2

3

5

11

12

13

14

16

15

17

18

19

20

22

21

23

25

24

(3) A communication and intelligence system to include an aircraft warning service, among the elements of the land defense, with provision for the prompt exchange of information or instructions with the Navy."

The Navy, in carrying out its functions, will provide and operate, among other things:-

- "(a) A system of offshore scouting and patrol to give timely warning of an attack, and, in addition, forces to operate against enemy forces in the vicinity of the coast.
 - (b) A communication and intelligence system among the elements of the sea defense, with provisions for the prompt exchange of information or instructions with the Army."

Joint Action also states the functions of Army and Nevy Air Components, and in order to minimize duplication, it provides:-

> "(a) The functions assigned to the Army Air component require the Army to provide and maintain all types of aircraft primarily designed for use in support of military operations, or in the direct defense of the land and coastal frontiers of continental United States and its

3

5

в

7

8

8

10

11

12

13

15

14

WASHINGTON.

16

18

17

19

21

20

22

23

24 25

overseas possessions, or in repelling air raids directed at shore objectives or at shipping within our harbors, or in supporting naval forces to assure freedom of action of the fleet.

(b) The functions assigned to the Nevy air component require the Navy to provide and maintain all types of sircraft primarily designed and ordinarily used in operations from aircraft carriers or other vessels, or based on aircraft tenders, or for operations from shore bases for observation, scouting and patrolling over the sea, and for the protection of shipping in the coastal zones. These aircraft may be required to operate effectively over the sea to the maximum distance within the capacity of aircraft development."

In accordance with Joint Action, the Commandant of the Fourteenth Naval District and the Commanding General, Hawaiian Department had entered into a "Joint Coastal Frontier Defense Plan" for the Hawaiian Coastal Frontier dated 25 April 1941. Among other things, this agreement assigned responsibility for the aircraft warning service and anti-aircraft and fighter defenses to the Army, while responsibility for distant re-

f21

...

connaissance was assigned to the Navy.

89. On receipt of the reply from Admiral Richardson, in reply to the letter in which I had asked his comment on how the War and Navy Departments could help them out out there, and largely predicated on it, I caused the Secretary of the Navy, on 24 January 1941, to send the following letter to the Secretary of War:-

"The security of the U. S. Pacific Fleet while in Pearl Harbor, and of the Pearl Harbor Naval Base itself, has been under renewed study by the Navy Department and forces afloat for the past several weeks. This reexamination has been, in part, prompted by the increased gravity of the situation with respect to Japan, and by reports from abroad of successful bombing and torpedo plane attacks on ships while in bases. If war eventuates with Japan, it is believed easily possible that hostilities would be initiated by a surprise attack upon the Fleet or the Naval Base at Pearl Harbor.'

"In my opinion, the inherent possibilities of a major disaster to the fleet or naval base warrant taking every step, as rapidly as can be done, that will increase the joint readiness of the Army and Navy to withstend a raid of the character mentioned

в

above.

"The dangers envisaged in their order of importance and probability are considered to be:

- (1) Air bombing attack.
- (2) Air torpedo plane attack.
- (3) Sabotage.
- (4) Submarine attack.
- (5) Mining.
- (6) Bombardment by gun fire.

"Defense against all but the first two -that is, air attack, both bombing and torpedo -of these dangers appears to have been provided
for satisfactorily. The following paragraphs are
devoted principally to a discussion of the problems
encompassed in (1) and (2) above, the solution of
which I consider to be of primary importance.

may be carried out successively, simultaneously, or in combination with any of the other operations enumerated. The maximum probable enemy effort may be put at twelve aircraft squadrons, and the minimum at two. Attacks would be launched from a striking force of carriers and thier supporting vessels.

"The counter measures to be considered are:

•

-

-

(a) Location and engagement of enemy carriers and supporting vessels before air attack can be launched;

- (b) Location and engagement of enemy aircraft before they reach their objectives;
- (c) Repulse of enemy aircraft by anti-aircraft fire;
- (d) Concesiment of vital installations by artificial smoke;
- (e) Protection of vitel installations by balloon barrages.

"The operations set forth in (a)" -- that is the location and the engagement of the enemy carriers and their destruction -- "are largely functions of the Fleet but, quite possibly, might not be carried out in case of an air attack initiated without warning prior to a declaration of war.

Pursuit aircraft in large numbers and an effective warning net are required for the operations in (b). It is understood that only thirty-six Army pursuit aircraft are at present in Oshu, and that while the organization and equipping of an Anti-Air Information Service supported by modern fire control equipment is in progress, the present

в

system relies wholly on visual observation and sound locators which are only effective up to four miles.

"Available Army anti-aircraft batteries appear inadequate if judged by the standards of the war in Europe. There are now in Oahu 26 - 3" fixed anti-aircraft guns (of which something over half are grouped about Pearl Harbor), 56 mobile 3" guns, and 109 - .50 caliber machine guns. The anti-aircraft batteries are manned in part by personnel which is also required to man parts of the sea coast artillery. Should an attack on Oahu combine air attack with a gun bombardment, one or the other countering fires would suffer from lack of men. If the prevailing high ceiling is taken into account the caliber of the anti-aircraft guns might be inadequate against high altitude bombing attack.

"By late summer the defenses will be considerably strengthened by additions in guns, planes, and radio locators. It is understood, sixteen additional 3" mobile twenty-four 90 mm., and one hundred twenty 37 mm. guns will be on hand; the pursuit aircraft strength is to be expanded to a total of 149; the new radio locators will have an effective range of

100 miles. Although the caliber of the guns will still be small for effective action against high altitude bombers, this augmentation will markedly improve the security of the Fleet. It does not, of course, affect the critical period immediately before us.

"The supplementary measures noted in (d) and (e) might be of the greatest value in the defense of Pearl Harbor. Balloon barrages have demonstrated some usefulness in Europe. Smoke from fixed installations on the ground might prove most advantageous.

"To meet the needs of the situation, I offer the following proposals:

- (1) That the Army assign the highest priority
 to the increase of pursuit aircraft and antiaircraft artillery, and the establishment
 of an air warning net in Hawaii.
- (2) That the Army give consideration to the question of balloon barrages, the employment of smoke, and other special devices for improving the defenses of Pearl Harbor.

в

L-1

(3) That local joint plans be drawn for the effective coordination of naval and military aircraft operations, and ship and shore anti-aircraft gun fire, against surprise aircraft raids.

- (4) That the Army and Navy forces in Oahu agree on appropriate degrees of joint readiness for immediate action in defense against surprise aircraft raids against Pearl Harbor.
- (5) That joint exercises, designed to prepare
 Army and Navy forces in Oahu for defense
 against surprise aircraft raids, be held
 at least once weekly so long as the present
 uncertainty continues to exist.

"Your concurrence in these proposals and the rapid implementing of the measures to be taken by the Army, which are of the highest importance to the security of the Fleet, will be met with the closest cooperation on the part of the Navy Department."

