

Doc. 2065 Evid

Folder 4

(302)

Doc. # 2065

4

Vol. 65

Congress of the United States

Report of Proceedings

Hearing held before

Joint Committee

on the

Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack

S. Con. Res. 27

February 18, 1946

Washington, D. C.

Pages: 12,781 to 13,079

NATIONAL { 4266  
4267  
4268

WARD & PAUL

(ELECTREPORTER, INC.)

OFFICIAL REPORTERS

1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N. W.

WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

C O N T E N T S

PAGE

Charles

12,785

Thomas

12,875

Robert E.

13,079

E X H I B I T S

PAGE

12,784

PAUL, WASHINGTON, D C

- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

152

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C O N T E N T S

TESTIMONY OF

HART, Senator Thomas Charles  
LAYTON, Captain Edwin Thomas  
SCHUKRAFT, Colonel Robert E.

PAGE  
12,785  
12,875  
13,079

E X H I B I T S

NUMBERS

152

PAGE  
12,784

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D C

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

S. Con. Res. 27

- - -

Monday, February 18, 1946.

- - -

Congress of the United States,  
Joint Committee on the Investigation  
of Pearl Harbor Attack,  
Washington, D. C.

The Joint Committee met, pursuant to adjournment, at  
10:00 A.M., in the Caucus Room (room 318), Senate Office  
Building, Senator Alben W. Barkley (chairman), presiding.

Present: Senators Barkley (chairman), George, Lucas,  
Ferguson and Brewster.

Representatives Cooper (vice chairman), Clark, Murphy,  
Gearhart and Keefe.

Also present: Seth W. Richardson, General Counsel;  
Samuel H. Kaufman, Associate General Counsel, and John E.  
Masten, of counsel, for the Joint Committee.

- - -

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

1           The Vice Chairman: The committee will please be in  
2 order.

3           Does counsel desire to call his next witness? Who  
4 does counsel desire to call as his next witness?

5           Mr. Richardson: The first thing I wish to call the  
6 committee's attention to, Mr. Chairman, is a letter I have  
7 just received from Mr. Farrington, the Representative from  
8 Hawaii, in which he states:

9           "I have received from Fred Ohrt, Manager and Chief  
10 Engineer of the Board of Water Supply of Honolulu the  
11 accompanying map and memorandum showing the bombs which  
12 dropped in the City of Honolulu on December 7, 1941.

13           "I am calling this to your attention to ascertain  
14 whether or not you care to incorporate this information  
15 in the record of the Pearl Harbor proceedings. I will,  
16 of course, be happy to have you do so if it is your wish,  
17 but in the event you feel it is not pertinent to this  
18 inquiry I trust you will return it to me for my records."

19           He accompanies it with a statement with reference  
20 to the bomb damage done in Oahu at the time of the attack,  
21 together with a map of the area, showing on that map the  
22 points of bomb damage and content. I present it in respect  
23 to the delegate for the committee to determine whether it  
24 thinks that matter would be of any importance in our record.

25           The Vice Chairman: Well, I at the moment, not having

1 heard of it before, I rather doubt whether that would have  
2 any particular place here. I would assume from what you say  
3 that it might be a question of damages sustained there that  
4 they might want some future consideration on, but that would  
5 not have anything to do with this inquiry.

6 Senator Brewster: I think perhaps, Mr. Chairman, that it  
7 would have a bearing, of course, on the nature of the attack  
8 which we have, of course, gone into in some detail as to the  
9 attack on the ships and the fields. I have never realized,  
10 as that indicated, that so many bombs hit on the city. I  
11 don't think anyone we have had before us has indicated it and  
12 I think it would be very valuable for historical purposes to  
13 have it in the record if it is not too extended.

14 Mr. Richardson: The statement which is attached to it,  
15 Mr. Chairman, is not controversial in any way.

16 The Vice Chairman: Well, I did not assume there was any  
17 controversy about it, Mr. Richardson. It was just a question  
18 whether the committee feels that that type of material ought  
19 to be included in this inquiry, in this record.

20 Senator Brewster: The bearing that it has is on the  
21 hazards which the Navy and other installations present. I had  
22 not realized that the bombs were scattered around that way.

23 The Vice Chairman: Of course, I know Mr. Farrington  
24 very pleasantly and any requests that he might present would  
25 certainly be worthy of the utmost consideration. I did not

1 get the impression from what he said that he was insistent  
2 on it one way or the other.

3 Mr. Richardson: No, no. I am presenting it only because  
4 Mr. Farrington asked me to present it to the committee.

5 The Vice Chairman: Did he specially emphasize that  
6 he thought it ought to be in the record here?

7 Mr. Richardson: No. He said:

8 "I am calling this to your attention to ascertain  
9 whether or not you care to incorporate this information  
10 in the record of the Pearl Harbor proceedings."

11 Senator Ferguson: I think, Mr. Chairman, that it ought  
12 to be made part of the record.

13 The Vice Chairman: All right.

14 Senator Brewster: I think it would be a good idea.

15 The Vice Chairman: All right, without objection then it  
16 will be included in the record.

17 Mr. Richardson: Well, then, may it be given an exhibit  
18 number?

19 The Vice Chairman: All right, it will be given the  
20 proper exhibit number and received as an exhibit.

21 (The document above referred to  
22 was marked Exhibit No. 152)

23 The Vice Chairman: Anything further from counsel?

24 Mr. Richardson: Now I would like to ask you to call  
25 Admiral Mr. Senator Hart, whichever is correct.



1           The Vice Chairman: Admiral Senator, Mr. Hart, please  
2 come forward.

3                           TESTIMONY OF SENATOR THOMAS CHARLES HART

4   (sworn by the vice-chairman)

5           The Vice Chairman: Counsel may proceed.

6           Mr. Richardson: Admiral, will you state your full name  
7 for the reporter?

8           Senator Hart: Thomas Charles Hart.

9           Mr. Richardson: You are now one of the Senators from  
10 the State of Connecticut?

11          Senator Hart: Yes.

12          Mr. Richardson: How long did you serve in the Navy?

13          Senator Hart: Nearly fifty-two years.

14          Mr. Richardson: And what was your rank and assignment  
15 at the time you were retired?

16          Senator Hart: I was a full Admiral on the active list,  
17 was switched over to the retired list on the 1st of July  
18 1942 but continued on active duty until the day before I  
19 came to the Senate.

20          Mr. Richardson: During what period were you the Com-  
21 mander-in-Chief of the Asiatic Fleet?

22          Senator Hart: From the latter part of July 1939 until  
23 the date of my transfer to the retired list; that was three  
24 years afterward.

25          Mr. Richardson: You are the same Admiral Hart who con-

Witness Hart

12,786  
Questions by: Mr. Richardson

1  
2 ducted an examination of witnesses under the direction of  
3 the Secretary of the Navy pertinent to the Japanese attack  
4 on Pearl Harbor, commencing in February 1944?

5 Senator Hart: Yes, I am that man but I do not know  
6 that the word "examination" is quite correct. I was really  
7 recording testimony for the purposes of preservation.

8 Mr. Richardson: And in your work in that connection  
9 witnesses did appear before you?

10 Senator Hart: Yes.

11 Mr. Richardson: Were sworn and their sworn testimony  
12 taken down and recorded?

13 Senator Hart: Yes.

14 Mr. Richardson: And among those witnesses, Admiral,  
15 was Captain Safford?

16 Senator Hart: Yes.

17 Mr. Richardson: Now, Admiral, in Captain Safford's  
18 testimony which appears at page 10,428 under examination by  
19 Senator Brewster the following record was made which I will  
20 read to you:

21 "Senator Brewster: Captain, I want to speak about  
22 this Hart incident, which has come to my attention,  
23 and in that connection will read the testimony which you  
24 gave before the Army Board at pages 172, 173 and 174:

25 "Captain Safford: There is a possibility that

Witness Hart

Questions by: Mr. Richardson

1  
2 the original distribution copy of that message is in  
3 existence in the Navy Department in the hands or in the  
4 safe of some high official, probably the Vice Chief of  
5 Naval Operations if it is in existence, possibly the  
6 Secretary of the Navy. Admiral Hart made a statement to  
7 me which implied that he had sighted it and that I was  
8 not justified in the statement that all copies of the  
9 "winds" message had been destroyed.

10 "Major Clausen: In connection with the answer  
11 that you just gave to General Russell you stated that  
12 Admiral Hart informed you he had cited a distribution  
13 list. Do you recall that?

14 "Captain Safford: No, sir. That he had sighted  
15 the actual "winds" message.

16 "Major Clausen: That he had cited the message in  
17 a written report that he rendered?

18 "Captain Safford: No, sir. He said to me, "I  
19 have just come from the front office, and I have seen  
20 your "winds" message. Now, don't make statements that  
21 you can't verify." This is of the time I came in to  
22 verify my testimony, so I withdrew from my testimony any  
23 statement to the effect relative then to other copies  
24 having been destroyed, because I didn't know where I  
25 stood then."

Witness Hart

Questions by: Mr. Richardson

1

"

2

"That is the end of the quotation of the testimony.

3

"Now, do you recall the statement of Admiral Hart to you?

4

5

"Captain Safford: Yes, sir.

6

"Senator Brewster: That is substantially correct, as you testified?

7

8

"Captain Safford: It is substantially correct.

9

"Senator Brewster: And that was at the time you were going to verify your testimony before Admiral Hart when he cautioned you to be careful about any statement that the winds message had been destroyed because you understood him to say he had seen a copy just before that?

10

11

12

13

14

15

"Captain Safford: Yes, sir, immediately before that.

16

17

"Senator Brewster: That is all."

18

Now, Admiral, do you recall having a conversation with Captain Safford that has any relation to the incident detailed in that testimony?

19

20

21

Senator Hart: Yes.

Shef--22

Shack

fls 23

24

25

Witness Hart

Questions by: Mr. Richardson

Shack  
fls  
Shef  
gl

Mr. Richardson: Will you tell the committee all you know about the incident?

Senator Hart: In every case, witnesses were allowed to verify testimony as a check on the correctness of the recording. Due to the lapse of time between the events that they were testifying to, and the dates that they were testifying, I was in the habit of allowing considerable latitude in that verification, and instructed them that I would before they began.

It is a very severe tax on memory at best, and my object was to get the most accurate testimony I could obtain.

Therefore all witnesses were told that after thinking over what they had given, if they noted errors of commission or omission that were of moment, and talked to me about it when they returned their testimony, I would make my decision as to what alterations could be made.

Captain Safford came in as a part of the process. I found that he had made very extensive alterations, not so much in the way of changes in what he did state, but in additions to it.

Now, as I recall, I pointed out in quite a number of places where was not stating simply what he knew, but what he had been told, and in certain places where he was, as of that date, making deductions and drawing conclusions.

Witness Hart

Questions by: Mr. Richardson

h2

1  
2 May I have the testimony?

3 Mr. Richardson: You mean your own record, or the testi-  
4 mony I read?

5 Senator Hart: N o, my record.

6 (The document was handed to Senator Hart)

7 Senator Hart: Captain Safford had very extensively  
8 expanded his answer to my question No. 18 that contained  
9 certain deductions and certain analyses on his part, which  
10 my conversation with him brought out were not made at the  
11 time, but were made subsequently.

12 I think in the end I permitted him to leave his amended  
13 answer about as he had brought it in in this case, although  
14 I did think that he was taking considerably more latitude  
15 than the situation justified.

16 Now, as I recall, in response to my invitation, or  
17 instruction, which was usual under Navy customs, to add  
18 additional facts which he might remember subsequent to his  
19 testimony and which would seem to be particularly pertinent,  
20 Captain Safford wrote a long reply, and I told him that so  
21 much of that reply was not a matter of stating facts, but  
22 was deductions on his part, and somewhat hearsay, that I  
23 did not think it was a correct answer and that it would be  
24 necessary for him to revise it in the other direction.

25 Now, it was in connection with that that Captain Safford's

Witness Hart

questions by: Mr. Richardson

h3

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

testimony before the Army Court which you have just read, must have been given.

To the best of my recollection he stated as a fact that one or all of the dispatches referring to the winds message had been removed from the files.

I pointed out that that was a very serious thing to say and that he ought not to say it unless he knew it to be a fact.

AL  
fls

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Shack (2) am  
follows  
Hook  
AL-1

12,792

1 Witness Hart

2 I think J told him that in my entire Naval career  
3 I had never known of any one instance where files had been  
4 falsified, and that he needed to be very sure before he  
5 made such a statement as that.

