4

1

2

3

8

5

8

7

9

11

13

16

15

18

17

20

21

19

22

25

24

does so in all deference to the much broader field of view of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull and in full awareness that the Ambassador's approach to the matter is limited to the viewpoint of the American Embassy in Japan."

That was a premise to all my reports.

To answer your question about the war lords I would merely read one paragraph of the report of my talk with the Prime Minister at that time. That is the telegram of September 6, 1941.

Mr. Gesell: Page 603, I think, is the one you quoted.

Mr. Grew: Page 605 of Foreign Relations.

"The report which the Prime Minister has received" --

Mr. Keefe (Interposing): Could I have the page again?

Mr. Grew: That is page 605 of Foreign Relations,

Volume II.

Mr. Keefe: I have it.

Mr. Grew: This is my report of the talk, of my conversations with the Prime Minister on September 6, 1941.

Paragraph No. 4 says:

"The report which the Prime Minister has received from the Japanese Ambassador concerning the latter's conversations with the President and the Secretary, have led the Prime Minister to think that the Administration in Washington entertains serious doubts as to the strength of the present elements.

T

4.

"Prince Konoe told me that from the inception of the informal talks in Washington he had received the strongest concurrence from the responsible Chiefs of both the Army and the Navy. Only today he had conferred with the Minister of War who had promised to send a full general to accompany the Prime Minister to the meeting with the President; the Minister of the Navy had agreed that a full admiral should accompany the Prime Minister.

cabinet, and that the Administration is not certain that

in the event that the Cabinet should adopt a peaceful pro-

gram it could successfully resist the attacks of opposing

The Navy and the Navy and other high ranking officers of the armed services who are in entire accord with his aims.

He admitted that there are certain elements within the armed forces who do not approve his policies, but he voiced the conviction that since he had the full support of the responsible Chiefs of the Army and control any opposition which might develop among those elements.

WARD

Mr. Keefe: Well, were you suggesting to our State

Department and the President that it was your opinion that
there should be a meeting between the President and Prince
Konoe?

Mr. Grew: That appears in this record, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. Keefe: You warmly recommended that, did you not?

Mr. Grew: From our point of view in Tokyo at that time.

Mr. Keefe: You felt Prince Konce was a man inclined to peace, and that some good would come out of such conference?

Mr. Grew: I think all of us in the Embassy at that time -- when I say "all of us" I mean the senior officers, the military attache, naval attache, commercial attache, and all of the senior members of the Embassy believed it was a good gamble; that Knnoe had come to a position where he realized the dangerous situation in which his country had got itself, and he was trying to find a way out.

Now, whether he controlled the military elements or not is a question we can never answer. It is not susceptible to proof. We cannot do it.

Mr. Keefe: As a matter of fact, that meeting was never held?

Mr. Grew: That meeting was never held.

Mr. Keefe: The proposal was rejected here at Washington, was it not?

c14

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

Mr. Grew: Well, the proposal was never acted on.

Although you will find that in August -- let me see if I

can put my hand on it. This is in Foreign Relations, page

572. The record shows that on August 28, 1941, when Admiral

Nomura, the Japanese Ambassador, had delivered to the President

a letter from Prince Konoe, the record shows:

"At the conclusion of the reading of the communication, the President said to the Ambassador that he could say to his government that he considered this note a step forward and that he was very hopeful. He then added that he would be keenly interested in having three or four days with Prince Konoe and again he mentioned Juneau."

He mentioned Juneau as the place of meeting.

Mr. Keefe: Do you know why the meeting was never held?

Mr. Grew: No, sir. I think Mr. Hull has made that amply clear in his statement. Mr. Hull felt that it would be futile to go ahead with the meeting unless the basis had been laid in advance in the Washington conversations.

Mr. Keefe: The futility of it appeared, according to Mr. Hull's statement, right while these negotiations were going on and Japan continued its unrepressed march of aggression.

Mr. Grew: That is perfectly true.

4

5

G

7

8

0

10

12

13

15

17

16

19

18

20

22

21

23

24

25

Mr. Keefe: Right on and on, day by day.

Mr. Grew: That is perfectly true.

Mr. Keefe: Mr. Hull and the President continually suggested if they were in earnest and if they were honest about the peace they would put a stop to some of those things.

Isn't that the situation? But the war lords would not do it; isn't that correct?

Mr. Grew: It is more of a story than that, Mr. Congressman. It is a pretty complicated story. No one who has not lived in Japan and understands the way things work there could possibly understand it. I have tried to explain one phase of it.

Mr. Keefe: You are making it pretty tough for me,
Mr. Grew, when you say nobody that did not live there can
possibly understand it. I am going to be in a hopeless situation, then, if that is the case.

Mr. Grew: The facts are these: At that time in Japan there were two camps. There were the militarist war leaders who were all out for expansion, and were carrying out the plans, as you have just said, day after day, week after week, steadily.

On the other hand, there were certain liberal-minded statesmen who realized the position their country had got into, realized the danger of war, and wanted to avert it, if

2

. 3

4

5

1

в

8

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

0

16

18

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

AL

fls

they possibly could.

Now, anything that appeared on the records had to go through the Foreign Office, which was always discredited by the military people. The Foreign Office was full of young officers, of extremist tendencies, many of them playing in with the Germans, and anything that went on the record, went through the Foreign Office, was promptly put through the hands of the extremists, and the Germans were constantly pressing, pressing to prevent any possibility of an understanding with the United States. That was the reason for their fear of formulas. That was the reason why I said in this telegram that they never would be able to bring about a satisfactory understanding in the conversations in Washington for the mere fact that they were so spread on the record. They had good reason to fear, because they were constantly trying to assassinate Prince Konce, and they very nearly did assassinate him just at this time when four thugs jumped abroad his car with daggers and tried to get at him, but failed. The former prime minister was also attacked. His throad was cut and he was out of the picture for many months thereafter. All these statesmen who were not playing in with the military were constantly under attack by the militarists. That is, I think, a fundamental reason why they were afraid of formulas.

Witness Grew

Now Prince Konoye said to me, "If I can meet the President face to face I will give him assurances, commitments which we will honorably carry out. We cannot carry them out overnight, but we will carry them out in as short a time as possible."

That is all on the record here, every bit of it. He said,
"A settlement of this kind will so electrify the Japanese
people, showing them that they can have what they want politically, economically, and socially, they can have security
without any more fighting," and they were tired out with the
China war, they were subject to the greatest economic sacrifices. Konoye said, "It will be accepted by the great mass
of the Japanese people, with the greatest satisfaction," and
he said, "I can guarantee that this will be carried out."

He said, "It can be carried out. It may take six months or more, it will take some time, but we will take our troops out of China, we will take our troops out of Indo-China.

Of course we have got to leave certain garrisons here and there for the purpose of our own security."

I said at once when this statement was made, "What do you mean by that?" He said, "I mean just the sort of thing like you yourselves are doing, the British are doing. You have garrisons in Peiping, in Tientsin, Shanghi, and so have the British, and so have many other countries." He said, "That is what we have in mind for the purposes of security."

WARD & PAUL. WASHINGTON, D. C.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

Witness Grew

There is the story. Nobody in the world can prove that even if Konoye had met the President and even if he had been able to give satisfactory commitments that he could have implemented them after he came back. That was definitely in the control of the military. Nobody could answer that question, and it cannot be answered today. It is not susceptible to proof.

Mr. Keefe: At least the President and Mr. Hull doubted his ability to implement any such suggestions with the military.

Mr. Grew: Very definitely.

Mr. Keefe: Because they declined the invitation for the conference.

Mr. Grew: Very definitely.

Mr. Keefe: That is true, is it not?

Mr. Grew: Absolutely.

Mr. Keefe: All right. That is in answer to my question, unless you have something further.