90. Copy of this letter was sent to the then Commander in Chief, U. S. Fleet, Admiral Kimmel. On 18 February 1941 Admiral Kimmel wrote:

"I feel that a surprise attack (submarine, air, or combined) on Pearl Harbor is a possibility. We

1-1

are taking immediate practical steps to minimize
the damage inflicted and to ensure that the attacking
force will pay. We need anti-submarine forces, - destroyers and patrol craft. The two squadrons of patrol
craft will help when they arrive."

91. In the meantime on 7 February 1941 the Secretary of War had replied to the letter of 24 January as follows:

"In replying to your letter of January 24, regarding the possibility of surprise attacks upon the Fleet or the Naval Base at Pearl Harbor, I wish to express complete concurrence as to the importance of this matter and the urgency of our making every possible preparation to meet such a hostile effort. The Hawaiian Department is the best equipped of all our overseas departments, and continues to hold a high priority for the completion of its projected defenses because of the importance of giving full protection to the Fleet.

and forty-eight pursuit planes. There are now in Hawaii thirty-six pursuit planes; nineteen of these are P-36's and seventeen are of somewhat less efficiency. I am arranging to have thirty-one P-36 pursuit planes assembled at San Diego for shipment to

WARD & PAUL. WASHINGTON. D.

Witness Stark

Hawaii within the next ten days, as agreed to with the Navy Department. This will bring the Army pursuit group in Hawaii up to fifty of the P-36 type and seventeen of a somewhat less efficient type. In addition, fifty of the new P-40-B pursuit planes, with their guns, leakproof tanks and modern armor will be assembled at San Diego about March 15 for shipment by carrier to Hawaii.

"There are at present in the Hawaiian Islands eighty-two 3-inch AA guns, twenty 37 mm AA guns (en route), and one hundred and nine caliber .50 AA machine guns. The total project calls for ninety-eight 3-inch AA guns, one hundred and twenty 37 mm AA guns, and three hundred and eight caliber .50 AA machine guns.

"With reference to the Aircraft Warning Service, the equipment therefor has been ordered and will be delivered in Hawaii in June. All arrangements for installation will have been made by the time the equipment is delivered. Inquiry develops the information that delivery of the necessary equipment cannot be made at an earlier date.

"The Commanding General, Hawaiian Department, is being directed to give immediate consideration to the question of the employment of balloon barrages

WARD & PAUL. WASHINGTON. D.

3

4

5

8

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1.1

15

Witness Stark

and the use of smoke in protecting the Fleet and base facilities. Barrage balloons are not available at the present time for installation and cannot be made available prior to the summer of 1941. At present there are three on hand and eighty-four being manufactured -- forty for delivery by June 30, 1941, and the remainder by September. The Budget now has under consideration funds for two thousand nine hundred and fifty balloons. The value of smoke for screening vital areas on Oahu is a controversial subject. Qualified opinion is that atmospheric and geographic conditions in Oahu render the employment of smoke impracticable for large scale screening . operations. However, the Commanding General will look into this matter again.

"With reference to your other proposals for joint defense, I am forwarding a copy of your letter and this reply to the Commanding General, Hawaiian Department, and am directing him to cooperate with the local naval authorities in making those measures effective."

Copies of this reply were sent to Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet, and Commandant, 14th Naval District.

Subsequent to the receipt of the letter of 7 February

18

17

19

13

20

21

22

24

2

3

4

5

в

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1-7

15

16

17

18

19

Witness Stark

from the Secretary of War, the matter of anti-aircraft defense and of planes for the defense of Hawaii was the subject of frequent conversations with General Marshall and I offered to transport planes via carrier whenever they could be made ready. On at least two occasions during 1941, I sent a carrier from the West Coast to Pearl Harbor to ferry Army fighter planes.

93. You will note that the Secretary of War in his letter of 7 February stated that the equipment for the aircraft warning service had been ordered and would be delivered in Mawaii in June, 1941, and that all arrangements for installation will have been made by the time the equipment is delivered. I was informed that this equipment was delivered in Hawaii about the middle of 1941.

94. On 31 March 1941, Rear Admiral Bellinger, who was Commander, Fleet Air Detachment, Pearl Harbor and Commander of Pacific Fleet Task Force Nine, made, with the Commanding General, Hawaiian Air Force, a joint estimate covering joint Army and Navy air action in the event of audden hostile action against Oahu or fleet units in the Hawaiian area and entered into an agreement covering joint air operation. A copy of this agreement and estimate was forwarded to the Chief of Naval Operations by the Commandant, Fourteenth Naval District on 1 May 1941. The estimate, under the

20

22

21

23

25

heading "Possible Enemy Action", reads in part as follows:

- "(a) A declaration of war might be preceded by:
 - A surprise submarine attack on ships in the operating area.
 - 2. A surprise attack on OAHU including ships and installations in Pearl Harbor.
 - 3. A combination of these two.
 - (b) It appears that the most likely and dangerous form of attack on OAHU would be an air attack. It is believed that at present such an attack would most likely be launched from one or more carriers which would probably approach inside of three hundred miles."

"Joint Security Measures, Protection of Fleet and Pearl
Harbor Base" to the Commandants of all the Naval Districts
and to the Commanders in Chief of the Atlantic, Pacific
and Asiatic Fleets, calling their attention to the importance
of the problems presented therein.

95. Admiral Kimmel left with me, during his trip to washington in mid-1941, a memorandum dated 4 June, which reads as follows:

"The agreement entered into betwirt the Commanding General, Hawaiian Department, and the Commandant, 14th

Naval District, in regard to joint action of the Army and Navy Air Corps in Hawaii provides:

- (a) That in activities in the defense of

 Oahu and the other islands against enemy
 bombing attacks the command shall be

 vested in the Army Air Corps assisted by

 Navy fighters which may be available.
- enemy ships the command shall be vested in the Navy Air Commander in charge of the Base. Briefly, when an alarm is sounded the Navy patrol planes take off to locate the enemy ships and when located the Navy directs the efforts of the Army and Navy bombers in the offensive action which they take against the enemy ships.

"The liaison betwixt the Army and Navy Air Corps in Hawaii is very satisfactory and weekly drills in air raid alarms with the two services acting in unison are held. These drills have developed many weaknesses but the conditions are steadily improving and it is felt they are in much better shape now than they were a few months ago. The conditions will continue to be unsatisfactory until certain equipment has been supplied

4 5

1.1

•

Ĭ

~

1-1

and the personnel drilled in its use.

"There are about 140 light Army planes (fighters and light bombers) and 21 heavy bombing Army planes now in the Islands. These in addition to some obsolescent bombers and fighters. It is believed that the number of Army bombers in the Islands should be at least four times the number that they have there now and it is felt these planes should be sent out as somn as it is practicable to do so.

"There are not now a sufficient number of Army pilots to man all the Army planes in the Islands."

96. In mentioning the Army's responsibilities with respect to the defense of Pearl Harbor, I don't mean to minimize the problems which were facing the Army at that time. They, too were faced with a shortage of equipment and men.

