

Doc. 2230 Evid

Folder 4

(12)

CHARGE OUT SLIP

DATE 16/9/46.

EVIDENTIARY DOC. NO. 2230

TRIAL BRIEF _____

EXHIBIT NO. 759

BACKGROUND DOC. NO. _____

*Extract - Litvinov's
talk w/ Shigimtsu
31 Aug 38.*

SIGNATURE Lt. Col. Taranenko

ROOM NO. 354

Exh 759

From the diary of
comrade M.M. Litvinov

Extract from the Record of the Talk with
SHIGEMITSU
August 31, 1938

SHIGEMITSU stated that the Japanese party has no objections to setting the treaties concluded by the representatives of China and Russia as principle of the work, but the Japanese party understands that additional documents may be submitted to the committee, and they will be considered by the committee, to make its work more successful.

SHIGEMITSU said that on the whole he had no objections to leaving point 4 in the version of the Soviet party. But as to the additional documents, of which he spoke, he thought there were no objections to using them.

I stressed this only as an argument. Whether the committee would accept them or not, is for the committee to decide. SHIGEMITSU repeated that he has no objections to leaving the contents of the point 4 in its present version, but speaking of the submission of the additional documents he repeated that he meant what I said to him last time and that which results from the contents of today's talk. Thus he, SHIGEMITSU, thought that both parties understand this point in the same way.

I replied to this: "Let us hope that both parties understand this point in the same way."

Here I added that to make it clearer I would make this point more precise. The Hunchun agreement and other documents signed by the representatives of Russia and China should be necessarily considered by the committee. The Japanese and Manchurian party cannot say: "We cannot accept this or that treaty." As to the other documents submitted by one of the parties, the opposite party may say that she does not accept this or that document. In this lies the difference between the nature of the agreements signed by the representatives of Russia and China and other documents. I think I made myself clear and the Ambassador probably understood me.

SHIGEMITSU answered that he understood it in the following way: The treaties and agreements concluded between Russia and China are set up as principle of the committee work, and other additional documents are taken into consideration—this is for the committee to decide in what manner to take them into consideration. Considering all that he stated that we had no differences.

The extract is correct:

Chief of the State Central Historic Record Office of the USSR

Professor

V. Maksakov

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Lt. Colonel Taranenko, G. I., a member of the military forces of the U.S.S.R., do hereby certify that extract from the record of the talk between Litvinov and Shigemitsu on August 31, 1938 in Moscow on 2 sheets was delivered to me by the Central State Historical Record Office of the USSR on or about March 13, 1946, and that the original of the said document may be found in the Central State Historical Records Office in Moscow.

I do further certify _____

Lt. Col. TARANENKO /s/
Signature and rank

Tokyo, Japan

June 24, 1946.

2230-1

同志MM「リトヴィノブ」ノ日記ヨリ

一九三八年（昭和十三年）八月三十一日重光大使
トノ會談記録ヨリノ抜萃。

日本側ハ中國及露國代表ニヨリ締結セラレタル條
約ヲ指導原點トナスコトニ何等反對スルモノデハ
ナイガ、日本例トシテハ專業ヲ更ニ固着ニ遂行ス
ル爲追加文書ハ委員會ニ提出シ委員會ニヨツテ考
慮セラルベキデアルト重光大使ハ述べタ。

ソコデ私ハ是ヲヨリ明白ニスル爲、コノ點ヲ更ニ
正確ニスル旨附加ヘタ。露國及中國代表ノ署名セ
ル條約協定及他ノ文書ハ必ず委員會ニヨツテ考慮
サレル必要ガアル。日本及滿洲側ハ「我々ハコノ
協定ヲ承認シナイ、アノ協定ヲ承認シナイ」ト言
フ事ハ出来ナイ。兩國ノウチ一國ニヨツテ提出サ
レル他ノ文書ニ關シテハ他ノ對手ニ「我々ハコ
ノ文書ヲ承認シナイ、アノ文書ヲ承認シナイ」ト
云フコトが出来ル。ココニ露國及中國代表ノ署名
セル協定ト他ノ文書トノ異ナル點ガアル。私ハ私
ノ意見ヲ明確ニシタト思フ又大使モ多分私ヲ了解
シテクレタト思フ。

重光大使ハ次ノ様ニ解釋スルト答ヘタ。露國及中
國代表ノ署名セル條約及協定ヲ委員會ノ專業原理

656 759

2230-2

ト爲シ其ノ他ノ追加文書ハ考慮ニ入レラレルガ如
何ナル方法ニ依ツテ考慮サレルカハ委員會ノ決定
スル所デアル。以上ヲ考察シテ大使ハ我々ノ考へ
ニ兵ル所ハナイト述ベタ。

上記沿革ハ正確ナリ

德國國立中央歴史の記念保存所長 V・マクサコヴ 教授

2230 (cert.)