Mr. Grew: I just want to say once more everything I have said today represents the point of view of one spot, our Embassy in Tokyo, and we were deprived of a great deal of the information which was available to the President and Mr. Hull. We had none of the secret intercepts or telegrams, we had none of the documents that have come into the State Department from time to time, documents of a secret nature, so of course

менистои. о.

18

19

20

22

21

23

24

(16)

Witness Grew

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

the President and Mr. Hull saw the picture with a great deal more information than we had available to us.

Mr. Keefe: Am I to understand then, Mr. Grew, that from the information available to you at the Embassy in Tokyo, being denied the information contained in the intercepts and all of the other information available here at Washington, you were recommending that this meeting with Prince Konoye be held and that it would be productive of some good?

Mr. Grew: Well, sir, to get the record straight on that --and it is all on the record -- I better read you exactly what
was said here. This is the telegram of September 29:

"In the opinion of the Ambassador, on the basis of the above observations which he has every reason to regard as sound," - that was my analysis of the whole situation at that time - "American objectives will not be reached by insisting or continuing to insist during the preliminary conversations that Japan provide the sort of clear-cut, specific commitments which appear in any final, formal convention or treaty. Unless a reasonable amount of confidence is placed by the United States in the professed sincerity of intention and good faith of Prince Konoye and his supporters to mould Japan's future policy upon the basic principles they are ready to accept and then to adopt measures which

Witness Grew

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

(17)

gradually but loyally implement those principles, with it understood that the United States will implement its own commitment pari passu with the steps which Japan takes, the Ambassador does not believe that a new orientation can be successfully created in Japan to lead to a general improving of Japanese-American relations and to the hope that ultimate war may be avoided in the Pacific."

I want to make clear the fact that I felt that, as far as our economic measures went, we had great leverage there and we were certainly not going to relax those measures, our freezing measures, the abrogation of our treaty with Japan, the embargoes, and so forth, unless and until we found Japan was going to loyally implement whatever undertakings they might tell us they would undertake. That was our opinion in the Embassy at that time.

Mr. Keefe: Well, now, on November 3, in your message which is in evidence, you made this statement in paragraph 5, and I am reading it:

"please realize that in discussing the foregoing grave and momentous subject I am out of touch with the Administration's thoughts and intentions thereon and it is far from my intention to imply that an undeliberated policy is being followed in Washington.

D & PAUL. WASHINGTON

Witness Grew

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

moment to advocate so-called 'appeasement' on the part of the United States or that our Government should in the slightest degree recede from the fundamental principles which it laid down as a basis for adjustment and conduct of international relations, including our relations with Japan.

My purpose is only to insure against my country getting into war with Japan through any possible misconception of the capacity of Japan to rush headlong into a suicidal conflict with the United States. National sanity would dictate against such an event, but Japanese sanity cannot be measured by our own standards of logic.

bellicose tone and substance of the Japanese press
which has attacked the United States in recurrent
waves of intensity during the past several years,
but it would be shortsighted to underestimate Japan's
obvious preparations for a program to be implemented
if her alternative program for peace should fail.

It would be similarly shortsighted to base our policy
on the belief that these preparations are merely in
the nature of saber rattling with the exclusive purpose

2

3

4

5

8

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of giving moral support to Japan's high-pressure diplomacy. Japan's resort to measures which might make war with the United States inevitable may come with dramatic and dangerous suddenness."

Mr. Grew: Yes, sir.

Mr. Keefe: In that same message, Mr. Grew, you obviously must have had some knowledge of some statements that were being made in speeches here in the United States about the ability of the United States to knock the Jap Navy over in 24 hours, and all those sort of things. Those things had come to your attention, had they not?

Some of them had, undoubtedly. Mr. Grew:

Mr. Keefe: Were you prompted, in sending this message of November 3rd, to warn the State Department and perhaps the American people that perhaps the Japanese were of a character that had the capacity to strike suddenly and carry on war?

Definitely. Mr. Grew:

Mr. Keefe: And that these statements that were being made by them, and by speakers going around the country, as to the impotence of Japan and its Navy were far from the truth?

Very definitely. Mr. Grew:

Mr. Keefe: That was your information then?

But where you That was my information then. say "Japanese" that is a pretty relative term. There are

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

13

15

16

18

17

19

20

21

22

24

23

25

Mr. Keefe: Now I do not want to be captious or capricious

about it. I am referring to those things which would govern.

Mr. Grew: Yes, I agree with that 100 percent, with every word said in that telegram.

Mr. Keefe: Yes.

different kinds of Japanese.

Mr. Grew: Of course, the situation, when that telegram was sent, was very different from the situation which obtained under the previous Cabinet in September.

Mr. Keefe: Yes.

Mr. Grew: That was in November, under the Tojo regime.

Mr. Keefe: When did the Konoye Cabinet form?

Mr. Grew: October 13, 1941.

Mr. Keefe: Shortly before you sent this telegram of November 3 that I read from.

Mr. Grew: I took about two weeks to size up the new situation. I was not quite sure what Tojo's policy was going to be. I had been assured he was going to try to keep on the conversations, going to do his best to come to an agreement with us, and all the rest of it. Frankly, I had my fingers crossed. I was waiting to size it up, and after I had sized it up I sent the telegram of November 3.

Mr. Keefe: Now, as a matter of fact, the very fact that the Konoye Cabinet fell was an indication to you, was it not,

Witness Grew

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

Mr. Grew; that the militarists were continuing in full and complete control?

Mr. Grew: At that time, absolutely, Mr. Congressman.

But the point which was brought out in these telegrams is unless
this meeting of the President took place the Konoye Cabinet
would fall definitely.

Mr. Keefe: The meeting did not take place and the Konoye Cabinet did fall?

Mr. Grew: It did.

Mr. Kesfe: And who came in charge of the situation?

Mr. Grew: General Tojo.

Mr. Keefe: He was a militarist of the first order, wasn't he?

Mr. Grew: He was.

Mr. Keefe: And a bandit of the first order?

Mr. Grew: I would say so.

Hook 18

+

Mr. Keefe: He was in charge of running the show, wasn't he, from then on?

Mr. Grew: Completely, he certainly was.

Mr. Keefe: And he was not deterred by any economic sanctions, was he, after he came into control?

Mr. Grew: Not for a moment.

Mr. Keefe: No, and nobody was deterred before he came into control, so far as their actions disclosed?

Mr. Grew: That is correct.

Mr. Keefe: All right. Now, then, I want to get into another subject. The statement was made by you and by Secretary Hull that the presence of the American Fleet at Pearl Harbor acted as a deterrent and had a deterrent effect. That was the language you used, "had a deterrent effect."

Mr. Grew: Yes, sir.

Mr. Keefe: Willyou point out to me, for the purpose of this record, one single act in the program of the war lords of Japan which was deterred by the presence of the Fleet at Pearl Harbor?

Mr. Grew: Mr. Congressman, that is a very difficult question to answer. I do not think I could do it. I felt out there to withdraw the Fleet from Pearl Harbor would be a complete confession of weakness, and the Japanese might

well have struck long before they did strike if we had done so. That is something we can never prove.

Mr. Keefe: You did not know, of course, when you came to that conclusion that due to the knowledge of the intercepts that we had, all of the information that was in the possession of the State Department here?

Mr. Grew: I did not know that.

Mr. Keefe: No. And of course we did not know either here, or in Washington, or in Japan, except by rumors that they had entered into an agreement to strike Pearl Harbor on December 7, as indicated by your message of January 27, 1941.

Mr. Grew: That is perfectly true.

Mr. Keefe: Now, Mr. Grew, your answer to my question is, as I interpret it, that you were of the opinion that to withdraw the Fleet would have been an indication of weakness on our part that might have stimulated the Japs to strike quicker than they did.

Mr. Grew: Quite possible.

Mr. Keefe: Do I so understand it?

Mr. Grew: That would be my interretation.