6 I think I prefaced what I said about having seen some-  
7 thing myself with the statement to him that when I first  
8 began this job of taking testimony, while I was planning  
9 the work, I spent some time in looking through the Navy's  
10 files to see how the pertinent material was stored -- and,  
11 incidentally, decided that I would simplify my own task  
12 by not doing other than referring to pertinent documents.

13 So I told Captain Safford that I thought that I myself  
14 had sighted something in the files about the winds message,  
15 and the conversation on that point stopped right there.

16 Now to complete the story, that same thing turned up  
17 during the Navy's Court of Inquiry on the subject and what  
18 had always seemed to me to be a matter of very little im-  
19 portance, as I still regard the entire winds code affair,  
20 was a point of issue in some respects, so I returned to that  
21 office to reconstruct what it was that I had seen, and found  
22 that I had not seen the file at all, because that particular  
23 file was not at that time even stored in the Navy Department  
24 Building. What I had seen was a compilation, rather a  
25 history, gotten out by some entirely non-technical officer,





Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Lucas

understood you to say in your statement to the committee, in the beginning this was more or less of a procedure for the purpose of preservation of testimony. Am I correct in that, or was it an actual investigation, or do you make a distinction between the two?

Senator Hart: As you state, Senator, it was a matter of recording testimony. My precept read:

"Certain members of the Naval forces who have knowledge pertinent to the foregoing matters are now or soon may be on dangerous assignments at great distances from the United States, and it is now deemed necessary, in order to prevent evidence being lost by death or unavoidable absence of those certain members of the Naval forces, that their testimony pertinent to the aforesaid Japanese attack be recorded and preserved."

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Lucas

That was the gist of my instruction.

Senator Lucas: Is that all of the original directive that you had?

Senator Hart: No.

Senator Lucas: I think perhaps at this point it probably all should go into the record.

Senator Hart: That is not all. The rest of it contains various preliminary "whereas's" and instructions about what would be available to me.

Senator Lucas: All right. I will withdraw that last request.

Now, Senator Hart, with whom did you have a conversation before you started to gather this testimony in connection with the disaster at Pearl Harbor?

Senator Hart: Will you repeat the first part of that question?

Senator Lucas: With whom did you confer before you started the gathering of this testimony in relation to the attack on Pearl Harbor?

Senator Hart: No one, except the Navy Judge Advocate General. That had all to do with ways and means. No instructions about how I should do it from him.

Senator Lucas: Now, as I understood your direct statement to the committee, after you interrogated a witness

hl  
fls  
AL

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

1 Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Lucas

h2  
2 you would permit that witness to review his testimony before  
3 it was actually recorded, in order to give him an opportunity  
4 to correct any statements that he might have made, or also  
5 you might give him the opportunity to add to anything that  
6 he had said previous to that time.

7 Senator Hart: Yes, within the limitations which I  
8 stated in my answer to the counsel.

9 Senator Lucas: I understand, and this examination of  
10 witnesses took place at what time? What year?

11 Senator Hart: The date of the precept was 12 February  
12 1944, and the date of my submitting it to the Secretary  
13 as completed was approximately 30 June. The date of the  
14 last testimony taken was 15 June, 1944.

15 Senator Lucas: And all the witnesses whom you examined  
16 at that time were members of the Navy, or members of the  
17 armed forces of this country?

18 Senator Hart: They were all Navy.

19 Senator Lucas: They were all engaged at that time in  
20 the prosecution of the war?

21 Senator Hart: There may be an exception or two, but  
22 in general that is correct.

23 Senator Lucas: You stated to the committee that it was  
24 a rather severe memory test of these men whom you examined  
25 in 1944, as to what actually happened at the Pearl Harbor

Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Lucas

h3

in early December, 1941.

Senator Hart: I considered it so at the time, and I still do.

Senator Lucas: What was true of the witnesses whom you examined would be true of all the witnesses who were examined in 1944, whether it was this inquiry or any other inquiry, I take it.

As far as their memory is concerned, as far as the memory test is concerned, it would be difficult for any witness -- if you found that to be true in the course of your inquiry, it would also be true in the Naval Court of Inquiry and it would be very difficult for any witness to remember exactly what transpired in those hectic days around December 1941, isn't that true?

Senator Hart: I do not wish to agree or disagree with you, Senator. You know that as well as I do.

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Larry  
fls

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Lucas

Senator Lucas: Now, you stated to the committee that Captain Safford made extensive alternations in his testimony.

Will you explain to the committee just a little more in detail what you mean by that?

Senator Hart: I don't think I am able to go into great detail. My statement was that his changes were largely additions rather than corrections.

Senator Lucas: Well, in the first statement that he made to you, do you recall whether he went extensively into the winds message?

Senator Hart: I don't recall, but I have an impression that there was nothing about it in his original testimony. I certainly didn't ask him anything about it.

Senator Lucas: It is your recollection now, that in the original testimony submitted to you, he said nothing to you about the winds message at all?

Senator Hart: That is my recollection, but I am most uncertain on the point. He might have.

Senator Lucas: I think it is rather important to ascertain whether Captain Safford did say anything to you in his original testimony about this winds message.

Counsel has suggested that this is the only compilation of testimony and that maybe you do not have any memorandum of what he first originally submitted to you.

Lac  
fls  
Shack  
10:40  
hl

Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Lucas

h2

2 Mr. Richardson: Senator Hart, would you be able to  
3 tell from your official record there what was or what was  
4 not in the original reporter's statement of the testimony  
5 prior to his amendment or addition to it.

6 Admiral Hart: No. The original, I am quite sure, was  
7 destroyed.

8 Senator Lucas: As I understand you, Senator, it is  
9 your best recollection now that in the first memorandum sub-  
10 mitted to you by Captain Safford, there was nothing in it  
11 about the winds message?

12 Senator Hart: By "memorandum" do you mean his first  
13 testimony?

14 Senator Lucas: That is correct, sir.

15 Senator Hart: That is what I said.

16 Senator Lucas: Later on, when he made additional  
17 statements, when Captain Safford gave you additional testi-  
18 mony, then is when the winds message was discussed between  
19 you and Captain Safford?

20 Senator Hart: That isn't what I said, Senator.

21 I didn't say that he was giving additional testimony.  
22 I said that in the process of the verification of his testi-  
23 mony, he was allowed to correct errors of omission and com-  
24 mission.

25 Senator Lucas: I stand corrected on that, sir.

Witness Hart

questions by: Senator Lucas

h3

1  
2 Now, as I understand it, you took some exceptions to  
3 Captain Safford's lengthy statement, because it included  
4 a lot of hearsay testimony, and he drew his own conclusions  
5 and deductions about a number of things?

6 Senator Hart : I think I said "A certain amount." I  
7 didn't say "a lot."

8 Senator Lucas: I said a number of things, or a certain  
9 amount. Whatever you said. Anyhow, he did have certain  
10 deductions and conclusions to which you took some exception?

11 Senator Hart: Yes, sir.

12 Senator Lucas: Now, in the conversation that you had  
13 with him about the winds message, as I recall you stated  
14 that you told him that you thought you had probably seen  
15 some sort of a winds message when you made an examination  
16 of the files?

17 Senator Hart: Well, I suggest that you have the re-  
18 corder read what I said.

19 Senator Lucas: I don't want to misquote you. I am  
20 just trying to get exact information on that question.

21 Senator Hart: I tried to give you a correct statement  
22 of the situation.

23 Senator Lucas: I think you did.

24 Senator Hart: I would rather rest on that rather than  
25 have you interpret what I did say.



Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Lucas

h4  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Senator Lucas: I am not trying to interpret what you said, Senator. I am trying to get additional light on this winds message because of its tremendous importance.

The newspapers of the country have told the people that you saw a message and that because of the conversation that you had with Captain Safford as brought out here in the examination by Senator Brewster the other day.

Senator Hart: You say it is of tremendous importance. I think I said in my testimony that I considered it of very little importance.

Senator Lucas: I agree, Senator, but certain people have made much to do about this so-called execute message.

In the opinion of the Senator from Illinois, and I think you agree, there isn't very much to it, but certain people on this committee, and certain newspapers of the country have made much to do about this winds message.

Senator Hart: All right, Senator, I will try to go along with it.

Senator Lucas: That is the reason the Senator from Illinois is interrogating you further on it.

In the final analysis, when you went back to the Navy Department, and you examined the files again to refresh your memory to see whether or not there was a so-called execute winds message, you found none?

Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Lucas

h5

1  
2 Senator Hart: I didn't look at the files. I simply  
3 returned, as I stated in my testimony, in order to see what  
4 it was that I had seen which caused me to carry on that  
5 conversation with Captain Safford.

6 I did not say that I had gone back and examined the  
7 files.

8 Senator Lucas: You went back to examine the original  
9 file where you thought, at least you had discovered a so-  
10 called winds message of some kind?

11 Senator Hart: Well, it wasn't a file, I didn't say  
12 it was a file.

13 Senator Lucas: Whatever it was. You went back to see  
14 whether or no your memory was correct?

15 Senator Hart: Right.

AL fls

WARD A PAUL, WASHINGTON, D C

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

LaCharity (2) am  
follows  
Shack  
AL-1

12,803

1 Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Lucas

2 Senator Lucas: And when you got there you found that  
3 it was not what you thought it was?

4 Senator Hart: I found that I had not seen the official  
5 file.

6 Senator Lucas: Well, I am talking about a winds message.  
7 As I understand it at least Captain Safford indicated in  
8 his testimony you had said, Senator, or he thought you said,  
9 at least, that you saw a winds message of some kind; later  
10 on you went back to look at the place where you thought you  
11 had seen the so-called winds message, or whatever it was,  
12 and you discovered that it was, as I recall your testimony,  
13 a history that had been compiled by a non-technical officer  
14 of some kind?

15 Senator Hart: That is what I said.

16 Senator Lucas: And it didn't have any relation at all  
17 to the winds execute message or the original so-called pilot  
18 winds message?

19 Senator Hart: No, I didn't say that.

20 Senator Lucas: Did it have?

21 Senator Hart: Did it have what?

22 Senator Lucas: Did what you saw when you returned,  
23 what was in this non-technical officers file, did it have  
24 any relation to the so-called winds message and the winds  
25 execute message?

1 Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Lucas  
Senator Ferguson

2 Senator Hart: I didn't differentiate between the two  
3 parts at all. I simply saw that there was something about  
4 the winds code subject and I think that at the time, I am  
5 fairly sure that at the time I didn't go any farther than  
6 simply to note that there was something about it in there.

7 Senator Lucas: You say there was something about it  
8 in there?

9 Senator Hart: That is what I said.

10 Senator Lucas: What was there about it?

11 Senator Hart: I don't remember. I don't remember any  
12 more than I have already told you.

13 Senator Lucas: All right. I think that is all.

14 The Vice Chairman: Mr. Murphy would be next. Senator  
15 Brewster would be next. Mr. Gearhart of California.

16 Mr. Gearhart: No questions.

17 The Vice Chairman: Senator Ferguson of Michigan will  
18 inquire.

19 Senator Ferguson: Admiral Hart, as I understand it, the  
20 purpose of your inquiry was to perpetuate the testimony.  
21 Had you been given the names of witnesses that you were to  
22 interview?

23 Senator Hart: The purpose was to record and not to  
24 inquire. I was not given any names or any instructions  
25 whatever as to who to include or exclude. It was all left

1 Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson

2 to my discretion.

3 Senator Ferguson: And I suppose the subject of the  
4 inquiry had been fully discussed with the Secretary of the  
5 Navy; is that correct?

6 Senator Hart: No. I discussed it with no one, as I  
7 stated before, except the Judge Advocate General.

8 Senator Ferguson: Was that Admiral Gatch?

9 Senator Hart: Yes, sir.

10 Senator Ferguson: What I am trying to get at is this,  
11 did it include Washington as well as what took place in  
12 Hawaii? What took place in both places?

13 Senator Hart: That was a subject, of course, of my  
14 own judgment and interpretation. And I carried out the  
15 instructions. I think, I am sure, that my first idea was  
16 to get on paper the evidence of those people whom we might  
17 lose, and after a few days of taking testimony of men in  
18 Washington I went out into the field, out into the Pacific,  
19 to get that testimony, and the general sequence was that  
20 I first examined those who were outside of Washington when  
21 the war began rather than those who were here.