證 明 書

余、中佐 G・I タラネンコ TARANEENKO G・I ハ社會主義ソビエツト共和國聯邦陸軍ノ部員ニシテ茲ニ左記ノ如ク證明ス

記

一九三八年八月三十一日モスコイニ於テ行ハタル、リトヴィノフ及ビ重光會談ノ二枚ヨリ成ル記録ノ拔萃ハ一九四六年三月十三日又ハ其前後ニ於テ社會主義ソビエツト共和國聯邦中央國立歴史記録局ニヨリ余ニ引渡サレタル事竝ニ該文書ノ原本ハ在モスコイ中央國立歴史記録局ニ所在スト看ラルル事。

(署名及階級) 中 佐 タラネンコ 署名

日本東京ニ於テ

一九四六年六月二十四日

From the diary of
comrade M.M. Latvinov

Extract from the Record of the Talk with
SHIGEMITSU
August 31, 1938

SHIGEMITSU stated that the Japanese party has no objections to setting the treaties concluded by the representatives of China and Russia as principle of the work, but the Japanese party understands that additional documents may be submitted to the committee, and they will be considered by the committee, to make its work more successful.

SHIGEMITSU said that on the whole he had no objections to leaving point 4 in the version of the Soviet party. But as to the additional documents, of which he spoke, he thought there were no objections to using them.

I stressed this only as an argument. Whether the committee would accept them or not, is for the committee to decide. SHIGEMITSU repeated that he has no objections to leaving the contents of the point 4 in its present version, but speaking of the submission of the additional documents he repeated that he meant what I said to him last time and that which results from the contents of today's talk. Thus he, SHIGEMITSU, thought that both parties understand this point in the same way.

I replied to this: "Let us hope that both parties understand this point in the same way."

Here I added that to make it clearer I would make this point more precise. The Hunchun agreement and other documents signed by the representatives of Russia and China should be necessarily considered by the committee. The Japanese and Manchurian party cannot say: "We cannot accept this or that treaty." As to the other documents submitted by one of the parties, the opposite party may say that she does not accept this or that document. In this lies the difference between the nature of the agreements signed by the representatives of Russia and China and other documents. I think I made myself clear and the Ambassador probably understood me.

SHIGEMITSU answered that he understood it in the following way: The treaties and agreements concluded between Russia and China are set up as principle of the committee work, and other additional documents are taken into consideration--this is for the committee to decide in what manner to take them into consideration. Considering all that he stated that we had no differences.

The extract is correct:

Chief of the State Central Historic Record Office of the USSR

Professor

N. Maksakov

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Lt. Colonel Taranenko, G. I., a member of the military forces of the U.S.S.R., do hereby certify that extract from the record of the talk between Litvinov and Shigemitsu on August 31, 1938 in Moscow on 2 sheets was delivered to me by the Central State Historical Record Office of the USSR on or about March 13, 1946, and that the original of the said document may be found in the Central State Historical Records Office in Moscow.

I do further certify _____

Lt. Col. TARANENKO /s/
Signature and rank

Tokyo, Japan

June 24, 1946.

INTERNATIONAL PROSECUTION SECTION

Doc. No. 2229 to 2244 inclusive

26 June 1946

ANALYSIS OF DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

DESCRIPTION OF ATTACHED DOCUMENT

Collection of affidavits, reports, plans, statistics, etc., showing Japanese violations of existing treaties, plans for and actual acts of military aggression against U.S.S.R.