Mr. Keefe: That was not an answer to my question. My question was: What act of the Japanese war lords, or the war government of Japan, was deterred by the fact that we had the Fleet in Pearl Harbor?

Mr. Grew: I could not point to any specific act,
Mr. Congressman. As a matter of fact, this whole procedure
passed over a considerable period of time. The movement
of the Japanese expansionists into China and eventually
into Indochina did not take place overnight. It was going
on gradually. It stopped for a while and then moved
ahead for a while.

Now, it is quite possible if we had withdrawn the Fleet from Pearl Harbor that expansionist movement might have gone a great deal faster than it did go. I cannot tell you that. I do not know. But I think that is a fair supposition,

Mr. Keefe: Well, I must interpret the fact, Mr. Grew, in the light of all the evidence that has been presented here, and we now have before us the evidence taken from the Jap files. Their story has been presented here by Admiral Inglis. So we not only have the story as it existed here in America, and at Tokyo, but we have the situation as it existed as shown by the Jap files.

Now, as a matter of fact, the Fleet went out there early in 1940, pursuant to regular plans for orderly maneuvers, as testified to by Admiral Richardson, merely for the purpose of maneuvers; its regular base being at San Diego, and San Pedro, up at Long Beach.

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

Now, when they concluded their maneuvers, the Fleet went into Pearl Harbor, and Admiral Richardson thought they ought to be brought back to their bases, and he received information and instruction to issue a press release, which was certainly contrary to his expressed opinion as he gave it to us here, to issue a press release to the effect that the Fleet was being retained for a time at his request, and being a Navy man he followed such instructions and issued such a press release, for the benefit of the Japs, I assume, and the Fleet remained there thereafter.

Now, you are not able, as the Ambassador being on the ground in Tokyo, to give to this committee one single specific instance of a case where the Japs were deterred from taking any action as the result of that Fleet being there, except the general statement that perhaps they might have infiltrated into Indochina and down south a little faster than they did, if the Fleet had not been out there. Is that the way I understand you?

Mr. Grew: Congressman, it is utterly impossible, and it would be utterly impossible for anybody to give one specific instance, because that is not the way armies work. They do not buck shead all of a sudden, and you cannot put your finger on it and say that was a specific instance, or one specific step that might not be taken if we did not have

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D C

.

c19

G

1-1

Э,

the Fleet there. Those things move slowly over a period of time. Nobody could give you one specific instance.

Mr. Keefe: Then it would be likewise quite impossible, would it not, for anyone to say that the presence of the Fleet in Pearl Harbor actually deterred the Japs at all?

If you cannot give any instances of where it did deter them, it will be quite impossible to say that they were deterred; isn't that true?

Mr. Grew: I do not believe anybody could answer that question. You cannot possible tell whether the presence of the Fleet in Pearl Harbor did or did not slow up the Japanese advance, whether they might have struck earlier than they did, whether we were much less ready than we were. The position I am taking is, from our point of view in Tokyo, we had the feeling that the presence of the Fleet in Pearl Harbor was a healthy thing, psychologically, and to withdraw it would be a confession of weakness which would be immediately taken up by the Japanese.

Mr. Keefe: I understand that thoroughly. I am not attempting to be critical of your position in that regard, or anybody else's. I am simply trying to get the facts of this situation so I thoroughly understand them.

Now, as a matter of fact, did you know the condition that the Fleet was in back in 1940 and 1941?

Mr. Grew: I knew nothing whatsoever about the condition of the Fleet.

Mr. Keefe: You assumed that the Fleet was ready for action, did you not?

Mr. Grew: I did.

Mr. Keefe: Had you know that the Fleet was not prepared for action, would you still have been of the opinion that it would be a deterrent?

Mr. Grew: I am afraid that is a hypothetical question which I find it very difficult to answer, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. Keefe: If you cannot answer, Mr. Grew, I will not press you for an answer. Unless you feel that you can answer it, I shall not press it.

Mr. Grew: I think I would prefer to pass that question.
Mr. Keefe: Very well.

Now, in answer to some questions by counsel, I believe, in answer to some questions by my colleague, Mr. Gearhart, there was quite an altercation as to the meaning of the word "ultimatum." Both you and Mr. Hull were very positive in your statements that the Jap message of November 20 constituted an ultimatum. Do you recall giving that testimony?

Mr. Grew: I do not think I testified to that effect, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. Keefe: Did you hear Mr. Hull so testify?

G

8

7

10

11

12

13

15

14

17

16

18

19

20

22

21

24

23

25

Mr. Keefe: It is in his statement, isn't it?

Mr. Grew: Yes, sir.

Mr. Grew: I did, yes.

Mr. Keefe: And it is the basis of his statement that the November 20 message constituted an ultimatum. Did you so conceive it to be an ultimatum?

Mr. Grew: Well, as for my personal views, Mr. Congressman, I have never felt that any communication from one government to another was an ultimatum if negotiations continued after that notice was served.

Mr. Keefe: Then, Mr. Grew, you must be in complete lack of agreement with Secretary Hull, because the facts clearly evidence that subsequent to the delivery of the Jap note to the Secretary of State, the note of the 20th of November, negotiations continued right on, conference after conference was held. You are aware of that, are you?

Mr. Grew: I am.

Mr. Keefe: Conferences were held not only with the Japanese but they were held with the British. They were held with the Dutch. They were held with the Chinese, especially with relation to the proposed modus vivendi proposal that the Japs had asked for.

Now, then, in view of those facts, and in view of your interpretation of what an ultimatum is, are you prepared to

say yourself that the message of November 20 was, in fact an ultimatum?

Mr. Grew: I have not said so, but I will say this,
Mr. Congressman, that I think if there is any difference
of opinion between Mr. Hull and myself on that point, it is
a pretty technical point; it is a point as to what is meant
by the term "ultimatum." It would be very difficult for
people to differ as to the actual meaning of that particular
word.

Mr. Keefe: Have you read the note of the 20th of November?

Mr. Grew: Yes, certainly.

Mr. Keefe: Did you find any language in it which indicates that negotiations were to be broken off?

Mr. Grew: I do not think it depends on the language in it so much as whether further negotiations continue after the delivery of that note.

Mr. Keefe: Then the facts are clear, Mr. Grew, that negotiations did continue. You know that, do you not?

Mr. Grew: That is a fact.

Mr. Keefe: They continued after the delivery of the note?

Mr. Grew: That is a fact.

Mr. Keefe: And it resulted in our offering a counter-

Williams Grov

h9

c20

2

5

4

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

17

16

18

19

21

20

22

23

24

25

Mr. Grew: That is correct.

proposal on November 26.

Mr. Keefe: You are sure of that, are you not?

Mr. Grew: That is right.

Mr. Keefe: Now, the statement has been made here that over in Tokyo a friend of yours, high in the Government circles, wrote you a letter in which he said that the people of Japan, without knowledge as to what was in the November 26 message, considered it to be an ultimatum, and you construe that to be the policy of the controlled press operating under the directions of the war lords to not give the Japanese people the truth; is that correct?

Mr. Grew: Very definitely.

Mr. Keefe: To make them believe that we terminated diplomatic relations?

Mr. Grew: That is correct.

Mr. Keefe: Do I so understand your testimony?

Mr. Grew: That is correct.,

Mr. Keefe: Now, the record discloses -- and I now refer to Exhibit 27, which I am advised is the first of the publication "Peace and War."

That is right. Mr. Grew:

Mr. Keefe: Published in 1942.

On page 137 of that short report there appears, beginning

hlo

1 .

on page 135, and continuing over to page 138, a memorandum entitled "United States Memorandum of November 26," and I find this expression, a statement as to the handling of this November 26 message to the Jap nese Ambassador in this language, and I quote from the top of page 136:

"On November 26, 1941, the Secretary of State handed to the Japanese Ambassador and Mr. Kurusu a proposed basis for agreement between the United States and Japan."