22 Senator Ferguson: Did you make any inquiry in the  
23 Secretary of State's office to obtain facts?

24 Senator Hart: Certainly not. I was not authorized to.

25 Senator Ferguson: And I assume the same answer applies

1 Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson

2 to the Executive Office, the White House?

3 Senator Hart: Yes; and also to the War Department.

4 Senator Ferguson: The War Department. Did you interview  
5 Admiral Stark?

6 Senator Hart: No.

7 Senator Ferguson: Admiral Ingersoll?

8 Senator Hart: Yes.

9 Senator Ferguson: At the time that you were in command  
10 of the Asiatic Fleet, Commander in Chief of the Asiatic Fleet,  
11 on about the 6th you sent a message to Washington. It is  
12 Exhibit 40. It says:

13 "Learn from Singapore we have assured Britain armed  
14 support under three or four eventualities. Have received  
15 no corresponding instructions from you."

16 This is from CINCAF to OPNAV, which would be from you  
17 to Admiral Stark.

18 Do you recall the sending of that message or having it  
19 sent?

20 Senator Hart: Mr. Chairman, Senator Ferguson now throws  
21 back two years farther, over four years, and during this  
22 intervening time I have had no time for any thoughts on the  
23 events of those days at all. I wish to be helpful to the  
24 committee but in order to give what I myself would consider  
25 the best testimony I need some time to throw everything out

Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson

1 of my mind and think over those days. My memory is cold.  
2  
3 By putting my thoughts back to those days, as would be  
4 assisted by what documents there are, I could warm my memory  
5 up. But if the committee wishes to go into my own participa-  
6 tion in those days I would like a certain amount of time  
7 to prepare.

8 Now, possibly I can answer this question of Senator  
9 Ferguson's forthwith.

10 Senator Ferguson: I will have quite a number along the  
11 same line. If you do want to use the documents to refresh  
12 your memory I would ask the committee to give you some time  
13 and to have you return as a later witness.

14 The Chairman: We might see how many of them he can  
15 answer now and determine that later. The committee would  
16 want the Admiral to be given every opportunity to refresh  
17 his recollection.

18 Senator Ferguson: It would take considerable time.  
19 I think we would get along faster if the Admiral had some  
20 time to refresh his memory on it, not only on this but on  
21 a longer message that was sent and the reply that was sent  
22 back.

23 Senator Hart: I can give a fair answer to this  
24 specific question, Mr. Chairman, but if it does go much  
25 farther I think I would like to have some time, and I would

1 Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson

2 also like to have with me one or two members of my staff  
3 during those days, whom I think are available and who could  
4 help me in remembering, and I might be more specific with  
5 their aid.

6 Now, as regards this one, the copy seems rather in-  
7 complete, but I gather from the reference number that it  
8 was on the 7th of December. On that supposition I can answer.

9 At about that time, the early days of December, I did  
10 receive a dispatch from Captain John Creighton, who was  
11 stationed in Singapore subject directly to the direct orders  
12 of the Navy Department but over whom I had a certain amount  
13 of authority, and the substance of the message was as  
14 follows: That he, Creighton, had learned from Air Marshal  
15 Brook-Pophar that the latter had been advised from London  
16 that in certain eventualities, which I cannot recall, they,  
17 the British, had been assured of our armed support. I think  
18 this dispatch of mine was entirely founded upon that one  
19 from Captain Creighton. At about that same time I was in  
20 conference with the new British Commander in Chief, Admiral  
21 Tom Phillips, who had just arrived on the station, but I  
22 recall that he said anything to me whatever on that subject,  
23 but he may have.

24 Senator Ferguson: The 7th would be your 6th, which  
25 was the 7th in the Philippines?



1 Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson

2 Senator Hart: No. The 7th would be our 8th.

3 Senator Ferguson: 8th.

4 Senator Hart: Yes. But, of course, this is --

5 Senator Ferguson: This was sent on your 7th, which was  
6 our 6th?

7 Senator Hart: Your 6th.

8 Senator Ferguson: Yes.

9 Senator Hart: But this is Greenwich time and the date  
10 on the face of this, I don't think it is too reliable. In  
11 stating the date and hour I would rather see the original.

12 Senator Ferguson: Well, it was prior to the attack  
13 at Hawaii?

14 Senator Hart: Yes. sir.

15 Senator Ferguson: Now, can you recall what the eventu-  
16 alities were, that we were to give armed support?

17 Senator Hart: I said I did not recall.

18 Senator Ferguson: Do you have officers here that are  
19 familiar with that conversation so that you could refresh  
20 your memory on that?

21 Senator Hart: I didn't say it was a conversation. I  
22 said it was a dispatch from Captain Creighton at Singapore.

23 Senator Ferguson: Well, do you know where we might  
24 locate that dispatch? Would it come later to the office  
25 here in the Navy?

Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson

1  
2 Senator Hart: You mean the dispatch from Captain  
3 Creighton?

4 Senator Ferguson: That is right.

5 Senator Hart: No. My files were lost and the only  
6 source that you would have would be Captain Creighton himself.

7 Senator Ferguson: Were you surprised at an attack on  
8 Hawaii on Sunday?

9 Senator Hart: You have two parts to your question,  
10 Senator. I was in no way surprised at the date. I was  
11 surprised at the attack, a part of the attack fell on Hawaii.

12 Senator Ferguson: You had been alerted in the Philippines,  
13 had you not?

14 Senator Hart: Well, I had alerted myself for a good  
15 many months and weeks.

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Hook  
follows

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Senator Ferguson: You had access to magic in the Philippines?

Senator Hart: I had a unit there which spent a certain amount of its time on the Japanese diplomatic code, if that is what you mean by "magic".

Senator Ferguson: That is what I have in mind. And you were familiar, I assume, with the 13 parts of the message -- did you receive that?

Senator Hart: No, I don't recall receiving it. I may have, but I don't recall it.

Senator Ferguson: Did you know that the Japanese were sending reconnaissance planes over the Philippines prior to the attack at Pearl Harbor?

Senator Hart: I don't recall having heard that that was the case.

Senator Ferguson: Was your fleet attacked at the same time as the airports, Clark Field, in the Philippines?

Senator Hart: No.

Senator Ferguson: Was the attack before or after the air fields had been attacked?

Senator Hart: The first attack in the Philippines occurred at daybreak on Monday morning. That would be about two hours after the exact hour of the beginning of the attack on Pearl Harbor. That attack was made on a small

Lac(4)  
hl  
fls  
AL

Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson

h2

1  
2 air reconnaissance unit which was stationed in the Gulf of  
3 Davao in the southeast portion of the Philippines. The  
4 attack was by air, but there was an attempted attack on the  
5 part of four Japanese destroyers which was evaded.

6 Senator Ferguson: Where was your fleet located at  
7 the time of the attack at Pearl Harbor?

8 Senator Hart: Well, it was located in its deployment  
9 positions.

10 Senator Ferguson: What was that position?

11 Senator Hart: There wasn't any one position.

12 Senator Ferguson: Did you have instructions or any in-  
13 formation as to what the United States would do, as far as  
14 your fleet was concerned, or any other fleet in case of an  
15 attack upon the British and/or the Dutch, and not upon  
16 American possessions?

17 Senator Hart: Throwing back to this dispatch which  
18 you brought in, Senator, I said, "Have received no corres-  
19 ponding instructions from you."

20 Senator Ferguson: You sent a longer dispatch, did you  
21 not, signed by you and by Phillips -- page 5125 of our record.

22 I will ask for the original, if it can be produced, to  
23 refresh the Senator's memory. Page 5125 of our record, up  
24 to page 5127.

25 I would like to have you see the record.

Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson

h3

(The record was handed to Senator Hart.)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Senator Hart: Mr. Chairman, I haven't seen or thought of this message since the day it was sent, and I have a very scant recollection of what is in it. I can read it, and perhaps go on, but possibly not.

The Chairman: You might read it now, and see what you think of it. If you don't feel you are qualified to answer specifically without further research, the committee will be glad to give you that time.

Senator Hart: Mr. Chairman, this pertains to a subject in which my Chief of Staff, Rear Admiral Parnell, was always the negotiator on my part, except on this one particular occasion. He was present through this entire interview with Admiral Phillips, and I think that his testimony on this, and all the rest of that series of the so-called A.D.B. agreements, if the committee wishes to go into it, would be much better than mine.

The Chairman: What is the date of that message?

Senator Ferguson: It is prior to the attack. It is on the 7th. Our reply was drawn up prior to the attack, but not sent out until after.

Senator Hart: This dispatch which Senator Ferguson has brought up was drafted on Saturday afternoon, the attack on the Philippines beginning on Monday morning, Philippine

Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

h4

time Monday morning, and it was the culmination of about a day and a half of conference, the British and our Navy with General MacArthur's representation part of the time.

Senator Ferguson: Admiral, I noticed, in the second paragraph, you say this:

"In the early stages of a war with Japan occurring at the present time, the initiative must inevitably rest with the Japanese."

Now, the bombs did not start to drop until Monday morning, and this language was used Saturday. Was that because you knew of the fleet going to the Kra Peninsula, and you knew it meant war?

Senator Hart: No, we did not know that when that was drawn up, that the Japanese expedition had left Camranh Bay.

Senator Ferguson: When did you first learn of that, that it had left Camranh Bay for the Kra Peninsula?

Senator Hart: About five or six hours after this dispatch was sent.

c5

LaCharity (5) am  
follows  
Hook  
AL-1

12,815

1 Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson

2 Senator Ferguson: How is it that you used this  
3 language then, "War with Japan occurring at the present time"?

4 Senator Hart: I don't know, that may be paraphrased,  
5 it doesn't look like very good language, but that whole  
6 paragraph simply says what everybody knew, that we were not  
7 going to start the war and if it was started that the  
8 Japanese would start it.

9 Senator Ferguson: Did you have such instructions about  
10 overt acts from Washington?

11 Senator Hart: I don't know whether the word "overt"  
12 ever appeared in any of my instructions, but I certainly  
13 didn't need any instructions to keep me from starting a war.

14 Senator Ferguson: Did you see the war warning message  
15 personally?

16 Senator Hart: Oh, yes.

17 Senator Ferguson: And you were alerted to war prior  
18 to that time, that was the 27th, I think you said for  
19 months you were alerted?

20 Senator Hart: Well, Senator, there is always a degree  
21 of alert. Yes. We were close to the enemy. The Japanese  
22 forces were in Formosa, Hainan, over in Indo-China, a few  
23 hundred miles away. So naturally we were alerted in various  
24 degrees for some time before that. But the actual, there  
25 was no actual time when we said, "Well, today we don't have





1 Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson

2 Senator Hart: That was drawn up in conference between  
3 Admiral Phillips and me.

4 Senator Ferguson: How do you account for the fact  
5 that a British Admiral -- your conference was in Manila, was  
6 it not?

7 Senator Hart: Yes.

8 Senator Ferguson: And how do you account for the fact,  
9 can you explain the fact that the British Admiral also sent  
10 this message to us here in Washington?

11 Senator Hart: That was a joint message that went to  
12 the Navy Department and to the Admiralty in London.

13 Senator Ferguson: I notice there is used in the fourth  
14 paragraph this language:

15 "We are agreed that it is of great importance to prevent  
16 any Japanese movement through the Malay Barrier."

17 What did you have in mind there, will you explain that  
18 on the record?

19 Senator Hart: I take it that you wish me to define  
20 the Malay Barrier?

21 Senator Ferguson: Yes. Why it was important to America  
22 to prevent any Japanese movement through there. I would  
23 like to have the record show what you had in mind on that.

24 Senator Hart: The Malay Barrier is a name that was  
25 given to a land from Singapore through the southernmost islands

1 Witness Hart Questions by: Senator Ferguson  
2 of the N.E.I. to the northwest coast of Australia, say  
3 Darwin. It has passages through, the most of which are  
4 rather narrow, and from the Naval strategic standpoint it  
5 is a defense land, and the best defense land that there was.

6 Senator Ferguson: Did it include the Malay Peninsula?

7 Senator Hart: No. I said it came from Singapore, which  
8 is the island south of the Malay Peninsula.

9 Senator Ferguson: So it didn't include a part where  
10 the Fleet could have gone, the Fleet that left Camranh Bay?

11 Senator Hart: The Fleet couldn't go across the Malay  
12 Peninsula.

13 Senator Ferguson: That is sure. That is certain. But  
14 it didn't include that territory, did it? I am trying to  
15 analyze this message because the Fleet was not moving in  
16 this direction toward the Malay Barrier as you defined it.