Date: (see below) Original () Copy (x) Language:

Has it been translated? Yes () No (x)

Has it been photostated? Yes () No (x)

LOCATION OF ORIGINAL

Document Division

SOURCE OF ORIGINAL: Russian Division

PERSONS IMPLICATED: KWANTUNG Army, SHIGEMITSU, others

CRIMES TO WHICH DOCUMENT APPLICABLE: aggression against Russia; Violation of existing treaties

SUMMARY OF RELEVANT POINTS

Document No. 2229. Preliminary draft of frontiers of Greater Asia Co-prosperity sphere and its structure, drawn up by General Affairs Bureau of Society "KOKUSAKU KENKYU KAI" on 18 Feb 42. (Japanese)

Document No. 2230 Extract from record of talk between LITVINOV and SHIGEMITSU of 31 Aug 38 taken from diary of LITVINOV re treaties concluded by representatives of China and Russia.

Document No. 2231. Report on provocative attack of Japanese in area of KHALIN-GOL River in 1939 and copy of an address by commander of 6th Army.

Document No. 2232. Report on detaining ship "SERGEI KIROV" by Japanese military authorities in ITO Bay from 17-22 April 42.

Doc. No. 2229 to 2244 incl. - Page 2 - SUMMARY Cont'd

Document No. 2233. Affidavit of YATSUGI, Kazuo, of 19 June 46, re text of note of Soviet Embassy of 4 May 36 about systematic organization of white guards by Japanese for struggle against U.S.S.R. (Japanese)

Document No. 2234. Affidavit of HATA, Hikosaburo of 15 May 46. (Japanese)

Document No. 2235. Extract from a journal of battle actions of Red Army General Staff concerning the incident in Lake HASSAN area in 1938, when Japanese and Manchurians violated the frontier.

Document No. 2236. Table of growth of technical equipment of KWANTUNG Army and Japanese Army as a whole from 1931-45.

Document No. 2237. Table of growth of strength of KWANTUNG Army and Japanese Army as a whole from 1932-45 with 5 diagrams showings increases in ground forces, tanks, infantry divisions, artillery pieces, and planes from 1932-45.

Document No. 2238. Affidavit of YANAGITA, Genzo of 27 Feb 46. (Japanese)

Document No. 2239. Affidavit of TAKEBE, Rokujo of 26 Mar 46. (Japanese)

Document No. 2240. Report on massacre of Japanese military clique in village of IVANOVKA.

Document No. 2241. Extract from record of talk of LITVINOV and SHIGEMITSU on 20 July 38 concerning the KHASSAN Lake Incident from LITVINOV's diary.

Document No. 2242. Report of Chief of Frontier Troops of U.S.S.R. Home Ministry re KHASSAN Lake Incident in 1938, with attached photocopy of map attached to KHUNCHUN Agreement of 1886 and 6 copies of reports of frontier detachments concerning violation of the frontier and conduct of Japanese troops.

Doc. No. 2229 to 2244 incl - Page 3 - SUMMARY Cont'd

Document No. 2243. Extract from record of talk between LITVINOV and SHIGEMITSU of 7 Aug 38 re frontier between MANCHUKUO and U.S.S.R.

Document No. 2244. Extract from minutes of closed session of Military Collegium of Supreme Court of U.S.S.R. held in MOSCOW and copy of the sentence of 13, 15 July 34, upon KIM-SAEN and others.

Analyst: 2d Lt Blumhagen

Doc. Nos. 2229 to 2244 incl
Page 3

2230

2230

證明書

余、中佐 G. I. タラネンコ / TARANENKO G. I. / ハ社
會主義ソビエツト共和國聯邦陸軍ノ部員ニシテ、
茲ニ左記ノ如ク證明ス

記

一九三八年八月三十日、モスコ―ニ於テ行ハレタル
リトヴィノフ及ビ重光會談ノニ板車^{ヨリ成}ル記録ノ板萃

ハ、一九四六年三月十三日又ハ其前後ニ於テ

社会主義ソビエツト共和国聯邦中央^{国立}歴史記録局

ニヨリ余ニ引渡サレタル事、並ニ該文書ノ原本ハ

モスコ―中央^{国立}歴史記録局

ニ所在スト看ラル、事、

余ハ更ニ左ノ事ヲ證明ス

(署名及階級) 中 佐 タラネンコ / 署名 /

日本東京ニ於テ

一九四六年十一月二十四日

by T. MORIYA

Checked by Anita