97. My war warning despatch of 27 November must be considered in the light of what had gone before. Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet, and Commander in Chief, Asiatic Fleet, were action addressees of the war warning despatch, and they were directed to "execute an appropriate defensive deployment preparatory to carrying out the tasks assigned in WPL-46" (Navy Basic War Plan).

98. I might mention that on 26 November, we sent to Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet, two despatches asking his

3

4

5

в

7

8

Witness Stark

reaction to the possibility of reinforcing Wake and Midway by Army units. These were routine matters having to do with the general strengthening of our Pacific bases - a matter we had long been pushing.

99. The same day that I sent the war warning, the Army also sent a despatch to its field commanders. In order that Navy coastal frontier commanders and Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet might be informed of what had been sent their Army opposites, I sent the following priority despatch on 28 November to Commander, Pacific Northern Naval Coastal Frontier and Commander, Pacific Southern Naval Coastal Frontier for action and to Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet and Commander, Panama Naval Coastal Frontier for information:

"*** Army has sent following to Commander Western Defense Command:

> Negotiations with Japan appear to be terminated to all practical purposes with only the barest possibilities that the Japanese Government might come back and offer to continue. Japanese future action unpredictable but hostile action possible at any moment. If hostilities cannot, repeat not, be avoided the United States desires that Japan commit the first overt act. This

DRAW

18

1.5

15

17

13

19

20

21

. 22

23

24

в

LaChanity, follows

policy should not, repeat not, be construed as restricting you to a course of action that might jeopardize your defense.

Prior to hostile Japanese action you are directed to undertake such reconnaissance and other measures as you deem necessary but these measures should be carried out so as not, repeat not, to alarm civil population or disclose intent. Report measures taken.

AH 1

в

Witness: Admiral Stark

Ninth Corps Area re subversive activities in United States.

Should hostilities occur you will carry out the tasks assigned in Rainbow Five so far as they pertain to Japan. Limit dissemination of this highly secret information to minimum essential officers.

not be placed in effect in that area except as now in force in Southeast Pacific sub-area and Panama Naval Coastal Frontier. Undertake no offensive action until Japan has committed a overt act. Be prepared to carry out tasks assigned in WPL46 so far as they apply to Japan in case hostilities occur.

100. On 30 November, I sent a despatch to Commander-in-Chief, Asiatic Fleet, making Commander-in-Chief, Pacific Fleet an information addressee, which reads as follows:-

"Indications that Japan about to attack points on Kra Isthmus by overseas expedition.

"In order to ascertain destination this expedition and for security our position in the Philippines desire you cover by air the line Manila Camranh Bay on three days commencing upon receipt this despatch. Instruct planes to observe only. They must not approach so as to appear to be attacking but must defend themselves if attacked.

"Understand British Air Forces will search arc

в

Witness: Admiral Stark

180 miles from Tedta Bharu and will move troops to line across Kra Isthmus near Singora.

"If expedition is approaching Thailand inform Mac-Arthur. British Mission here informed."

101. On 3 December, we sent to Commander-in-Chief,
Asiatic Fleet, Commander-in-Chief, Pacific Fleet, Commandant, 14th Naval District and Commandant, 16th Naval District
the following priority despatch:-

"Highly reliable information has been received that categoric and urgent instructions were sent yesterday to Japanese diplomatic and consular posts at Hongkong, Singapore, Batavia, Manila, Washington and London to destroy most of their codes and ciphers at once and to burn all other important confidential and secret documents."

102. Also on 3 December, I sent a priority despatch to Commander-in-Chief, Asiatic Fleet and Commandant, 16th Naval District for action, and to Commander-in-Chief, Pacific Fleet and Commandant, 14th Naval District for information, which reads as follows:-

December ordered London, Hongkong, Singapore and Manila to destroy purple machine. Batavia machine already sent to Tokyo. December second Washington also directed destroy purple, all but one copy of other systems, and all secret documents.

Witness: Admiral Stark

British Admiralty London today report Embassy London has complied."

Japanese of their codes and ciphers and secret documents was one of the most telling items of information we had received, and our despatch informing Commanders-in-Chief, Asiatic Fleet and Pacific Fleet and the Commandants of the 14th and 16th Naval Districts of this fact was one of the most important despatches we ever sent. We felt that was was just a matter of time.

104. On 4 December, because of Guam's highly vulnerable position, we sent her the following message:-

"Guam destroy all secret and confidential publications and other classified metter except that essential for current purposes and special intelligence, retaining minimum oryptographic channels necessary for essential communications with CINCAF, CINCPAC, COM 14, COM 16 and OPNAV. Be prepared to destroy instantly in event of emergency all classified matter you retain. Report crypto channels retained."

Commander-in-Chief, Asiatic Fleet, Commander-in-Chief, Pacific Fleet, Commandant, 14th Naval District and Commandant, 16th

Naval District were all information addressees on this despatch.

105. We were also concerned lest Commander-in-Chief,
Pacific Fleet, might feel that he needed specific authorization

~2

3

4

5

8

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

Witness: Admiral Stark

from us before he could authorize destruction of secret papers and codes in the outlying Pacific Islands. Accordingly, we sent him a despatch on 6 December which reads as follows:-

"In view of the international situation and the exposed position of our outlying Pacific Islands you may authorize the destruction by them of secret and confidential documents now or under later conditions of greater emergency. Means of communication to support our current operations and special intelligence should of course be maintained until the last moment. "

106. In the few days immediately preceding 7 December, Admiral Ingersoll (then Assistant Chief of Naval Operations), Admiral Turner (then Head, War Plans Division), and I went over the information we had sent to the fleet commanders. all of the opinion that everything we could do had been done to get them ready for war, and that we had sent them sufficient information and directives.

107. During the night and early morning of 6-7 December, the Japanese transmitted to their Ambassador in Washington an answer to the ten-point note which had been handed to the Japanese on 26 November by Mr. Hull. The answer was in 14 parts, the 14th part being received some time early Sunday morning, December 7. I was not acquainted with this despatch until I arrived at my office Sunday forenoon. I would like

17

16

18

20

19

21

23

22

24

AH 5

Witness: Admiral Stark

to invite attention to the meat of the 14th part of this message and compare it with the meat of my war warning message. The Japanese message concludes:-

Government to adjust Japanese-American relations and to preserve and promote the peace of the Pacific through cooperation with the American Government has finally been lost.

"The Japanese Government regrets to have to notify hereby the American Government that in view of the attitude of the American Government it cannot but consider that is impossible to reach an agreement through further negotiations."

Our war warning message stated:-

** * Negotiations with Japan looking toward stabilization of conditions in the Pacific have ceased * * **.

Thus, what we learned on the morning of 7 December only confirmed what we had sent out on 27 November.

108. During the morning of Sunday, 7 December 1941, we had information to the effect that the Japanese Ambassador was to present his Government's reply to the ten-point note to the Secretary of State at one P.M. that same day. I was discussing this note and the time of its presentation with the Head of the Central Division (Captain Schuirmann) when General Marshall called me on the 'phone to ask if I knew of it. I told him

19.