17 Now, did you have another movement in mind?

18 Senator Hart: I don't agree that it wasn't moving  
19 toward the Malay Barrier. Any movement that it made to the  
20 southward was toward that barrier.

21 Senator Ferguson: Did our airplanes make reconnaissance  
22 so that you knew from the time the Fleet left about six hours  
23 after you had sent this message -- so we kept track of where  
24 that Fleet was going?

25 Senator Hart: No, my planes didn't see them leave Camranh

1 Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson

2 Bay and did not follow them at all.

3 Senator Ferguson: Did you get information from the  
4 British as to the movement of that Fleet?

5 Senator Hart: That was where the information came from,  
6 which was the first we knew that they left Camranh Bay, was  
7 the dispatch originated by a British plane. It was the  
8 northeast monsoon season. That whole area is filled with  
9 rain squalls. And on the occasion of the last reconnaissance  
10 made by my own planes, everything seemed to have been shut  
11 in so they saw nothing and I do not know to this day whether  
12 the Japanese expedition was still there on that occasion or  
13 whether it had departed.

14 Senator Ferguson: The information that you received  
15 from the British, did you send that on to Washington?

16 Senator Hart: The best evidence for that would lie  
17 in the files. I feel that I must have, but I don't recall  
18 having written the dispatch.

19 Senator Ferguson: Do you recall a message dated the  
20 2nd of December 1941, page 39 of Exhibit 37:

21 "PRESIDENT DIRECTS THAT THE FOLLOWING BE DONE AS SOON  
22 AS POSSIBLE AND WITHIN TWO DAYS IF POSSIBLE AFTER RECEIPT  
23 OF THIS DISPATCH. CHARTER THREE SMALL VESSELS TO FORM A  
24 'DEFENSIVE INFORMATION PATROL'."

25 Then you were to equip three small vessels to make them

1 Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson

2 men-of-war. I wish you would look at that message.

3 Senator Hart: Yes, I recall the dispatch.

4 Senator Ferguson: Was it carried out?

5 Senator Hart: No. Time did not serve. One ship was,  
6 the ISABEL was dispatched in consequence of this instruction  
7 and was nearing her station when the Japanese attack occurred.  
8 The second one to be made ready was on the point of sailing  
9 and the third was not yet ready.

10 Senator Ferguson: So the ISABEL had been equipped, or  
11 was equipped at the time, and you sent her on the mission,  
12 the other one was just about ready to sail, and the third not?

13 Senator Hart: Yes.

14 Senator Ferguson: Will you tell us where the ISABEL  
15 was to be stationed?

16 Senator Hart: She was the one that was to be off  
17 Camranh Bay.

18 Senator Ferguson: She had not taken her station or  
19 had not obtained information that she could send about this  
20 Fleet movement, is that correct, until after the attack?

21 Senator Hart: That is correct.

22 Senator Ferguson: Will you give us the purpose, if you  
23 know, that was to be served by these three small men-of-war?  
24 That was more for patrol of what was going on in the Gulf  
25 of Siam, was it not, than what would be going on in the

1 Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson

2 Philippines?

3 Senator Hart: I know nothing, Senator, that is not  
4 contained in the dispatch. I wouldn't say that your analysis  
5 was quite correct.

6 Senator Ferguson: I wish you would correct me.

7 Senator Hart: The Gulf of Siam is quite a distance  
8 around the corner, it is south and west, and the coast of  
9 the Philippines is 600 miles east.

10 Senator Ferguson: Well, did you give instructions to  
11 the ISABEL as to what they were to do, what they were to  
12 patrol?

13 Senator Hart: Yes, based on this dispatch.

14 Senator Ferguson: Will you tell us what that was?

15 Senator Hart: I don't remember the wording of the  
16 wording of the dispatch and I can't give you anything better  
17 than that, that whatever instructions she had were in con-  
18 formity with this dispatch.

19 Senator Ferguson: Now, going back to a question that  
20 I had asked you previously on Exhibit 40, I am trying to  
21 get information on the question of if you had received  
22 any instructions as to what would or should be done in case  
23 of an attack upon the British and not upon any of our  
24 possessions. This message says:

25 "Learn from Singapore we have assured British armed

Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson

support under three or four eventualities."

Now, you have told us that you didn't remember those eventualities but your message, signed by you and Admiral Phillips, as I read it indicates that we were to do certain things, and I find nowhere in it that they were based upon the fact that first an attack had to be made upon the American possessions.

I am trying to find out if you had any information either from the British or from America as to what we were supposed to do if there was an attack upon the British and not upon the American possessions.

Senator Hart: You mean did I have? You said "we". Did you mean "me"?

Senator Ferguson: Yes.

Senator Hart: No. Again the same answer that I gave the Department. "I have received no instructions".

Shefner follows  
11:30

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Witness Hart

Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

WARD A. PAUL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Senator Ferguson: So you were at that time seeking information as to what we intended to do because you had the information from the British, is that correct?

Senator Hart: No, no, I don't think so. Will you repeat the question?

(Question read.)

Senator Ferguson: When I use the word "we" I mean the country here, the government here in Washington. The British had told you, as I understand it, that there were eventualities that we were to give them armed support.

Senator Hart: Well, you don't understand it correctly. I had not been told that by the British.

Senator Ferguson: You learned from Singapore. Was that an American that gave you that information?

Senator Hart: I have told you two or three times, Senator, it came from Captain J. Creighton, U. S. Navy.

Senator Ferguson: Did he tell you where he --

Senator Hart: Who said that Brooke-Popham had told him.

Senator Ferguson: So the information from Brooke-Popham was the British, was it not?

Senator Hart:

Senator Ferguson: Or the Dutch?

Senator Hart: British.

Senator Ferguson: British. So the information did come

Witness Hart

Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

1  
2 from the British, isn't that correct, even though it was hear-  
3 say?

4 Senator Hart: The information to whom?

5 Senator Ferguson: To the Captain that gave you the mes-  
6 sage.

7 Senator Hart: Yes, yes.

8 Senator Ferguson: Now, did this armed support include an  
9 attack upon the British or the Dutch, that one of the eventu-  
10 alities was an attack upon the British or the Dutch?

11 Senator Hart: I have told you that I do not remember  
12 what those eventualities were.

13 Senator Ferguson: Do you think that by some study with  
14 other officers you can get those eventualities?

15 Senator Hart: I think the best man to remember it would  
16 be what I said before, Captain Creighton himself. He did not  
17 have as many things on his mind as the rest of us had and he  
18 perhaps would remember it quite accurately.

19 Senator Ferguson: Did Creighton place in his message to  
20 you what the eventualities were or did he use the same kind  
21 of an expression, the conclusion being three or four eventu-  
22 alities, or did he describe them so that when we call him we  
23 can find out what the eventualities were?

24 Senator Hart: I don't remember well enough to say.

25 Senator Ferguson: You don't remember that?



Witness Hart

Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

1

2

Senator Hart: No. I think Captain Creighton would be your best source of information.

3

4

Senator Ferguson: He would be the best source of information on that.

5

6

Now, on December the 4th it shows from the Army Top Secret, from Captain Safford, that on the 4th of December, from OPNAV to Commander-in-Chief, Asiatic Fleet, under Serial No. 042018:

7

8

9

10

"Communications room should now be stripped of all secret and confidential books and papers which in the hands of an enemy would be a disadvantage to the United States, retaining for essential purposes the minimum number of cryptographic channels at your discretion. Report those retained."

11

12

13

14

15

16

General Frank asked the question:

17

"Did this go to the Asiatic?"

18

"Captain Safford: Those went.

19

"General Frank: Did information copies of that go to the Pacific Fleet?"

20

21

"Captain Safford: No, that also did not go to the Pacific Fleet."

22

23

I read that indicating that it went to you, as far as Safford was concerned, and I would like to show you that and ask you if you remember that message?

24

25

Witness Hart

Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

1  
2       Senator Hart: No, I don't remember that dispatch and  
3 from its nature I think it is most unlikely that I would have  
4 been shown it. It was a matter of rather a small detail  
5 to come to me about.

6       Senator Ferguson: Who would the officer that would re-  
7 ceive that kind of a message to the Communications?

8       Senator Hart: My intelligence officer would have had  
9 the most direct cognizance of it. He is Captain Redfield Ma-  
10 son. Also the officer who was in charge of that unit on  
11 Corregidor and his name is Leitwiler, E-e-i-t-w-i-l-e-r, I  
12 think it is.

13       Senator Ferguson: Well, that kind of a message, Admiral,  
14 would indicate that at Washington they thought war was near  
15 as far as your fleet was concerned, would it not?

16       Senator Hart: No, I think that is a message which deals  
17 with activities on a rather minor scale, on lower levels in the  
18 Navy Department and in my own command and that no particular  
19 inference was to be drawn from it. It was rather a follow-up  
20 of the higher level instructions that had already been sent  
21 out, a matter of carrying out of certain detail.

22       Senator Ferguson: Did you have any discussion with the  
23 High Commissioner in the Philippines in relation to the coming  
24 attack or coming war?

25       Senator Hart: Oh, yes, we used to talk about it all

Witness Hart.

Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

1

2 through the last three or four months preceding the war.

3

4 Senator Ferguson: Did he indicate that he had received  
5 a message from the President and that he was to take a matter  
6 up with you in relation to the attack or the war?

6

7 Senator Hart: There was a dispatch which was transmitted  
8 over Navy Radio from the President to the High Commissioner  
9 and it was approximately current with the war warning. Is  
10 that the one you mean, Senator?

10

11 Senator Ferguson: Yes. Your name was not mentioned in  
12 it. General MacArthur, as I recall the message, was mentioned  
13 in it but I wondered whether or not he had taken it up with  
14 you also.

14

15 Senator Hart: Oh, I no doubt saw it before the High  
16 Commissioner did himself because it came over my radio, my  
17 system. I think I sent it over to him with my own aide.

16

17 Senator Ferguson: Did that mean in your opinion that war  
18 was imminent?

18

19 Senator Hart: Nothing additional to what we already had.

19

20 Senator Ferguson: I want to show you another exhibit  
21 and ask you about it, or it is in the transcript, a penciled  
22 memo which had nothing to do with that.

22

23 Senator Hart: Yes, Senator.

23

24 Senator Ferguson: You are familiar with that message?

24

25 Senator Hart: Well, I hadn't thought of it for four and

Witness Hart

Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

1

2

a half years. I had forgotten all about it.

3

Senator Ferguson: Well, does it refresh your memory?

4

Senator Hart: Somewhat.

5

6

7

8

Senator Ferguson: You were asked to do some scouting with airplanes and you, as I recall the instructions, were to avoid the appearance of attacking. Will you explain how that could be done and what you did in relation to that order?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Senator Hart: Well, we began doing it rather before we got the order, Senator, and Admiral Hart stuck his neck out considerably in doing it, too. We felt that we had to, - that the time had arrived when we had to take a certain number of chances which in air scouting would be a minimum because we were concerned in order to find out what was going on along the Indo-China coast and as far as Hainan, to say nothing about Formosa.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I started it myself personally and personally instructed the pilots who were going in on the coast that they were not to get into combat and even if they returned having seen nothing that would be a whole lot better than if they brought on a collision in the air. Being aviators I knew how they would interpret most anything that I told them and that I was taking chances. However, it would not have been an overt act. The air is free and we had just as much right to be using it along the Indo-China coast as the Japanese had. Still,

Witness Hart

Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

1.

2

they were to be as careful about it as possible.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Senator Ferguson: The message from Washington?

11

12

Senator Hart: (Continuing) -- the message from Washington.

13

14

15

Senator Ferguson: Did Washington notify you that the Japs were complaining that one of your planes had gone over Formosa?

16

17

Senator Hart: I don't recall any incident of that sort. It most likely would have been an Army B-17.

18

19

20

21

Senator Ferguson: Rather than one of your own?

Senator Hart: Rather than Navy, because the Army B-17's had finally volunteered to take one rather narrow sector which covered Formosa.

22

23

24

25

Senator Ferguson: Well, now, we have some evidence here of a message -- or not a message -- indicating that in the morning previous, three mornings or four mornings previous to the attack there had been a scouting plane or a Japanese

Witness Hart

Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

1  
2 plane flying over the Philippines or Clark Field. Did you  
3 have that information?

4 Senator Hart: I don't recall it now and I don't think I  
5 was told that.

6 Senator Ferguson: There isn't any doubt that you were  
7 fully alerted to war and that was true even prior to the  
8 warning message?

