(212)

Vol. 40



# Congress of the United States

# 196

Report of Proceedings

Hearing held before

Joint Committee

on the

Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack
S. Con. Res. 27

4 96

January 19, 1946

Washington, D. C.

Pages?480 to 7690

WARD & PAUL

NATIONAL 4266 4267 4268 OFFICIAL REPORTERS

1760 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N. W.
WASHINGTON 6, D. C.



## 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

January 19, 1946

Washington, D. C.

Pages?480 to 7690

4266 4267 NATIONAL

WARD & PAUL (ELECTREPORTER, INC.) OFFICIAL REPORTERS 1760 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N. W.

WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

	CONTENTS	
TESTIMO	MY OF:	PAG
KIMMEL,	Rear Admiral Husband E. (Resumed)	748
	EXHIBITS	•
NUMBER		PAG
126		748
127		748
128		748
74-A		748
113-A		759
113-B		759
129		768

VARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D

18Charity (1) am International Prosecution Sect 7480

S. Con. Res. 27

Saturday, January 19, 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.

.. WASHINGTON. D

Ø

1-1

G

1-1

#### Witness Kimmel

The Chairman: The committee will come to order.

Mr. Murphy was in the process of examining Admiral Example: Proceed.

TESTIMONY OF REAR ADMIRAL HUSBAND E. KIMMEL, U.S. NAVY (Ret. (Resumed)

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Chairman --

The Chairman: I think before you begin counsel have two or three documents they want to make a part of the record.

Mr. Masten: Mr. Chairman, I find in checking the transcript on the three dispatches that were read into the record yesterday, the third of which appears on page 7316, I neglected to state the date of the dispatch. In order that that may be clear on the record I would like to state that that is Dispatch No. 282301, dated November 28, 1941.

As Exhibit 126 we would like to offer three documents which have been distributed to the committee this morning, the first of which is dated February 3, 1941 and is entitled "General Order No. 143, Organization of the Naval Forces of the United States", signed by Frank Knox, Secretary of the Mavy; the second is a single page containing excerpts from Mavy regulations; the third is a document entitled "Pacific Fleet Staff Instructions, 1941".

All of these have to do with the general duties and responsibilities of the Commander in Chief of the Pacific

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D C

-1

5

G

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

#### Witness Kimmel

Fleet and his staff. We would like to offer those as Exhibit 126.

The Chairman: I don't see any paper here that contains only one sheet.

Mr. Masten: It is the third page of the collection of documents the first of which is entitled, up in the upper left-hand corner, "General Order No. 143".

The Chairman: I am talking about those others.

Mr. Masten: It is the third page of that collection, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Oh, I see.

Exhibit 126 will be filed.

(The documents referred to were marked as Exhibit No. 126.)

Mr. Masten: As Exhibit 127, we would like to offer a collection of several letters and memoranda having to do with the air situation in Hawaii after December 7, 1941. At page 77 of Exhibit 113 there is a letter dated January 7 from the Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet to the Commander in Chief of the United States Fleet regarding the aircraft situation in Hawaii.

We would like to offer these as additional information regarding the situation after December 7, 1941.

The Chairman: Without objection they will be filed as

F.

1.5

Witness Kimmel Exhibit 127.

(The documents referred to were marked as Exhibit No. 127.)

Mr. Masten: As Exhibit 128, we would like to offer a collection of letters and memoranda, six in all, having to do with the prosecution of Japanese consular agents in Hawaii. This matter came up at page 6966 of the transcript and these letters or memoranda are the only documents that we have thus far discovered in this general connection.

The first is a letter dated June 4, 1941 addressed to the Attorney General and signed by the United States Attorney for the District of Hawaii. We would like to offer those as Exhibit 128.

The Chairman: It will be so filed.

(The documents referred to were marked as Exhibit No. 128.)

Mr. Masten: And finally, at the request of Senator Ferguson we would like to offer as Exhibit 74 (a) a memorandum dated December 4, 1941 to the Secretary of State signed by Mr. Maxwell Hamilton, regarding a conversation between the First Secretary of the British Embassy and an officer of the Far Eastern Division on December 4, 1941. We would like to offer that as Exhibit 74(a). Exhibit 74 has to do with warnings to nationals.

The Chairman: It will be so filed.

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D C

.3

4

 $I^{\tau}$ 

G

8

9

10

11

12

13

11

15

16

17

10

10

20

21

23

23

24

25

(The document referred to was marked as Exhibit No. 74(a).)

Mr. Masten: That is all we have.

The Chairman: All right, Congressman Murphy.

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Chairman, there has been quite a deal said in the record about establishing the Fleet at Pearl Harbor and as to whether it should have been or should not have been. I think it is pertinent to read into the record et this time a report of the United States Congress on why Pearl Harbor was established.

Now reading from "U.S. Congress, House Committee on Naval Affairs - Establishment of a Naval Base at Pearl Harbor in the Hawaiian Islands", dated 1908:

"The Committee on Naval Affairs, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 18120) to establish a naval station at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, report the same with the recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

"The Hawaiian Islands afford the only possible location for a strong naval base in the central Pacific Ocean for a distance of over 4,000 miles from our western coast.

"Pearl Harbor is beyond question one of the best, if not the best, natural harbor in the world. It has a depth of water of over 60 feet and an area of nearly 10 square miles, and capable of floating the combined navies of the world. It

4

5

0

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

1-1

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

23

24

25

is not only landlocked, but, by reason of the topography of the surrounding ground, ships lying in this harbor are out of view from the open sea. It is the only practicable site for a naval base in the Pacific Ocean, and is the recognized key to naval supremacy in those waters. Its equipment as an operating base is a prerequisite to the most successful operation of our fleets whether offensive or defensive.

"For over sixty-five years the United States Government has officially recognized the strategetic importance of the Hawaiian Islands and the necessity of preventing their occupation by any other nation.

"Beginning in 1842 President Tyler gave notice to all European nations that the United States would never consent to their occupying Hawaii or establishing any naval base there.

"This 'Monroe Doctrine of the Pacific' was reiterated by Daniel Webster, as Secretary of State, in 1851, and by William L. Marcy, the great Democratic Secretary of State, by James G. Blaine, and by William McKinley.

"Captain (now Admiral) A. T. Mahan, writing in 1893, came to the conclusions:

"To anyone viewing a map that shows the full extent of the Pacific, \* \* \* two circumstances will be strikingly and immediately apparent. He will see at a glance that

1.1

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

the Sandwich Islands stand by themselves in a state of comparative isolation, amid a vast expanse of sea; and \*gain, that they form the center of a large circle whose radius is approximately the distance from Honolulu to San Francisco. \* \* \*

This is substantially the same distance as from Homolulu to the Gilbert, Marshall, Samoan, and Society Islands, all under European control except Samoa, in which we have a part influence. \* \* \*

To have a central position such as this, and to be alone, having no rival and admitting no rival, \* \* \* are conditions that at once fix the attention of the strategist.\*\*\*

But to this striking combination is to be added the remarkable relations borne \* \* \* to the great commercial routes traversing this wast expanse.

Too much stress cannot be laid upon the immense disadvantage to us of any maritime enemy having a coaling station well within 2,500 miles, as this is, of every point of our coast line from Puget Sound to Mexico. Were there many others available we might find it difficult to exclude from all. There is, however, but the one. Shut out from the Sandwich Islands as a coal base, an enemy is thrown back for supplies of fuel to distances of 3,500 or 4,000 miles - or between 7,000 and 8,000 going and coming - an impediment

March 2040

### Congress of the United States

# 196

Report of Proceedings

Hearing held before

Joint Committee

on the

Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack
S. Con. Res. 27

4 196

January 19, 1946

Washington, D. C.

Pages?480 to 7690

WARD & PAUL

NATIONAL 4266 4267 4268 (ELECTREPORTER, INC.)
OFFICIAL REPORTERS
1760 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N. W.
WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

### CONTENTS

2	TESTIMONY OF:	PAGE
3	KIMMEL, Rear Admiral Husband E. (Resumed)	7481
4		
5	EXHIBITS	
O	NUMBER	PAGE
7	126	7482
8	127	7483
9	128	7483
10	74-A	7484
11	113-A	7590
12	113-B	7590
13	129	7683
14		
	H	

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

4

G

7

8

9

10

13

13

1-1

15

16

# S. Con. Res. 27

#### Saturday, January 19, 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.

TRANSPORT OF THE PARTY OF THE P

17

19

18

50

21

23

23

24

?

4

F

G

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

10

20

21

23

23

24

25

#### Witness Kimmel

The Chairman: The committee will come to order.

Mr. Murphy was in the process of examining Admiral Kimmel: Proceed.

TESTIMONY OF REAR ADMIRAL HUSBAND E. KIMMEL, U.S. NAVY (Ret (Resumed)

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Chairman --

The Chairman: I think before you begin counsel have two or three documents they want to make a part of the record.

Mr. Masten: Mr. Chairman, I find in checking the transcript on the three dispatches that were read into the record yesterday, the third of which appears on page 7316, I neglected to state the date of the dispatch. In order that that may be clear on the record I would like to state that that is Dispatch No. 282301, dated November 28, 1941.

As Exhibit 126 we would like to offer three documents which have been distributed to the committee this morning, the first of which is dated February 3, 1941 and is entitled "General Order No. 143, Organization of the Naval Forces of the United States", signed by Frank Knox, Secretary of the Mavy; the second is a single page containing excerpts from Mavy regulations; the third is a document entitled "Pacific Fleet Staff Instructions, 1941".

All of these have to do with the general duties and responsibilities of the Commander in Chief of the Pacific

### -

1

2

.73

-1

5

7

G

8

9

10

11

12

14

13

15

16

17

18

20

19

21

23

24

23

25

#### Witness Kimmel

Fleet and his staff. We would like to offer those as Exhibit 126.

The Chairman: I don't see any paper here that contains only one sheet.

Mr. Masten: It is the third page of the collection of documents the first of which is entitled, up in the upper left-hand corner, "General Order No. 143".

The Chairman: I am talking about those others.

Mr. Masten: It is the third page of that collection, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Oh, I see.

Exhibit 126 will be filed.

(The documents referred to were marked as Exhibit No. 126.)

Mr. Masten: As Exhibit 127, we would like to offer a collection of several letters and memoranda having to do with the air situation in Hawaii after December 7, 1941. At page 77 of Exhibit 113 there is a letter dated January 7 from the Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet to the Commander in Chief of the United States Fleet regarding the aircraft situation in Hawaii.

We would like to offer these as additional information regarding the situation after December 7, 1941.

The Chairman: Without objection they will be filed as

WARD & PAUL WASHINGTON.

cattin

Witness Kimmel Exhibit 127.

(The documents referred to were marked as Exhibit No. 127.)

Mr. Masten: As Exhibit 128, we would like to offer a collection of letters and memoranda, six in all, having to do with the prosecution of Japanese consular agents in Hawaii. This matter came up at page 6966 of the transcript and these letters or memoranda are the only documents that we have thus far discovered in this general connection.

The first is a letter dated June 4, 1941 addressed to the Attorney General and signed by the United States Attorney for the District of Hawaii. We would like to offer those as Exhibit 128.

The Chairman: It will be so filed.

(The documents referred to were marked as Exhibit No. 128.)

Mr. Masten: And finally, at the request of Senator Ferguson we would like to offer as Exhibit 74 (a) a memorandum dated December 4, 1941 to the Secretary of State signed by Mr. Maxwell Hamilton, regarding a conversation between the First Secretary of the British Embassy and an officer of the Far Eastern Division on December 4, 1941. We would like to offer that as Exhibit 74(a). Exhibit 74 has to do with warnings to nationals.

