.
20	"2. 7th 1000 Washington 2000 - 6th Mr. Hull
21 22	cables Mr. Grew that telegram on way.
23	"3. 7th 1100 Washington 2100 - 6th Mr. Hull
24	sends President's message to Emperor to Mr.
25	Grew; both Mr. Hull's cables marked 'Triple
	Priority. By President's order message sent

1		in easil	y deciphe	erable code.	
2	114.	7th 1200	Tokyo	1200 - 7th	President's
3		message	received	in Tokyo.	
4	"5.	7th 1500	Tokyo	1500 - 7th	U.S. Radio
5		announce	es a messa	age on the way.	
6	116.	7th 1800	Tokyo	1800 - 7th	By this time
7		at lates	st content	ts of message kn	own in Japan-
.8		ese Gove	ernment of	ffices.	
9	"7.	7th 2230	Tokyo	2230 - 7th	Mr. Grew
10		gets the	e message	from Mr. Hull.	
11	"8.	8th C015	Tokyo	0015 - 8th	Mr. Grew
12		sees For	reign Mini	ister TOGO, read	s message to
13		him, asl	s for app	pointment to del	iver it
14		personal	lly to the	Emperor, and g	coes home.
5	"9.	8th 0045	Shanghai	2345 - 7th	The Shang-
6		hai Bund	d (Interna	ational Settleme	ent) occupied
7		by Japan	nese troop	os.	
8	"10.	8th 0140	Kota Bal	nru 2400 - 7th	British
9		beach de	efenses sh	nelled from the	sea.
0	"11.	8th 0200	Washing	ton 1200 - 7th	Mr. NOMURA
1		asks to	see Mr. H	Hull at 1300 hou	irs.
2	"12.	8th 0205	Kota Bal	nru 0025 - 8th	Japanese
3		landing	at Kota I	Bahru in Norther	n Malaya."
4				Does that contin	
5	G ame			read the line	
	bame	TOCKT OTHE:	110. 75	Tour one True	

There may be a mistake in the paper: The difference between "0205" and "0025."

BRIGADIER NOLAN: There is a difference,
I think, of almost two hours between Tokyo and Kota
Bahru.

THE PRESIDENT: You said they were the same, but I do not think you mean that, Brigadier. Look at No. 10.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: I say they are not the same because item No. 10 shows a difference in the two times. I will have to have that translated, Mr. President, in the correct time in Kota Bahru.

The difference, Mr. President, lies in the difference in date. In the earlier item, No. 10, it will be observed that "0140, Tokyo" was "2400" on the 7th in Kota Bahru. In the result, Kota Bahru is one hour and forty minutes ahead of Tokyo.

THE PRESIDENT: The difference between midnight and 1:40.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: (Continuing to read)
"TOKYO TIME PLACE LOCAL TIME EVENTS
December

"13. 8th 0300 Washington 1300 - 7th Mr. NOMURA asks for postponement of meeting with Mr. Hull to 1345 hours."

```
"14.
         8th
               0305 Singora 0125-8th About this time
1
            at Singora and Patani in Southern Siam, Japan-
2
            ese landed and advanced towards Malayan border.
3
   "15.
         8th
             0320-25 Pearl 0750-55 7th Attack at
4
                         Harbor
                                          Pearl Harbor.
5
   "16. 8th
             0405 Washington 1405 - 7th Mr. NOMURA
6
            arrives at Mr. Hull's office.
7
   117.
         8th
             0420 Washington 1420 - 7th Mr. NOMURA
8
          hands Mr. Hull document No. 2215 N, the docu-
9
            ment terminating negotiations.
10
   "18. 8th 0520 Shanghai 0420 - 8th H.M.S. Peterel
11
            sunk with casualties.
12
   "19." is withdrawn, My Lord, from this chart.
13
   "20. 8th
             0610 Singapore 0430 - 8th Air Raid on
14
            Singapore.
15
         8th 0700 Tokyo 0700 - 8th Tokyo Radio
   "21.
16
            gives first announcement that hostilities
17
            have begun.
18
   "22.
         8th 0730 Tokyo
                                0730 - 8th Mr. Grew
19
            calls on Foreign Minister TOGO at his re-
20
            quest and TOGO hands him copy of document
21
22
            handed by Mr. NOMURA to Mr. Hull, describing
23
            it as Emperor's answer to President's mes-
24
            sage.
25
   1123.
         8th 0800 Tokyo 0800 - 8th Sir Robert
```

