

SECRET
(When Filled In)

DOCUMENT TRANSFER AND CROSS REFERENCE				
SUBJECT OF DOCUMENT		DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION		
Attached memorandum		RI FILE NO.	Central File 11241 Box 198	
		DISPATCH OR SOURCE DOC. SYMBOL NO.	DATE	
		RI/AR	19 Nov 1942	
		SOURCE CRYPTONYM	DATE OF INFO.	EVALUATION
ANALYST	DATE PROCESSED	DISSEMINATED IN	DATE	
	4 Jan 1957			
DOCUMENT DISPOSITION				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CROSS REFERRED TO THIS FILE	TRANSFERRED TO RI FILE NO.		
PERTINENT INFORMATION				
Memo to Mr. F. L. Delin From: William L. Langer				
See attached pages.				
DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT DATE 2008				
FILE THIS FORM IN FILE NO.		➔		

FORM NO. 867 REPLACES FORM 867, 1 AUG 54
1 MAY 56 AND FORM 137 WHICH ARE OBSOLETE.

SECRET

(7-46)

SECRET

#00358

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES
Research and Analysis Branch
Far Eastern Section

MEMORANDUM

NOTES ON SECOND INSTALLMENT OF CONFIDENTIAL
DOCUMENT DEALING WITH JAPAN

Chronological Inconsistencies

The chronological inconsistencies of the first installment of this document have been indicated in previous notes, particularly the fact that the date of July 14, 1942, ascribed to the report, conflicts with the reference to a meeting on July 16, and with mention of General Ushiroku as holding a post to which he was not appointed until August 17, 1942. If the second installment is to be thought of as being a continuation of the first and of contemporary composition with the first, the chronological inconsistencies become quite spectacular.

Reference to Gandhi

There is a statement (page 1) that certain arrangements with the Japanese and Moslems were "tentatively agreed to by...Gandhi whose negotiations on this matter were foreseen by the British and cut off in time." It is hardly possible that the statement that the negotiations were "cut off" can refer to anything except the confinement of Gandhi by the Government of India, which would place this particular section as having been written at some time after August 10, 1942, the date of Gandhi's arrest.

Reference to General Tatsumi

More important, however, is the mention (page 6) of General Eiichi TATSUMI as being one of those responsible for the direction of

the "used steel plan" which, according to the document, was "made a part of the Eastern and Central Defense Plan and is being undertaken under strict Military Rule." General Eiichi Tatsumi was appointed Japanese military attaché to London in 1939, was exchanged with other Japanese diplomats from Europe in the summer of 1942, and did not reach Japanese-occupied territory until the Tatsuta Maru arrived at Singapore on September 16, 1942. General Eiichi Tatsumi was specifically mentioned in a Japanese broadcast of that date as being among those disembarking from the repatriation vessel at Singapore. On October 1, 1942, according to our information, General Tatsumi was appointed Chief of Staff to the Air Force (Army), and presumably still holds this position.

At first sight the reference to General Tatsumi as responsible for the "used steel plan" would seem to be merely a mistaken statement. Curiously enough, however, there is reason to believe that the statement can be used to date the passage in question. On October 2, 1942 both the UP and AP news agencies carried the item that General Eiichi Tatsumi had "been appointed Chief of Staff of the Eastern Defense Zone." Both agencies gave as their source a recording of a German broadcast, and the UP stated that the broadcast quoted a German news agency dispatch from Tokyo (presumably of October 1). American papers of October 2 carried this story, generally in the form of a small 4-line fill-in. Actually, as stated above, Tatsumi was appointed Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and the FCC monitoring service recorded announcements of this fact in Tokyo broadcasts of October 1.

It is obvious that if Tatsumi had really been appointed to the post of Chief of Staff of the Eastern Defense Zone there would

have been logical grounds for assuming that he would be made partially responsible for the "used steel plan" which, according to the document, was to be a part of "the Eastern and Central Defense Plan" and would quite naturally fall under the partial control of the Chief of Staff to the Eastern Defense Zone.

To assume therefore that the passage referring to General Tatsuni was written before October 1, and that the reference to Tatsuni is simply a mistake would stretch coincidence almost beyond the bounds of possibility. If the passage was written before September 16, (i.e., before Tatsuni reached Singapore and before there was any possibility of his receiving a new assignment), the coincidence involved would seem to be even less likely. In either case it would be necessary to assume that by sheer chance the writer of the document hit upon the choice of a former military attaché to London, who was either returning or had just returned to Japanese controlled territory, who had no announced assignment, who had no possible connection with the collection of scrap, and who was eventually appointed to an Air Force post, but who, for a brief period of time, on the basis of mistaken European and American reports, could logically be thought to have a connection with the supervision of the "used steel plan."

There is therefore good reason to believe that this particular passage of the document was written after October 1. Moreover, since it obviously seems to have been influenced by mistaken European and American reports, it was probably written either in Europe or in the United States.