This was the culmination of these negotiations that had been going on between the 20th and 26th.

"In a statement accompanying the proposal, it was said that the United States earnestly desired to afford every opportunity for the continuation of discussions with the Japanese Government; that the Japanese proposals of November 20 conflicted in some respects with the fundamental principles to which each government had declared it was committed," and so forth.

Then appears this on page 137:

document, Mr. Kurusu said that when this proposal of the United States was reported to the Japanese Government that Government would be likely to 'throw up its hands'; that this response to the Japanese proposal could be interpreted as tentamount to the end of the negotiations. The Japanese



to?

representatives then asked whether they could see the President."

Now, there was an expression of opinion of the Japanese envoy, expressed to the time the note was handed to him on November 26, and before it had even been transmitted to Japan, indicating that, - after reading it, on the day that it was delivered to them, they considered it to be an ultimatum.

Do you so interpret that language?

Mr. Grew: Definitely not, Mr. Congressman. Do I interpret the language of the Japanese envoys as themselves having believed it to be an ultimatum?

Mr. Keefe: Yes.

Mr. Grew: That would appear to be clear from the record.

Mr. Keefe: All right. That is what I asked. As evidence of the fact that subsequent to November 20 there were continuing negotiations between the State Department and the Japanese envoy, I refer to page 134 of Exhibit 27, after the Japa had handed their proposal of the 20th to Mr. Hull, and this appears:

\*During a conversation on that same day with the Japanese Ambassador, and Mr. Kurusu, Secretary Hull said that Japan could at any moment put an end to the existing situation by diciding upon an'all-out' peaceful course; that at any moment

Đ.

Larry 0 15

fls

Japan could bring to an end what Japan chose to call 'encirclement.'

believed that the purposes underlying our aid to China were the same as those underlying our aid to Great Britain and that there was a partnership between Hitler and Japan aimed at enabling Hitler to take charge of one-half of the world and Japan the other half.

harping of Japan's leaders upon slogans of the Nazi type,
the Secretary said, served to strengthen this belief; what
was needed was the manifestation by Japan of a clear purpose
to pursue peaceful courses. He said that our people desired
to avoid a repetition in East Asia of what Hitler was doing in
Europe; that our people opposed the idea of a 'new order'
under military control.

"In this conversation the Japanese representatives reiterated that their Government was really desirous of peace and that Japan had 'never pledged itself to a policy of expansion.' Secretary Hull remarked that the Chinese 'might have an answer to that point.'"

With which I, parenthetically, agreed.

Then:

"During a conversation on November 22nd the
Secretary of State informed the Japanese Ambassador
and Mr. Kurusu that he had called in representatives of
certain other governments concerned in the Far East
and that there had been a discussion of the question
whether there could be some relaxation of freezing;
there was a general feeling that the matter could be
settled if the Japanese could give some evidence of
peaceful intentions. The Secretary said that if the
United States and other countries should see Japan
pursuing a peaceful course there would be no question
about Japan's obtaining all of the materials she desired."

Were you advised as Ambassador to Japan of these conversations relating to this proposed modus vivendi?

Mr. Grew: I couldn't answer that question, Mr. Congressman, without looking up the record. As I said before I was advised

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Witness Grew

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

of some of the conversations. In certain cases the records were telegraphed out to me. I do not know that I was advised

of the records of all the conversations.

Mr. Keefe: What records would you have to go to?

Mr. Grew: Those are on file in the Department of State available to counsel.

Mr. Keefe: Well, of course, then these documents that we have in evidence here, War and Peace, Foreign Relations and your book, don't contain all the messages?

Mr. Grew: That I cannot tell you.

Mr. Keefe: Can you turn and find any evidence in your book of any messages in reference to this modus vivendi proposition?

I don't recollect that there is anything there. Mr. Grew: I don't think there is.

Mr. Keefe: Well, do you have any present recollection now, Mr. Grew, that you were informed and knew about the negotiations?

Mr. Grew: I have no present recollection of that particular point.

Mr. Keefe: Were you advised that before any settlement of the relationships between the United States and Japan could be accomplished that it was necessary to call in consultation other powers that were interested -- Great Britain, the Dutch and the Chinese?

менистои.

2

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Witness Grew

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

Mr. Grew: Was I advised, you say, that it would be necessary to call them in?

Mr. Keefe: Yes.

Mr. Grew: No, sir, I certainly was not advised to that effect. I may have been advised after the meeting took place. I can't answer that question because, as I say, there were a great many such messages sent out to me, and I would have to check up the record to see whether that particular point was telegraphed to me or not.

Mr. Keefe: I believe you stated that you had no knowledge of the so-called ABCD agreement?

Mr. Grew: I had no knowledge of any such agreement.

Mr. Keefe: Have you been advised recently that there was such an agreement?

Mr. Grew: No, sir.

Mr. Keefe: Do you know anything about such an agreement?

Mr. Grew: I do not, sir.

Mr. Keefe: I call your attention to the fact that General Marshall testified with respect to that agreement when he was a witness before the Army Board of Inquiry, and I read this just to attempt to refresh your recollection, if it will.

The question was:

"Who constituted the military authorities representing the United States in entering into this agreement?"

маянистои. В.

24

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

Witness Grew

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

And the agreement referred to is the one already read into the record by the Senator from Michigan, Mr. Ferguson. The answer is:

"The agreement was reached in the so-called American-British-Dutch staff conversations held at Singapore in April of 1941. United States Army officers participated on my instructions and with the approval of the Secretary of State.

"The participants were: Captain Purnell, U. S. Navy, Chief of Staff of the U. S. Asiatic Fleet; Colonel A. C. McBride, U.S. Army, Assistant Chief of Staff of the Military Forces in the Philippines; Captain A. M. R. Allen, U. S. Navy, the U. S. Naval Observer in Singapore; Lieutenant Colonel H. G. Brink, U. S. Army, U. S. Military Observer at Singapore."

Does General Marshall's testimony bring back any recollection to you of the fact that there was such an agreement entered into?

Mr. Grew: No, sir, it does not, and I do not think that any report of that meeting which you just referred to came to, me in Tokyo, so far as I can now recollect.

Mr. Keefe: All right. Now, I want to ask a couple of other questions in relation to your book and your diary.

Oh, before I get to that:

20

21

22

24

23

3

4

5

8

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

## Witness Grew

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

Where is Mr. Dooman at the present time, who was formerly the counsellor of the Embassy at Tokyo?

Mr. Grew: Mr. Dooman lives in Washington but he is away for a few days. I think he will be back shortly but I don't know when.

Mr. Keefe: What is his full name?

Mr. Grew: Eugene F. Dooman, D-o-o-m-a-n.

Mr. Keefe: Did he return with you at the time you were exchanged and came back, which I believe was in July or August of 1942?

Mr. Grew: Yes, we came back together.

Mr. Keefe: Is he presently occupying any position in the State Department?

Mr. Grew: No, sir. He recently retired from the Foreign Service and the State Department. He has now no official position.

Mr. Keefe: He is in the same position that you are?

Mr. Grew: Yes, sir; exactly.

Mr. Keefe: Did he work with you when you became Under Secretary of State?

Mr. Grew: Mr. Dooman, as I recollect it, when he came back I think he was assigned to work in the Department of State, shortly after we came back. I would have to check up on that. But I had nothing to do with that because I was out

(2) пистои. в.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

•

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in the field speaking for the first year or year and a half.

Mr. Keefe: Well now, reference was made this morning to this report which you made setting forth the conversations had between Mr. Dooman and Mr. Ohashi on February 14, 1941.