The Chairman: It will be so filed.

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D 0

1-1

f"

6

7

8

9

16

11

12

13

1 1

15

16

17

18

10

20

21

23

23

(The document referred to was marked as Exhibit No. 74(a).)

Mr. Masten: That is all we have.

The Chairman: All right, Congressman Murphy.

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Chairman, there has been quite a deal said in the record about establishing the Fleet at Pearl Harbor and as to whether it should have been or should not have been. I think it is pertinent to read into the record at this time a report of the United States Congress on why Pearl Harbor was established.

Now reading from "U.S. Congress, House Committee on Naval Affairs - Establishment of a Naval Base at Pearl Harbor in the Hawaiian Islands", dated 1908:

"The Committee on Naval Affairs, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 18120) to establish a naval station at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, report the same with the recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

"The Hawaiian Islands afford the only possible location for a strong naval base in the central Pacific Ocean for a distance of over 4,000 miles from our western coast.

"Pearl Harbor is beyond question one of the best, if not the best, natural harbor in the world. It has a depth of water of over 60 feet and an area of nearly 10 square miles, and capable of floating the combined navies of the world. It

24

- 1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1-1

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

.

is not only landlocked, but, by reason of the topography of the surrounding ground, ships lying in this harbor are out of view from the open sea. It is the only practicable site for a naval base in the Pacific Ocean, and is the recognized key to naval supremacy in those waters. Its equipment as an operating base is a prerequisite to the most successful operation of our fleets whether offensive or defensive.

"For over sixty-five years the United States Government has officially recognized the strategetic importance of the Hawaiian Islands and the necessity of preventing their occupation by any other nation.

"Beginning in 1842 President Tyler gave notice to all European nations that the United States would never consent to their occupying Hawaii or establishing any naval base there.

"This 'Monroe Doctrine of the Pacific' was reiterated by Daniel Webster, as Secretary of State, in 1851, and by William L. Marcy, the great Democratic Secretary of State, by James G. Blaine, and by William McKinley.

"Captain (now Admiral) A. T. Mahan, writing in 1893, came to the conclusions:

"To anyone viewing a map that shows the full extent of the Pacific, \* \* \* two circumstances will be strikingly and immediately apparent. He will see at a glance that

WARD & PAUL WASHINGTON, D C

4

5

0

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1.1

15

16

17

18

19

20

13

22

23

24

25

Francisco. \* \* \*

Questions by: Mr. Murphy Witness Kimmel the Sandwich Islands stand by themselves in a state of comparative isolation, amid a vast expanse of sea; and again, that they form the center of a large circle whose

radius is approximately the distance from Honolulu to San

This is substantially the same distance as from Hemolulu to the Gilbert, Marshall, Samoan, and Society Islands, all under European control except Samoa, in which we have a part influence. \*

To have a central position such as this, and to be alone, having no rival and admitting no rival, \* \* \* are conditions that at once fix the attention of the strategist. \*\*\* But to this striking combination is to be added the remarkable relations borne \* \* \* to the great commercial routes traversing this vast expanse.

Too much stress cannot be laid upon the immense disadvantage to us of any maritime enemy having a coaling station well within 2,500 miles, as this is, of every point of our coast line from Puget Sound to Mexico. Were there many others available we might find it difficult to exclude from all. There is, however, but the one. Shut out from the Sandwich Islands as a coal base, an enemy is thrown back for supplies of fuel to distances of 3,500 or 4,000 miles or between 7,000 and 8,000 going and coming - an impediment

B

1-7

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

to sustained maritime operations well nigh prohibitive. \* \* \*

It is rarely that so important a factor in the attack or

defense of a coast line - of a sea frontier - is concentrated

in a single position, and the circumstance renders doubly

imperative upon us to secure it if we righteously can.

"Twenty-two years ago, by the reciprocity treaty with King Kalakaua, the United States acquired the right to establish a naval base on Pearl Harbor.

"Ten years ago this nation, foreseeing the likelihood that they might fall into the hands of an Oriental nation, annexed the Hawaiian Islands. This momentous action was taken primarily because of the strategic value of the Hawaiian Islands and for the purpose of establishing a strong naval base on Pearl Harbor.

"Since that time a magnificent site for a naval station, consisting of over 600 acres of land, has been purchased by the Federal Government, and a 30-foot channel has been dredged through the channel bar.

"The War Department has also acquired ample sites for fortifications at the channel entrance, and the first battery is now under construction.

Up to the present time no beginning has been made toward the actual construction of a naval base on Pearl Harbor. Year after year the needs of the Naval Establishment in other

1-1

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

directions have been permitted to crowd it out of the naval bills.

"In the judgment of your committee the new developments on the Pacific and among the nations that border its shores make it imperative that a strong operating base be established for our Navy at Pearl Harbor without further delay.

"A naval base at Pearl Harbor is not designed primarily for the protection of Hawaii. Its main purpose is to form buffer of defense for our entire Pacific coast and to make possible our naval supremacy upon the Pacific.

"An enemy in possession of Hawaii could harass and threaten our entire western coast. On the other hand, with our own fleet operating from a well-equipped base at Fearl Harbor, no fleet from the Orient would find it practicable to threaten our coast, because of the stronghold left in their rear and of the prohibitive distance from their coaling base.

"The equipment of Pearl Harbor is therefore a matter of national prudence and not of extravagance. It affords the nation's least expensive way of defending our Pacific coast it will constitute one of the strongest factors in the prevention of war with any power in the Far East.

"Your committee has received memorials from all of the strongest commercial organizations on the entire Pacific Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

S

.

4

ŗ

7

8

9

10

. .

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Shefner follows

10:15

21

50

10

23

23

24

25

coast, urging that the development of Pearl Harbor be provided for at this session of Congress.

The national importance of this measure is emphasized by the fact that commercial bodies from the Central West and from New York City have also memorialized Congress on this subject during this present session.

"The question of a naval base in Hawaii is not comparable with the same problem in the Philippines. Hawaii is both a permanent organic part of our nation, and is also a source of revenue; during the past eight years Hawaii has paid more than \$9,000,000 into the Federal Treasury.

"Every consideration, whether of national honor or policy, demands that Pearl Harbor be made impregnable and equipped as a naval base immediately.

"With a naval base at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii would be our great defensive outpost; in the hands of an enemy it would double the nation's cost for naval defense."

-1

inational reserve Lection 7490 Witness Kimmel Mr. Keefe: Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Shefner fls LaChar 10:15

.7

.1

7

N: 17-14-1

Mr. Murphy: I will be glad to yield.

Mr. Keefe: As I understand the procedure Admiral Kimmel was under cross examination. I am wondering whether the counsel is now presenting testimony or whether we are going

on with the examination of Admiral Kimmel. If he is making

out a case for himself of some kind here we ought to know about it and all of us can spend the rest of the next week intro-

ducing excerpts from opinions of this person and that person

and the other person. Idid not think there was any dispute

about the facts that have been set forth here in that Naval

Report of 1908 as to Pearl Harbor. I just wonder how far counsel is going to go in reading all this material into the

record at this time.

The Chairman: Well, the chair cannot answer that question. It occurred to the chair that instead of reading the document it might be printed as a part of the transcript at this point so that it will be in the record. It is not my understanding that there is any controversy over the fact that Congress established Pearl Harbor as a naval base.

Mr. Murphy: Are you through, sir?

Mr. Keefe: Yes.

Mr. Murphy: Now, I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that my reason for putting this in is not to destroy my voice nor to take the time of the committee. If I did not think it was

Vosfiet 8 Tie Islier 10.15 \$ (

1.7 0

12

13

1 :

10

17

111

10

20

22

22

23

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

pertinent I would not have put it in, and the fact is that there has been a great deal in this record, as well as throughout the country, about some unusual situation that the President of the United States had ordered the Fleet to Pearl Harbor and there has been testimony of Admiral Richardson as well as Admiral Kimmel as to why the Fleet should be at Pearl Harbor and this is the basic document as to why the United States Congress established the base at Pearl Harbor and if it is not interesting to the gentleman from Wisconsin it may be to the American people. It is to me.

The Chairman: Well, the only point is whether a document that is admitted as an official record of Congress should be read rather than printed as a part of the transcript.

Mr. Murphy: My only reason, Mr. Chairman, in reading it is so that the other members of the committee will know what I am putting in the record, - of course they can read it later,and so that Admiral Kimmel will know what I read and I expect to ask some pertinent questions about the matter that I read.

The Chairman: All right.

Senator Brewster: Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to agree, I would like to say, with the gentleman in the importance of this thing and we have, I think, - and I would like to say this as a member of the minority, - that we have shown considerable latitude to members of the majority in introducing

12

13

11

15

16

17

18

10

20

2.1

22

23

24

-1

1 1

.25

what they deem proper and pertinent and I should be reluctant to see any restrictions imposed upon any individual member as to what they deem to be pertinent.

The Chairman: There has been no restriction imposed upon any member whether he is a member of the majority or minority. The only point is whether these official locuments should be read or put in the record for the sake of the record.

Senator Ferguson: Mr. Chairman, if the Congressman wants to ask questions on this I think he should read it into the record so that the witness will be familiar with the text of it and then he will be in a position to answer questions.

I assume that counsel is going to ask some questions.

The Chairman: Well, it has been read and therefore it is all done and he can proceed to ask questions about it if there are any, and I presume there are.

Mr. Murphy: Now, then, Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct the committee's attention to a report on the inspection of the naval shore establishment in 1929 and 1930 by Ernest Lee Jahnoke, Assistant Secretary of the Navy. I am not going to read the report but there were recommendations at that time back in 1930 that the nation was slow in getting Pearl Harbor in the condition it should be in which to meet the enemy. I won't read that. Anyone who wants to read it can read it.

WARD & PAUL WASHINGTON, D C

2

5

G

7

8

0

10

11

12

13

1 1

15

16

17

15

10

20

15

22

23

24

25

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

Now, then, Admiral, I direct your attention to an exhibit which was placed in the record this morning referring to the aircraft scouting force and dated December the 8th, 1941. Will you kindly look at that?

Mr. Mas ten: It is exhibit 127, Mr. Murphy.

Mr. Murphy: Exhibit No. 127. I direct your attention, Admiral, to page 2, on the second page of the exhibit.

Admiral Kimmel: May I have an opportunity to read this a moment, please, sir?

Mr. Murphy: Yes, surely. I am referring particularly, Admiral, to the letter of the 22nd, on the second page of the exhibit, dated December 22, 1941 and signed "C. L. Tinker."

Admiral Kimmel: What is that, sir?

Mr. Murphy: I say I am referring particularly to the letter of the 22nd, on the second page of the exhibit, dated December 22, 1941 and signed C. L. Tinker, T-1-n-k-e-r, Brigadier General.

Admiral Kimmel: I see it.

Mr. Murphy: I would like to go over with you the items in that letter and go down first to paragraph 1, Section "f" . On December 22, 1941 the order directed that all planes be camouflaged. Were the planes camouflaged before December 7th?

Admiral Kimmel: I think you had better ask General Short about that.

0

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

15

Mr. Murphy: I am asking about Navy planes. Were the

F. Navy planes camouflaged?

> Admiral Kimmel: I read a letter into the record the other day dated in September in which I directed the dispersal of all Navy planes in Oahu and to proceed with the camouflage measures. I am not familiar with the steps that were taken. I presume they were camouflaged; I do not know.

Mr. Murphy: You do not know yourself whether or not the Navy planes were camouflaged ---

Admiral Kimmel: I do not.

Mr. Murphy: (Continuing) -- prior to the morning of December 7th?