1	
	Craigle Calls on Foreign Minister 1000 at
2	his request and is handed a copy of the same
3	document.
4	"24. 8th 0805 Guam 0805 - 8th Guam
5	attacked.
6	"25. 8th 0900 Hong Kong 0800 - 8th Hong Kong
7	attacked.
8	Between Between
9	"26. 1140 and 1200 Tokyo 1140 & 1200 Imperial
10	Rescript issued."
11	The first stage in the proof of this chart
12	
13	is to show how the times are synchronized, for which
14	I offer in evidence IPS document No. 2581. This not
15	only shows how the times on the chart are converted
16	from local time to Tokyo time, but will enable the
17	Tribunal to convert for themselves any timed event
18	at any one of the material places into the time at
19	any other. Items, 1, 2, 3, 11, 13, 16 and 17 on the
20	chart will be proved by Mr. Ballantine.
21	THE PRESIDENT: This last document is ad-
22	mitted on the usual terms.
23	CLERK OF THE COUPT: Prosecution's document
24	No. 2581 will receive exhibit No. 1223.
25	(Whereupon, the document above re-
2)	
	ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit

No. 1223 and received in evidence.)

BRIGADIER NOLAN: Exhibit 1223 is an affidavit of Philip Earl Sanders, Chief Boatswain's Mate,
United States Navy, "now attached to the International Prosecution Section of S.C.A.P., being duly sworn,
depose and say that I am qualified in Navigation and
have recently examined United States Navy Hydrographic Time Tables.

"I have examined the variations in time between places marked on the first line of the attached Time Table and say that they are accurately set out. I have, by arithmetical calculations, prepared the said Time Table for the 24 hours of December 8th, 1941, Tokyo Time, and these calculations are, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true. Variations in time for any other date can be calculated accordingly."

Signed "Philip Earl Sanders,

"Chief Boatswain's Mate,

"United States Navy.

"Subscribed and sworn to before me this 8th day of August, 1946 "Harryman Dorsey

"Captain, JAGD."

The document itself is described as a comparative time table based on Tokyo, proceeding eastward on 7 to 8 December.

At the top of the document it will be observed that there are certain localities or places set out. They are: "Tokyo, Pearl Harbor, Washington, Greenwich, Bangkok, Kota Bahru and Singapore, Hong Kong, Shanghai and Manila."

It will also be observed that each hour is divided into five-minute periods. I will not take up the time of the Tribunal in reading this document which has been prepared according to the mathematical calculations for the assistance of the Court.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: May the defense inquire whether the man who prepared this chart is in Tokyo and will be called for cross-examination?

(Whereupon, a discussion was had off the record by the Members of the Tri-bunal.)

THE PRESIDENT: Can you give us any reason for calling him for cross-examination?

MR. FURNESS: Just to inquire whether these are based on any international time belts or based on geographic calculations. I notice that in the

preceding exhibits most of the different times are exact hours apart, but in Kota Bahru particularly it was not hours apart but hours and some odd minutes. In other words, whether it is based on geographical calculations or on specific time belts on which people would agree. THE PRESIDENT: For the time being, the Court can see no good reason for calling him. 8 MR. FURNESS: Could we inquire whether he 9 is in Tokyo so that, if he is, we can talk with 10 him? · 11 12 BRIGADIER NOLAN: I have made inquiries, Mr. 13 President, and he is not in Japan. 14 We now offer in evidence IPS document No. 15 2405, an affidavit of Mr. Grew, one time the United 16 States Ambassador to Tokyo, which, in our submission, 17 proves items 4, 5, 7, 8 and 22 of the time chart 18 marked as evhibit 1222. 19 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 20 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document 21 No. 2405 will receive exhibit 1224. 22 (Whereupon, the document above re-23 ferred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 1224 and received in evidence.) 25

BRIGADIER NOLAN: I now read exhibit No.