9 Senator Hart: I tried to express a little while ago,  
10 Senator, that it would not be possible even in the future I  
11 don't think and it is not possible now to say that at this  
12 time we became fully alerted and before that we were not.  
13 Our degree of alertness had been growing for several weeks  
14 before the war warning dispatch was received.

15 Senator Ferguson: Well, then, there wasn't any doubt as  
16 far as the Philippines were concerned that you anticipated  
17 for a considerable time that there would be war between the  
18 United States and Japan and it was only a question as to  
19 when it would start?

20 Senator Hart: Well, if I had been getting up a bet on  
21 the subject, Senator, I would have given tremendous odds  
22 but I would have felt that I would have liked to have a  
23 chance on earning a dollar or two in risking my one thousand.  
24 We were never absolutely certain, of course.

25 Senator Ferguson: But did you think it was a thousand

Witness Hart

Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

1  
2 to two?

3 Senator Hart: I never got up a bet.

4 Senator Ferguson: You did not. Well, it was very cer-  
5 tain, was it not, in your mind?

6 Senator Hart; Well, again, Senator, in the effort to  
7 warm up a cold memory and go back four years I think the simp-  
8 lest way to state my estimate of the situation as of those  
9 days would be this:

10 The Japanese, of course, sought to attain their ends  
11 without getting into any more extended war and no doubt we were  
12 the last nation that they wished to take on in case they did  
13 extend. They had to go to the NEI to get oil. That was a  
14 must in their situation. The question then resolved to this:  
15 Did they dare go into the NEI in force, running into British  
16 opposition perhaps as well as Dutch, certainly Dutch, and  
17 leave the Philippines on their flank while they stuck their  
18 necks out fifteen hundred miles farther south? My own estim-  
19 ate was that they would not leave us on their flank and make  
20 the venture. Consequently, that they would attack.

21 Senator Ferguson: That answers my question. Now, did  
22 you know Admiral Helfrich?

23 Senator Hart: I became acquainted with him after the  
24 war began.

25 Senator Ferguson: Did you communicate with him at any

Witness Hart

12,832  
Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

1  
2 time after the war began or have someone communicate with him  
3 in relation to your fleet getting in?

4 Senator Ferguson: There, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that  
5 you bring in Admiral Purnell who, as I stated before, was the  
6 conferee in all of that and who can give you much better tes-  
7 timony. I had no communications with Admiral Helfrich, no  
8 direct communication and the only business that went on be-  
9 tween the two commands were either of a minor nature or if  
10 on a higher plane were a subject of conference with Admiral  
11 Purnell.

12 Senator Ferguson: Well, Senator, we have had consider-  
13 able testimony on the meaning of "deploy" as far as the fleet  
14 was concerned. I wish that you would give us your opinion  
15 of what it meant by deploying your fleet, which you have  
16 indicated that you did this morning. You have stated that  
17 you had your fleet deployed at the time.

18 Senator Hart: Senator, are you bringing in the language  
19 of the war warning dispatch?

20 Senator Ferguson: Yes.

21 Senator Hart: Then I think you should say a "defensive  
22 deployment".

23 Senator Ferguson: All right.

24 Senator Hart: Is that what you mean?

25 Senator Ferguson: Yes, if you will tell us about that.



Witness Hart

Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

1  
2 I wanted first the word "deployed", but the words used were  
3 "defensive deployment."

4 Senator Hart: I think the easiest way is to indicate  
5 what the Asiatic Fleet did in carrying out that directive.

6 Senator Ferguson: That is what I would like to know,  
7 what you understood it to mean and what you did in compliance  
8 with it.

9 Senator Hart: The Asiatic Fleet had to await attack.  
10 It could not attack. So, manifestly, the measure was to so  
11 dispose ourselves that when the attack came it would inflict  
12 as little damage as was possible and under the circumstances  
13 that obtained out there the only way to do that was follow-  
14 ing the principle of dispersal and concealment. That is what  
15 we did.

16 The submarines, in which lay the main power of the Asi-  
17 atic Fleet, their concealment is inherent in the type. The  
18 surface ships were dispersed and disposed in a southerly  
19 direction, where they were farthest away from what would  
20 have to be the points from which the Japanese would jump  
21 off and that was about all there was to it.

22 Well, I could go on and say that following that we  
23 sent all the cruisers, including the Boise, which arrived on  
24 the 4th of December and which I did not permit to return,  
25 and three-fourths of the destroyers well south, and a part

1 Witness Hart

Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

2 of them even in down to the Borneo oil ports.

3 Senator Ferguson: Admiral, did that defensive deploy-  
4 ment, was it done in any way to protect the base, your base?

5 Senator Hart: You mean Manila Bay?

6 Senator Ferguson: Yes, or the base where your fleet  
7 had been stationed?

8 Senator Hart: Certainly not as regards the surface  
9 ships.

10 Senator Ferguson: And you would not so construe the  
11 words "defensive deployment", that they were to be used for  
12 the purpose of defending the base?

13 Senator Hart: I do not think -- I think your question  
14 is theoretical rather than practical, if you can permit me  
15 that observation, Senator, from from the theoretical stand-  
16 point I think you are quite correct, that bases are for the  
17 purpose of fleets and it is always a wrong conception to  
18 tie a fleet to a base in order to protect it, but at the same  
19 time since no one ever knows enough, if there is anything  
20 that the Navy can do while not violating theoretical concep-  
21 tions to assist the other force, particularly the Army, in  
22 defending bas es, why, that is the thing to do and insofar  
23 as the Philippines were concerned that was what we did. We  
24 so disposed the submarines as to be in good defensive posi-  
25 tions and the main power of defense that lay in the Asiatic

Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

Witness Hart

1 Fleet was confined to the submarines.

2  
3 Senator Ferguson: Those submarines were a defense from  
4 surface ships, were they not, of the enemy?

5 Senator Hart: You mean warships?

6 Senator Ferguson: Yes, as far as protection of the  
7 bases is concerned.

8 Senator Hart: That or invading expeditions with trans-  
9 ports and supply ships.

10 Senator Ferguson: Now, did you at any time anticipate  
11 that the Japanese fleet or ships that were in Camranh Bay were  
12 intended for an attack upon the Philippines?

13 Senator Hart: Repeat that question.

14 (Question read.)

15 Senator Hart: I am not sure what you mean by "anticipate",  
16 Senator. I think I can only answer you to the effect that I  
17 saw the possibility that they would.

18 Senator Ferguson: It had never reached the stage, though,  
19 of probability?

20 Senator Hart: I don't think that I can warm up to the  
21 point of differentiating between probability and possibility  
22 back in those days.

23 Senator Ferguson: Well, now, your Asiatic Fleet, as you  
24 have explained, was certainly not intended as an offensive  
25 fleet and had you had trouble getting ships for your fleet or

2814

Witness Hart

Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

1

2

equipment for your fleet that you did have?

3

Senator Hart: You mean had I been having trouble in getting reinforcements?

5

Senator Ferguson: Yes.

6

Senator Hart: Or ships and equipment for the fleet I had? Details and equipment for the fleet I had?

8

Senator Ferguson: Both reinforcements and details of equipment.

10

Senator Hart: Oh, yes, yes, plenty of trouble.

11

Senator Ferguson: Were you very anxious to obtain more vessels, more ships I will say?

13

Senator Hart: Yes, I think I had the common failing of all commanders-in-chief. You always want more.

15

Senator Ferguson: Well, was that just because you felt and sincerely felt that you needed them for the purpose of defending even those that you did have, helping with the defense?

18

Senator Hart: Well, as you express it, Senator, it would not be my conception of the way to do, get some ships to defend some others, but perhaps I can answer you this way; I think I know what you mean.

22

I don't think that at any time during the months leading up to the war I felt like persistently urging upon the Navy Department that I be reinforced with surface ships. The reason was that unless that reinforcement was great I would not be in a markedly stronger position. Shall I go on?

25

Shel-  
Shack  
fla

2814

Witness Hart

Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

1

2

equipment for your fleet that you did have?

3

Senator Hart: You mean had I been having trouble in getting reinforcements?

5

Senator Ferguson: Yes.

6

Senator Hart: Or ships and equipment for the fleet I had? Details and equipment for the fleet I had?

8

Senator Ferguson: Both reinforcements and details of equipment.

10

Senator Hart: Oh, yes, yes, plenty of trouble.

11

Senator Ferguson: Were you very anxious to obtain more vessels, more ships I will say?

13

Senator Hart: Yes, I think I had the common failing of all commanders-in-chief. You always want more.

15

Senator Ferguson: Well, was that just because you felt and sincerely felt that you needed them for the purpose of defending even those that you did have, helping with the defense?

18

Senator Hart: Well, as you express it, Senator, it would not be my conception of the way to do, get some ships to defend some others, but perhaps I can answer you this way; I think I know what you mean.

22

I don't think that at any time during the months leading up to the war I felt like persistently urging upon the Navy Department that I be reinforced with surface ships. The reason was that unless that reinforcement was great I would not be in a markedly stronger position. Shall I go on?

25

Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson

Senator Ferguson: Yes, sir.

Senator Hart: The only urging of that sort that I did was to give me more modern ships, because the cruisers and destroyers that I had were the weakest and the slowest that I had in the Navy.

A small, fast force of very high quality could have been used under those conditions, whereas my cruisers and destroyers which were both weaker and slower than the Japanese did not give us much to work with.

Senator Ferguson: Can you tell us just how many hours after the attack at Pearl Harbor the first attack on our Navy was made, as far as your fleet was concerned.

Senator Hart: I have already testified to that in the instance of Davao Bay, Davao Gulf.

Senator Ferguson: It was then two hours -- I will let you tell that.

Senator Hart: I said it was at daybreak that morning. It was about, in point of time, an hour or two after the attack began on Pearl Harbor.

Senator Ferguson: Do you know in time, how long that attack was, either before or after in relation to the attack upon the air field in the Philippines? I am trying to get this time down. We have had some difficulty with this time.

Senator Hart: Well, the attack at Belalak on my

Shack  
fls  
Shel  
hi

WARD A PAUL WASHINGTON, D. C.

Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson

h2

1 unit in the Gulf of Davao was a little before 6 a.m.

2  
3 The first Japanese air attack on Luzon was on Bagio,  
4 as I recall, about 10:30, and the heavy very damaging  
5 attack upon the Army's air fields, as I recall, was at about  
6 12:30.

7 Now, those hours are as I pull them out of memory,  
8 and there is much better evidence.

9 Senator Ferguson: Well, I assume -- and do I assume  
10 correctly, that as soon as the attack came upon your part  
11 of the fleet, which was the first attack that there was notice  
12 given both to the Navy headquarters at Manila and also notice  
13 given to the Army, so that every one was warned there had  
14 been an attack upon the Philippines?

15 Senator Hart: That would be a natural assumption,  
16 Senator, but I fear that was not right, because the only  
17 unit that took that attack, that could transmit the news  
18 of it, was the destroyer, and she was so exceedingly busy  
19 the next two hours in evading the four Japanese destroyers  
20 that, as I recall, she did not get the message in, and  
21 we did not hear about that until, Oh, I would guess 9 o'clock.

22 After that no doubt it was immediately sent to the  
23 Army.

24 Senator Ferguson: And you were in Manila at that time?

25 Senator Hart: Yes, sir.

Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson  
Mr. Keefe

h3

1 Senator Ferguson: That is all I have.

2 The Chairman: Mr. Keefe.

3 Admiral, do you want to go and answer that roll call?

4 We do not pay very much attention to roll calls here in the  
5 committee.

6 Senator Hart: I would like to do anything to get me  
7 out of this seat, but I will continue.

8 The Chairman: Mr. Keefe.

9 Mr. Keefe: I shall be very brief.

10 The Chairman: All right.

11 Mr. Keefe: Admiral, the entire Hart report is in evi-  
12 dence before this committee.

13 Senator Hart: What report?

14 Mr. Keefe: The evidence taken by you.

15 Senator Hart: Yes, sir.

16 Mr. Keefe: Under the direction or precept of February  
17 12, 1944.

18 Senator Hart: Yes, sir.

19 Mr. Keefe: Now, in accordance with the directions  
20 which were given to you by the Secretary of the Navy, Knox,  
21 you did, in fact, examine the witnesses, did you not?

22 Senator Hart: Well, as it appears on the record,  
23 subject to the modifications in the testimony concerning  
24 which I have already testified, all questions and answers  
25



Witness Hart

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

h4

1  
2 appear in the testimony.