Admiral Kimmel: That is right.

Mr. Murphy: Now, paragraph 1, specification "a":

"Ordered immediate wider dispersal of airplanes, supplies and personnel."

And that is exactly what you had done with the Navy planes, isn't that so? I say that is exactly what you had ordered for the Navy planes?

Admiral Kimmel: That is correct.

Mr. Murphy: Paragraph "b":

"Directed surveys to be made of additional fields for operation of aircraft on the Island of Cahu.

Required the movement of pursuit into Hickam

10 17

19

18

21

20

22

23

24

3

4

!

0

7

8

9

16

12

13

1.1

15

10

17

18

10

20

21

22

23

24

Field area for more positive protection in the event of adverse weather at the former base at Wheeler Field.

"d. Moved" --

Admiral Kimmel: Are you asking me about paragraph "b"? Mr. Murphy: No, no, I am reading it into the record, Admiral, because it pertains to the Army.

Admiral Kimmel: Oh, I see.

Mr. Murphy: Paragraph "d":

"Moved obsolescent B-18 and A-20s to Bellows Field to eliminate the airplane congestion at Hickam Field. A-20s were later moved to Wheeler Field.

"e. Moved one squadron B-17s to Wheeler Field to further relieve congestion at Hickam Field."

Paragraph "f" is about the camouflaging of the planes already referred to.

"g. Directed plans be completed for air transport of aircraft ammunition to Maui and Molokai, capable of dispatch on two hours notice.

"h. Have issued orders on alerts as follows:

"1. 30 before sunrise to 0800, and one (19 hour before sunset to 30 after sunset 1/3 Army Pursuit and Nawy fighters in air."

That was not done prior to the seventh? I say that plan was not in effect prior to December 7th?

-3

1

G

8

O

10

1:

12

13

1.7

15

16

17

18

11)

20

21

20

23

24

25

#### Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

Admiral Kimmel: No, that plan wasnot in effect prior to December 7th and my information is that they tried this for a few days and were forced to abandon it because the planes and crews could not stand up.

Mr. Murphy: We will go into that. I am glad to have your information.

Admiral Kimmel: Isn't that correct, sir?

Mr. Murphy: I don't know. I never saw this before. You say that this plan of the 22nd was put into effect and abandoned?

Admiral Kimmel: I am talking about this particular section which you have just read.

Mr. Murphy: Yes.

Admiral Kimmel: In regard to having the planes in the air and warmed up and ready. My recollection is that in a report submitted by the Commander-in-Chief U. S. Pacific Fleet he reported that they had tried that and that they had to abandon it after a short time on account of wear and tear on both crews and planes.

Mr. Murphy: I ask for a copy of that report. We certainly oughly to have it. It is pertinent.

Admiral Kimmel: I have seen it somewhere. I cannot out my fingers on it at the moment.

Mr. Murphy: I am going to request the Navy liaison to

r

а

4)

0

8

0

10

11

12

WARD & PAUL.

1 +

13

15

16

17

18

20

10

2i

22

23

25

24

produce that report so that it can be made an exhibit and until such time I will proceed reading, Admiral:

"All other Army and Navy planes including pursuit excepting searching planes warmed up, manned and ready to take off."

That was not done prior to December 7th, was it?

Admiral Kimmel: I cannot speak for the Army planes.

Mr. Murphy: The Navy?

Admiral Kimmel: No.

Mr. Murphy: Paragraph 2:

"Between 0800 and one (L) hour before sunset:

1/6 Army and Navy Pursuit in air.

1/6 Army and Navy Pursuit warmed up, manned and ready to take off.

"All other Army and Navy planes including fighters excepting searching planes on one hours notice.

\*3. One (1) hour after sunset, 30 minutes before sunrise 1 planes on one (1) hours notice, three-quarters on four hours notice.

"e. I have visited all operating airdromes, made ground reconnaissance of areas where additional airdromes are to be located, have discussed tactical operations, administrative problems, morale and rewards with all major commanders.

?

F.

4

15

0

7

8

8

10

11

13

13

1 1

15

16

17

143

10

20

21

22

23

24

25

#### Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

"j. I have conferred with Com. Pat. Wing Two and expect to submit to the Department Commander within twenty-four hours revised plans for the employment of the Air Force in the Hawaiian area.

"k. I have directed that plans be made and they are well under way for the use of certain elements of the Air Force in offensive operations.

"1. Commanding General, 18th Bombardment Wing, directed to have striking force of minimum of 18 B-17's available at all times."

In connection with that, Admiral, it would be difficult to have 18 prior to December 7th when they only had 6 in commission, isn't that right?

Admiral Kimmel: I did not follow you.

Mr. Murphy: Will you read it, please?

(Question read.)

Admiral Kimmel: Yes, sir.

Mr. Murphy: It is a fact they only had six in commission on the 7th, is that right, Admiral?

Admiral Kimmel: That was my understanding and my belief at the time, yes.

Mr. Murphy: Paragra ph "m";

"Directed that a positive system of aircraft and surface ship identification be arranged. "

Shef-Shack

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

Admiral Kimmel: I think this will be all right, sir.

Mr. Murphy: All right, Admiral. Now then I read paragraph "m":

"Directed that a positive system of aircraft and surface ship identification be arranged."

It is a fact, is it not, Admiral, that you had asked for that equipment before December 7 but was unable to obtain it?

Admiral Kimmel: I have lost you, sir. I do not know where you are right now. I am trying to keep up.

Mr. Murphy: I am now referring to paragraph "m" of the same thing I was reading, Admiral.

Admiral Kimmel: "m"?

Mr. Murphy: Yes.

Admiral Kimmel: I see.

Mr. Murphy: Reading:

"Directed that a positive system of aircraft and surface ship identification be arranged."

The fact is that you did not have the equipment at Pearl Harbor but had requested it before December 7, is that right?

Admiral Kimmel: That is right.

Mr. Murphy: I ask to have spread on the record at this point, Mr. Chairman, from Exhibit 112, a letter dated January 7, 1942, and I refer particularly to page 4 thereof,

3

4

5

0

7

8

0

10

12

13

1.1

15

16

17

18

10

20

21

22

23

24

25

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

paragraph 7.

Admiral Kimmel: Let us catch up, please, sir.

Mr. Murphy: Yes. Page 4, paragraph 7, Admiral, which is page 80 in the exhibit.

Admiral Kimmel: I have it now.

Mr. Murphy: A letter from the Commander in Chief, United States Pacific Fleet, to the Commander in Chief, United States Fleet.

Admiral Kimmel: Yes, I have it.

Mr. Murphy: And I would like to read. Admiral, in connection with what you said that there was a change in the plans that were recommended, in Exhibit 127 the following, paragraph 6 on page 3:

"With these it is not possible simultaneously and effectively to maintain necessary long-range search operations, to keep available a useful air striking force, and to meet constant requirements for special missions, such as covering Submarine contacts and guarding convoy approach and departure, without having on hand for search alone at least three times the number of planes that are needed for search on any given day. There is no way of getting around this if material and personnel are to maintain the pace. Neither one nor the other can do more."

Then paragraph 7, which describes the search actually

1,

4

5

G

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

being made and that it had to be reduced to the following basis, which is therein outlined. That would be in accordance with what you said before, would it not?

Admiral Kimmel: Yes, sir. Probably this is what I was talking about.

Mr. Murphy: Now, Admiral, I am referring to Volume 35 of the testimony in this case and particularly to page 6489. The reason why I am referring to this is at page 6489, which was while Admiral Stark was on the stand and during the course of the morning hour, the distinguished Senator from Michigan had read into the record several messages about the bomb plot and about the report, regularly and irregulatly, at Fearl Harbor to which you have referred.

Incidentally, I think you should have gotten that information, but in order to show what was before the people at Washington, at page 6489 and at 6490 I refer to the general situation, referring to Puget Sound, to San Diego, to the Panama Canal and to Alaska and the Philippines .

Did you know, Admiral, or do you know now that there were messages about those particular areas that were not ship location messages?

Admiral Kimmel: I have heard -- I have not seen the messages, all the messages, but I have been informed, and I believe that in no one of those localities were there

(2)

9

F.

4

15

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1-1

15

16

17

18

10

50

15

22

23

24

25

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

messages of the same character and content as those that were requested by the high officials of the Government of Japan, nor did the high officials of the Government of Japan show any such anxiety as to the location of ships in other localities.

Mr. Murphy: I would agree with you, Admiral, that there was no other message which talked about the plans as to berthing ships, but I ask you to refer to Exhibit 2, at page 34, if you will.

Admiral Kimmel: I have it.

Mr. Murphy: That is a message from Buenos Aires to Tokyo -- or to Panama, rather, --

Mr. Keefe: From Tokyo to Panama?

Mr. Murphy: Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman on the left has made a statement before I started a question and he was going to try to cut me off. We are all men. Now let us not have this needling going on. I want to conduct a fair examination and I do not propose to be cut off.

The Chairman: The Chairman did not hear the remark.

Mr. Murphy: I did.

Mr. Keefe: I did not hear any such remark as that at all, and if he did he does not hear well. That is all I have got to say about it.

The gentleman has asked a question which I did not

4

7

8

0

9

10

11

12

14

13

15

17

16

18

19

20

21

23

22

24

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

understand, and I wanted to understand it. I ask the reporter to read the question so that the members may know what the question is.

The Chairman: Yes, the reporter will read the question.

Mr. Keefe: Let us see what it is.

Mr. Murphy: I ask to have it stricken.

Mr. Keefe: I should like to have it settled, Mr. Chairman, because the gentleman has caustically referred to my interruption and I think the interruption was thoroughly justified.

If the gentleman wants to throw the question out and start over again, I have no objection to that.

The Chairman: Let us proceed, gentlemen.

Mr. Murphy: Now, Admiral, I am referring to Exhibit 2, page 34, and to the message which is on that page. It is from Buenos Aires to Tokyo, and dated the 23rd of September, 1941. It is circular number 146. Then it says, "Buenos Aires to Tokyo #416.

"Strictly secret; C.O.R.

"When Minister Yamagata was in Panama he was asked by the Italian Minister there to deliver some maps and charts of the Panama Canal Zone for him, which he did. Since then, we had Usui go to Chile to take charge of those maps and upon their arrival here they were delivered to the Italian Ambassador. At the same time, we requested that we be given

Witness Kimmel

copies of them.

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

٦,

G

Hook 21

"Recently, these copies were delivered to us. (At the time of this delivery, Assistant Attache Kameda and Usui were present to ascertain that they were exact copies of the originals). And we entrusted them to our Navy's courier Tatuma who is returning home on the Buenos Aires Maru.

"The Italian Ambassador here requests that upon the arrival of these papers in Tokyo, we notify the Italian Government to that effect through (our Embassy in Rome?)

"Minister Yamagata has already advised Chief of Bureau Terasaki regarding this matter. The Navy has also sent a report."

That would be an inquiry which would be rather pertinent whether they wanted maps of the Panama Canal, wouldn't it, Admiral?

Admiral Kimmel: I see nothing which indicates that the Government of Japan wanted maps of the Panama Canal. That follows the pattern of Japanese espionage over many years.

hl fls AL

1

2

3

4

5

8

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Mr. Murphy: You say if you saw the one about Pearl Harbor, in the month of September and translated on October 10, about the bomb plot, that would have changed your whole plan?

Admiral Kimmel: That is right.

Mr. Murphy: This is one in September also, looking for maps of the Panama Canal, maps and charts.

Admiral Kimmel: Yes.

Mr. Murphy: Would that indicate a special interest in the Panama Canal?