In transmitting that report you used this language:

"The presentation by Mr. Dooman of his impressions of the position of the United States as gathered during his recent furlough appeared to cause Mr. Ohashi astonishment. Mr. Ohashi is, for a Japanese, extraordinarily direct and sparing of words. Upon listening attentively to what Mr. Dooman described as the philosophy of the American position Mr. Ohashi remained perfectly quiet for an appreciable space of time and then burst forth with the question, Do you mean to say that if Japan were to attack Singapore there would be a war with the United States. Mr. Dooman replied, The logic of the situation would inevitably raise that question. Mr. Ohashi then left that subject and adverted to the character of reports sent to London by the British Ambassador. Circumstancial evidence that Mr. Ohashi was affected by the interview was given by Sir John Latham, the Australian Minister, who called on Mr. Ohashi a few minutes after Mr. Dooman left. Sir John, without being aware that Mr.

Dooman had just called on Mr. Ohashi, told me that he found Mr. Ohashi greatly agitated and distrait.

"I propose to say to Mr. Matsuoka, with whom I have an appointment this morning, that the statements made by Mr. Dooman to Mr. Ohashi were made with my prior knowledge and have my full approval."

Now, this incident has been known quite widely in diplomatic circles as the "Dooman Incident", has it not?

Mr. Grew: Well, I hadn't heard that term applied to it,

Mr. Keefe: It caused some astonishment in diplomatic

Mr. Grew: I don't think it ever came out in public in Tokyo, so far as I recollect. Those things very seldom did come out. Is there any indication there that it did? I don't think so. Sir John Latham, the Australian Minister, appears to have known of it.

Mr. Keefe: Then you agreed at that time, when you sent this message, that it was the considered policy of the United States that if the Japs attacked Singapore we would go to war?

Mr. Grew: It is not a categorical statement to that effect.

Mr. Keefe: I know it is not, but what did you mean?

Mr. Grew: I think that was pretty good doctrine to spread

Witness Grew

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

to the Japanese at that time. I always held, during that period, that only a display of force and the establishing of the conviction among the Japanese that we intended to use it, if necessary, would have any effect out there.

Mr. Keefe: Mr. Grew, if you will pardon me, I am not attempting to place any false interpretation upon the language. I could let it stand for itself. The words speak for themselves as to just what was said. I am not in disagreement with you. I hope you do not get that impression. The statement says the logic of the situation would inevitably raise the question as to whether or not we would go to war.

Now, do I understand you to say that the purpose of Mr. Dooman making this statement to Mr. Ohashi, of which you had prior knowledge and approval, was part of the program to attempt to deter the Japs from the course they had set out on?

Mr. Grew: Congressman, no one is omninescient at any one time, of course, but we in Tokyo had during those years watched the impression created among the Japanese people as to the attitude of the United States and the American people.

Whenever a speech by some prominent isolationist was made in America that speech was generally emblazoned in headlines in the Japanese press and very few other speeches were ever allowed to be published.

Whenever there was a strike in the United States that

Азмінатом. р. с

(3)

strike was emphasized in the Japanese press in order to convey to the Japanese people that the American people were isolationists and pacifists and secondly that we were completely disunited and would never be able to fight a total war.

Washington it was pretty sound doctrine for him to speak as he did speak. There was no precise threat there. There was no categorical statement that we would or would not do this. It was simply the general tone and substance of his talk which I approved.

Mr. Keefe: Thank you, Mr. Grew, for that statement.

The fact is that Mr. Dooman was back here in the United States during the campaign of 1940, wasn't he?

Mr. Grew: I believe so.

Mr. Keefe: That is when he was here; it says so in the statement.

Mr. Grew: Yes.

Mr. Keefe: Now, were the speeches being printed in Japan that were being made during this campaign, do you know?

Mr. Grew: I can't recollect any particular speech at any time in particular, but in general that was the type of thing which was being published in the Japanese press because, apparently, the militarists wanted to give the Japanese people the idea that we were timid, that we could easily be intimidated,

Witness Grew

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

иотригнаму.

back.

Mr. Keefe: As I recall that campaign there were a great many speeches made by people who never have been termed isolationists, who were leading the people of America to believe that we weren't going to go to war.

I recall Mr. Willkie making those speeches and I recall the President making a speech in which he indicated that we weren't going to war.

Were those speeches published in Japan?

Mr. Grew: I can't answer that question, Mr. Congressman.

I can't recollect what speeches were and what speeches were

not published.

Mr. Keefe: I wonder, Mr. Ambassador, whether or not the purpose of Mr. Dooman having the conversation with Mr. Ohashi was not to try to give him the impression that a lot of this stuff that they had heard during this campaign did not represent the real and true spirit of the people of America?

Mr. Grew: I think one of the purposes of Mr. Dooman's talk was to create the impression that the American people were not completely isolationist and pacifist as many of the Japanese had been led to believe.

Japan you brought with you a diary consisting, as I understand

it, of some 13 volumes; is that right?

Mr. Grew: I believe that is correct, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. Keefe: And that is the diary which has been the subject of some discussion between you and the committee and Senator Brewster?

Mr. Grew: That is correct.

Mr. Keefe: Now, Mr. Grew, after you came back with this diary of 13 volumes, will you state whether or not you submitted it to Colliers Weekly for publication; for publication by Colliers Weekly first?

Mr. Grew: I did not submit the entire diary to Colliers
Weekly. I did submit parts of it having in mind the possibility
of a series of articles but I later found that I could not
write that series of articles and the whole thing was dropped.

Mr. Keefe: Now, as a matter of fact -- and you can answer this or not, as you wish, Mr. Grew -- isn't it a fact that you did submit your diary to Colliers Weekly for the purpose of having it edited into a series of articles and that when it was submitted it was found that there had been passages cut out of the diary and Colliers Weekly was not interested in publishing the diary with those deleted portions taken out?

Mr. Grew: I don't recollect that. The whole diary was not submitted.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

(4) 24

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Witness Grew

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

Mr. Keefe: What part was submitted?

Mr. Grew: I can't recollect. Certain parts were submitted to one representative of Colliers Weekly to look over and see whether a series of articles would be worth while.

Mr. Keefe: Who was that man?

Mr. Grew: I can't recollect his name now. He is now I think he died last year. But I can't remember his dead. name .

Mr. Keefe: Was he not the Washington representative of Colliers Weekly, the man to whom you submitted the diary?

I don't think so. Mr. Grew:

The Chairman: I was trying to think of his name. I think I knew him.

Mr. Grew: I remember that he came down to meet me when we got off the Japanese ship to see if he could sign me up for a series of articles. I wasn't willing to sign up at that time but as he had taken that trouble I realized that if I was going to write anything for the magazines that Colliers Weekly had a reasonable priority. We looked over the ground and I finally decided that I did not want to write those articles at that time and the whole thing was dropped.

Mr. Keefe: Where were those conversations held, here in Washington?

Mr. Grew: Well, -- the talks about the diary?

Witness Grew

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

9

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

Mr. Keefe: Yes.

I think so. Mr. Grew:

Mr. Keefe: What volumes of your diary did you submit to him?

Mr. Grew: I couldn't possibly tell you, Mr. Congressman. I wouldn't remember.

Mr. Keefe: Do you wish to say that Colliers Weekly gategorically did or did not refuse to publish an article because of the deletions which appeared in your diary?

Mr. Grew: I don't recollect any such decision now.

Mr. Keefe: Well, would you say that that decision was not reached or that you just do not remember?

Mr. Grew: I haven't thought of that incident. It is at least three years ago now. As far as I can recollect the matter Colliers never abandoned the idea completely. I think I just didn't go ahead with it. I don't recollect that Colliers definitely declined to publish. No, I don't recollect that.

Mr. Keefe: Will you answer this question, please:

Was it your intention to personally write the diary or did Colliers suggest that you go over it with an editorial writer that would shape up the material?