Witness: Admiral Stark

I did, and he asked me what I thought about sending the information concerning the time of presentation on to the various commanders in the Pacific. My first answer to him was that we had sent them so much already that I hesitated to send more. I hung up the 'phone, and not more than a minute or two later I called him back, stating that there might be some peculiar significance in the Japanese Ambassador calling on Mr. Hull at one P.M. and that I would go along with him in sending the information to the Pacific. I asked him if his communications were such that he could get it out quickly because our communications were quite rapid when the occasion demanded it. He replied that he felt he could get it through very quickly. I then asked him to include in the despatch instructions to his people to inform their naval opposites. I am informed that this despatch* was sent "First Priority"

The text is quoted for the convenience of the Committee:-

"Japanese are presenting at one P.M. Eastern Standard
Time today what amounts to an ultimatum; also they are under
orders to destroy their code machine immediately.

"Just what significance the hour set may have we do not know but be on alert accordingly. Inform Naval authorities of this communication."

to the Army Forces in the Far East (Philippines), Caribbean

в

10.

ш

Witness: Admiral Stark

Defense Command (Canal Zone), Hawaiian Department, and the Fourth Army (San Francisco). I am told that the message was sent at 1217 EST (0647 Honolulu time) to the Hawaiian Department, but was not delivered in Hawaii until after the attack.

my responsibility to keep the fleet commanders fully informed of all significant military and political developments would not be complete without a reference to certain very secret information which we were receiving during this period. This information was gathered by the intelligence centers at the headquarters of Commandant, 16th Naval District (Cavite), Commandant, 14th Naval District (Pearl Harbor), and the Office of Naval Intelligence (Washington). There was a considerable volume of this material received in Washington during 1941, but it increased substantially during the last half of the year. The volume was so great and the personnel qualified to handle it so limited that we shared the work with the Army - they processed the material one day, we did it the next.

110. To be useful, the diplomatic information obtained from this source required careful evaluation, a task which could be better performed here in Washington where the officers charged with this task had access to other sources of information, such as the State and War Departments.

111. After this information was evaluated and distilled -

S

3

so to speak - we sent our conclusions and recommendations to the fleet commanders for their information and guidance.

112. I considered that the letters and despatches I sent

4

to Commander-in-Chief, Asiatic Fleet and Commander-in-Chief,

в

Pacific Fleet were sufficient to keep them informed on the

important military and political developments in the Pacific as

8

we knew them, and that they had received adequate information

8

and directives to be on guard.

11

10

113. I have gone into considerable detail - though by no means mentioning all my letters and despatches - to indicate

12

to the Committee how I discharged my duties as Chief of Naval

13

Operations with reference to the expansion of the entire naval

14

establishment, its strength and efficiency; with reference to

15

plans for the use of the fleet in war; with reference to assign-

16

ment of forces available in accordance with war plans; and with

17

reference to keeping the fleet commanders informed of important

18

political and military developments affecting them.

19

114. I have endeavored to stick to the record of events

20

21

as they happened, rather than to give present impressions of what has happened, or of conjecture as to what might have

22

happened if some things had been done differently.

23

115. My correspondence with the Commanders-in-Chief in the Pacific during the years 1940 and 1941 indicated that for

25

24

almost two years before the attack on Pearl Harbor the lack

в

Witness: Admiral Stark

of physical resources was fully known to all the Navy officers in critical positions, and that the danger of war with Japan and a possible surprise attack on Pearl Harbor and methods of meeting it had been fully considered.

116. By way of summary, I would like to point out that during the critical period October, November and December, 1941, I sent the following specific warnings to the Commanders in the Pacific:-

(a) Secret dispatch, dated 16 October 1941, containing the statement:-

"The resignation of the Japanese cabinet has created a grave situation. If a new cabinet is formed it will probably be strongly nationalistic and anti-America. " " " Since the U. S. and Britain are held responsible by Japan for her present desperate situation there is also a possibility that Japan may attack these two powers. " " " "

(b) My letter to Admiral Kimmel, copy to Admiral Hart, dated 17 October 1941, containing the following words:-

"Personally I do not believe the Japs are going to sail into us and the message I sent you merely stated the 'possibility'; in fact I tempered the message handed to me considerably. Perhaps I am wrong, but I hope not. In any case after long pow-wows in the White House it was felt we should be on guard, at least until something indicates the trend."

AH 10

S

witness: Admiral Stark

(c) My letter to Admiral Kimmel, dated 7 November 1941, containing the paragraph:-

crisis in the Pacific. Just when it will break, no one can tell. The principal reaction I have to it all is what I have written you before; it continually gets 'worser and worser'!

A month may see, literally, most anything. Two irreconcilable policies cannot go on forever - particularly if one party cannot live with the set up. It doesn't look good."

(d) My letter to Admiral Kimmel, dated 14 November 1941, in which I stated:-

patches a listing of a number of points by the Japan Times and Advertiser upon which concession by the United States was necessary for the 'solution of the Pacific Crisis'. Complete capitulation by the United States on every point of difference between the Japanese and this country was indicated as a satisfactory solution. It will be impossible to reconcile such divergent points of view."

With this letter, I enclosed a memorandum for the President, prepared jointly by General Marshall and me, in which the following conclusion is stated:-

"War between the United States and Japan should be avoided while building up defensive forces in the Far East,

Witness: Admiral Stark

until such time as Japan attacks or directly threatens territories whose security to the United States is of very great importance."

and in which we recommended:-

"That no ultimatum be delivered to Japan."

LARRY WLC fws Hecht

(e) Secret dispatch, dated 24 November 1941, stating that -"Chances of favorable outcome of negotiations with Japan very doubtful. This situation coupled with statements of Japanese Government and movements their naval and military forces indicate in our opinion that a surprise aggressive movement in any direction including attack on Philippines or Guam is a possibility."

- My letter to Admiral Kimmel, dated 25 November 1941, including the statement that neither the President nor Mr. Hull --"would be surprised over a Japanese surprise attack."
- (g) Secret dispatch, dated 27 November 1941, including the paragraph:-

"This dispatch is to be considered a war warning. Negotiations with Japan looking toward stabilization of conditions in the Pacific have ceased and an aggressive move by Japan is expected within the next few days. *** Execute an appropriate defensive deployment preparatory to carrying out the tasks assigned in WPL-46" (the war plan).

Secret dispatch, dated 3 December 1941, stating:-"Highly reliable information has been received that categoric and urgent instructions were sent yesterday to Japanese diplomatic and consular posts

3

-1

5

0

7

8

0

10

11

12

13:

1 -5

15

16

17

10

19

20

21

22

23

24

at Hongkong, Singapore, Batavia, Manila, Washington and London to destroy most of their codes and ciphers at once and to burn all other important confidential and secret documents."

Secret dispatch, dated 3 December 1941, stating:-(1)

"Circular Twenty Four Forty Four from Tokyo one December ordered London, Hongkong, Singapore and Manila to destroy purple machine. Batavia machine already sent to Tokyo. December second Washington also directed destroy purple, all but one copy of other systems, and all secret documents. British Admiralty London today report Embassy London has complied."