1224 omitting the preamble. 1 2 "Town of Manchester, County of Essex. 3 Commonwealth of Massachusetts 4 United States of America. 5 "I. JOSEPH CLARK GREW, being duly sworn, 6 on cath, denose and say: "l. I was in Japan as United States Ambas-8 sador from 6 June 1932 to 25 June 1942. At about 1500 9 hours in the afternoon on 7 December 1941 (Tokyo time) 10 it was announced by a radio station in the United 11 States that the President of the United States had sent 12 a message to the Emperor of Japan, but no information 13 was given as to its substance or the channel of trans-14 mission. 15 "2. At about 2100 hours (Tokyo time) there 16 was delivered to me a telegram, marked 'triple priority,' 17 from Mr. Cordell Hull which had been dispatched at 2000 18 hours on 6 December (Washington time) and received in 19 Tokyo 7 December (Tokyo time) stating that a telegram 20 was then being encoded containing a message from the 21 President which I was to communicate to the Emperor 22 at the earliest possible moment. 23 "3. At about 2230 hours (Tokyo time) 7 Decem-24 ber, the actual message was delivered at the United 25 States Embassy in Tokyo. The telegram was officially

stamped as having been received at the Japanese telegraph office at 1200 hours and was marked 'triple pricity' dispatched 6 December, 2100 hours (Tashington time). The text is printed at pages 784-6 of 'Papers relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States: Japan 1931-1941' Vol. II.

"4. I immediately caused a telephone message to be sent to the Secretary to the Japanese Foreign Minisger TOGO, asking for an urgent appointment with the Minister around midnight. The Secretary asked if the matter was so urgent that it could not wait until the next day, but ultimately made the appointment. As soon as the telegram was decoded and typed, I took it to the linister's official residence and saw him at about 0015 hours, 8 December (Tokyo time). I requested an audience with the Emperor in order to present the the President's message which I then read aloud and of which I then handed a copy to TOGO. The latter at first said that he would study the document, but when I asked if that meant some doubt as to whether he would ask for an advience for me, he replied that he would present the matter to the Throne. He made some further remarks about the Washington Conversations, but when I said that I had not yet received a report of the conversation of 5 December and it would merely complicate

25

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

3

4

6

8

9

10

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

matters if I undertook to reneat his comments to the Department, he said it was not necessary. I left him at about 0030 hours.

"5. At about 0700 hours on 8 December (Tokyo time) I was awakened by a telephone call from an official of the Foreign Ministry asking me to come to see the Minister as soon as possible. He said that he had been trying to telephone to me ever since 0500 hours, but could not get through. I arrived at the Minister's . official residence and saw him at about 0730 hours. He said that he had seen the Emperor and handed me a copy of the memorandum which is reproduced at pages 727-792 of the above-mentioned Volume headed 'Memorandum handed by the Japanese Ambassador (NOMURA) to the Secretary of State at 2:20 p.m. on 7 December 1941. TOGO said that he had seen the Emperor (at about 0300 hours I understand) and that this memorandum constituted the Emperor's reply to the President's message. I immediately reminded TOGO that I had asked for an audience with the Emperor and that I still wished to present the President's message to the Emperor personally. TOGO merely replied that he had no desire to stand between the Throne and myself. He then made a little speech thanking me for my cooperation during the conversations and came downstairs to see me off at the door. Not a

word was said about war having broken out anywhere or about Pearl Harbor. "6. Shortly after returning to the Embassy I was informed through a newspaper bulletin (Gogai) that Japan was in armed conflict with the United States and Great Britain. "Later in the morning of 8 December (Tokyo time) an Official of the Foreign Office called at the United States Embassy and read the official announce-10 ment that armed conflict had commenced." 11 12 (Signed) "JOSEPH CLARK GREW" 13 14 "Subscribed and sworn to before me this 23rd day of 15 June, A. D., 1946. 16 "Raymond B. Roberts, Notary Public." 17 18 THE PRESIDENT: We will recess now for 19 fifteen minutes. 20 (Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was 21 taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:) 23 24

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

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, in view of the submission by the prosecution of a further affidavit by Joseph Clark Grew, former Ambassador to Japan, we renew our request that Ambassador Grew be brought to this Tribunal to present himself for cross-examination. This affidavit further strengthens a statement that we made the other day to the effect that Ambassador Grew knew many of these accused and spoke with them and would be able to assist this Tribunal in arriving at the facts in this case. Of all the witnesses who have been named and have appeared at this Tribunal, it seems to us that a man who was in Tokyo and had his finger on the pulse of the Japanese nation should be produced so that he can be cross-examined.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, this second affidavit does not make a material difference to the position as it was when we dealt with the matter previously, however I will leave the matter to my colleagues.