Mr. Grew: I think the idea was that certain parts could be taken out and possibly an editorial writer might go over

to details.

them and write up something for me.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

.8

11

12

13

14

манистои. р.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

--

24

25

Mr. Keefe: Did you discuss the matter with any editorial writer of Colliers Weekly?

Mr. Grew: Only in a very general way. We never got down

Mr. Keefe: What editorial writer of Colliers did you discuss the matter with?

Mr. Grew: That was that gentleman whose name escapes me.

I can't recollect it. I believe he died last year. I can't remember his name.

Mr. Keefe: What specific reason do you now ascribe for failing to go on and having Colliers publish the diary?

Mr. Grew: Well, I can't remember exactly the reasons. In the first place, I was exceedingly busy. I was making speeches all over the country. And I dare say that at that the I possibly was thinking of a book, in which case it would have been better not to do a series of articles. I think that was the idea, that I was proposing to bring out this book and therefore that I did not wish to go ahead with the articles.

Mr. Keefe: How many volumes of your diary did you turn to Colliers to inspect?

Mr. Grew: I don't remember whether I turned over the actual volumes or not. I had copies of various parts of the

Witness Grew

Questions by: Mr. Keefe

diary which I think I showed them. Whether I showed them the volumes or not I don't know.

Sherner follows.

Mr. Keefe: You just to not recall?

3

2

Mr. Grew: No, sir.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

WASHINGTON. D

15

16

18

17

19

20

21

22

24

23

25

Mr. Keefe: Well, then, after you decided, or it was decided, whatever the fact may be, that you were not going to have Collier's publish this series of articles, to whom did

you next submit your material for publication?

Mr. Grew: To whom did I next submit my material for publication?

Mr. Keefes Yes.

Mr. Grew: I then dewided to go ahead with the book and I decided to put it in the hands of Messrs. Simon & Schuster of New York and Mr. Quincy Howe, one of their foremost editors whom I knew personally, went over the diary with me and helped me pick --

Mr. Keefe: Now, you submitted your complete diary to Mr. Quincy Howe, did you not?

Mr. Grew: At one time he had it, yes.

Mr. Keefe: Yes. And he went through it for the purpose of editing this book, did he not?

Mr. Grew: That is correct.

Mr. Keefe: And he prepared the material that went into this book, "Ten Years in Japan"?

Mr. Grew: No, he did not prepare it.

Mr. Eeefe: Well, he put it together?

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

# Witness Grew:

### Questions by Mr Keefe

Mr. Grew: Well, he made suggestions as to passages that might be used and it was up to me to decide whether they should be used or not. In the last analysis I had this considerable amount of material and I decided what I wanted published and what was published.

Mr. Keefe: Well, you supervised it, Mr. Grew, I think.

Mr. Grew: That 1s correct.

Mr. Keefe: He actually drew up a manuscript, did he not?

Mr. Grew: That 1s correct.

Mr. Keefe: That is, under your supervision?

Mr. Grew: That 1s correct.

Mr. Keefe: And before publication could be had of that manuscript it had to be taken down to the State Department and cleared there, flid it not?

Mr. Grew: As I said the other day, Mr. Congressman, in wartime everything which is published by an officer of the government is supposed to be considered by a Publication Committee which then existed in the Department of State.

Mr. Keefes Yes. Well, I understand that, of course. It is a simple question. It was submitted regardless of reason, to the State Department?

That is a fact. Mr. Grew:

Mr. Keefe: And the reason was that we were at war and

25

24

Witness Grewa

Questions by Mr. Keefe

they had a right to see what was being published.

Mr. Grew: That is a fact.

Mr. Keefe: Now, then, when this original manuscript was prepared by Mr. Howe as the editor in charge of this, working for you and for Simon & Schuster, it was submitted to the State Department and there were suggestions for deletions from this manuscript, were there not?

Mr. Grew: There we re.

Mr. Keefe: And a new manuscript was prepared with the deletions?

Mr. Grew: I do not remember whether a new manuscript was prepared or whether the original manuscript was simply clipped. I dare say that the original manuscript was clipped of the passages which I determined to cut out and that manuscript was sent back to the publishers.

Mr. Grew: Well, as I said the other day, they were about a variety of things. Some of the deletions were taken out at my own initiative because I had prepared more material than could be comprised in the kind of book that my publishers wished to bring out. Therefore, that material had to be materially out down.

In fact, when the original manuscripts were prepared there were a good many passages in there marked "out", to be

Witness Grews

Questions by Mr. Keefe

considered as to whether there was room for them or not and,
if so, whether they would fit in with the type of book I
was going to publish. A good many of those passages I out
out myself.

It was suggested by the committee, and I remember no demand on their part at all, but suggested that certain passages might well be omitted because they might embarrass or possibly even injure or endanger individuals during war time, that they might be misinterpreted by foreign governments, passages of all kinds of natures which were cut out for one reason or another, but mostly of that kind.

Mr. Keefe: Do you remember, Mr. Grew, that after the second revision of this manuscript had been prepared that the story of the death march on Bataan was published in this country?

Mr. Grew: Well, I do not recollect the precise chronology of that. I remember very well that the story on the death march in Bataan was published in this country.

Mr. Keefes And didn't the publication of that story precipitate the necessity for further revision of your manuscript and wasn't it revised after that story was published?

Mr. Grew: Not to my recollection whatsoever. I do not think that that had anything whatsoever to do with it.

Mr. Keefe: Well, do you want to state categorically that

25

Mr. Quincy Howe?

```
Witness Grew:
                                           Questions by Mr. Keefe
     it did not have anything to do with it?
         Mr. Grew: No.
        Mr. Keefe: Or that you just do not remember?
         Mr. Grew: I frankly do not remember.
5
         Mr. Keefe: All right.
         Mr. Grew: I do not believe it had anything to do with it.
         The Chairman: Did you finish your answer?
 8
         Mr. Keefe: I thought he said he had finished. Had you
 9
     finished?
10
         Mr. Grew: I finished sir, yes.
11
12
         Mr. Keefe: Yes. Well, now, in order to prepare this
13
     book under those circumstances it was necessary at least for
14
     Mr. Quincy Howe to have the benefit of reading your entire
15
     diary, was it not?
16
         Mr. Grew: He had the benefit of reading the diary, yes,
17
     sir.
18
         Mr. Keefe: And he is a reputable man, is he not?
19
         Mr. Grew: He is a completely reputable man.
         Mr. Keefe: And you would believe him, would you mot?
20
         Mr. Grew: I certainly would, otherwise I certainly would
21
     not have intrusted the diary to him.
23
         Mr. Keefe: Now, do you know how many other people in the
```

office of Simon & Schuster had access to your diary besides

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

I doubt very much if anybody did. Mr. Grew:

Mr. Keefe: Well, he was up in New York, wasn't he?

Mr. Grew: Mr. Howe was in New York, yes.

Mr. Keefe: And the diary was with him?

Mr. Grew: That is right.

Mr. Keefel And you were here in Washington and out on the road making speeches?

Mr. Grew: That is perfectly correct.

Mr. Keefe: Now, you cannot say how many people could have had access to this diary then, can you?

Mr. Grew: Well, I cannot tell you categorically but I know that Mr. Quincy Howe is a man of such reputability that he would not have for a moment left the diary in a position where other people could have access to it.

Mr. Keefe: Well, would you have any objections to Mr. Howe testifying here as a witness as to the material that was cut out of this manuscript?

Mr. Grew: Well, that comes right down, I think, to the question originally brought up as to whether I am not within my rights in claiming that the diary itself was of a personal and private nature; that I have produced in my book the pertinent material which I think would be helpful to this committee; that I have looked through the diary for the months preceding Pearl Harbor and have found nothing further that I

Witness Grewa

Questions by Mr. Keefe

think would be pertinent to this committee.

The question arises on that basis if I am not justified in regarding the rest of the diary as a personal and private document. I feel very strongly on that point myself.