Secret dispatch, dated 4 December 1941, stating:-(j)

"Guam destroy all secret and confidential publications and other classified matter except that essential for current purposes and special intelligence retaining minimum cryptographic channels necessary for essential communications with CINCAF, CINCPAC, COM 14, COM 16 and OPNAV. Be prepared to destroy instantly in event of emergency all classified matter you retain. Report crypto channels retained."

Secret dispatch, dated 6 December 1941, stating:-

3

5

0

8

Ð

10

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

23

24

"In view of the international situation and the exposed position of our outlying Pacific islands you may authorize the destruction by them of secret and confidential documents now or under later conditions of greater emergency. Means of communication to support our current operations and special intelligence should of course be maintained until the last moment."

That concludes the statement.

20-

Hecht

3

-1

5

Witness Stark

0

7

8

0

10

12

13

11

1.5

16

15

18

17

19

50

2.1

22

23

24

25

Mr. Mitchell: Admiral Stark, in 1940, when the discussion arose between Admiral Richardson, then Commander of the Pacific Fleet, and officials in Washington, about basing the fleet at at Pearl Harbor, according to the record we have to take no question was raised by anybody prior to November, 1940, about the safety of the fleet while in Pearl Harbor; is that in accord with your recollection?

Admiral Stark: I do not recall anything up until the letter which --

Mr. Mitchell: Which you wrote?

Admiral Stark: Which I wrote at that time. There may have been.

Mr. Mitchell: Admiral Richardson gave the Secretary of the Navy a memorandum dated September 12 in which he listed all the objections he had to keeping the fleet based at Pearl Harbor, and in that list there was no suggestion about the dangers to the fleet while in Pearl Harbor. Can you remember any instance where the safety of the fleet was discussed before that? I mean, safety while in Pearl Harbor.

Admiral Stark: I do not, specifically. I have a rather hazy remembrance that before I wrote Admiral Richardson asking him to get data with Com. 14, with the Army, I had written Admiral Bloch, in fact, I think a letter to Admiral Richardson stated that I had gotten some information but it wasn't specific

10

12

15

50

21

22

113

25

Witness Stark

Questions by: Mr. Mitchell

or complete enough for our purposes, and we wanted the entire situation gone over.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, the first document in evidence we have in this case that anybody was worrying about the safety of the fleet while in Pearl Harbor is your letter of November 22, 1940 written to Admiral Richardson in which you referred to a dispatch that you had sent in October to Admiral Bloch asking him for a report on the question of safety.

Admiral Stark: Yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: What inspired you to write that letter, how did it happen that it occurred?

Admiral Stark: The incident at Taranto and the British success there in torpedoing ships at anchor in harbor.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, that was an attack that the British made on the Italian fleet in the harbor with torpedo planes, was it?

Admiral Stark: Yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: And bombers. Which was quite successful? Admiral Stark: That is correct. Of course, we had long and often thought of an attack on Pearl Harbor as a possibility and something which might some day be pulled. Our fleet exercises always contained an exercise of an attack in which the two sides, the attacking force wanted to get in, if it could, and the defending force, of course, would first want to get the

n

1.

Witness Stark

Questions by: Mr. Mitchell
attacking forces carriers. I mean, it had been much discussed.
So, I am answering your question by saying that was the first
time I am thinking of what documentary evidence I can recall
at the moment. Whether or not I had mentioned it previously
in some of my letters to Admiral Richardson, I would have to
look it up.

Mr. Mitchell: Admiral Richardson didn't raise any question about the safety of the fleet as a reason for going back to the coast?

Admiral Stark: No, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: You agreed with him, didn't you, about the better training facilities?

Admiral Stark: I did agree with him, yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: You didn't raise any question at that time about the safety of the fleet?

Admiral Stark: No, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: It was after the decision had been made to keep the fleet out there and a little time had passed that then you began to think about that problem; is that it?

Admiral Stark: That is correct. When the fleet went out there for that fleet problem I had no thought, and so far as I know no one else had any thought whatsoever, of the fleet remaining there. It all developed when we talked about bringing the fleet back. We had not, not having envisaged the

2

-1

5

8

Ø

11

12

13

1.1

15

16

17

Questions by: Mr. Mitchell

fleet going out there, we had not sent many things which they would need to carry on their routine target practice, which was one of the things Admiral Richardson was worried The fleet had left with the idea of coming back. about. The people on the coast all expected the fleet to come back. The question of morale came up. Of re-enlistments. In other words, personnel and morale and material conditions effecting training of the fleet, and also getting it ready for war quickly, that was what he was concerned about. Now, the drill out there, and so forth -- and we did get them ready, but if he came back to the coast he could strip a ship more effectively and quicker than he could out there. It could be done out there. But those were his primary reasons.

Mr. Mitchell: Now, as the result of your letter to Admiral Richardson of November 22, 1940, you remember he undertook an inquiry.

Admiral Stark: Yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: He went right out into the Army defenses and inspected those, did he not?

Admiral Stark: Yes, sir. We asked -- the letter to him stated not only the fleet but the commandant of the naval district, and also the Army -- so that all hands out there would be in on that estimate.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, do you recall that it was as a result

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

END LaCharity Shefner Cws

Witness Stark

3

3

5

0

7

8

D

17

18

19

20

13

22

24

20

Questions by: Mr. Mitchell

of an inquiry, started and conducted in that way, that Admiral Bloch made his report of December 30, which is in evidence here?

Admiral Stark: Yes, sir. The report came in and our reply was largely predicated on it.

Mr. Mitchell: I notice here --

Admiral Stark: That is, our action, I should say.

Mr. Mitchell: There has been handed me a copy of the letter from the Chief of Naval Operations to the Director of Naval Districts Division, dated December 31, 1940, a memorandum signed by R. E. Ingersoll, Acting Chief of Naval Operations. I have never seen it before. Have you any knowledge of that?

Admiral Stark: I would like to see it.

(Short pause.)

Mr. Mitchell: This is one of the papers that you have in the brown envelope.

The Chairman: You mean the one we got today?

Mr. Mitchell: In the same envelope.

Questions by: Mr. Mitchell

Admiral Stark: I think I saw that. It had slipped my mind for the moment.

Mr. Mitchell: That letter was written before Bloch's report came in, wasn't it?

Admiral Stark: Yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: His report was dated the 30th of December, indorsed by Richardson at Hawaii on the 7th of January.

Admiral Stark: Yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: I would like to put that in evidence and I will read it into the record.

The Chairman: All right. It is (Reading);

"From: The Chief of Naval Operations.

"To: Director, Naval Districts Division,

"Subject: Defense of Pearl Harbor by Army.

"l. The Chief of Naval Operations has for some time felt considerable concern over whether the Army's antiaircraft defense of the Navy Yard, Pearl Harbor, including vessels of the United States Flaet berthed there, is adequate in view of the probability of an early surprise attack by carrier aircraft if Japan decides to make war on the United States.