Admiral Kimmel: The difference I think is that in the one case this was information which had been gathered by the local espionage units in the ordinary course of their duties, and was being sent to Tokyo. I can see mothing in this message, and any other messages that I have had access to, where the Government in Tokyo was seeking and demanding this information at that particular time.

Now, incidentally, I think this message might well have been supplied to me as well as the others. I did not mention it at the time.

Mr. Murphy: At any rate, Admiral, as I understand you, the distinction you make is it is significant if Tokyo asked for it, but not significant if it is supplied to

& GRAW WASHINGTON. D.

19

21

20

22

23

5

3

6

8

7

9

10

13

12

15

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

23

25

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

Witness Kimmel

Tokyo?

Admiral Kimmel: Significant that Tokyo asked for it and related information on several occasions.

Mr. Murphy: Let me come again to the Panama Canal.

At page 36, from Panama to Tokyo. This is a message dated October 2, 1941.

"Since the recent shift in military aviation efforts to the Pacific Area the 'Panama Air Depot' located at France Field was transferred to Curundu Heights (immediately adjacent to Albrook Field).

"Rear Admiral SANDLER, Commander of the 15th Naval District, since the extensive activities on the Pacific end of the Canal, made public on the 1st a statement to the effect that because of the increase of neval supplies a four-story warehouse built on pier 18 (it will be completed the middle of November), the ammunition unloading pier (west of pier 18) consisting of 32 buildings, and the existing buildings in the neighborhood of the Balboa dry dock would all be taken over as warehouses. Furthermore, the petroleum supply tank at Boca on the Pacific side and at Mt. Hope (the railroad junction from which the line branches to Colon and Ft. Randolph) on the Atlantic side . (recently it is believed that these tanks have been camouflaged) have been taken over.

1 h3

4

2

3

5

6

8

7

0

10

12

13

14

16

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

23

25

"There are intelligences at hand concerning the construction of a food storage depot at Corozal which would contain sufficient foodstuffs to supply the Canal Zone for a six-month period, even though shipping routes between this point and the United States are severed."

Would that mean anything to you if you were at Washington and you had these series of messages about that particular area?

Admiral Kimmel: I think this is in the same category as the previous message.

Mr. Murphy: They are talking about camouflaging oil tanks and the like, and giving certain vital military information to Tokyo there, are they not?

Admiral Kimmel: They are giving military information to Tokyo.

Mr. Murphy: Yes.

Do you think that you should have had that message also?

Admiral Kimmel: I see no reason why it should not have been supplied to me.

Mr. Murphy: You were awfully busy as it was without reading hundreds of additional messages, were you not?

Admiral Kimmel: I had a sizable staff out there.

Mr. Murphy: All right.

h4

в

1+

- 7

Now, I refer you, Admiral, to page 122 of the same exhibit 2, this being a message from Tokyo to Mexico, from the Tokyo Jap Foreign Minister to Mexico, Koshi, dated 23 June, 1941. No. 106.

"Regarding the plans for procuring maps of the Panama Canal and vicinity, please have career attache Kihara make an official trip to Panama. (It might be well to have secretary Yoshimizu accompany him).

Have the maps taken out by plane, and then have Sato, the Naval Attache, bring them to Tokyo with him when he returns.

Furthermore, since the Panama Legation, in their #62\* from Panama to me, mentioned the question of a trip get in touch with them regarding date and time of arrival. (American surveillance will unquestionably be vigilant. There are also some suspicions that they read some of our codes. Therefore, we wish to exercise the utmost caution in accomplishing this mission. Also any telegrams exchanged between you and Panama should be very simple.\*\*)"

Would not that show an unusual interest on the part of Tokyo in the Panama Canal?

Admiral Kimmel: That shows an interest, yes.

Mr. Murphy: And would not that have been before the authorities in Washington when they were wondering where

h5

в

-1.

Witness Kimmel Questions by: Mr. Murphy the Japanese were going to strike, if they were going to strike?

Admiral Kimmel: I presume it was before them.

Mr. Murphy: Don't you think that adds a chapter, at least, to your impression about the bomb plot message, that that directed that the attack was going to happen at Hawaii?

Admiral Kimmel: I see nothing here requesting specific information of ships in the harbor, or their location
in the harbor, and that type of information is good just
so long as the ships remain where they are. This information is information of more or less permanent installations which will be good for a long time.

Mr. Murphy: The fact is. Admiral, however, that the authorities in Washington. on deciding where the Japs were going to strike, did have this before them, as well as the bomb plot message?

Admiral Kimmel: Oh, yes, I presume they did.

Mr. Murphy: I would like to now refer you, Admiral, to page 125 of the same exhibit. This is a message from Vladivostok to Tokyo, dated July 3. 1941.

"Report on recent naval activities in this area.

"Since the beginning of the German-Soviet war the naval authorities here have tightened up on watch and

h6

в

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

are engaged in naval preparations by enforcing various exercises to meet any eventuality. However, naval exercises are limited to only one section of the force for there are many ships which are undergoing repairs. Evidently the preparations are intended for defense against Japan."

I am wondering, Admiral, if that kind of a message had been sent by Japanese espionage from Hawaii to Tokyo, if there would have been am attack on Hawaii? They say there the Russians are prepared to meet any eventuality. They could not have said that about Hawaii, could they? You were not prepared to meet any eventuality on Hawaii, were you?

Admiral Kimmel: I think you are a better judge of that, or the committee is a better judge of that, sir.

Mr. Murphy: At any rate, you had nothing at all to take care of an oncoming air raid by way of reconnaissance, did you, or any radar working at the time, or any watchers on the hills, at the observation posts, or any pursuit planes in the air, or any ships out scouting to the north from which they came, you did not have that, did you?

Admiral Kimmel: The evidence answers all of those questions very conclusively.

Mr. Murphy: At any rate, there was a message from

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

Admiral Kimmel: I only speak of the language here, that is all.

Mr. Murphy: It says, "-- in naval preparations by enforcing various exercises to meet any eventuality."

Of course, that may not mean what I think it does, but it is English, and we can both interpret it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to the fact

Admiral Kimmel (interposing): Certainly in the Hawaiian area we had had exercises designed to meet any eventuality.

Mr. Murphy: You had exercises right along up to
November 20, and after November 20 you had no more exercises,
did you?

Admiral Kimmel: Oh, yes.

Mr. Murphy: With the army. You did not have any exercises after November 20, did you, with the army?

Admiral Kimmel: I do not recall those details, but we had exercises designed to meet any eventuality, up to and including December 7th.

Mr. Murphy: The fact is that you had no exercises with the Army after November 20, did you, of 1941?

Admiral Kimmel: I do not know. You have some records on that which I presume are correct.

fls

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

Mr. Murphy: All I know is what was put in the record.

Admiral Kimmel: You are talking now about an air raid drill. That is by no means the only exercise to meet eventualities.

Mr. Murphy: It was a very important one, w asn't it, Admiral, reconnaissance?

Admiral Kimmel: Yes, it was important, and we held the drills regularly and as completely as possible.

Mr. Murphy: Now, then, Admiral, I direct your attention to page 6491 of the record.

Admiral Kimmel: Page what?

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

Mr. Murphy: I am just putting this in the record. I am referring to page 6491 of the printed record at which refer-

Mr. Murphy: Yes. That is another message from Panama

"The result of my investigations, as I reported in

"1. The airplane bases which the United States is constructing are located at La Chorrera in Panama province, (please refer to part 4 of my #149) Chitre in Herrera province, Monsabo in Los Santos province and at Remidios and Las Ra-Hasu

"2. The Panamanian airports already constructed which will be converted into military establishments are the ones at David in Chiriqui province and Paidonya outside the limits

"3. Airports which have been surveyed but because of the poor condition of the terrain have not been constructed, are the airports at Guarare in Los Santos province and at

Does that also show an additional interest on the part

Admiral Kinmel: They were always interested in the

defenses of Panama.

Mr. Murphy: Now I would like also to refer to page 39 of the same exhibit, from Panama to Tokyo, dated October 18, 1941, where the statement is made:

"In order to find out the plans of the Canal command,
I inspected the military establishment at the Pacific end on
the 10th."

And again:

"I found that construction is going on at a rapid rate and the whole area is being covered with fortifications."

Admiral Kimmel: I have lost you, sir.

Mr. Murphy: I will read the whole thing. I have been reading only the high lights.

Admiral Kimmel: What is that?

Mr. Murphy: I will read the whole thing:

"Ship movements from the 14th to the 18th:

"Moving toward the Pacific: 4 American, 1 British freighters; 2 American tankers.

"Moving toward the Atlantic: 4 American, 2 British, 1 Dutch freighters; 1 American tanker, 1 American passenger steamer. Recently ships have been going through the canal at night.

In order to find out the plans of the Canal command,
I inspected the military establishment at the Pacific end

3

3

4

5

0

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

٤

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

on the 10th. (Naturally they do not allow us to inspect the forts.) I found that construction is going on at a rapid rate and the whole area is being covered with fortifications. Specifically, at Albrook Field, 3 large hangars, storehouses for airplane parts, underground tanks, and 8 barracks to accommodate 200 men each.

"At Corozal, 4 two-hundred-men barracks, 55 two-family officer's quarters and a 500-patient hospital are nearing completion."

That again would show an active interest of Tokyo in the Panama Canal area, would it not?

Admiral Kimmel: It shows an interest, yes.

Mr. Murphy: Now, then, I direct your attention to an entry on page 40, from the Panama Canal, or from Panama to Tokyo, dated October 18, 1941, and you will find in that particular message, Admirel, without my reading it, a reference to gun emplacements at Panama.

Admiral Kimmel: A reference to what kind of place? Mr. Murphy: Gun emplacements.

Admiral Kimmel: I presume so. I haven't read it.

Mr. Murphy: Now I direct your attention to page 51. That particular message, while it is dated November 22, 1941, it is translated December 25, 1941. Of course that was before the Japs but not before Washington, but I think

G

it shows the course of conduct of the Japanese.

You will find the following:

"The United States Government is going on the assumption that the attack on the Canal will be made from both air and sea."

Do you see that, Admiral?

Admiral Kimmel: Yes, I see it.

Mr. Murphy: I would like to direct your attention to page 52, a message from Panama to Tokyo, dated November 22, 1941:

"The anti-air defenses (?) on lock #1, which is now being used, are being improved. (Of course, there are anti-air defenses (?) at lock #3.) The naval defense area, patrolled against possible lightning attacks, extends in the north from Salina Cruz on the Tehuantepec Isthmus to Monepene (on ?) the Gulf of Fonseca. The southern limits extend to the air base on the Galapagos Islands."

That would seem to divide up Panama a bit, wouldn't it, as to air defenses, and as to what they have in each section?

Admiral Kimmel: The message speaks for itself there.

Mr. Murphy: We 1, Admiral, they talk about anti-aircraft defenses on lock 1, and again on lock 3, and then talk about the naval defense a ea, don't they?

Admiral Kimmel That is right.

G

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

Mr. Murphy: Now, Mr. Chairman, on page 6493 of the record, in order that the committee, or whoever desires to read in the record the messages which are along the lines which I have referred at the Panama Canal, covering Alaska, covering the Philippines and the other areas, are referred to by me by page numbers.

The stenographer has copied into the record all of the entries referred to by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, but he has not copied into the record the references which I have given, but only shows the page numbers.

I ask that at this point in the record the entries on the pages referred to on page 6493 be spread in the record. The Chairman: Without objection it will be so ordered.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D C

Hook 16

hl

Witness Kimmel

Manila From:

Tokyo To:

August 20, 1941

#532

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Re your Circular #17932.