The Chairman: Well, the chair might suggest that regardless of Mr. Grew's attitude or his willingness or unwillingness for Mr. Quincy Howe to testify about this personal diary, it may be a matter, after all, for the committee to determine whether it would call Mr. Howe to testify about that.

Mr. Grews Undoubtedly it would be, Mr. Chairman, yes.

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Chairman, my I inquire of the gentleman from Wisconsin if he feels that Mr. Quincy Howe would shed any light on the Pearl Harbor investigation and whether we should call him as a witness?

Mr. Keefe: Now, Mr. Chairman, I object to those kinds of interjections. I am acting in good faith.

The Chairman: The chair hopes that the committee will not get into a discussion over Mr. Quincy Howe at this stage of the proceeding, so go ahead, Congressman, with your inquiry.

Mr. Keefe: I am not asking foolish questions. I am trying to ascertain some facts and pertinent facts, pertinent to this inquiry.

AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTY OF

The Chairman: Go ahead.

Mr. Keefe: Who is Mr. Stanley Hornbeck?

Mr. Grew: Mr. Stanley Hornbeck from 1928 to 1937 was Chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs in the Department of State and in 1937 he was appointed political adviser in the Department of State. He was later, some time in the past year, made Ambassador to the Netherlands and so far as I know he is now at The Hague.

Mr. Keefe: I would like to ask the counsel at this time is it expected to call Mr. Hornbeck as a witness here?

Mr. Mitchell: He is not so far on our list of witnesses and nobody has asked to have him placed on it.

Mr. Keefe: Well, I am making that request very definitely now, that I would like to have Mr. Hornbeck as a witness. He was in charge of the Far Eastern branch in the Department of State all through these critical times, as I
understand it.

Mr. Grew: Well, he was Chief of the Far Eastern Division, which handles Far Eastern affairs, only up to 1937 and
after that he was political adviser, although he was still
closely in touch with Far Eastern affairs.

Mr. Keefe: Yes.

Mr. Gesell: It may be off some help to the Congressman.
We have been trying to find out what Mr. Hornbeck's schedule

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D C

is. He is in Holland at the present time. We were hoping if he was planning to come to this country during the time the committee would be in session that we could consider his availability then.

Senator Brewster: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it should be said in that connection that the committee have been assured that anyone anywhere in the world who could help in this situation would be available, so that I do not think it is material as to whether he is in Holland or not.

The Chairman: I have no doubt that if Mr. Hornbeck's testimony is desired here that he will be available even if he has to be brought back from Holland.

Mr. Keefe: Well, I conceive, Mr. Chairman, if you will pardon me, that Mr. Hornbeck is a very important witness in connection with the very things that we are going over and I think Mr. Grew will agree with that, that he ought to have plenty of information.

Mr. Grew: I agree completely.

Mr. Keefe: Yes.

The Chairman: All right.

Mr. Keefe: Now, as a matter of fact did you discuss Mr. Hornbeck at all in your diary?

Senator Lucas: Probably some Senators, too.

Mr. Keefe: That may be an unfair question. I will

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D C

W11

Witness Grew:

Questions by Mr. Keefe

withdraw it.

Mr. Grew: All right. As a mat ter of fact, I have no recollection on that point, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. Keefe: Well, I will try to refresh your recollection at the proper time, which is not now. It will be at the proper time, on many of these things, I assure you.

Now, here is one last question that I want to interro-

I have in my mind some place out of this mass of material that is hurled at you, it is hard to put your hands on it immediately, that at a time prior to the outbreak of war in Europe in 1939 there was a memoranda submitted to the State Department with reference to a proposal made at that time by Japan for ameeting of the Great Powers, quite a long memorandum. I wonder whether you have knowledge of that proposal of the Japanese.

Mr. Grew: Can you tell me, Mr. Congressman, whether that proposal was made by Baron Hiramuna as Prime Minister?

Mr. Keefe: Well, it is a proposal that I am advised does not appear in any of these documents but that is presently in the archives of the State Department. It was a proposal which embodied a proposal by the Japs for a conference of the Great Powers to be held in an effort to try to avert the outbreak of war in Europe. Do you recall that?

WARD & PAUL. WASHINGTON, D C

WASHINGTON.

n

Witness Grew:

Questions by Mr. Keefe

Mr. Grew: I am inclined to believe that that may have been a proposal which was made by Baron Hiramuna, then Prime Minister of Japan, to Mr. Dooman when I was at home in the United States on leave of absence in 1939 and he was charge d'affaires. That is my impression. I think he could answer that question bet ter than I could.

Senator Ferguson: Mr. Chairman, might --

The Chairman: When was it?

Mr. Keefe: In 1939.

Senator Ferguson: Might I suggest that I brought that question up yesterlay and asked you about it? I had the date of May or some time in 1939 and you were going to look that up. I think it is the same thing that the Congressmen is talking about. That is the same point, is it?

Well, what he is asking refreshes my memory that it is the same point. You have in the book here a memorandum but not covering the particular point covered in the memorandum that I had in mind. It was a specific proposal some time in the spring of 1939 or summer, it was around in May.

Mr. Grew: Is there any indication in the record that that proposal was made to me? Because I am inclined to think it was a proposal which was made to Mr. --

Senator Ferguson: It may not have been made to you but coming through the Embassy you would have notice of it if

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Dooman knew about 1t.

Mr. Grew: I think that took place when I was absent. am not sure of 1t.

Senator Ferguson: I am sure you were in Tokyo in May because the book indicates on page 1 of Volume II, in May 1939 it indicates that you were in Tokyo.

Mr. Keefe: Well, it was in 1939.

Mr. Grew: Well, I will look into that also, Senator. It is possible it is being looked into now, but if it is a fact that this was a proposal made to Mr. Dooman while charge d'affaires I might prefer to have him elaborate the point than to try to do it myself, if it is agreeable to the corrittee.

Mr. Keefe: Now, Mr. Counselor, on that point, is it proposed to have Mr. Dooran called as a witness?

Mr. Gesell: He is not on the list of witnesses.

Mr. Keefe: Well, I would like to have him put on the list because he is a very important witness.

The Chairman: Well, the chair would like to remind the Senators that when the corrittee was discussing the addition of other witnesses to those that were listed it was generally understood that any member of the committee could suggest to counsel and to the corrittee any additional witnesses on any subject and that in some way the committee would consider

19

20

21

23

24

Witness Grew:

what the witness would testify to in order to determine whether his testimony was material.

Now, that might be regarded as a technical point, but it was discussed in the committee in executive session. I think we might keep that in mind.

Mr. Keefe: Well, I have that in mind, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Keefe: But may I say this: I would not for one moment ask to have someone called here who I did not feel from the search and examination of the records that I have made up to date could not throw relevant and pertinent light upon this inquiry.

We have already talked about Mr. Dooran and the ressage is in the record here, one of the ressages.

Now, referring to the Senator from Michigan, he is referring to a very important communication that was sent to the State Department, I believe, during the time that you were on furlough, Mr. Grew, and while Mr. Dooman was in charge of the Embassy in Japan.

Mr. Grew: That is probably so.

The Chairman: The chair is not suggesting anything to the contrary of that.

Senator Brewster: Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Senator Brewster.

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

### Witness Grew:

Senator Brewster: Perhaps this is the appropriate time to point out that there are many questions of procedure, the calling of witnesses, the order of witnesses, which must be determined from time to time.

I fully agree with the chairman that those questions should be the subject of corrittee consideration and I think it would be well if it were in a somewhat less public forum than this, but as I must remind the chairman, we have not been called together for the consideration of any questions of this character for some time and the result has been that the only way we can make suggestions is when the committee is in public convention assembled.