3 Mr. Keefe: Exactly. But I gained the impression from  
4 your testimony today that this was an effort on the part  
5 of the Navy to preserve the testimony, and that it was in  
6 the nature of taking statements, rather than the examination  
7 of witnesses.

8 Senator Hart: Well, the witnesses were under oath.

9 Mr. Keefe: They were, in fact, questioned, were they  
10 not?

11 Senator Hart: Yes.

12 Mr. Keefe: Questions were submitted to them to answer?

13 Senator Hart: Questions were asked them.

14 Mr. Keefe: Questions were asked them, we will put it  
15 that way.

16 I note also in this directive, it specifically set  
17 forth:

18 "In view of the fact that Real Admiral Husband E.  
19 Kimmel, U. S. Navy, Retired, was on 7 December 1941, serving  
20 on active duty as the Commander in Chief, U. S. Pacific  
21 Fleet, with the rank of Admiral, U. S. Navy, and therefore  
22 has an interest in the matter into which this examination  
23 is being made, you will notify him of the times and places  
24 of the meetings to be had and that he has the right to be  
25 present, to have counsel, to introduce, examine, and cross

Witness Hart

questions by: Mr. Keefe

h5

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

examine witnesses, to introduce matter pertinent to the examination and to testify or declare in his own behalf at his own request."

That right was extended to Admiral Kimmel, was it not, during the course of your examination?

Senator Hart: Of course, I carried out the directive of the precept.

Mr. Keefe: Was Admiral Kimmel represented at any of these hearings?

Senator Hart: None of them.

Mr. Keefe: He did not appear at any of these hearings?

Senator Hart: No.

Mr. Keefe: Was he notified of the hearings?

Senator Hart: You will find attached to the record, which you say is before the committee, certain letters on the subject which I think fully explain it, although he did not appear, we continued to send him notices of the meetings for, Oh, I would guess, the first seven or eight sessions, and after that I believe my assistant told me that he had heard indirectly from Admiral Kimmel that we need not inform him any longer.

Mr. Keefe: Now, I note according to this record, that you did examine Admiral Wilkinson, the Director of the Office of Naval Intelligence, Admiral Turner, Director of

Witness Hart

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

h6

1 War Plans. That is right, is it not?

2 Senator Hart: Yes.

3 Mr. Keefe: Admiral Schuirmann, Director of Central  
4 Division of the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations?

5 Senator Hart: Yes.

6 Mr. Keefe: And Admiral Ingersoll, as Assistant Chief  
7 of Naval Operations?

8 Senator Hart: Yes.

9 Mr. Keefe: And Captain McRea, Aide to the Chief of  
10 Naval Operations?

11 Senator Hart: Yes, sir.

12 Mr. Keefe: Captain Wellborn, Assistant Aide to the  
13 Chief of Naval Operations?

14 Senator Hart: Yes.

15 Mr. Keefe: But you did not examine Admiral Stark.  
16 That is the thing that impressed me, and I wondered if there  
17 was any reason for it.

18 Senator Hart: Well, for one reason he was very busy in  
19 London carrying on the war. I decided not to make a trip  
20 to London.

21 After I had examined Admiral Ingersoll, I felt per-  
22 haps I should have gone to London and examined Admiral Stark,  
23 but I decided not to.

24 Mr. Keefe: Well, as a member of this committee, it  
25

Witness Hart

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

h7

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
rather impressed me when all of the high ranking officers in connection with the Office of Chief of Naval Operations had their testimony preserved through your interrogation, that the Chief of Naval Operations, who was the responsible head of that department, was not examined, and the only reason for it was because, as you state, he was then in London, and busy, as Commander in Chief of the European Fleet, and you did not see fit to go there to preserve his testimony for that reason.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
Senator Hart: Yes, Mr. Keefe. I think you may well be quite right in criticizing me for not having done it. I felt that I had met the requirements of my precept, with the exception of the two witnesses whom I mentioned in the end.

16  
17  
18  
Mr. Keefe: Well, of course, Senator, I am not asking you questions with any desire to be critical.

19  
20  
Senator Hart: That is all right.

21  
22  
Mr. Keefe: I want this record to be clear.

23  
24  
Senator Hart: That is all right.

25  
Mr. Keefe: It impressed me that the most important testimony that should be preserved, that there was any reason for preserving, should be the testimony of the Chief of Naval Operations, and his testimony was not preserved as the result of the precept which was issued to you by the

1 Witness Hart

questions by: Mr. Keefe

h8

2 Secretary of the Navy, and I would like to have that ex-  
3 plained, as to why it was not.

4 Now, the Court of Inquiry set up by the Navy Department  
5 followed your examination, did it not?

6 Senator Hart: Yes.

7 Mr. Keefe: So as to get the chronological record, so  
8 that we will have it in this record at this point, my record  
9 indicates that your investigation began on February 12, 1944,  
10 and ended on June 14, 1944.

11 Are those dates correct?

12 Senator Hart: Whatever is shown in the report which I  
13 submitted.

14 Mr. Keefe: Well, I would like to have the dates  
15 established in our record here now, if it is not too difficult  
16 to ascertain it.

17 Mr. Richardson: He has already testified to it speci-  
18 fically.

19 Senator Hart: I think I have given that a couple of  
20 times. The first testimony was under date of 22 February  
21 and the last date is 15 June. It states the examination is  
22 then finished.

23 Mr. Keefe: My record indicates that the first hearing  
24 of the Naval Court of Inquiry was on July 31, 1944, which  
25 is about a month after you had concluded your investigation,

1 Witness Hart

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

h9 2

3 and that the first witness called, a month after you had  
4 concluded your investigation, the first witness called by  
5 the Naval Court of Inquiry was Admiral Stark, Chief of  
6 Naval Operations.

7 Did you know that?

8 Senator Hart: Yes, sir.

9 I might also add that I was not authorized to call  
10 Admiral Stark to testify, but, of course, the Court of  
11 Inquiry was. That was a much higher level instrument than  
12 I was.

13 Mr. Keefe: Now, when Admiral Stark first appeared  
14 before the Naval Court of Inquiry, did you appear before  
15 that court as his counsel?

16 Senator Hart: No.

17 Mr. Keefe: Or one of his counsel?

18 Senator Hart: No. Admiral Stark was called back, and  
19 was made an interested party, and at the same time it was  
20 entirely apparent that he could not be present throughout  
21 the proceedings and would have to return to London to carry  
22 on the war.

23 He called me by long distance phone in Chicago, and  
24 set forth the dilemma, said he, of course, would like to  
25 stand on his rights and insist on being present throughout  
the proceedings of the Court of Inquiry, but the exigencies

Witness Hart

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

1  
h10 2 of the war and his duties in connection therewith were such  
3 that he could not conscientiously do that, and he thought  
4 if I would consent that some arrangement might be made  
8 under which I could act as his counsel, and do my best towards  
6 representing him.

7 I tried to get him to do much better than that, to  
8 get a lawyer, but he could not get one whom he wished to  
9 turn it over to.

10 Mr. Keefe: Did you attend the Naval Court of Inquiry  
11 proceedings?

12 Senator Hart: Yes.

13 Mr. Keefe: You appeared before the Naval Court of  
14 Inquiry as his counsel?

15 Senator Hart: Yes.

16 Mr. Keefe: Did you have an assistant counsel in the  
17 person of Admيران Ingersoll?

18 Senator Hart: I think Admiral Ingersoll was in there  
19 as counsel before the Court before I got back to town, just  
20 filling in, and was there for one or two sessions of the  
21 court, when he returned to his duties as commander of all  
22 the forces in the Atlantic.

23 Mr. Keefe: Then at least after you got back to Washington  
24 you assumed the responsibility of representing Admiral Stark  
25 as his counsel before the Naval Court of Inquiry?

Witness Hart

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

hll

1  
2 Senator Hart: That is putting it rather extremely,  
3 but I will go along with that, yes, sir.

4 Mr. Keefe: Well, if there is anything extreme about  
5 it -- all I want is the facts, Senator, that is all.

6 Senator Hart: I do not know what you are leading up to,  
7 so possibly I will come back to that.

8 Mr. Keefe: I am not leading up to anything.

9 Senator Hart: I set forth the situation under which I  
10 was before the Court.

11 Mr. Keefe: Yes. I am very frank to state to you the  
12 reason for my asking these questions is because my attention  
13 was challenged by the fact that you, in your investigation  
14 had failed to examine Admiral Stark. A month after you  
15 had completed your examination, the Naval Court of Inquiry  
16 is set up, Admiral Stark is brought here from London and  
17 is the first witness, and that in the proceedings before the  
18 Naval Court of Inquiry you then appeared as counsel for  
19 Admiral Stark.

20 Senator Hart: And what is the inference?

21 Mr. Keefe: I just wondered whether there is any question  
22 that ought to be explained in reference to that situation.

23 Senator Hart: I think you have an inference there, do  
24 you not?

25 You may as well state it.



Witness Hart

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

hl2

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Mr. Keefe: I am not the witness on the stand.  
I am asking you if there isn't any or if there is.  
I would be glad to have you state it.

Senator Hart : No, I have stated my position, and  
expressed my reluctance to assume the position of represent-  
ing Admiral Stark.

Mr. Keefe: Very well.

Senator Hart: There happened to be a war on at the  
time, otherwise I certainly would not have done it.

Mr. Keefe: Very well.

Thank you sir.

The Chairman: Is that all?

Mr. Keefe: That is all.

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

AL  
fls

Shack (8) am  
AL-1  
follows  
Hook

12,849

1 Witness Hart

Questions by: The Chairman

2 The Chairman: Admiral, I would like to ask you one  
3 or two questions. I was absent when you began your testimony.

4 I would like to ask you with reference to this dispatch  
5 you received from Captain Creighton from Singapore, in which  
6 he told you that he had been informed by this British Naval  
7 Officer -- whether he named him or not is not material --  
8 that he had received information from London that in certain  
9 eventualities, maybe three or four, assistance would be  
10 given. Do you know whether that had any relationship to  
11 the conference that took place I think in Singapore previous  
12 to that between American, British and Dutch Military and  
13 Naval Officers in which a plan was worked out and agreed  
14 to there to do certain things under certain eventualities,  
15 but which was never approved by the President.

16 You are familiar with that, aren't you?

17 Senator Hart: Dimly so, Senator. I think not. I  
18 think the last conference at Singapore had terminated some  
19 weeks before. I do not think there was any connection.

20 The Chairman: Well, the evidence here is that these  
21 representatives of these different Governments did meet  
22 there and they worked out there a tentative plan based  
23 upon certain assumptions, that that plan was never agreed to,  
24 never was approved by the President and never went into  
25 effect. I wondered if it could have any relationship to

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

1 Witness Hart

Questions by: The Chairman

2 this information that Captain Creighton had received from  
3 the British Officer who said he had gotten it from London.

4 You do not think it had any relationship?

5 Senator Hart: I would not think so, Senator, because  
6 all that planning was staff planning, with the idea, "Well,  
7 if we do become Allies in a war this is what we will do",  
8 but with no commitments whatever.

9 The Chairman: You do not know from what sources the  
10 British Officer in Singapore received that information, or  
11 how reliable it was, I presume, or what it was based on?

12 Senator Hart: No.

13 The Chairman: When you received it you sent a dispatch  
14 here in which you said you had gotten this information, but  
15 that you had received no -- what did you call it -- no  
16 corresponding instructions from the Navy Department or from  
17 Washington, and you never did after that receive any in  
18 reply to that message.

19 Senator Hart: I do not think I ever had any reply.  
20 No, I am sure I never had any reply to that message.

21 The Chairman: So you had no instructions or no in-  
22 formation from Washington with reference to any Naval  
23 assistance?

24 Senator Hart: No.

25 The Chairman: That anybody had promised?

1 Witness Hart

Questions by: The Chairman

2 Senator Hart: I had nothing at the time, as I stated  
3 in my dispatch, and I got no reply.

4 The Chairman: Now, Admiral, you got the dispatch from  
5 the Navy that was sent out on the 24th of November in which  
6 they said that the Japanese attack from any direction, or  
7 in any direction might be expected.

8 Senator Hart: Yes.

9 The Chairman: You got the one on the 27th also which  
10 started out by saying this was a war warning?

11 Senator Hart: Yes.

12 The Chairman: You got that?

13 Senator Hart: Yes.

14 The Chairman: You also got a dispatch from the Navy  
15 that the Japanese were burning their codes, which was sent  
16 out I believe December 3 or 4? You got that?