I am reporting to you below information which I have been able to get, though it may be somewhat incoherent.

1. There are many tall buildings in the city, to the ipper stories of which admittance is forbidden. It is thought, therefore, that anti-aircraft guns have been placed in them. It is fairly certain that guns have been placed on the Great Eastern Hotel (some have actually seen ten disguised machine guns on the top of it), the (hitchcock?) Avenue Hotel (this is the former Marco Polo Hotel), and on the Insular Life and the Trading Commerce. Besides these, I presume guns have been placed on top of the Capitol, the Municipal Building, the post office, etc. (I believe that the army and the navy both have in their possession a map giving the locations of the tall buildings in the city).

2. A person has seen during the evenings in the latter part of July, 3 anti-aircraft guns being transported to Camp Murphy.

a - Not available. 21461

8/26/41 (6) Trans.

h2

```
Witness Kimmel
               to Borneo.
h3
     2
              Town in British North Borneo.
     3
          d - In Netherlands Borneo.
     4
                                         Trans. 11/7/41 (6)
                       24468
          ARMY
     5
     в
          From: Tokyo
     7
          To: Davao
     8
          October 2, 1941
     9
          #62
    10
                    Re your #105ª.
    11
                    Please wire me the location and movements of
    12
          fishermen and ---- since your last report.
    13
          a - Not available .
    14
                      25697
                                          Trans. 12-4-41 (6)
          ARMY
    15
    16
          From: Tokyo (Toyoda)
    17
                Manila
          To:
    18
          October 4, 1941
    19
          #318
    20
               I want you to make a reconnaissance of the new defense
    21
          works along the east, west and southern coasts of the Island
    22
          of Luzon, reporting on their progress, strength, etc. Also
    23
          please investigate anything else which may seem of interest.
    24
                                            Trans. 10/8/41 (6)
          ARMY
                   23207
```

Witness Kimmel

From: Manila (Nihro).

To: Tokyo

1 November 1941

(RE your #318)

Strict guard is being maintained hence the gathering of information is extremely difficult. We are making secret investigations but I will wire you the following newspaper and foreign office reports for the present.

1. The incorporation of the Philippine Army into the Far Eastern Army is progressing slowly but surely and it is reported that by the end of the year the incorporation of 120,000 will be completed. Additions to the barracks at the various camps are being rushed to completion. It seems that particular emphasis is being placed on the concentration of military strength.

Localities are as follows:

Kabanatuan, San Marcelino - - - - - -

- (several groups missing).

in the number of soldiers stationed in the vicinity Lingayen during the month of November. Army maneuvers are to be carried out during the widdle of the month. This may be a temporary measure.

h5 2

в

2. In the vicinity of Mariveles more than 3000 workmen are being used to rush the work on the various projects. However, there are not more than 300 infantry and cavalry troops stationed there.

On the 27th, what I estimated to be between 2000 and 3000 infantry troops left Mamila by bus headed north. Their destination may have been the above place. It is being investigated at present. It appears that three airports are being built there and the docks are being enlarged.

In the Bataan area the surveillance is particularly strict and it is said that even the entry of Filipinos is prohibited.

3. Work is being rushed on the road between Dingalan and RAARU (Laur?) and by the middle of October there were less than two kilometers that had not been completed and this will be finished in the near future. The road between Infanta and Manila is being widened to 5 meters. Work is being carried on day and night and the progress is amazing.

4. In Iba there are 30 or 40 fighter planes, 20 or 30 light bombers and several score of altitude planes (?) it is said.

Details by Mail.

```
Witness Kimmel
          *JD-1: 5681. "I want you to make a reconnaissance of the
h6
          new defense works along the east, west and southern coasts
     3
          of the island of Luzon, reporting their progress, strength,
     4
          etc. Also please investigate anything else which may seem
     5
          of interest."
     в
          (SIS #23207)
     7
                                  (H) Navy Trans. 11-4-41(S-TT)
          JD-1:
     8
          24382
     9
    10
                 Manila (Hihro)
          From:
    11
                 Tokyo
          To:
    12
          November 4, 1943
    13
          #726
    14
               PISU, HON, BERU D-8, 5-13 and M-3 left on the after-
    15
          noon of the 3rd, destination unknown
    16
          and D-1 are new in Haku (Brazil ?)
    17
          ARMY 24691
                                        Trans. 11/13/41 (6)
    18
    19
         From:
                 Manila (Nihro)
    20
          to:
                 Tokyo
    21
          November 4, 1941
    22
         #727
    23
                    Intelligence.
    24
```

1. Since about a month ago little by little brown

h7

2

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

long.

concrete bridges.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Lingayen Gulf.

ARMY 24626

4. At the foot of a hill situated to the north of Teraiso (the hill overlooks the Lingayen Gulf) about 200 barracks have been constructed. I understand that new barracks are being built at Ste Ignatia.

5. From what I hear the American soldiers stationed at Stotsenburg maintained an arrogant attitude toward the Filipinos and, since there have been two or three cases of assault on Filipinas, the Filipinas are furious.

soldiers have been arriving at the Stotsenburg Barracks.

The number at present is about two or three thousand. In

view of the fact that these soldiers speak Spanish, they

2. Taraiao a. Recently the Miguel Air Field

All the wooden bridges on the national highway

may be "Iko's." I understand that they are not very

friendly with American soldiers. We are now secretly

has been extended to forms rectangle about 1,000 meters

between Taraiao and Lingayen have been replaced with

investigating where they have come from.

a - Tarallo, Camarines Province.

b - Pangasinan Province, Luzon, Philippine Islands on

Trans. 11/12/41 (6)

Page & PAUL. WARHINGTON. D. C.	1	Witness Kimmel
	2	From: Tokyo
	3	To: Manila
	4	5 November 1941
	5	#355
	в	For Secretary Yuki.
	7	The Naval General Staff has requested that
	8	investigation be made on the following items. Please
	9	arrange as you think best for the same:
	10	These items in regard to each port of call:
	11	(1) Conditions at air ports on land.
	12	(2) Types of planes at each, and number of
	13	planes.
	14	(3) Warships; also machinery belonging to
	15	land forces.
	16	(4) State of progress being made on all
	17	equipment and establishments.
	18	JD-1: 6424 (F) Navy Trans. 11-13-41(6-AR)
	19	24696
	20	
	18	From: Menia (Nihro)
	22	To: Tokyo
	23	November 12, 1941
	24	#754
	25	According to a report handed on to me by a Japanese

h9

11.

Witness Kimmel

who has lived in the Province of Ilocos Norte for some fourteen or fifteen years, the following has been ascertained.

- 1. At the present time there are approximately 400 Philippine soldiers and seven or eight officers stationed in Lacaga. It is being rumored, however, that the Philippine troops will be increased to approximately 1,700. At the present time they are constructing additional barracks.
- 2. There seems to be no indication that they plan the expansion of the present civil airport in Lacag (length 1,200 metres; width, 850 metres) nor are they stationing any military planes at that field. Aside from a reconnaissance flight nightly (one plane) over the coastal area in the vicinity of the city, no extensive activity is in progress.
- 3. Though it is said that Claveriab and Burgosb are being equipped with ----, the details are unknown.

  (I am continuing my private investigations in this connection.)
- a Seaport in the Province of Ilocos Norte on the Island of Luzon, P. I.
- b Towns on the northern shore of the Island of Luzon, P.I.

ARMY 25064

Trans. 11/21/41 (6)

hlo

ã

в

Witness Kimmel

From: Manila (Nihro)

To: Tokyo

November 12, 1941

#755

A report given me by a Japanese who resides in Camarines Norte<sup>a</sup> is as follows:

- 1. In that area at the present time there does not seem to be many troops stationed. Only about 60 members of the Philippine Patrol organization, with headquarters im Daet<sup>b</sup>, are located in that area. Every day five or six of these patrolmen are dispatched as a relief unit to Paracale<sup>c</sup> and Jose Panganiban<sup>d</sup>.
- 2. The Civil Airport at Paracale is not being used at the present time. Insofar as the military air field at Daet is concerned, though one or two military planes landed there during February of this year, from that time to this there has not been a single military plane alight on this field. As this field is located right on the beach, should it be necessary it is said that naval planes could land in the shipping lane just off the beach as well.
- 3. On the point of land, San Muricio<sup>e</sup>, north of
  Jose Panganiban it is rumored that they are equipping ---with ----, but this has not been verified. (I am continuing my secret investigations.)

hll ;

Witness Kimmel

4. Twelve or thirteen coastal reconnaissance planes were seen to have flown over the area within a period of three days. Toward the latter part of last year 13

American freighters are said to have entered the port of Panganiban. Since then, almost on the average of once week, American freighters sail from Batganas to Hondaguag.

ARMY 25162

From: Tokyo

To: Manila

15 November 1941

#368

Strictly confidential.

Re your #746\*

Please ascertain by what route the large bombers went to the Philippines, and also please make investigations again as to their number.

(SIS #24850)

\*JD-1: 6545. Reports 32 B-19 bombers in the Philippines.

JD-1: 6753 25236

(H) Navy Trans. 11-24-41 (AR)

hl4

в

USAW

About 12 planes (of medium size) used by the Philippine
Army, have been transported to Java by air, and 12 or 13
American Army planes (monplanes - whether they were scout
planes or pursuit planes was not clear), are now stationed
there. In addition to these there is one large bomber in
the hangar (double type, capacity 40 planes.)

3. The headquarters of the former patrol force are being used as the commisariat storehouse and all sorts of provisions are being stored there.

American warships anchored on the northwest coast of the Sulu Archipelago. Around the middle of October two destroyers and one cruiser entered Cebu harbor and early this month, one oil supply ship of the 20,000 ton class, and a camouflaged cruiser of the 10,000 ton class, entered port and anchored for two or three days. It has been recognized that occasionally two or three American ships anchor around the south of Mactan, Bacol, and Panglao.

5. There is an open drydock at MAKUGAA (operated by Chinese) capable of handling ships up to 10,000 tons.

JD-1: 6587 24933

(H) Navy Trans. 11-18-41 (S-TT)

в

WARD

иотринави.

Witness Kimmel

About 12 planes (of medium size) used by the Philippine
Army, have been transported to Java by air, and 12 or 13
American Army planes (monplanes - whether they were scout
planes or pursuit planes was not clear), are now stationed
there. In addition to these there is one large bomber in
the hangar (double type, capacity 40 planes.)

- 3. The headquarters of the former patrol force are being used as the commisariat storehouse and all sorts of provisions are being stored there.
- American warships anchored on the northwest coast of the Sulu Archipelago. Around the middle of October two destroyers and one cruiser entered Cebu harbor and early this month, one oil supply ship of the 20,000 ton class, and a camouflaged cruiser of the 10,000 ton class, entered port and anchored for two or three days. It has been recognized that occasionally two or three American ships anchor around the south of Mactan, Bacol, and Panglao.
- 5. There is an open drydock at MAKUGAA (operated by Chinese) capable of handling ships up to 10,000 tons.

