



“Tokyo Trial”

The International Military Tribunal for the Far East

Background guide

*(*The Chinese and Japanese place family names before first names. In this background guide, the same rule applies. All of the Chinese and Japanese name in this guide are family name+ given name.)*

Your Crisis Director:



Hello Delegates! My name is Lei Guo and I am a sophomore majoring in Political Science and Public Affairs. I was born in Guangzhou, China. After spending my first eighteen years in that warm southern city in China, I came all the way to Columbus to pursue my college education at the Ohio State University. I joined CCWA because I used to participate in and direct the Model UN program in my high school back to China, and wanted to continue my MUN journey in the United States.

Aside from Model UN, I also take great interest in hot chocolate. I am pretty well aware of the fact that I consumed more than one hundred cups of hot chocolates last winter and am ready to break that record this winter.

I hope to learn and progress with all the delegates in the committee of International Military Tribunal for the Far East and potentially fund my delegates' hot chocolate purchases during the three days of OSUMUN 2018.

The “Tokyo Trial”:

On August 15th, 1945, Japanese Foreign Affairs Minister Shigemitsu Mamoru formally signed on the Japanese Instrument of Surrender, marking the end of WW2 and the return of peace in the Far East areas. Within a month after Japan surrendered, General Douglas MacArthur, permitted the arrest of War crime criminals and began the arrest process of Japanese authorities and warlords who needed to be held accountable for starting the aggressive war in Asia and Pacific Ocean Areas. When the time came to December 16th, 1945, the Foreign Ministers of Soviet Union (Vyacheslav Molotov), the United States (James F. Byrnes) and the United Kingdom (Ernest Bevin) met in Moscow. In this Moscow Conference, they announced the establishment of the “International Military Tribunal for the Far East” in order to give a fair trial to the war criminals and to return justice to the innocent souls that suffered during the war in the Far East area. On the same day, Kono Fumimaro, who served as the 34th, 38th and 39th Prime Minister of Japan committed suicide by taking potassium cyanide poison.

The International Military Tribunal for the Far East, also known as “The Tokyo Trial,” involved the implementation of the Cairo Declaration and Potsdam Declaration. 11 Judges from the 11 countries that signed on the Japanese Instrument of Surrender: United States, Republic China, United Kingdom, Soviet Union, France, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Holland, India and Philippines (Far East Commission), were appointed by their government and General MacArthur to sit in the court. Their duty is to knock down the important sentence towards the war criminal by their gavels.

Together with the Judges, were the prosecutors from the same 11 countries (Far Eastern Commission). Led by the Chief Prosecutor of International Military Tribunal for the Far East—— Joseph Keenan, all the prosecutors worked hard to collect the evidence to testify against the war crimes Japan had committed. Respectively, the prosecutors collected the evidence of Japanese conspiracies in the Second Sino-Japanese War, the Mukden Incident, the Second Sino-Japanese War and the Pacific War. The prosecutors went all over the world, digging evidence from the dust and ashes of the Japanese documents that were burned down, and from the pain and the scars that people had borne and suffered. And all of these efforts allowed the people to craft the 3 main charges against the Japanese war criminals: Crime against Peace, the Crime of War, and the Crime against Humanity.

After almost 6 months of intense testifying, on April 29th, 1946, the prosecution team finally submitted an indictment to the court. The starting date of prosecution, followed the suggestion of prosecutor for Republic China——Xiang Zhejun, (also known as Hsiang Che-chun), was set as June 4th, 1928, when the “Huanggutun Incident” took place. In this Incident, Japanese general Doihara Kenji successfully murdered Zhang Zuolin, the warlord of Manchuria, which is now the official and world recognized Chinese government before Republic China.

On May 3rd, 1946, international Military Tribunal formally began. 28 of the “Class A” criminals who “participated in a joint conspiracy to start and wage war” were asked to be brought to the court. Three of the criminals died before the trial even took place, only 25 of them made to the tribunal. No one had expected this “Tokyo Trial” would be so difficult for most of the defendants who refused to plead guilty, and the trial followed the common law system forcing the prosecution to prove beyond reasonable doubts in order to convict the defendants. Most of the defendants used silence to face the court and some of them remained so certain and kept claiming they never committed aggressive interventions. Some of the defendants even suggested that the Japanese invasion of China, was committed out of the demands of Chinese civilians who supposedly begged for Japan to bring them greater life and liberty.