17 Senator Hart: Yes.

18 The Chairman: I will ask you this question, and if you  
19 do not feel you can properly answer it, why, I will leave  
20 that up to you.

21 You described awhile ago your method of deployment.  
22 It is a sort of scatterment of your ships, if I can use  
23 such a word, so they would not be subject to a concentrated  
24 attack; in the first place, to conceal them, or to get them  
25 as far away from the jumping-off place of an attack as possible.

1 Witness Hart

Questions by: The Chairman

2 In the case of submarines, it is easier to conceal them  
3 because concealment is inherent in their construction largely.

4 Now assuming that the same information you got went  
5 to Pearl Harbor with respect to the attack from any direction,  
6 with respect to the war warning, with respect to the burning  
7 of the codes, and with instructions to execute an appropriate  
8 defensive deployment of the ships preparatory for such  
9 possible attack, do you think that the concentration of a  
10 fleet, any fleet, such as the one that was concentrated in  
11 Pearl Harbor, would be interpreted or regarded as an appro-  
12 priate defensive deployment of those ships?

13 Senator Hart: Senator, you, I think, should have in-  
14 cluded in your question also what was expected of the  
15 Pacific Fleet in case a war broke out, in the way of offensive  
16 movements and readiness to carry them out.

17 The Chairman: Probably so.

18 Senator Hart: Now even so, I doubt, despite all the  
19 information that I have read and heard concerning the Pearl  
20 Harbor incident, that I can properly put myself in the  
21 position of the Commander in Chief who was there and give  
22 a useful opinion on what was the best thing to do.

23 The Chairman: I will not press you on that. I will  
24 ask you this: Whether, from the information that you have  
25 about what was done there with the ships that were in Pearl

1 Witness Hart

Questions by: The Chairman

2 Harbor, and from the testimony that has been adduced in  
3 all of these hearings as to where they were located, was  
4 it the sort of deployment that you executed in the control  
5 of your Fleet?

6 Senator Hart: No, it was not.

7 The Chairman: Now I will ask you this: You spoke  
8 awhile ago about no Naval Commander ever having all that  
9 he wanted. At that time we were engaged in a two-ocean  
10 war and we did not at that time have a two-ocean fleet or  
11 Navy, did we?

12 Senator Hart: No.

13 The Chairman: So that those who were in control on  
14 the war strategy had to decide the relative importance of  
15 shifting ships from one ocean to another, and not having  
16 enough ships for the two oceans simultaneously to match the  
17 Japanese Navy and German submarine menace and Italian, and  
18 others, that were being carried on in the Atlantic, you,  
19 I suppose, recognized that the Joint Chiefs of Staff of  
20 the countries at war had to determine how much of the Navy  
21 in the Pacific might be needed in the Atlantic, or how much  
22 of the Navy in the Atlantic could be shifted into the Pacific  
23 without weakening either one out of proportion to its  
24 importance; that is true, isn't it?

25 Senator Hart: I do not know whether you are correct



1 Witness Hart

Questions by: The Chairman

2 disagreement in not keeping almost all of our force in  
3 the Pacific waters during those times, but at the same time  
4 I know I did not have very good knowledge of what the  
5 requirements and responsibilities were in the Atlantic.

6 The Chairman: Yes.

7 Senator Lucas.

8 Senator Lucas: Senator Hart, do you recall from whom  
9 you first learned about the attack on Clark Field at 12:30  
10 on the afternoon of December 7th, or whenever it was?

11 Senator Hart: Some one of my staff officers came in  
12 and told me.

13 Senator Lucas: Did you ever have a talk with General  
14 MacArthur about the destruction of those planes on Clark  
15 Field thereafter?

16 Senator Hart: Only on that afternoon when he told  
17 me what had happened.

18 Senator Lucas: Will you give to the committee the  
19 substance of that conversation, please?

20 Senator Hart: The substance was that the Japanese  
21 had made a highly efficient attack, displayed excellent  
22 ability in the air, and told me about what he had lost and  
23 about what he had left. The respective figures I no longer  
24 remember.

25 Senator Lucas: Did he give you at that time any



1       Witness Hart                               Questions by: Senator Lucas  
2       information as to why the planes were on the ground?

3             Senator Hart: No.

4             Senator Lucas: Do you recall how many he said he lost  
5       at that time?

6             Senator Hart: No. I said I did not remember.

7             Senator Lucas: There are no records that I can find  
8       here in the War Department as to the number of planes that  
9       were lost at Clark Field, and that is one of the reasons  
10       I am asking you about it.

11            Senator Hart: I would not know.

12            Senator Lucas: That is all.

13            Senator Ferguson: Mr. Chairman.

14            The Chairman: Senator Ferguson.

15            Senator Ferguson: You have indicated to one of the  
16       Chairman's questions --

17            Mr. Richardson: I have some questions that I would  
18       like to ask him, so you might adjourn to the afternoon.

19            The Chairman: It is now 12:30. We might as well go  
20       over.

21            Admiral, you will be back at 1:30, please.

22            Senator Hart: Mr. Chairman, I repeat what I told you  
23       a little while ago, that I have been doing my best to be  
24       helpful here to the committee, but if there is going to  
25       be much more questioning I suggest that I be given some

1 Witness Hart

2 time to get better prepared.

3 The Chairman: I imagine there will not be but a few  
4 more questions, Senator. I hate to bring you back, but  
5 we do have to recess. The time has arrived.

6 (Whereupon, at 12:30 o'clock p.m., the committee  
7 recessed until 1:30 o'clock p.m. of the same day.)

8  
9 - - -

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D C

AFTERNOON SESSION

1:30 P.M.

1  
2           The Vice Chairman: The committee will please be in  
3 order. Senator, will you please come forward and take the  
4 stand? Senator Ferguson will inquire.

## TESTIMONY OF SENATOR THOMAS CHARLES HART

(resumed)

5  
6  
7           Senator Ferguson: Admiral Hart, I show you the memorandum  
8 which you wrote at the time that you learned that there had  
9 been an attack upon America and ask you to read it into the  
10 record. I think that should be read into the record.

11           Mr. Richardson: You might give the circumstances at the  
12 time when you wrote it.

13           Senator Ferguson: Yes, if you will just relate under  
14 what circumstances you wrote it.

15           Senator Hart: This is a photostat copy of a scrap of  
16 paper in my hand which was written at four A.M. sitting on my  
17 bed in Manila just after we had received the dispatch which  
18 was sent out from Pearl Harbor to the effect that there was  
19 an air raid on Pearl Harbor and that it was no drill.

20           I made sure from the staff officer who brought it over  
21 to me from my command post about two hundred yards away that  
22 it was authentic and did emanate from someone who was on the  
23 official key in Pearl Harbor and then wrote this dispatch to  
24 send to all my forces:

25           "Priority dispatch: Japan started hostilities.

1 Witness Hart

Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

2 Govern yourselves accordingly."

3 That was all they had to go on until they got official  
4 word from Washington that the war was on.

5 Senator Ferguson: Now, I show you another exhibit, which  
6 is the one, as I understand it, you received from Washington.  
7 Is that correct?

8 Senator Hart: Yes.

9 Senator Ferguson: And will you read that into the record  
10 and, if you can, tell us when as Commander-in-Chief of the  
11 Asiatic Fleet you received that one.

12 Senator Hart: This also is a photostat copy of the work-  
13 ing copy of the dispatch. I might say that these two scraps  
14 of paper were picked up by one of my men when we were abandon-  
15 ing that command post and were carried by him throughout his  
16 three and a half years of captivity and finally got to me. I  
17 returned them to him to keep for his own purposes. The dispatch  
18 says:

19 "Execute WPL-46 against Japan."

20 That was the war plan which was in effect. It was issued  
21 by the Secretary of the Navy and went to the entire Navy. The  
22 hour at which it was sent seems to be 1930 Greenwich time on  
23 7 December. It was received in my communication office fif-  
24 teen minutes afterward.

25 Senator Ferguson: That is five hours earlier in Washing-

Witness Hart

Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

1

2

ton?

3

Senator Hart: In Washington time this would mean 2:30

4

P.M. on the 7th of December when it was sent.

5

Senator Ferguson: Yes. And fifteen minutes later it

6

was received?

7

Senator Hart: Yes.

8

Senator Ferguson: I want to ask you a few questions

9

about the fact that you have now stated that your fleet was

10

not deployed as the one at Pearl Harbor. I notice in this

11

dispatch of the 27th it is this way:

12

"Execute a preparatory defensive deployment prepara-

13

tory to carrying out the tasks assigned in WPL-46."

14

Now, your task and the Commander-in-Chief at Pearl Har-

15

bor's task under WPL-46 were different, were they not?

16

Senator Hart: In detail, yes, sir.

17

Senator Ferguson: He had certain tasks to carry out

18

against the Marshalls, did he not, under WPL-46? I have a

19

copy if you want to look at it. I have turned up the page

20

on one of your tasks if you will just look at that.

21

Senator Hart: That is correct, Senator. His first task,

22

either given to him in the Navy Department's war plan or

23

following that written into his own contributory plan was a

24

raid on the Japanese Mandate Islands.

25

Senator Ferguson: Could that account for the fact that

Witness Hart

Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

one man, if he had one plan to carry out, would deploy his ships in one way, whereas if he had another plan to carry out he might deploy them in another way?

Senator Hart: Well, the war plan was not in effect until the dispatch was sent which I have just read into the record. Up to that time it was simply a plan, but it did require something to put it into effect.

Now, the dispatch that you mentioned of 27 November said, "preparatory to carrying out the plan."

Senator Ferguson: Yes.

Senator Hart: In the meantime, as I read that dispatch, from anybody's standpoint deployment should be defensive.

Senator Ferguson: Defensive alone or preparatory to carrying out this task?

Senator Hart: It is pretty difficult to figure just where you are going to draw the line and that is the difficulty that any commander-in-chief is always under under such circumstances.

Senator Ferguson: In reading the language that is sent to him,

Senator Hart: In knowing how to act.

Senator Ferguson: Yes, in knowing how to act and understanding it.

Senator Hart: There is no fault with the language at

Witness Hart

Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

1

2

all but on the conditions that face you.

3

4

5

6

Senator Ferguson: I understand then from this language you are not attempting to say how Admiral Kimmel should have deployed his fleet preparatory to carrying out the tasks assigned in WPL-46.

7

8

9

Senator Hart: No. I told Senator Barkley in the preceding session that as to what it might mean that it was difficult to give an opinion on that point.

10

11

12

13

Senator Ferguson: And the fact that you carried this out in a way different than Admiral Kimmel carried his task out is not to be considered a criticism of his method of doing it under this message?

14

15

16

17

Senator Hart: Not at all. There was a vast difference of geography between the two commands. Japan was over three thousand miles away from Pearl Harbor and very much less than that from where the Asiatic Fleet was.

18

19

20

21

22

23

Senator Ferguson: There is one thing, and this is only for the purpose of trying to locate the instrument that you were speaking of, will you describe a little more on the record the so-called historical paper or historical instrument that you looked at in relation to the winds message, that we may be able to locate that if possible?

24

25

Senator Hart: I think that Admiral Redmond probably knows what that is better than I and will know what it means

Witness Hart

Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

if he reads my testimony. It obviously was produced primarily with a view to at some later date being able to show the rest of the Navy what that unit had been engaged in, what it had been trained for and what it had accomplished.

Senator Ferguson: I assume then it had been made out after the attack, that paper?

Senator Hart: Oh, yes. I do not recall but I rather think it was probably produced about January or February 1942.

Senator Ferguson: Now, would you just tell us what office it was in when you saw it, which may help us locate it?

Senator Hart: Office of Naval Communications and it was given me by Admiral Redmond.

Senator Ferguson: And, Admiral, you made no report and was not supposed to make a report on your work that you did in getting this testimony in the, as we call it in this hearing the Hart Report or the Hart hearing?

Senator Hart: No, no findings of fact or opinion were required of me and it would have been going way out of my field to have volunteered any. It was simply what the precept says it is. It was recording testimony that was being forgotten and worse yet was being lost on account of men dying.