"2. It is, therefore, requested that information be obtained concerning the details of the Army's Hawaiian

10

11"

12

131

11

15

10

17

15.

:0

1)

23

2.5

defense plan in this regard. We should be informed as to their present and also the projected anti-aircraft defense, including such features as the following:

- Number, caliber, and proposed location of anti-aircraft guns, including machine guns.
- "(b) Use that is to be made of smoke screens from either fixed or mobile sources.
- Number and location of pursuit p lanes to be used for this purpose, with probable percentage of availability/
- The character and extent of the warning net to be used, from shore or floating stations, and the present percentage of availability of such stations.
- Whether or not the present defense elements have received adequate training.

R. E. INGERSOLL.

Acting. "

Now, here is another letter lated January 9, 1941 that has not yet been offered in evidence, from the Chief of Naval Operations to the Chief of Staff. That is again signed by Admiral Ingersoll. Did you know of that at the time it was sent to the Chief of Staff?

Admiral Stark: January 9th? Mr. Mitchell: January 9th.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

17

19

21

20

22

23

24

3

4

5

в

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Adriral Stark: Yes, sir, I think I saw that, I think I have seen that despatch.

Mr. Mitchell: I will read that into the record. (Reading):

"January 9, 1941.

"From 8 The Chief of Naval Operations.

To The Chief of Staff, U. S. Army.

Subject Installation of Aircraft Detection Equipment.

- 1. The Navy Department considers that improvement of the antiaircraft defenses, and particularly of the aircraft detection components of those defenses, in the Hawalian Islands is urgently necessary for the protection of the fleet units there present. It is believed that in the spring and summer of 1941 enemy air operations are much more likely to take place in the Hawaiian area and in Alaska than in Puerto Rico, Panara and the Continental United States.
- 2. For the foregoing reason the intended priority of permanent installation of the fixed antiairoraft detection equipment being procured by the Navy is as follows: - Midway, Johnston, Guar, Palmyra, Samoa, Wake, Guantanamo. It is requested that consideration be given to revising schedules of delivery so as to provide Army installations in the Hawaiian Islands and at Kodiak, Dutch Harbor and Sitka before completing installations at Panama and before proceeding with

18

19

17

20

21

23

24

3

5

8

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Witness Stark

Questions by: Mr. Mitchell

installations in Puerto Rico and the continental United States.

- 3. Confirmation is also requested of the understanding reached on 8 January 1941 in a conference between the Director of Naval Communications, the Chief Signal Office, and representatives of the War Plans Divisions of both services, that the Navy Department will be given priority in deliveries of seven sets of mobile equipment and at least eight of the eighteen sets of antiaircraft equipment for the use of Marine Defense Battalions.
- It was learned in the conference on 8 January that delays are anticipated in obtaining steel for use in completing this equipment. It is recommended that the highest priority be given to production of this equipment and supplying the material needed. The Navy Department will be glad to cooperate in obtaining the necessary priorities.

R. E. Ingersoll,

Acting."

Now, following that this Bloch report care in. You remember that?

Admirat. Stark: Yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: In which he conderned the situation at Hawaii as inadequate for defense against an air attack?

Admiral Stark: That is correct, yes, sir.

3

4

5

6 '

7

8

10

8

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

20

19

21

23

22

24

25

Mr. Mitchell: And then you said in your statement today that you caused that letter to be written by Secretary Knox to Secretary of War Stimson?

Adriral Stark: That is correct.

Mr. Mitchell: What part did you take in that?

Admiral Stark: That is correct, yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: Admiral Turner said that he did, too.

Admiral Stark: That letter was formed in the War Plans
Division, gone over very carefully in the front office and
then submitted to the Secretary for signature.

Mr. Mitchell: You were in full accord with the conclusions in that letter?

Admiral Stark: Yes, sir, in complete accord with it.

Mr. Mitchell: From that time on, following that letter to the Secretary of War, steps were taken by both the Army and the Navy to prime the defense, both naval and military, in Hawaii against a possible air attack, were they not?

Admiral Stark: That is correct, yes, sir.

Mn Mitchell: Now, we have had here in much of the correspondence between General Marshall and General Short, as to the latter's desire for more planes and guns and other equipment. What did the Navy do? What did you do towards supplying Admiral Kimmel with any additional equipment that he needed or that was available for defense against an air

2

3

4

5

в

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Witness Stark

Questions by: Mr. Mitchell

attack in the way of anti-aircraft equipment on the ground or fighter planes or reconnaissance planes, PBY's'

Aimiral Starks We increased, - I have forgotten just how much, off course it is a matter of record, - the number of squadrons he had out there capable of long distance reconnaissance. With regard to surface vessels, we were able to do very, very little for him and we --

Mmr. Mitchell: Well, were surface vessels of real significance in the detection of an incoming enemy carrier force?

Admiral Stark; They would have been helpful, yes, sir. Mr. Mitchell: They would have had a great deal of ground to cover, would they not?

Adriral Stark: Yes, they would have had a great deal of ground to cover but still you will note in his letters his constant request for them and my statement to him that we could not supply them.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, I inferred from his letters that he was referring a good deal to patrols against submarines.

Admiral Stark: Yes, but they might have helped him in an emergency to use his eyes. For example, we told him that we did not have them and that he would have to detail such craft from his own fleet, which meant a detail of destroyers. I told him, - I think it appears in one of these personal

Witness Stak

Questions by: Mr. Mitchell

letters, - that statement and we also sent him an official letter to that extent.

Mr. Mitchell: Am I wrong in thinking that that patrol by surface craft was merely for the purpose of determining submarines approaching and vessels?

Admiral Stark: Well, it was all to be used in that, in the distance. It would have helped him for use in shore patrol, but he might have extended them.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, you were familiar with the plans that were made from time to time thereafter affecting Hawaii, dir ected towards the coordination and the unionof action between the Army and Navy forces in defense against an air attack?

Admiral Stark: Yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: Do you remember the Martin-Bellinger report?

Admiral Stark? Very clearly, yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: In which they practically described the Jap attack as it afterwards occurred?

Admiral Stark: Well, we thought that report was so good when it care in that we distributed it as noted in the statement.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, now, in August 1941 there was a report or study by General Martin, the Army air commander,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Witness Stark

Questions by: Mr. Mitchell

that went directly to the Chief of the Army Air Forces. Did you see that, that study of reconnaissance by Martin?

Admiral Stark: I do not recall having seen it at the time. I may have. I have seen it since.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, that report showed very clearly that in order to insure against the complete thwarting of an air attack by the Japs it would be necessary to detect their carriers at sea the afternoon before and bomb them?

Admiral Stark: That is correct.

Mr. Mitchell: That was the condusion that Martin and Bellinger reached together, was it not?

Admiral Stark: Well, the conclusion was to spot them if you could before they could launch their planes.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, that is what I am leading up to. Admiral Stark: Yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: Now, in order to be sure that your fleet was not going to be bombed from the air they agreed that you would have to catch the carriers before their planes were launched, did they not?