JD-1: 6587 24933

(H) Navy Trans. 11-18-41 (S-TT)

Manila (Nihro) From: To: Tokyo 2 November 22, 1941 3 #785 4 A camouflaged British cruiser (guessed to be 4 or 5 5 thousand tons; having 8 guns; name unknown) entered port on 6 the morning of the 21st and anchored at Pier #7, sailing at 5 7 in the afternoon, destination unknown. 8 On the 21st an American transport (rumored to be the 9 President Harrison) entered port and took on soldiers (number 10 unknown) and material. 11 Boats anchored in port on the 22nd were: 12 Manila -- Portland (entered the port on the 13 21st); Marblehead; Black Hawk; Isabel; Heron; Wohotosua; one 14 mine layer; 9 destroyers; 20 submarines. 15 Cavite -- Houston (?); Canopus. 16 a - Kana spelling. 17 Trans. 11/29/41 (6) 25471 ARMY 18 19 Manila (Nihro) From: 20 Tokyo To: 21 November 24, 1941 22 #789

Putting together various reports, it appears that

a large amount of military stores was removed from the "port

WLC

23

24

в

..

area" during the "black-out" on the night of the 21st. Forty or fifty civilian buses (carrying the "mark" of the Manila Electric Company) were seen in the Rizal Province district. Investigations are being made to find out if these were loaded with troops.

- 2. At about two o'clock in the afternoon of the 22nd, 60 light tanks (carrying one gun two \_\_\_\_) and 20 ammunition trucks were seen leaving (Quezon Bridge?). These light tanks and ammunition trucks were seen on the 21st grouped near the headquarters of the "port area" military police. It is conjectured that (troops?) arrived on military boats recently entering the harbor. An English language "bulletin" of the 24th stated that a large number of light tanks and ammunition trucks had left at four and six o'clock on the afternoon of the 22nd in transit for Meycuayan in Bulacan Province and San Fernando in Pampanga Province. I believe that these had been landed sometime around the 21st. The final destination of these tanks and trucks is now being investigated.
- 3. At present it is seen that there are two or three hundred American army trucks near the "port area" which have been imported at short intervals, creating a hurried atmosphere. Also, troops have newly arrived at (certain places in ?) the hills within the city. They are evidently American reinforcements. Feeling among the people in general has become tense.

ARMY 25530 Trans. 12/1/41 (6)

```
Menila (Nihro).
     From:
      To : Tokyo
 2
      26 November 1941
 3
     #790
 4
5
                                            On the 23rd a camouflaged
     submarine tender, the Holland* (5 or 6 thousand tons, apparently
6
     a camouflaged Dutch vessel), entered port.
 7
                                             On the 24th, 5 submarines
8
                                       2.
     left port, destination unknown.
9
10
                                       3.
                                             On the 25th, 7 destroyers
     left port, destination unknown.
     *Probably the U.S.S. HOLIAND of 8000 tons).
12
                                 (H) Navy Trans. 12-4-41 (6-AR)
     JD-1: 7035 25708
13
14
             Manila (Nihro).
     From:
15
     To:
             Tokyo
16
17
     27 November 1941
     #797
18
19
                                      The Portland, BUKKU*, 2
     destroyers, 10 submarines, left port on the 26th (?).
20
     Destination unknown.
21
     *Probably Black Hawk
22
23
     JD-1: 7082
                    25782
                                   (H) Navy. Trans. 12-5-41 (6-AR)
24
```

Tokyo To: November 28, 1941 #799 Recently they have utilized a group of nine planes (one flight of six and another of three planes) in high-level scouting patrols over the city of Manila from four o'clock in the morning. In addition, three other planes fly over the city independently. Though in the morning and evening the weather is clear and windless, squalls come once a day. Trans. 12/5/41 (6) ARMY 

Manila (Nihro)

п. иотамінеам

From:

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

h15

Mr. Murphy: Admiral, was it not your feeling while you were Commander in Chief of the Fleet, that you had an attack force mission to perform and that you should not be chliged to participate in the defense of the Hawaiian Islands as such; I mean the base itself?

Admiral Kimmel: I felt, and I believe all the Navy felt, that the real mission of the Pacific Fleet was offensive, and I think that nothing has ever occurred to change that conviction in the minds of any responsible Naval officers.

Mr. Murphy: At any rate, I would like to refer your attention to a letter which you wrote, and in which you objected to having the combined houses for the Army and Navy.

By the way, there was a proposition, was there not, that the Army and Navy Commanders, the C ommanding General and Commander in Chief of the Fleet at Hawaii be housed together in the same building? That was made prior to December 7, was it not?

Admiral Kimmel: My recollection of that is that that referred to an information center.

Mr. Murphy: No, I think you will find it is beyond that.

Mr. Masten: Mr. Murphy, that is Exhibit 123.

DRAW

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

Mr. Murphy: Will you get that exhibit for the Admiral please?

(The document was handed to Admiral Kimmel.) Mr. Murphy: Do you have Exhibit 123 before you?

Mr. Murphy: I direct your attention to the second page of that exhibit, being a letter from the Commandant Fourteenth Naval District, for the Chief of Naval Operations.

Admiral Kimmel: Yes, I have Exhibit 123.

Admiral Kimmel: Wait a minute. Will you say that again?

Mr. Murphy: I direct your attention to the second page of the exhibit, a letter dated November 3, 1941.

Admiral Kimmel: Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Mr. Murphy: From the Commandant, Fourteenth Naval District, to the Chief of Naval Operations, by way of the Commander in Chief, U. S. Pacific Fleet.

Admiral Kimmel: Yes.

Mr. Murphy: Paragraph 1 says:

"It is recommended that no steps be taken at the present time to concentrate the Army and Navy in a common building as proposed in reference (a)."

That was a plan to combine how much of the Army and Navy, Admiral?

Admiral Kimmel: My recollection of all this is that that was a common information center. Under date of the 15th of October, 1941, you will see a dispatch. He says:

"Your dispatch 140400 to BUDOCKSX request consideration be given to construction of combined operating center sufficient in size and facilities to accommodate in time of emergency staffs of all essential operating activities of both Army and Navy in Hawaii such as CINCPAC COMFOURTEEN COMTRAIN COMSUBFOR COMPATWING and parallel activities of Army. CNO considers contemplation of Army and Navy activities in one building of proper construction constitutes great advantage for emergency operations. Comment with recommendations including location and estimate of cost requested."

Mr. Murphy: Was not that to combine all of you in one

17 18

19

21

20

22

23

24

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

1

2

3

4

5

0

7

Ð

10

8

(9) \$ 11

7 12

13

15

16

17

19

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

building?

Admiral Kimmel: It is a combined operating center.

Mr. Murphy: It says, "operating activities \*\*\* of CINCPAC COMFOURTEEN". Would not that put you and Admirs! Bloch together in the same building?

Admiral Kimmel: If that had been carried out, yes.
That is what it says.

Mr. Murphy: I say that is the recommendation, is it not?

Admiral Kimmel: It would not necessarily put me and

Admiral Bloch in the same building. It would put the operating

staffs necessary for the Army and Navy together in the building.

Mr. Murphy: In the November 3rd letter Admir: Bloch says:

"I do not believe that the Commander in Chief or the Fleet operations would be benefitted by being in a common office building with the Commanding General and the Commandant, Fourteenth Naval District."

That was his version of it there, wasn't it, at the bottom of the page, in paragraph 5, about the fifth line up from the bottom?

Admiral Kimmel: What is that?

Mr. Murphy: Referring to the letter of November 3, 1941, paragraph 5, the fifth from the last line.

Admiral Kimmel: Yes. What about it?

b

8.71

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

Mr. Murphy: It says there, "I do not believe that the

Commander in Chief or the Fleet operations would be benefitted by being in a common office building with the Commanding General and the Commandant, Fourteenth Naval District."

So that his impression apparently was that they were discussing putting all three of you in the same building, isn't that right?

Admiral Kimmel: Yes, they were discussing that.

Mr. Murphy: Yes.

Admiral Kimmel: The operating agencies.

I might shorten up your work here if you want to, however.

Mr. Murphy: All right. You mean by saying it was adopted after December 7?

Admiral Kimmel: It was adopted?

Mr. Murphy: Yes, wasn't it, after December 7?

Admiral Kimmel: Not in that form, no. I do not know what was done after December 7 definitely, because I have not been out there since, and I haven't talked it over with people, but my general feeling at the time, and as I have expressed it in here, I think I have expressed it in some of these letters -- I have not had a chance to read them recently -- but the Fleet Commander should not be concerned with the immediate operation of the Hawaiian Coastal Frontier. You had a Naval Admiral and an Army General, and a Fleet

3

4

5

0

7.

8

0

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

Witness Kimmel

Commander in my opinion should have been free to do other things besides concern himself with the details of the defense of Hawaii.

Mr. Murphy: That is exactly what I am coming to. In other words, that was your feeling on December 7, and prior thereto, and in your letter of November 3rd, the first endorsement dated November 3rd on page 2 in that exhibit, under paragraph(f), I mean paragraph 3, subparagraph (f).

"In objecting to a combined operating center for the Army and Navy", you say --

Admiral Kimmel: Wait a minute.

Mr. Murphy: Excuse me. That is paragraph 3(f).

Admiral Kimmel: Yes.

Mr. Murphy: You say there, "In objecting", and so forth, paragraph 3. Then you say, "On the other hand, there are manifest disadvantages among which are the building," and then I go down to (f), "It would have at least a psychological tendency to divert Fleet units to defensive tasks."

Admiral Kimmel: That is right.

Mr. Murphy: In other words, you did not feel that the planes of the Fleet should be used for the purpose of defending that base, did you? You felt that Admiral Bloch should have his own planes and the Army should have their planes, that absolutely and primarily it was an Army obligation and

WASHINGTON.

18

19

50

21

22

23

(10)

25

G

that you should be left to go on with your preparation to fight, because that is what you thought you were out there for, isn't that right?

Admiral Kimmel: Yes, but I made plans to utilize every facility, every naval facility that happened to be in Pearl Harbor in the defense of Pearl Harbor, and I think that the plans that I made show that most conclusively.

Mr. Murphy: You did object to Washington to the fact that you had to do that, did you not?

Admiral Kimmel: Certainly I objected, and I objected because I wanted to have those planes free for other things, and I knew that even with all the planes and everything we had that we were forced to make a choice as to what we could and should do.

Mr. Murphy: You complained to Admiral Stark and Admiral Stark, in effect, kind of agreed with you but said, "There is no choice. We have to do it," did he not?

Admiral Kimmel: That is right.

Mr. Murphy: That was an old problem, because it existed back in 1940 with Admiral Richardson, did it not?

Admiral Kimmel: Yes, it existed always.

Mr. Murphy: I would like to read into the record from a letter dated November 28, 1940, a letter to Admiral Stark from Admiral Richardson. I would like to refer to the second

C

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

paragraph, Admiral, which reads as follows:

"With regard to the first of these matters, I will take
this up with Bloch on my arrival back in Hawaii. This fight
on the problem does not give me a great deal of concern and
I think it can easily be provided for. I think torpedo nets
within the harbor are neither necessary nor practicable. The
area is too restricted and ships at present are not moored
within torpedo range of the entrance."

In that connection I would like to direct your attention, Admiral, to the discussion of the torpedo nets at Hawaii.

Mr. Masten: That is Exhibit 116, Mr. Murphy.

Mr. Murphy: Exhibit No. 116. Do you have your copy of it?

Admiral Kimmel: Yes.

Mr. Murphy: Admiral, there was a letter in February that gave you the impression that there was no danger of a torpedo attack at Pearl Harbor. Do you recall that?

Admiral Kimmel: Gave me definite data, which was conclusive, that there was no danger of torpedo attack in Hawaii or in Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Murphy: Right. By the way, there was reference made, when counsel was questioning you, to Whitehead torpedoes that were purchased by the Japa. Is it not a fact that the Japanese had perfected those torpedoes in 1931 for the

3

4

5

B

7

8

9

01

11

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

Specific purpose of being used in an attack on Pearl Harbor?
Of course we did not know about that.

Admiral Kimmel: Of course I did not know about that, but if that be true, this is the first time I ever heard it.