The Chairman: The chair did not mean to suggest any objection in making these suggestions in public as to witnesses, but we have a long list of witnesses who were arranged for by counsel through consultation with the committee and the chair simply had in mind until we have made a little more progress in exhausting the list which has already been prepared and submitted to the committee, that we have ample time to consider what other witnesses would be called later; but, of course, the chair has no objection whatever to putting Mr. Dooran's name on the list and having him called at some appropriate time when he is here.

Senator Brewster: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the state-

WASHINGTON.

19

20

21

22

23

24

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

ment. There are two things right now which it seems to me invite consideration. One is the suggestion which has been made to change the order of witnesses insofar as Mr. Hamilton is concerned; and, second, in view of the announcement regarding General Marshall I think that there should be immediate consideration of whether or not, if he is to testify--

The Chairman: That is a --

Senator Brewster: May I finish?

The Chairman: Yes. I wanted to say something. General Marshall is under consideration at the present time.

Senator Brewster: Fine.

The Chairman: We have got to consult with him as to when he proposes to leave Washington.

Senator Brewster: I suggest this because I think that is obviously an important matter. If General Marshall is to leave shortly, I think we ought to suspend everything on the order of the hearing.

The Chairman: That is being considered and General Marshall is being consulted about it. All right, Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Keefe: Now, Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions to ask at this time of Mr. Grew, but I would like to suggest this to counsel: I would like to have him produce and obtain, if possible, the ressage or reroranda prepared by Mr. Hornbeck on December 1st, 1941. I understand that it

WASHINGTON.

Witness Grews

is addressed to the Army and Navy and has reference to the condition of the Army and Navy at that time. Will you kindly see if that message can be obtained?

Mr. Mitchell: We have made a note of it.

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Chairman, may I make one request?

The Chairman: Wait until we get this one disposed of.

Counsel has made a note of it and that document will be sought. Congressman Murphy?

Mr. Murphy: I would like to make a request of the Navy to prepare a statement as to when we established the port and base of Pearl Harbor and whether or not we continued Pearl Narbor as our most important base in the Pacific after December 7, 1941 until the present time for our fleet.

The Chairman: Mr. Gesell will take note of that.

Mr. Gesell: Yes.

Senator Lucas: Mr. Chairman. is Captain Kramer on the witness list?

The Chairman: At two different times.

Mr. Gesell: Mr. Chairman, before we adjourn I would like to introduce into the record a series of five documents which were distributed to the committee two weeks ago, between the dates of April and December 1941, reporting conversations in South America held by Japanese representatives of the governments of Peru,

IRD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D

•

.

Witness Grew:

Brazil, Dominican Republic, Chile, and so forth, concerning the attitude off those governments in the event Japan were to declare war against the United States and I think this series, which is all related, might be designated --

The Chairman: The committee and spectators will please be in order. We have not yet recessed.

Mr. Gesell: I think this exhibit might be designated

The Chairman: Those articles or exhibits will be filed under documentation No. 31.

(THE DOCUMENT ABOVE REFERRED TO WAS MARKED EXHIBIT NO. 31)

Senator Ferguson: Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Senator Ferguson.

Senator reguson: Mr. Chairman, has there been a change in the calling of witnesses for the near future?

The Chairman: The chair is not aware of any change.

Mr. Gesell: Mr. Chairman, I think there has been one change indicated by our memorandum to the members of the committee indicating that we had felt under the circumstances it more appropriate to call General Miles, Admiral Wilkinson, Admiral Turner and General Gerow prior to calling certain witnesses scheduled prior to those officers, who were in subordinate positions, our thought being to call

RD & PAUL. WASHINGTON, D C

the heads of the various units, war plans and intelligence and then following them with the witnesses that have been scheduled before.

We had also hoped that in view of the very detailed State Department inquiry which we have had over the last few days that we could dispense with calling Mr. Hamilton at this time. Mr. Hamilton was originally scheduled when it was thought that Mr. Hull would not be able to give as much time as he has to the committee and before Mr. Grew and Mr. Welles were added to the list of witnesses and we feel that those responsible officials have been in the best position to cover the matters of interest to the committee.

Senator Ferguson: Mr. Chairman, could I inquire then what the new order will be so that we might prepare?

Mr. Gesell: As indicated in the memo handed to the committee at the end of last week, General Miles and Admiral Wilkinson will be the next two witnesses, followed by Admiral Turner and General Gerow.

Senator Brewster: Mr. Chairman, I would ask that if there is to be a change in the order, recognizing the consecutive character of the presentation of the State Department and the diplomatic corps, that it should be considered by the committee. I think it is a matter off considerable importance, the appropriate order in which witnesses are to be called.

### Witness Grew:

The Chairman: The chair will, remini members of the committee that when the list of witnesses was originally submitted by counsel it was stated that it did not represent the order in which they would appear and, also, counsel stated that they would attempt to give the committee and the press and the public two or three days notice of witnesses that would appear on any given day. That course has up to now, I think, been followed and the notice that we got at the end of last week with respect to General Miles, Admiral Wilkinson and the others, as I understood it was in compliance with that understanding.

Mr. Gesell: We have had this problem. I am sure the members of the committee recognize this. We have had this problem in scheduling witnesses: We have had to bring responsible officers in from active theatres and we are anxious not to keep them in Washington any longer than necessary, so that they can return to their posts.

Senator Brewster: You are not applying that to General Miles, are you?

Mr. Gesell: No, I am not applying that to General Miles, although I do not believe he is stationed here.

The Chairman: Are there any further questions that counsel wish to ask Mr. Grew?

Senator Ferguson: I have a question that I spoke to him

WARD & PAUL, WASHINGTON, D (

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Witness Grew:

about the --

The Chairman: I was speaking to the counsel first.

Mr. Gesell: No. Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Any other questions desired by members of the committee?

Senator Ferguson: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I have one or two I would like to Senator Brewster? ask.

The Chairman: Well, it is now after four o'clock. The chair had hoped that we might finish with Mr. Grew today, but it is entirely up to the committee whether it wants to adjourn now or continue.

Senator Ferguson: I just have one question that I was not able to find the citation for this morning and I have 1t now.

The Chairman: Well, if we could finish --

Senator Brewster: I have two or three questions. I do not know that they will take any extended time.

What is the wish of the committee about The Chairman: proceeding?

Senator Ferguson: I move to proceed.

Senator Brewster: What is the position of Mr. Grew as to returning in the morning?

Mr. Grew: I am entirely at the disposal of the com-

n

3

5

θ

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

## Witness Grew:

mittee, Senator. I will be glad to come back.

Senator Brewster: Well, I suggest this, that in view of the very extended examination of Mr. Grew that he might like to think the thing over a little himself and I am sure perhaps some of the rest of us would and perhaps get our questions in a form that would reduce rather than increase the time. I personally prefer to adjourn.

Senator Ferguson: Mr. Chairman, could I just suggest one thing?

The Chairman: Yes, Senator.

Senator Ferguson: I would like to call attention to the memorandum that was given to us on November 24th as following the State Department, the next series. That did not indicate, as I understand it, that Mr. Hamilton was not to Could I show that to counsel and ask if that is be called. the rerorandum?

I think I made That is the remorandum. Mr. Gesell: clear that our point with respect to Mr. Hamilton was one that we were advancing to the corrittee at this time.

Senator Ferguson: Oh, at this particular moment? Mr. Gesell: That is right.

Senator Brewster: Well, then there have been no previous suggestions to the committee on that.

Mr. Gesell: That is right.

O

WASHINGTON.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

# Witness Grew:

The Chairman: Well, suppose we recess until ten o'clock toworrow morning. You be back at ten o'clock toworrow morn-

ing, Mr. Grew.

Mr. Grew: I will be here with pleasure at ten o'clock tomorrow morning.

The Chairman: I hope the committee can conclude with you tomorrow.

(Whereupon, at 4:10 o'clock P.M., Wednesday, Noverber 28, 1945, an adjournment was taken until 10:00 o'clock A.M., Thursday, November 29, 1945.)