Admiral Stark: That is correct, yes, sir.

Mn Mitchell: And they figured out that the natural way for the Japs to come in there would be at drylight, that is, with the planes.

Admiral Starks Yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: And it would be necessary to run a reconnaissance out for seven or eight or nine hundred or a thousand
wiles and detect them the afternoon or the night before in
order to damage them before their planes were launched, is
that right?

Admiral Stark: It is always the objective to get the carriers before they can launch their planes.

Mr. Mitchell: And it was also equally true, as they said, that actually if you could not do that, if you had to rely on catching the planes in the morning after they had left the carriers and had been launched at a distance up to two or three or four hundred miles, they could not be confident that the attack would not get home to some extent,

Admiral Stark: It is pretty difficult to stop all of an air attack once it gets started. You might break up its effectiveness somewhat but some planes, we have always felt, are very likely to get in.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, now, as a result of all those studies and all those plans, which indicated very clearly that unless you had a certain number of reconnaissance planes and a certain number of bombers you could not count on discovering the Japs before they had launched their planes, you were taking some hazards by having your fleet in Pearl Harbor, isn't that correct?

WARD & PAUL. WASHINGTON, D. C.

1

S

3

5

в 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

16

15

17

19

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

Admiral Stark: There is always a hazard to have a fleet on the firing line, sir, or in an exposed position and there has been ever since the war started.

Mr. Mitchell: The number of planes that the Army had and the number of planes that the Navy had were admittedly known at both ends, both at Hawall and in Washington by the Army and Navy to be inadequate to run a full reconnaissance over a 360 degree circle at a distance of seven or eight hundred miles, is that true?

Admiral Stark: That is correct, yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: And isn't it a fact that your PBY's, plus the bombers that were there for the Army, were so limited in number that the best you could put out, or that the commander out there could put out would be to run a sectional reconnaissance, taking one sector one afternoon or morning am another one another day?

Admiral Stark: Yes, sir. He did not have enough for a 360 degree search.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, even assuming that he left out the west and southwest, where your task forces were operating and Guar and Midway intervening and all that, and he even tried to cover the area to the north, which was apparently the dangerous area, there being little traffic up there, the commanders out there could not have run a reconnaissance that would

Questions by: Mr. Mitchell

2

3

3

4

5

в

7

8

10

11

13.

15

18

17

18

19

20

22

24

23

25

cover more than a third of the area in one day, could they?

Admiral Stark: Well, I do not understand just what you mean by "a third of the way" or "a third of the area."

Mr. Mitchell: Well, I am speaking of a sector. There is 180 degrees on the north side on a horizontal line.

Admiral Stark: Yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: I ar speaking of a reconnaissance to the north.

Admiral Stark: Yes. He did not have enough for that whole northern semi-circle.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, could they have covered more than a third of that northern semi-circle daily?

Admiral Stark: The air people have testified on that, as to what they could cover, or if they have not testified they can testify, considering the upkeep of their planes and their pilots, and so forth, and I hesitate to get into detail on that.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, Martin said he needed 189 big four motored planes to run a 360 degree reconnaissance daily out to a distance of seven hundred or eight hundred miles. That would mean half that number at least to run the 180 degree sector, would it not, and you did not have that many?

Admiral Stark: Kimmel had available, without regard to Army planes, approximately 60 operating planes at that time.

3

4

5

8

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Witness Stark

Questions by: Mr. Mitchell

He had 82, I believe, out there, of which 60 were operating. There are always a certain number laid up for repairs.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, he had a little less than a third of the planes that Martin reported he needed for the 360 degrees.

Admiral Stark: As I say, that has been studied both by the Army and the Navy. There has been testimony submitted, not before this court but I believe before the Navy last summer, or perhaps before the Army, as to what could have been done and witnesses can be called for that. I would hesitate to pronounce an opinion.

Mr. Mitchell: I was hoping possibly that you had given that subject some thought in 1941 when the question of the safety of the fleet was at stake and that maybe you had formed some ideas yourself about the extent of the hazards and the difficulty of their discovering the Jap carrier fleet in that way. Did you not give it some attention then?

Admiral Stark: Yes. What we did was to give them in distributing all we had to different areas, all that we felt that they needed, - all that we felt that we could give them.

Mr. Mitchell: That is right.

Admiral Stark: They needed more.

Mr. Mitchell: You gave them everything you had.

Admiral Starks Yes, sir.

3

5

8

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Mr. Mitchell: But it was not quite enough.

Admiral Stark: No, 1t was not.

Mr. Mitchell: That is just what I am getting to. I think I am not making any statement exactly as to what the record will show, but the impression one gains from it to date is that admittedly they were away short of the reconnaissance planes, fighting planes and anti-aircraft at Hawaii and that the chances of detecting a carrier force in tire to destroy the carriers before the planes were launched was a rather slir chance, as Mr. Churchill said about the Chinese.

Admiral Stark: When you haven't got enough planes to search the entire area which you would like to search, whether it is planes or what not, you narrow lown to where you think is the most likely area of travel and your next study is how can you cover that or how much of it you can cover. That had been studied out, I believe, and witnesses who have made that study can be available.

Mr. Mitchell: I was trying to get your views on it.

Admiral Stark: I know it only by hearsay. I never made a personal study of the number of degrees they could cover, and so forth.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, were you troubled about the possibility of an air attack at Hawaii after the 1st of November 1941 as a possibility? Did it seem to you to be a real

18

19

21

20

22

24

23

Questions by: Mr. Mitchell

hazardi

2

5

в

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

23

24

25

Abriral Stark: We always recognized the possibility.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, then, when you had a fleet out there and you did not have an adequate anti-aircraft defense why were you not worried about the safety of the fleet in Pearl Harbor?

Admiral Stark: I stated in my letter that I was worried about 1t.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, that is in November 1940. Adriral Stark: Yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: I am bringing you down now to the period between November 27th and December 7, 1941. Had you lost your fear of an air attack?

Airiral Stark: No, I won't say that I was fearing an air attack. We recognized the possibility of it.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, had you changed your views? Admiral Stark: And we recognized that we should be ready so far as what we had available to use.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, suppose you did not have enough and you thought there was a substantial hazard, didn't the question arise in your mind and those of your staff here as to what you ought to do, whether you ought to move the fleet east a ways or make arrangements to keep a smaller number of the vessels in the harbor at a time and things of that kind?

3

4

5

в

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

-8

Questions by: Mr. Mitchell

Admiral Stark: There are certain hazards which you have to anticipate. As to just what should be kept in port and what should be kept at sea of what was out there, that was clearly up to the man on the spot.

Mr. Mitchell: Your idea was that having done everything you could for him and given him all the equipment that you could scrape up and he was still inadequately prepared to defend against an air attack, that the responsibility of just what he did to meet that situation was up to him, is that the 11ea?