Mr. Higgins.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. President, at Tuesday's session, November 12, pages 10,249 and 10,250 of the

record, objection was made to the introduction of IPS document No. 497, which was admitted and read as prosecution exhibit No. 1148. The document described the reasons for the fall of the third KONOYE Cabinet. According to the certificate it was dictated by Prince KONOYE to one of his secretaries, corrected by him, but the certificate of authenticity was signed by a different secretary. The Court asked that we make an investigation and report.

It has been ascertained that the foregoing document was obtained by IPS on 26 December 1945 from Lieutenant Branstad of the Interpreter-Translator Section, CIS of SCAP Headquarters. It has been ascertained that CIS obtained the document with a number of others from the summer residence of Prince KONOYE at Karuizawa on 17 December 1945, which was the day following the Prince's death.

Investigation discloses that ARAYA, Shigeki, the former secretary to whom the memorandum was dictated, died in March of this year.

MR. LOGAN: I am sorry, your Honor, but was a question addressed to me before about this Ambassador Grew matter? My radio wasn't working.

THE PRESIDENT: I said the second affidavit did not add anything material, but I would consult

my colleagues.

I point out that in his previous affidavit it skipped several months and all of a sudden we get another affidavit where he testifies about December 7 and December 8, and we firmly believe, in view of the fact that this trial involves one of the great moments in history, where we have a man who was really here that he should be produced so that we can cross-examine him. I understand in his previous affidavit it ends at the period of about May 30, and I am not making this application pro forma, may it please the Court, but I urge with all the sincerity at my command that he be produced.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. President, it is our information that Mr. Grew is physically unable to make the trip from the United States to Tokyo.

MR. FURNESS: If the Tribunal delay on this, if Mr. Grew's physical condition is in issue, Colonel Warren, as I said, has just returned and if he is in the building tonight -- today -- he can come in and tell just what Mr. Grew's condition is. He has talked to Mr. Grew within the month and we are sending now to ask Colonel Warren to come into the courtroom.

THE PRESIDENT: Why can't he be examined in

7 8

the United States on commission? Is it suggested that we might gain something if we see him give his evidence; that his credibility is in question?

MR. FURNESS: I am sure that his credibility will be in question, but that will not be the only purpose of our cross-examination. There are collateral matters, and there is a long gap between the events which he testified to in his first affidavit and the events which he testified to in this.

THE PRESIDENT: If the question of his credibility is not raised, of course he can be effectively cross-examined in the United States. I am expressing my own opinions, because there are mixed views about this.

MR. BROOKS: Mr. President and Members of the Tribunal, I know in this case there are many divergent opinions among the attorneys, and the accused, as represented by one attorney, the interests and the matters that he has specifically in mind are not those of another.

THE PRESIDENT: If the defense want him and apply to me I shall find it hard to resist the application, if he is able to come.

MR. BROOKS: And as to the taking of the matter up, we want to bring out by way of commission

in the United States, with all due respect to my other colleagues, I don't know of any attorney that has an understanding of my part of the case that I would want to delegate that to, or likewise that I would want to accept the responsibility for inquiring into his phase of the case.

3 4

against calling him for cross-examination, but I can say candidly here if you ask me to allow you to subpoena him I would find it most difficult to refuse a subpoena because he can give material evidence, or you may be able to show he would be able to give material evidence, in your favor. You have said he can do so.

MR. BROOKS: Of course, the Court realizes the defense doesn't feel that a subpoena for this man would give us the opportunity that we would have on cross-examination because we would have to treat him as a hostile witness. Possibly I should say a prosecution witness rather than a hostile witness.

And further that in the light of one defendant cross-examining on possibly a diplomatic phase or military phase or economic phase, others may have other matters peculiarly within their knowledge of their defense that would be very important to place before this Court.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Warren.