Mr. Murphy: Well, it is my impression, and only an impression, that in the record a statement is made that the Japanese perfected this torpedo for use against Pearl Harbor in 1931. Of course the Navy did not know about it, and I am not criticising the Navy.

Admiral Kimmel: No.

Mr. Murphy: But I am putting it in the record.

Admiral Kimmel: I think you are a little bit in error.

Mr. Murphy: All right.

Admiral Kimmel: My understanding, although I do not know, is that they took some Whitehead torpedoes that were manufactured in 1931 and shortly before Pearl Harbor they succeeded in so altering them as to make them suitable for use in the waters of Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Murphy: It may be so.

Admiral Kimmel: I think that is the correct statement.

Mr. Murphy: I am glad to have you say that. My only reason for going into it, Admiral, was I was wondering if the Japs were plotting an attack on Pearl Harbor in 1931. Some people in this country would have us believe that they started

(11)

3 13

14

13

15

16

0

17

18

19

20

22

21

23

24

3

4

5

B

7

8

0

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

to prepare on November 26, 1941.

I am referring, Admiral, to this group of letters in Exhibit 116, and you have already covered the letter written in February that led you to believe that there was absolutely no danger from torpedoes.

This reference has been made to the letter in June. Do you remember that?

Admiral Kimmel: That is right.

Mr. Murphy: The letter of June 13.

Admiral Kimmel: That is right.

Mr. Murphy: Where they discussed Taranto. Now both the opinion of Admiral King and a great many opinions are to the effect that the idea was then abandoned.

I now direct your attention to the letter of September 16, 1941.

Admiral Kimmel: Wait a minute. It appears I haven't got that letter.

Mr. Murphy: You say you do not have the letter?

Mr. Masten: Is it in the same exhibit?

Mr. Murphy: Yes.

Mr. Masten: What is the date of it?

Mr. Murphy: September 16, 1941, a letter from Admiral Ingersoll.

Mr. Masten: I think you will have to read from the one

you have.

2

3

4

5

7

0

8

0

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

50

19

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Murphy: Under date of September 16, Admiral.

Admiral Kimmel: Yes.

Mr. Murphy: A letter was written from Admiral Ingersoll, Acting Chief of Naval Operations, to the Bureau of Ordnance, and in paragraph 1 the following may be found:

"It is suggested that in order that progress may be made in solving some of the problems which confront us, that a small group of officers, engineers and draftsmen be assigned exclusively to planning improvements in net and boom designs and to development and experimental work."

Then again in paragraph 2:

"In references (a) and (b) the Chief of Naval Operations indicated the desirability of undertaking some research and development work. Among other suggestions, the need for a lighter anti-torpedo net was stressed, which can be laid and removed in harbors in a short time for temporary use, and which will give good if not perfect protection from torpedoes fired from planes."

At any rate, that indicates that the Chief of Naval Operations in September 1941 was trying to get a net that could be used, isn't that right?

Admiral Kimmel: Which could be what?

Which could be used if they had perfected Mr. Murphy:

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

one?

2

3

4

5

3

7

Admiral Kimmel: Oh, yes. I knew nothing of this letter. I never saw it until recently.

Mr. Murphy: Do you also find, Admiral, a letter in October following this?

Admiral Kimmel: I presume so.

Mr. Murphy: I wonder if you would be kind enough to read the October letter? It is lost in my exhibit. It is a short letter.

(The document was handed to Mr. Murphy.)

Mr. Murphy: I find a letter dated October 3, 1941, from the Chief of Naval Operations to the Chief of Bureau of Ordnance, and paragraph 2 reads as follows:

"Attention is invited to paragraph 3 of the enclosure.

The Chief of Naval Operations considers it urgent to develop an anti-torpedo net which can be made up, towed to a desired location, and quickly laid. The use of pontoons, as suggested, does not appear to solve this question; a reduction in the number of moorings, at present necessary for the standard net, would seem to be required."

You did not know about that letter either, Admiral, did you?
Admiral Kimmel: No, I did not know about it.

(12)

8

10

12

11

13

15

14

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

Larry 24 follows

3

4

5

O

7

8

8

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

## Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

Mr. Murphy: My reason for putting it in the record is to show that the Navy had a very active interest in perfecting a net and that the Navy should not be subjected to the criticism which they have received from some quarters that they were derelict in not trying to get a net for Pearl Harbor.

Admiral Kimmel: They were obtaining nets to be used in all harbors, I presume. Their efforts were not confined to Pearl Harbor by any means.

Mr. Murphy: That is right.

Admiral Kimmel: And the fact that that letter is in existence shows that they were working for a net. It doesn't show where they were going to put the net. I presume they would have sent some to Pearl Harbor. I don't know.

Mr. Murphy: It showed they had an active interest in the development of a good torpedo net; isn't that correct? Admiral Kimmel: Oh, yes.

Mr. Murphy: I would like now to refer to a letter dated December 30, 1940, from Admiral Bloch to the Chief of Naval Operations, in which he says in paragraph 1:

"In view of the inquiries contained in references (a), (b) and (c), I consider it desirable to write this letter to set forth the present ability of the Fourteenth Naval District to meet surprise hostile attacks of an enemy with

0

19 20

22

21

23 24

õ

G

Then I desire to read only a part of paragraph 2, in which it states:

"The Navy component of the local defense forces has no planes for distant reconnaissance with which to locate enemy carriers, and the only planes belonging to the local defense forces to attack carriers when located would be the Army bombers."

Again at the end of the paragraph:

the equipment and forces at hand."

"For distant reconnaissance, requisition would have to be made on the forces afloat for such as could be spared by the Fleet."

I would like also to read from a letter dated January the 4th, 1941, from Admiral Richardson as Commander in Chief of the United States Fleet to the Chief of Naval Operations, paragraph 2:

"As neither the increase anti-aircraft batteries nor the augmented pursuit squadrons will be available for an extended period, the defense of Fleet units within Pearl Harbor will have to be augmented by that portion of the Fleet which may be in Pearl Harbor in event of an attack by hostile aircraft."

Now, Admiral, I direct your attention to the basic exhibit of Navy dispatches. That would be Exhibit No. 37.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

I direct your attention, Admiral, if you will, to a dispatch in that exhibit where you were notified that the Japanese were going to proceed to attack sometime prior to November.

Yesterday we were discussing the significance which you attached to the messages about the destruction of the codes and you said at that time that the reason why you didn't pay particular attention to the first message about the codes was that it said that only some, not all, but most of the codes were being destroyed; do you recall that?

Admiral Kimmel: Yes, I do.

Mr. Murphy: Now, you did have a subsequent message, however, which did say that the machines were being destroyed, didn't you?

The first dispatch of December 3 said that they were told to destroy most of their codes and ciphers at once.

Admiral Kimmel: That is right.

Mr. Murphy: There was also a dispatch on the 3rd which said that they were to destroy the machine.

Admiral Kimmel: There was a qualifying word in there and it referred to a particular machine.

Mr. Murphy: Well, I will read it exactly.

"CIRCULAR 2444 FROM TOKYO 1 DECEMBER ORDERED LONDON X HONGKONG X SINGAPORE AND MANILA TO DESTROY MACHINE XX BATAVIA MACHINE ALREADY SENT TO TOKYO XX DECEMBER SECOND WASHINGTON

2

3

4

5

B

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

.. WASHINGTON, D C

(2)

21

24 25 Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

ALSO DIRECTED DESTROY X ALL BUT ONE COPY OF OTHER SYSTEMS X
AND ALL SECRET DOCUMENTS XX BRITISH ADMIRALTY LONDON TODAY
REPORTS EMBASSY LONDON HAS COMPLIED."

Wouldn't that be a highly important and significant message in view of the developments at that time, to you?

Admiral Kimmel: You will note on your copy that the word "purple" was inserted by Mr. Gesell on December 17, 1945 and "there no longer being any necessity for maintaining it a secret". Gesell's amendment is found in Volume 26, page 4559.

Mr. Murphy: I am talking what was before Admiral Kimmel before December 7.

Admiral Kimmel: And I am trying to show exactly what was before Admiral Kimmel and what was before Admiral Kimmel was that the Japs had ordered the destruction of one particular machine which was by no means all they had.

Mr. Murphy: I take it then that when you heard about the purple code, which was their most precious one, their ultra code, you didn't know what "purple" meant, was that it?

Admiral Kimmel: No, I didn't know what purple meant.

Mr. Murphy: Did you ask Washington?

Admiral Kimmel: No. I asked my Intelligence Officer.

Mr. Murphy: Did he know?

Admiral Kimmel: No, he didn't know.

٠,

õ

B

Ø

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

Mr. Murphy: Did you ask Washington then?

Admiral Kimmel: No, I didn't. My Intelligence Officer finally found one officer on the Island of Oahu who told us it was one of the Japanese very secret machines, which one I did not know at the time.

Mr. Murphy: Well, wouldn't that, in view of the war warning, indicate to you that trouble was afoot and that war was coming?

Admiral Kimmel: It was a step but it was by no means a conclusive step.

Mr. Murphy: Admiral, you had other messages too about the destruction of codes, didn't you, from your own Intelligence Officer?

Admiral Kimmel: On the afternoon of December 6 my
Intelligence Officer came to me and told me that they were
burning papers outside of the Japanese consulate. Such
report had been made to me three or four times in the course
of the year. The first time I received such a report I was
considerably concerned and attempted to find out all I could
about it and on succeeding reports of that nature I also
attempted to find out about it.

When this report was made to me I knew nothing about any information that the FBI may have obtained and I did not see the dispatch that was sent by the Commandant of the District

Witness Kimmel

until after the attack.

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

19

21

22

23

24

25

Now, whether or not they were destroying codes, I do not know. There was nothing definite that came to me that they were destroying codes. The report that came to me was

that they were burning papers once more.

Mr. Murphy: Did the FBI man talk to you before you went to the hotel that night, the night of the 6th? There was an FBI man who I understand talked to General Short before he went into Schofield Barracks. I was wondering if that same FBI man talked to you before you went to the hotel? Admiral Kimmel: He did not.

Mr. Murphy: Now, you did have reports besides the one of the 6th about the destruction of codes, from your own Intelligence Officer, didn't you, Admiral? Didn't you have messages showing you that they were being destroyed at other posts in the Pacific?

Admiral Kimmel: Yes, I had some, and I had a message authorizing me to destroy codes on the outlying islands.

Mr. Murphy: Did you know, Admiral, that the Navy code was much more difficult to break than the Army code?

Admiral Kimmel: You mean our own Navy code?

Mr. Murphy: Yes, your own Navy code, was a much better code and harder to break than the Army code?

Admiral Kimmel: No, I didn't know it at the time. I

2

3

4

5

в

7

8

9

10

11

12

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

had an idea that the Navy code might be better. I thought we had a better communications system than the Army had.

Mr. Murphy: The Army says so.

At any rate, you did have a message from Batavia about them destroying codes and machines there?

Admiral Kimmel: That is the message I just read, I think.

Mr. Murphy: No, the one of the 6th was the one from Honolulu. I am now talking about one of a couple of days before December 1st. You had a message from Batavia about them destroying codes, in your Intelligence Report?

Admiral Kimmel: Where is that?

Mr. Murphy: I will get it for you. It is in the Fleet Intelligence Report. The one that goes up to December 2, as I recall it.

Lieutenant Hanify: I have that exhibit, sir. It is Exhibit 115.

Mr. Murphy: From 27 October to 2 December 1941.

Lieutenant Hanify: I haven't found the reference yet.

Admiral Kimmel: In this message that we have just been discussing, the one of 3 December 1941, it talks about the destruction of the purple machine. "Batavia machine already sent to Tokyo". Is that what you are referring to?