Airiral Stark: Yes, sir. That was all we could do, except we were pressing continually to get more material.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, I know, but I am talking now about on November 27th, when the clock had struck and the codes were being burned and wer was a matter of days and you could not get any material in that length of time. You were up against a second problem, weren't you, of how to handle the fleet at Pearl Harbor?

Admiral Stark: Well, it was then up to the Commanderin-Chhief on the spot. I would not have presumed, sitting at a desk in Washington, to tell him what to do with his There were many factors involved, of which he was the only person who had the knowledge, and once I had started, if I had started, to give him directives, I would have been

17 18

20

19

21

22

23

24 .

3

в

8

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Mitchell: I was wondering why when you send the warning message at that time, what does this "defensive deployment" mean that was in your message of November 27th? What does that mean as applied to the conditions that existed there?

handling the fleet. That was not my job.

Admiral Stark: My thought in that ressage about the defensive deployment was clear all-out security measures. Certainly, having been directed to take a defensive deployment, the Army having been directed to make reconnaissance, but regardless of the Arry, our message to Admiral Kimmel, that the natural thing, - and perhaps he did do it, - was to take up with the Army right away in the gravity of the situation the plans that they had made and then make dispositions as be st he could against surprise for the safety not only of the ships which he decided to keep in port but also for the safety of the ships which he had at sea. He had certain material which he could use for that and we naturally expected he would use it.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, the word "deployment", at least in the Army sense, is to scatter, isn't it?

Admiral Stark: That is correct, yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: Is that what you meant when you applied 1t to the Navy command?

3

4

5

6

7

8

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Questions by: Mr. Mitchell

Admiral Stark: He should deploy what planes he had; submarines are splendid craft to see without being seen. They might have been employed. He could have used a light force if he had seen fit and had them available. He had certain forces at sea. We were not handling ther. That was his force. Just what deployment he was using them for, that also was up to him. He could search, - I am not stating that he should and it is difficult to testify on this, particularly in the light of hindsight.

Mr. Mitchell: I know.

Admiral Stark: It is awfully difficult to keep away from 1tp

Mr. Mitchell: I am just trying to get a translation of the words "defensive deployment".

Admiral Stark: Well, a defensive deployment would be to spread and to use his forces to the maximum extent to avoid surprise and, if he could, to hit the other fellow and in conjunction with the Army, to implement the arrangements which had previously been made for just this sort of thing.

Mr. Mitchell: Do you think the possibilities of a successful surprise attack by the Japs in the way that it was done was increased by moving the shipping out of the northem ship lanes in October? Did that give the Japs a little better chance to get through without being observed?

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Witness Stark

Questions by: Mr. Mitchell

Admiral Stark: It never occurred to me, I never thought of it in that light until I heard it brought up recently, because there were not many ships up there, not an awful lot anyway. It was easy to cross the lanes. A fleet that does not want to be seen and that has adequate air scouting does not have to be seen as a rule. They can steam darkened at night. Also, they can search out the night area that they propose to go through and I would not have said that it had any bearing.

Mr. Mitchell: You were aware, of course, that the Jap espionage system in Hawaii was working without any real hindrance?

Admiral Stark: The Jap what, sir?

Mr. Mitchell: The Jap espionage system, their spies in Hawa11.

Admiral Stark: We had always felt, - and again there are other witnesses available to you there who can tell you just what the Japs were doing. We had felt that not only in Hawaii but at practically all our given posts the Japs knew everything we were doing.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, you told us here and you yourself knew then in 1941 that the Japs not only had every opportunity to watch the movements in Hawaii and to know whether the forces there were alert or not alert, but they also had other means

3

5

8

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Questions by: Mr. Mitchell

of communicating it to their superiors in Tokyo. They had access to the radio and to the cable companies?

Admiral Stark: Yes, sir, that is correct.

Mr. Mitchell: Don't you think that really the key to this attack at Pearl Harbor was not only the fact that our forces were not alerted but that the Japs knew it?

Admiral Stark: You mean they knew our forces were not alertei?

Mr. Mitchell: Yes.

Admiral Stark: That would be conjecture. I do not know, sir. They may have, but I do not know. We have nothing, I believe, of record to show it. I think it is very likely.

Mr. Mitchell: We have plenty in this record to show they were getting dispatches from Hawaii every day telling exactly what was going on and they were inquiring about the conditions there. Some of these dispatches that we did get and decoded in time talk about aircraft reconnaissance and all that sort of thing.

Admiral Stark: That is true, yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: It is a fact, isn't it, that they must have known everything he was doing and had every means of reporting that fact to their government.

Admiral Stark: That is true, yes, sir. Just what they reported in the last hours I do not know, but what you say is

21 22

> 23 24

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

23

quite true. 2

> Mr. Mitchell: I do not mean over the last hours but I mean over the last weeks.

Admiral Stark: Yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: As a matter of fact, that was a considerable hazard normally in the Japs making an attack of that kind, a hazard to them, was it not?

Admiral Stark: That is correct, yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: And in order to decide whether they would take it or not they would have to know something about the extent of preparedness at the other end, wouldn't they?

Admiral Stark: Yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: Did you know here in Washington between November 27th and December 7, 1941 that our D.F. system, direction finder system, had lost tractk of all but two divisions of Jap carriers and that they did not pick ther up again before the 7th?

Admiral Stark: I was familiar at that time in general with the general picture. It is a long time ago and what I heard recently that is so definite on that. Just how much I am colored by hindsight on that I do not know. I do distinctly recall their changes of call signs and that sort of material and also we asked -- it shows in the record, I believe, - the Army to make reconnaissance over the Mandates

Questions by: Mr. Mitchell

and we were not too sure at that time, in fact I say we were not too sure; the last information we had as to the carriers had come in some time previously as I recall.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, your report sheets that we have here about the location of carriers seem to differ a little bit from the ones that they were using out in Hawaii. Diin't you get your information from Hawaii or did you pick it up directly here in the Navy Department?

Admiral Stark: The information that came in with regard to material of that sort came from the field. That is, it came from Hawaii and it came from the Philippines. were dependent upon them for that information.

Mr. Mitchell: You had about the same date to work on that they did?

Admiral Stark: Yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, there are two in one of the old records that has not been presented yet here, - there is evidence by one of the officers in charge of that work in Hawaii, of the direction finding reports and ship locations, that they lost track of the Jap carriers around the 26th or 27th of November and that he reported it to his chief.

Admiral Stark: Yes, sir.

Mr. Mitchell: Did anything like that occur around that time? Did anybody call it to your attention, anything to

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

4

5

8

7

8

Witness Stark

Questions by: Mr. Mitchell

that effect?

Admiral Stark: I have no recollection of it now.

The Chairman: Are you ready to suspend?

Mr. Mitchell: Yes.

The Chairman: The committee will stand in recess until ten o'clock on Wednesday morning. The chair desires to hold a brief executive session with the committee and everybody else will please retire from the room.

(Whereupon, at 4:10 o'clock P.M., December 31, 1941, an adjournment was taken until 10 o'clock A. M., Weineslay, January 2, 1946.)

D. C. HOTDHIHBAW JUAY & URAW