I might further say that I did not turn it in as by any means a complete job. A complete job, of course, would have required me to put Admiral Kimmel on the stand as well as



Witness Hart

Questions by: Sen. Ferguson

1

2 Admiral Stark, who was mentioned this morning by Mr. Keefe,  
3 and various other subordinates who were important.

4 At the end of the report I advised the Secretary only  
5 as regards two witnesses, the names were McCollum and Kramer,  
6 whom I had not examined but pointed out that I thought they  
7 did have very pertinent testimony and I probably might well  
8 have gone back to the Pacific, chased them to Australia and  
9 then to the Solomons, in order to get the testimony, but I  
10 decided to close it down at that point.

11 Senator Ferguson: Admiral, you started this in 1944.  
12 Did the Secretary of the Navy state to you why he was doing  
13 this that many years after the happening of the event, as to  
14 what his purpose in getting this testimony was?

15 Senator Hart: No, I don't think Secretary Knox ever  
16 said anything whatever to me about that. All of my dealings  
17 were with Admiral Gatch, quite a little of it is persuading  
18 me that I ought to be willing to take on the task, and while  
19 that was going on I think Admiral Gatch said that Admiral  
20 Kimmel himself had pointed out that situation, that testimony  
21 was being forgotten and lost and that something ought to be  
22 done.

23 Senator Ferguson: So as I understand it, then, the  
24 Navy did not close the matter just because the President had  
25 appointed a Commission and that Commission had made a report;

Witness Hart

Questions by Sen. Ferguson

1

2 that Admiral Gatch desired that the Navy itself perpetuate  
3 this testimony?

4 Senator Hart: You refer to the Roberts Commission,  
5 Senator?

6 Senator Ferguson: Yes.

7 Senator Hart: I doubt if there was any relationship  
8 there. If there was, I did not know of it and it is my im-  
9 pression that I was put on this job because there was a feel-  
10 ing on the part of, - a considerable feeling that better re-  
11 cords ought to be made and that Admiral Kimmel was one of the  
12 leaders in setting that forth.

13 Senator Ferguson: That is all I have.

14 The Vice Chairman: Any further questions?

15 Mr. Richardson: Yes, I have a question.

16 The Vice Chairman: Counsel will inquire.

17 Mr. Richardson: Admiral, might I ask you to turn your  
18 attention to the dispatch of November 24th? Would you care to  
19 offer any statement, Admiral, as to what meaning the words,  
20 "Aggressive movement in any direction", meant to you? In  
21 other words, is the language as broad as it seems or did the  
22 words "aggressive movement in any direction" confine itself  
23 to any particular theatre in your mind?

24 Senator Hart: Well, there are six addressees to this  
25 dispatch.

Witness Hart

Questions by: Mr. Richardson

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Mr. Richardson: That is right.

Senator Hart: The two Commanders-in-Chief afloat and the commanders of four different naval districts, including the one in the Canal Zone, and in specific answer to your question I would read it now as I read it then: They may strike in any direction and particularly watch out in the Philippines and at Guam.

Mr. Richardson: But there can be no place where you have indicated the dispatch went that would not have to bear the burden of interpreting that language as it applied to them?

Senator Hart: Oh, I think that is always the case when a dispatch is written to multiple addressees scattered over as large a portion of the world as this one was scattered.

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Sher--  
Shack  
fls

T

Witness Hart

Questions by: Mr. Richardson

1 Mr. Richardson: Now, if you will turn to the dispatch  
2 of the 27th, would you care to indicate, Admiral, what mean-  
3 ing you gave to the phrase, "This dispatch is to be consid-  
4 ered a war warning"?

5 Did that differentiate this dispatch from other dis-  
6 patches, or was there anything in your mind that was signi-  
7 ficant in the use of those terms?

8 Senator Hart : Well, absolutely. Insofar as I was  
9 concerned, the dispatch might have ended right there, "This  
10 dispatch is to be considered a war warning."

11 Mr. Richardson: Did you regard the subsequent matters  
12 in that dispatch in any extent qualifying or minimizing the  
13 language in the first nine words?

14 Senator Hart: Well, it certainly did not from where I  
15 sat.

16 Mr. Richardson: Now, at the end of the dispatch,  
17 what significance would the phrase "Spinavo inform British"  
18 have? What would that mean to you?

19 Senator Hart: I am not sure that I knew at the time  
20 who Spinavo was. I think he was a liaison man, a naval  
21 officer in London. It meant nothing to me.

22 Mr. Richardson: The inference you got was that the  
23 nature of this dispatch and the purport would come to the  
24 knowledge of the British in that way?  
25

Shack  
fls  
Shel  
hl

Witness Hart

Questions by: Mr. Richardson

1

Senator Hart: Yes, but not through me.

h2

2

Mr. Richardson: That is right. I realize that.

3

4

"Spinavo" would identify someone in London who would advise the British?

5

6

Senator Hart: Yes. It is addressed to him for information.

7

8

Mr. Richardson: That is right.

9

10

Now, Admiral, did you observe, following the attack at Pearl Harbor, that there was any change in the amount of ships and military supplies that were brought into the Pacific area?

11

12

Senator Hart: Did you say after the attack?

13

14

Mr. Richardson: I will repeat that.

15

16

You testified this morning that you asked for and desired additional ships and additional military supplies. You spoke of the fact that Commanders are always doing that.

c2

17

18

I am asking you whether there was any change in the getting of supplies and equipment and ships into the Pacific after Pearl Harbor.

19

20

21

Senator Hart: Certainly not in my area, because it could not be done, and I do not know anything about the rest of the area.

22

23

Mr. Richardson: Now, one question further.

24

25

You spoke about the Japanese having to take into con-

Witness Hart

Questions by: Mr. Richardson

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

h3

sideration the presence of your fleet on their flank, if they proceeded to go down to the Malay barrier.

Would you, as a skilled Naval Commander have regarded the Pacific Fleet which was based on Pearl Harbor as also presenting any flank threat to a Japanese aggressive move?

Senator Hart: Eventually, when they were able to get there.

Mr. Richardson: I have no further questions.

Senator Hart: From Pearl Harbor, the radius over which they could deliver their power did not reach to the Philippines.

Mr. Richardson: I will ask you one thing further.

Would the duty, imposed by a desire for readiness to move under a proper order, under war plan 46, have required a Commander to make the preparation and conditioning of his fleet, his first objective, to get it ready to execute such an order when it should come, at the sacrifice of defensive deployment in the meantime?

Senator Hart: Well, it is a matter of being between the devil and the deep blue sea. It is an occasion where you have to use your judgment and make the right guess, and it does take a certain amount of guessing. A commander could easily make the mistake of taking himself so far afield that the offensive which the Government has a right to expect of its forces, would be too slow in being brought to

Witness Hart

Questions by: Mr. Richardson

h4

1

play.

2

3

On the other hand, if he does not guard himself against an attack sufficiently, he is making another mistake.

4

5

Mr. Richardson: Do you recognize, as a skilled Naval expert any difference in the priority status between a future aggressive movement of the fleet and the protection or the safety of the fleet before that movement?

6

7

8

Is one prior to the other in importance?

9

10

Senator Hart: Any general statement either way, would be no good. Some men err, some commanders err on the side of caution and others err on the other side.

11

12

13

Mr. Richardson: I have no further questions.

14

Senator Brewster: Mr. Chairman.

15

The Vice Chairman: Senator Brewster will inquire.

16

17

Senator Brewster: I apologize for not having been here this morning, and what I have in mind may have been covered, so I shall not try to duplicate.

18

19

As I think I have said to you privately, I did hear from Admiral Helfrick of a message which, as I understood it you sent to him prior to Pearl Harbor dealing with the possibility of moving some parts of your fleet down there.

20

21

22

I am not clear as to what the state of the record is regarding that.

23

24

25

Senator Hart: No, I was not asked that.

Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Brewster

h5

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

I communicated with Admiral Helfrick only informally.

Under peacetime regulations naval ships cannot be sent into foreign ports without a process of getting permission and authority via the State Department.

Well, of course, I was not going to do that, so I sent the ships down to these oil ports ostensibly to get fuel -- and, incidentally, they did get some -- and had word conveyed over to Admiral Helfrick informally what I was doing, and I apprehended that those ships would have a great deal of difficulty in getting any fuel and might be there some days, and please not to raise any row about it.

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D C

fls



Shack (3) pm  
follows  
Hook  
AL-1  
rwr

Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Brewster

Senator Brewster: That was some time prior to December 7?

Senator Hart: About 10 days.

Senator Brewster: That indicated some concern you felt at that time regarding the security of your ships?

Senator Hart: Well, that was the primary reason for sending them down there.

Senator Brewster: Those ships did remain down there?

Senator Hart: Yes, sir.

Senator Brewster: It was thought it would not have been helpful to bring them back to the Philippines to join you?

Senator Hart: You mean after the war broke?

Senator Brewster: Yes.

Senator Hart: Well, their first task was guarding the escape of about 200,000 tons of Allied merchant craft which fled into Manila Harbor and which we got out and to safety. As I stated this morning, Senator, those destroyers and cruisers were both weaker and slower than the Jap opposite numbers, and that, coupled with the superiority in the air which the Japanese obtained within two or three days, meant that they did not have much chance to accomplish anything if they had returned, so I never did bring them back.

Senator Brewster: That is all.

Senator Ferguson: Mr. Chairman, the last answer has

1 Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson

2 brought up a question that was not fully covered, as I  
3 recall.

4 The Vice Chairman: Senator Ferguson.

5 Senator Ferguson: Admiral Hart, you made the statement  
6 this morning, as I recall it, in relation to the transfer  
7 of the ships from the Pacific to the Atlantic, in relation  
8 to your private opinion, or at least your opinion possibly  
9 not through direct Navy channels that you had an opinion  
10 on the matter.

11 Would you explain what you did, or what your opinion was?

12 Senator Hart: I answered to this effect in reply to  
13 a question by Senator Barkley, that I, sitting out where  
14 I was, rather naturally perhaps, could not see any good  
15 reason for having much of our Naval power in the Atlantic  
16 because of our situation in the Pacific, but that I  
17 acknowledged freely that I was not faced with the over-all  
18 responsibility and did not know the situation which con-  
19 fronted our highest levels of command as well as they knew  
20 it themselves.

21 Senator Ferguson: Well, were you of the opinion that  
22 the Pacific Fleet was sufficient, as it was constituted  
23 on the 7th of December, to carry out the war plan against  
24 Japan?

25 Senator Hart: Yes, I thought that they had power

1 Witness Hart

Questions by: Senator Ferguson

2 enough to make a raid into the Japanese Mandated Islands.

3 Senator Ferguson: They were not sufficient to go  
4 further than the Mandated Islands, as constituted?

5 Senator Hart: No. The logistic considerations would  
6 have prevented their reaching much further than the eastern  
7 edge of the Mandated Islands.

8 Senator Ferguson: That, of course, would not have  
9 been true if we had had our entire Fleet in the Pacific?

10 Senator Hart: Well, the entire Fleet, including all  
11 of the logistic power that we had, would have been another  
12 thing. But just the combat ships --

13 Senator Ferguson: No, I mean all of the trains, and  
14 all.

15 Senator Hart: Yes.

16 Senator Ferguson: That we would have been able to  
17 secure.

18 Senator Hart: I do not know how far we would be able  
19 to go.

20 Senator Ferguson: That is all.

21 The Vice Chairman: Senator, the raid you spoke of  
22 into the Mandated Islands, is that what was provided under  
23 the war plans?

24 Senator Hart: Yes.

25 The Vice Chairman: We thank you for your appearance

1 Witness Hart  
2 Witness Layton

Questions by: Mr. Richardson.

3 and the information you have given the committee, and  
4 your apparent desire to be helpful to us in every way.  
5 You are now excused.

6 Senator Hart: Thank you, sir.

7 (Witness excused)

8 The Vice Chairman: Will counsel please call the next  
9 witness?

10 Senator Ferguson: May I ask counsel if they can locate  
11 the report and history that has been talked about so the  
12 committee might see it?

13 Mr. Masten: Yes.

14 Mr. Richardson: We will call Captain Layton.

15 The Vice Chairman: Is Captain Layton the next witness,  
16 Counsel?

17 Mr. Richardson: Yes.

18 The Vice Chairman: Will Captain Layton please come  
19 forward.

20 TESTIMONY OF CAPTAIN EDWIN THOMAS LAYTON,

21 UNITED STATES NAVY

22 (Captain Layton was duly sworn by the Vice Chairman.)

23 Mr. Richardson: Will you please state your full name  
24 to the committee?

25 Captain Layton: Edwin Thomas Layton.

The Vice Chairman: You are a Captain in the United States

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D. C.