MR. WARREN: Thank you, Your Honor. If I may be permitted a word, about ten days ago I talked with Ambassador Grew in Washington, D.C. I was impelled to believe from my conversation with him that he, in common with many other persons who write books,

has a tendancy to place a different interpretation than what this Tribunal or those who read the book might place upon his words.

THE PRESIDENT: The book isn't in evidence.

MR. WARREN: No, sir; no, your Honor, that is true. But other documents compiled by him which are contained in his book are in evidence and unquestionably before the conclusion of this trial his book will probably reach the evidence. And to that extent I am anticipating what will come before the Tribunal.

However, with reference to Ambassador Grew's health, of course, I am not a medical man and I can't may that he is in sound physical condition. Certainly he is not decrepit and he appears to be in as normal health as you could possibly expect for a man of his years, which I understand to be seventy-two. I don't believe his health is impaired in any manner except due, perhaps, to his age, and before he is characterized as an invalid, unable to travel to the Orient, I think that he first should be consulted himself.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Warren, Mr. Brooks
mentioned many matters upon which Mr. Grew might testify,
but I must remind you -- I have been reminded of it
myself -- that if he is called here for cross-examination you will be confined to matters arising out of his

examination in chief, that is to say, arising out of his affidavit. If you call him as your witness, though, there will be no limit of that kind, and, according to the representations of some of the defense counsel, at least one or more of the accused could safely call him. Perhaps you had better think it over.

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, would the Court indulge me for just one further observation. I am of the opinion -- and it is purely my opinion and not a fact -- that Ambassador Grew would place an entirely different interpretation upon the meaning of his affidavit than what has appeared before the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: That statement is wholly unwarranted.

I am telling the Tribunal, as I consider myself an officer of this Court, that that is merely my opinion.

And without the opportunity of cross-examining the man here before the Tribunal, I see no manner in which we could bring to the Tribunal those assertions -- I mean, not those assertions but the true feeling of the witness.

I had not in any manner meant to, as I realize now, I hadn't meant to attempt to judge the consideration of the Tribunal's feelings towards this matter and I realize my remark indicated that I had. So, for

that matter, I ask the Court to forgive me for not having had a very good choice of words. I am speaking solely as to the manner in which it has been interpreted by counsel in their discussions which, of course, has not come to the Tribunal. I have nothing further, your Honor, on the matter. Thank you very much.

W olf & Duda

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, may I be permitted briefly to state that the prosecution has been at all times informed that Mr. Grew is unable physically to make the trip. Mr. Grew, in the humble opinion of the prosecution is a very important witness, and, in view of the statement of defense counsel, we will make our own inquiries forthwith and if there is any practical possibility of Mr. Grew being here, the prosecution will present him as its witness.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not know whether the defense are satisfied with what the Chief of Counsel has said, but I repeat that, if an application is made to me in chambers, we will have the question of his ability to travel fully investigated.

I think the consensus of opinion of this
Tribunal, I have not gathered it fully, is that he
should be defense witness and not a witness for the
prosecution, unless the prosecution want to call him.

MR. LOGAN: As it is indicated, your Honor, we would rather have him for cross-examination than for direct-examination. I believe it is the consensus of the defense attorneys that we will accept the prosecution's offer to see what they can do to get him here for cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: We will leave the matter as it stands. It can be raised again at some appropriate time.

President, I desire to call as a witness, Mr. SHIRAO,
Tateki, whose affidavit, IPS document No. 2597,
the circumstances under which the delivery of the
telegram to Ambassador Grew was delayed will be proved,
and, also, item six on the chart, namely, that by
1600 hours and certainly by 1800 hours on December
7, the President's message had been decoded and its
contents were generally known in Japanese Government
offices.

