

26 March 1946

MEMO TO: Chairman, Executive Committee  
FROM : John F. Barry  
SUBJECT: Recommended Witness, YOSHIZAWA, Kenkechi

1. The above subject is recommended as one suitable to be called as a witness. He has stated to me on 14 March 1946 and 26 March 1946 that he is willing to testify in the forthcoming trial on any of the information covered in his interrogation.

2. Pertinent biographical information:

Born, 1874  
Consul Hongkong, 1906  
1st Secretary Embassy in England, 1910  
Councillor Embassy in Peking, 1916  
Director Asia Bureau of Foreign Office, 1920  
Minister to Peking  
Ambassador to France, until 27 December 1931  
Minister of Foreign Affairs, 14 January 1932 to 26 March 1932  
Member of House of Peers, July 1932 to August 1945  
Ambassador to Batavia, 26 November 1940 to July 1941  
Ambassador to French Indo China, November 1941 to November 1944  
Senior Councillor Foreign Office, May 1944 to August 1945  
Member of Privy Council, August 1945 to Present

General

Mr. YOSHIZAWA speaks and understands English well. He is mentally alert for his age (72). He expresses disapproval of the military's usurpation of power in the last fifteen years and blames them for Japan's downfall. He is the son-in-law of Premier INUHAI (assassination May 15, 1932). Interrogation - March 1, 4, 12, 14, 21, 23, 25, pending 3 April.

3. Value as a witness:

Because of his association, when Minister of Foreign Affairs, in the INUHAI Cabinet with ARAKI (then Minister of War) from 14 January 1932 to 25 May 1932, at a time when the Manchurian Incident was developing and the Shanghai Incident began, he can offer some corroborative testimony as to the desires of ARAKI, MASAKI, KOISO and other militarists to recognize the independence of Manchuria at an early date, February 1932.



As Ambassador to Batavia, he can give direct evidence that the commercial mission headed by him to Batavia in 1940 was successful and that the propaganda line put forth by the Japanese Government that this mission was unsuccessful was false. The alleged failure of this mission to negotiate a commercial treaty with the Dutch was used by the Japanese to show that they were being economically strangled by the ABCD powers and thus were being forced into a defensive position. This argument, that Japan was being economically as well as militarily surrounded by the ABCD powers, is advanced by TOJO as an excuse for the Japanese attack. One of the facts used to substantiate his argument is the alleged failure of the Dutch to cooperate on the commercial negotiations conducted by YOSHIZAWA. YOSHIZAWA will testify vigorously on this point as he considers the distortion of fact a reflection on his ability.

In Indo China YOSHIZAWA had the function of carrying out the terms of the treaty entered into between Japan and French Indo China during May 1941. His testimony will show that the carrying out of the treaty actually constituted a monopoly for Japan in French Indo China. All this is pertinent in showing the expansionist policy of the Japanese and their domination in French Indo China. He can also by his testimony show the switch over from control of French Indo China by the Foreign Office to control by the Ministry for Greater East Asia.

#### 4. Vulnerability as a witness:

While Foreign Minister, YOSHIZAWA took the conventional Japanese view that the Manchurian and Shanghai Affairs (1932) were started by the Chinese and made official addresses to that effect. Yet, as far as I have been able to determine, he was not an advocate of expansion into Manchuria or of the use of force against the Chinese as a means of subjugation for territorial gain or for lessening Chinese claims to Manchuria and Inner Mongolia.


Again while YOSHIZAWA was French Ambassador and representative of the Japanese at Geneva at the time of the Manchurian Affair, he officially opposed the first invitation to America by the League of Nations to participate in the league investigation of the Manchurian Affair. He explained this by saying he was acting with strict orders from Tokyo and that the excitement of the Japanese delegation forced him to technically object until the situation clarified.

Anyone who held the numerous official positions that YOSHIZAWA held during the last 15 years has probably carried out official acts or made official speeches tending to show that he himself was sympathetic to the cause of aggressive warfare. None have appeared thus far. I believe that his testimony on any point, showing an apparent sympathy for the prosecution, will not be weakened by any official acts that have appeared thus far.



5. Defendants:

I think YOSHIZAWA's testimony can be used against ARAKI, TOJO, as indicated above. MATSUOKA can also be implicated for the same reason as TOJO.

  
JOHN F. BARRY  
Witness Officer