Mr. Murphy: No. There is a separate message in your Intelligence Report.

13 14 15

18

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

3

4

5

6

8

7

8

10

12

13

14

15

18

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

Lieutenant Hanify: The last item in that, sir?

Mr. Murphy: Yes. On December 2nd --

Lieutenant Hanify: U.S. Ambassador at Bancock?

Mr. Murphy: Yes. On December 2, 1941 the Intelligence Report that was placed you shows the United States Ambassador at Bancock on the 30th requested permission to destroy all but a limited number of codes. That showed that our Ambassador there was quite concerned about war coming, did it not?

Admiral Kimmel: Bancock is in Thailand. He was concorned that they might get his code down there when they attacked Thailand. I might say that was the least significant of all of them.

Mr. Murphy: Didn't it indicate to you that he felt down there that war was coming on December 2? You said yesterday that when nothing happened in several days the importance of these things started to become minimized in your mind.

Admiral Kimmel: That was a precaution that he might well have taken.

Mr. Murphy: You don't see any particular significance to that?

Admiral Kimmel: You will recall the information I had about the conspiracy of the Japs to induce the British to come into Thailand and attack them. That was all part of that picture.

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

2

1

\_

3

4

5

в

7

8

9

11

10

12

13

14

16

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Murphy: Yes; that was also in that same group of messages, wasn't it? That was placed before you within two or three days of this other one.

Admiral, you have the intrigue message?

Admiral Kimmel: Yes, I have it here.

Mr. Murphy: That was just a few days before, wasn't it?
Admiral Kimmel: The day before.

Mr. Murphy: Admiral, you speak in your statement about the winds code and the winds code execute. You knew the details of the winds code, didn't you?

Admiral Kimmel: I knew the winds code had been set up.

Mr. Murphy: You knew that we were looking for it and trying to find out if there was an execute message?

Admiral Kimmel: That is right.

Mr. Murphy: You had a dispatch on the 28th of November giving you that in detail, didn't you?

Admiral Kimmel: Yes.

Mr. Murphy: Telling you exactly what it would mean and showing, if there had been an execute, it would mean that there was a rupture in diplomatic relations; isn't that right?

Admiral Kimmel: At least that, yes.

Mr. Murphy: Now, it is your opinion, is it not, that there was an execute message? You say so in your statement.

Admiral Kimmel: My opinion, yes. I took my opinion

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

from the findings of the Naval Court of Inquiry. I quoted them on it. I don't recall that I gave any opinion.

Mr. Murphy: At any rate, the assertions in your statement which led you to believe that you had been misled were based in part upon the belief by you now and at the time you made your statement that there had been a winds code execute; isn't that right?

Admiral Kimmel: I based that on the findings of the Naval Court of Inquiry who heard all the evidence.

Mr. Murphy: At any rate, if there had not been an execute message it would considerably alter your statement to that effect?

Admiral Kimmel: It would not alter my statement that the Naval Court of Inquiry found as a fact that the winds message execute had been received.

Mr. Murphy: If it is a fact, Admiral, that there was no execute message, would it alter your statement that you have made to this committee that you were misled to that extent?

Admiral Kimmel: If I became convinced that the Naval Court of Inquiry was in error and they had conclusive evidence that it never had been received it would alter my statement to that extent.

Mr. Murphy: Now, speaking about the Naval Court of Inquiry,

17

16

18

19

21

20

22

23

24

Witness Kimmel Questions by: Mr. Murphy

were you given a fair trial there?

Admiral Kimmel: I was, indeed.

Mr. Murphy: Were you given a fair hearing before the Roberts Commission?

Admiral Kimmel: I was permitted to testify before the Roberts Commission. I didn't have any counsel.

Mr. Murphy: You had somebody beside you, didn't you? Didn't you have Admiral Theobald with you?

Admiral Kimmel: He was assisting me with the papers. He was not counsel. And he said he was not counsel.

Mr. Murphy: He said he wasn't counsel, but he did volunteer quite a little information?

Admiral Kimmel: And Mr. Roberts said he wasn't counsel.

Mr. Murphy: But he was at your side, getting papers and making statements occasionally to clarify the picture, wasn't he?

Admiral Kimmel: Yes, for which he was -- all right.

Mr. Murphy: They asked him to be sworn?

Admiral Kimmel: They asked him to be sworn so that he would be a witness.

Mr. Murphy: Yes; as long as he was giving information.

Admiral Kimmel: Yes.

Mr. Murphy: There were some distinguished Admirals on that Board, on the Roberts Board, were there not?

WARD & PAUL. WASHINGTON, D. C.

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

Admiral Kimmel: There were two Admirals on the Board, yes, sir.

Mr. Murphy: Well, did you have any reason, Admiral, to feel that they weren't able Admirals?

Admiral Kimmel: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Murphy: Up to the time that you saw their report did you have any grievance against them or any criticism to make of their capacity to sit? Up to the time you saw their report and differed with it, had you any particular criticism of the ability of those two gentlemen?

Admiral Kimmel: They were able officers.

Mr. Murphy: Well, were they competent to sit on this Board?

Admiral Kimmel: They were.

Mr. Murphy: Now, the Army Board, you appeared before that, didn't you? The Army Pearl Harbor Board, you testified before them, didn't you?

Admiral Kimmel: Yes.

Mr. Murphy: Were you treated all right there?

Admiral Kimmel: Oh, yes. I was not permitted to hear the testimony of other witnesses before the Army Board not to introduce evidence. I merely testified before the Army Board.

Mr. Murphy: The Navy Board, how were you treated there?

-

Admiral Kimmel: The Navy Court of Inquiry?
Mr. Murphy: Yes.

Admiral Kimmel: I was permitted to have counsel, I was permitted to introduce evidence, I was permitted to cross-cxamine witnesses, I was permitted to confront witnesses.

Mr. Murphy: That was ordered by the Secretary of the Navy and you were given every right that you wanted to demand, that you required, or that you requested, except that it was not made public?

Admiral Kimmel: I was given full facilities to present my case to the Naval Court of Inquiry.

Mr. Murphy: Now do you know of any reason why Admiral King and Secretary Forrestal would differ as they did, and The Adjutant General of the Navy differ as he did, with the findings of the Naval Court of Inquiry?

Admiral Kimmel: I do not.

Mr. Murphy: Now, I would like to go with you, if I may, to the testimony of General Short before the Roberts Commission.

I direct your attention -- do you have it?

Lieutenant Hanify: No, sir.

Mr. Murphy: Can you make that available, Counsel?

In the meantime I will read -- would you prefer to have
a copy before you? I am going to ask you some questions.

I think in fairness to you you ought to have a copy before you.

в

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

Admiral Kimmel: Yes, I think I ought to have a copy.

I would like to see what it is you are reading from.

Mr. Murphy: While they are going downstairs to get a copy I will go into some other things, Admiral.

Admiral, in your statement you complain, apparently, about the tenor of the messages that were sent to you from Washington, first the messages about the economic sanctions in July, and then the messages in October about the change of Cabinet, and then the other messages in November, and you say that each of them were in effect a war warning.

Wouldn't you think the responsibility was more on the Japanese than it was on the officials at Washington for that series of messages? Wasn't it the conduct of the Japanese that prompted those different messages which appeared to be war warnings?

Admiral Kimmel: I am unable to say.

Mr. Murphy: It is a fact that you did expect to be told about the change in Cabinet and what might happen in October, October 16?

Admiral Kimmel: I expected full information, yes. I was glad of any information I could get.

Mr. Murphy: You certainly expected to be told about the economic sanctions in July, didn't you?

Admiral Kimmel: Certainly.

(5)

25

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

Mr. Murphy: And on each of those occasions they would have to have a message of pretty serious import to describe that occasion to you, wouldn't they?

Admiral Kimmel: Yes.

Mr. Murphy: Would Washington be to blame for the series of messages or the Japanese?

Admiral Kimmel: I didn't blame anybody for the series of messages. I set forth what I had.

Mr. Murphy: Except that you seem to complain about having had some messages prior to the war warning message.

Admiral Kimmel: Well --

Mr. Murphy: I was wondering if it wasn't the Japanese that caused that instead of somebody in Washington.

You did have a message from the Chief of Naval Operations about code machines or codes being destroyed, before, Admiral, didn't you?

I refer to a message in July, July 17, 1941, reading as follows --

Lieutenant Hanify: Which exhibit, sir?

Mr. Murphy: 37, page 9:

"17 July 1941.

"FROM: OPNAV

"ACTION: CINCAF

"INFO: CINCPAC

Witness Kimmel

Questions by: Mr. Murphy

MOTON!HE

"THE TIME HAS COME BLANK TOKYO TO VICHY TWELVE JULY TWO SEVEN FOUR AND TWO SEVEN FIVE LIST SIX TERMS OF ULTIMATUM TO BE ANSWERED BY TWENTY JULY X JAPAN WILL SEND NECESSARY ARMY NAVY AIR FORCES TO SOUTHERN FRENCH INDO CHINA X FRENCH TURNOVER NAVAL AND AIR BASES LISTED IN JONAB OR SEVEN JULY X EXPEDITIONARY FORCE TO HAVE RIGHT TO MANEUVER AND MOVE ABOUT PREELY X FRENCH WITHDRAW FORCES AT LANDING POINTS TO AVOID POSSIBLE CLASHES X VICHY AUTHORIZE FRENCH INDO CHINA MILITARY TO ARRANGE DETAILS WITH JAPANESE EITHER BEFORE OR AFTER LANDING X COLONY TO PAY JAPAN TWENTY THREE MILLION PLASTRES ANNUALLY TO MEET COST OF OCCUPATION XX TOKYO TO VICHY FOURTEEN JULY TWO EIGHT ONE ARMY NOW PLANNING ADVANCE ON OR ABOUT WENTY JULY XX TOKYO TO SAIGON AND HANOI SIXTEEN JULY CIRCULAR ONE FIVE ONE EIGHT FORMAL DEMANDS PRESENTED TO VICHY ON FOURTEEN X REPLY ASKED BY TWENTIETH X JAPAN INTENDS CARRY OUT PLANS BY FORCE IF OPPOSED FOR IF BRITISH OR UNITED STATES INTERFERES X KANJU MARU BEING HELD AT SAIGON TO EVACUATE ALL JAPANESE THERE SAILING EARLY DAWN TWENTY FOUR JULY X BURN CODES X JAPANESE IN NORTHERN AREA EVACUATE OR MOVE INTO HANOI END OF THIS."

Hook 22 Follows

23

21

24

hl

AL

fls

Witness Kimmel

Questions By: Mr. Murphy

Would that indicate that since war was coming in that direction that the Japanese were ordering the codes be destroyed and wouldn't that indicate --

Admiral Kimmel: Let me say, I haven't seen this message for a long time.

Mr. Murphy: Well, the only part I am interested in is the fact that they seem to be going to advance.

Admiral Kimmel: I am trying to find out what he is talking about.

Mr. Murphy: Well, it is a Navy message.

Admiral Kimmel: Who is to burn codes, and how? Can you make out?

Mr. Murphy: My assumption is that OPNAV is telling what has happened between Tokyo and Vichy. They are talking about what they are going to do. They are going to make an advance, and before they make their advance --

Admiral Kimmel: There must be something missing, because I can't see that it makes any sense, so far as the burning codes business is concerned. I don't know what that is.

Mr. Murphy: My only purpose is to ask you, as between an ordinary layman and an expert, if it wasn't a fact that the advance at that time meant war?

Admiral Kimmel: Your command of language is better