1	TATEKI SHIRAO, called as a witness on
2	behalf of the prosecution, being first duly
3	sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters
4	as follows:
5	THE PRESIDENT: Are you tendering this
6	affidavit directly or through the witness, Brigadier?
7	BRIGADIER NOLAN: I was tendering it through
8	the witness, Mr. President. As soon as I have had the
9	witness say he made the affidavit, I will read it my-
10	self to the Tribunal by reason of the language difficult
11	DIRECT EXAMINATION
12	BY BRIGADIER NOLAN:
13	Q What is your full name, please?
14	A SHIRAO, Tateki.
15	Q And where do you live?
16	A Tokyo-To, Suginami-Ku, Nishi Takaido,
17	1 Chome, 139.
18	Q What is your present employment?
20	A I am a secretary in the Communications Office.
21	BRIGADIER NOLAN: Will the Clerk have the
22	affidavit No. 2597 shown to the witness, please.
23	(Whereupon, the document above
24	referred to was handed to the witness.)
15	Q I show you a document dated 18 August 1946.
	What is that document? Is that your affidavit, Mr.

1	SHIRAO?
2	A Yes.
3	BRIGADIER NOLAN: I offer in evidence,
4	Mr. President, IPS document No. 2597, being the
5	affidavit of SHIRAO, Tateki.
6	THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
7	CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document
8	No. 2597 will receive exhibit No. 1225.
9	(Whereupon, the document above
10	referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit
11	No. 1225 and received in evidence.)
12	BRIGADIER NOLAN: I now read from exhibit
13	No. 1225:
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

"I am SEIRAO, Tateki, at present employed at the Hinistry of Communications in Tokyo and I live at: Tokyo-to, Suginami-ku, Nishi Takaido, 1 Chome 139.

"In November 1941 I was in charge of the department of Censorship which is a section of the Hinistry of Communications.

TOMURA Morio, who was then employed in the communications section of the Chief of Staff, telephoned me at my private house in the evening and told me that for security reasons all foreign telegrams were to be delayed in delivery by five hours. I at once telephoned to the central telegraph office, and gave orders that all incoming and out-going telegrams should be delayed for five hours. This applied to all telegrams except those of the Japanese Government and, I think, those concerning the German and Italian Governments. At the time I did nothing more in the matter.

"On December 4th, having discussed the matter with members of the Ministry, I issued writeen instructions to all branch telegraph offices in the Tokyo area and to all other sections of my censorship staff. I do no think it likely that any copy of these written instructions still exists. At no time, so far as I remember, did I ever receive writeen confirmation of the

telephone instructions of Colonel TOMURA.

"On December 6th my orders from Colonel TOMURA as to the delay in telegrams was varied and, in future,
I was told to delay the delivery by five hours and ten
hours on alternate days.

6:00 p.m. when I left the office, and I think some time between four and six p.m. of the contents of the message of the President of the U. S. A. to the Emperor of Japan. I cannot remember, for certain, who told me, but I think it was Colonel TCLURA who gave me this information in the course of a conversation on the telephone that afternoon. He telephoned me to say that henceforth all telegrams were to be delayed by fifteen hours and I gave instructions to my subordinates accordingly.

Office and for the Chiefs of Staff of the Army and of the Navy to send a messenger to my department at least once a day, generally in the morning, to take away copies of telegrams in code which they thought might interest them. As December 7th was a day of great excitement, there were probably messengers in and out all day, and I cannot say at what time the President's telegram would have been taken away by any of these messengers. I do know, however, as I have already ex-

plained, that Colonel TOLURA of the War Ministry was telling me the contents of the telegram probably by 4 o'clock and certainly by 6 o'clock that evening.

"I should explain that, although my department is called the Department of Censorship, and was
therefore responsible for decoding telegrams in code, it
was operating for public and commercial codes only and
did not handle secret codes.

about 4:30 a.m. by Mr. NAKAYAMA, who was Chief of the Foreign Telegram Section of the Telecommunication Bureau of the Ministry of Communications and, as such, my immediate superior officer. He told me that he had received an order from the Army to stop all communication with Foreign Countries. I immediately telephoned the order to my office, dressed and went there, arriving about 6:00 a.m. There I found Colonel MURAKAMI of the War Ministry, and Lt. Colonel TOMMRA, waiting for me, and we discussed all future control of communications.

"At noon on this day, the Hinister of Communications read out to the Staff of the Ministry the Imperial Rescript of the declaration of war.

"I am certain of many of my times and all my dates in this period as I kept a Diary, and it is after refreshing my memory from this Diary that I have made

the present Affidavit. 1 "I, SFIRAO, Tateki have red the above statement in 2 English, a language which I understand. I swear on 3 my conscience that the contents of the above statement 4 are true to the best of my knowledge and recollection of facts. "Sworn and subscribed to before the undersigned by the above 9 named SHIRAO, Tateki at the War 10 Ministry Building, Tokyo, this 11 12 18th day of August 1946 /s/"John F. Hurmel
"Major, J.A.G.O." 13 14 I have no questions further to ask the 15 witness. 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. KIYOSE. Y DR. KIYOSE: I have three or four questions 2 to ask this witness. 3 CROSS-EXAMINATION 4 BY DR. KIYOSE: 5 You have stated in the last part of your 6 affidavit that you read and understand English and understood the contents of this affidavit. Did you write this affidavit in English? 9 A No, in Japanese. 10 Then, did you listen to the English translation of the Japanese afficavit which you made, and signed that? Yes, I read the translation into English and affixed my signature thereto. THE MONITOR: "I was asked to read it, which I did, and then signed." Then you did not see the Japanese text of this affidavit? Your question is not clear, sir.

21

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

I saw it. A

the Japanese affidavit?

There is no -- you are sure of its contents?

The Japanese affidavit has been circulated

among us defense counsel. Have you never seen or read

A Yes, I am.

2 3

Then I will ask you some question, basing them on the Japanese text, on the Japanese affidavit.

4

Will you tell us of your position at the time, in the period ' covered by this afficavit; that is to

8

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

say, will you explain in detail the organization of your ministry? That is, in the first part of December, 1941. At that time I occupied the position of

Communications Secretary or Official in the Ministry of Communications; and I was assigned to the Foreign Telegraph Section of the Tele-Communications Bureau of the Ministry of Communications.

What is the organization immediately above this bureau?

That is the Tele-Communications Bureau of the Ministry of Communications, and the Foreign Telegraph Section is under the Tele-Communications Bureau.

Is the Tele-Communication Bureau under the direct control of the Minister of Communications, or is there another intermediate agency?

Yes, it is under the direct supervision of the Minister.

THE MONITOR: "I believe."

I am asking you concerning the department

in which you worked. When you say "I believe," that is not very exact. Do you mean you believe, or are you sure?

A Do you mean to say that the Tele-Communications
Bureau is not very clear to you?

Q No, my question -- I asked you my question because you said, "I believe" the Tele-Communications Bureau was under the direct control of the Minister of Communications. There is the Vice-Minister of Communications under the Minister, so I wanted to ask you whether you knew it for a fact that the Tele-Communication Bureau was under, directly under, the Minister of Communications?

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. KIYOSE, the reason for these questions is far from clear. Do you suggest that he was not employed as he claims he was?

to ascertain where he got his orders from. That is to say, I wish to ask as my next question whether or not he received the order on December 7 from his immediate superior, from someone from whom he should receive that order, or not.

Q If you can, please reply to my previous question. If you cannot, I shall go to my next question.

25

No, I shall try to reply. I said that the 1 Tele-Communications Bureau was under the direct charge 2 of the Minister of Communications, but in between 3 there is the office of the Vice-Minister. Therefore. I must say that it also receives supervision and orders of the Vice-Minister, who assists the Minister 6 in the administration of the Ministry. You said you were employed in the Foreign 8 Telegram Section. Who was your section chief? 9 NAKAYAMA, Jiro. 0 With that, the organization of the Ministry 11 has become clear. 12 In the third paragraph of your affidavit 13 you state that orders were given for all incoming 14 telegrams to be delayed for five hours. Where did 15 these orders come from? 16 From Lieutenant Colonel TOMURA, of the Army 17 General Staff. 18 Q From about when? 19 20 A From the end of November. 21 Did Colonel TOMURA, that is to say, did the 22 Army General Staff have the right to order, to give 23 orders to you or to your section?

A No, he did not have the authority to give orders, but we interpreted it as being the request

1	of the army.
2	THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn now until
3	half past nine tomorrow morning.
4	At half past ten we will adjourn until
5	half past one.
6	(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment
7	was taken until Friday, 15 November 1946,
8	at 0930.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