But as an old saying states: “Justice will be late sometimes, but it will never miss.” After several years in court and 818 trials, the justice that Allies had expected for so long finally arrived. On November 12th, 1948, a judgement was reached. As the gavel hit the table, 7 of the “Class A” criminals were sentenced to death at the insistence of Chinese Judge---Mei Ju-ao. The result of the secret ballots that judges use to determine if they supported Mei’s idea of Death sentence was 6 votes for death sentence that overweighed the 5 votes against. The rest of “Class A” defendants were sentenced to life imprisonment. Aside from the “Class A” criminals, the “Class B” criminals that committed war crimes and “Class C” criminals who committed crime against humanity also were judged in this vast tribunal.

Even through the judgement was reached after this long tribunal, there is no certainty if justice was truly served. Hirohito, the 124th Emperor of Japan, who actually signed on every single war plan during the launch of war and the invasion never received a trial. Instead, he just kept his position after the war in the name of comforting and supporting the innocent Japanese civilians. Another issue that people could not overlook, was the fact that Okawa Shumei, the theorist and advocator behind Second Sino-Japanese War, escaped the trial by claiming insanity. There are also opinions that the Tokyo Trial was never a fair trial but instead the tranny of victorious Allies.

Far East Commission and the Appointing of Judges and Prosecutors:

In fact, the United States had decided to hold a military tribunal to prosecute the Japanese war criminals long before Moscow Conference established the “Tokyo Trial”. On November 30th, 1945, President Truman appointed Joseph Keenan as the chief prosecutor and gave him charge of this tribunal for Far East, which, in the media, was depicted as “the other Nuremberg” in Japan. Keenan soon started collecting evidence of war crimes and flew to Japan with his first prosecution team on December 6th, 1945. On the contrary, the other 10 countries which signed the Japanese Instrument of Surrender showed little interest in the trial at this time.

General MacArthur was ready to accept his political advisor's suggestion to start the trial for Japanese with only the United States serving as caterers of justice, as other countries could not dedicate their attention to the trial. Coincidentally, on December 27th, the Foreign Minister of China, and the leaders of Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom together decided to give General Douglas MacArthur the authority to impel clauses in Japanese Instrument of Surrender. They also established a Far Eastern Commission that was formed by the 11 countries which signed the Instrument of Surrender. This commission would provide advice to General MacArthur regarding the implantation of clauses. China, the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom also established the Allied Council of Japan to further discuss details the of Japan Instrument of Surrender with General MacArthur. General MacArthur authorized the trial on January 16th, 1946, even after not a single country appointed neither a Judge or Prosecutor.

Finally, on February 15th, 1946, 9 countries appointed their judges and prosecutors. Far Eastern Commission originally did not consider including a Filipino judge or Indian judge in the trial. But General MacArthur had the intention to include Filipino judge, since Philippines also experienced major invasions at the hand of the Japanese army during WWII. Indian insisted to have a judge sit on the trial as well, as India fought for its territory and helped guard British territories in the Far East areas in WWII. India argued there was no reason to exclude its judge from the trial if France, which made limited and minor contributions to the fight against Axis powers in the Pacific, could have a judge in the trial. On April 3rd, 1946, the commission reached its decision to allow each member in the commission have one judge, one prosecutor and their personnel to involve in the trial.

Indictment and Defendants

There were total 28 Japanese war criminals be considered as "Class A" criminal and listed in the Indictment for Tokyo Trial as defendants. The list including:

- 4 former Prime Ministers of Japan: Hiranuma Kiichiro, Hirota Koki, Koiso Kuniaki, Tojo Hideki.
- 3 former Ministers for Foreign Affairs: Matsuoka Yosuke, Shigemitsu Mamoru, Togo Shigenori.
- 4 former War Ministers: Araki Sadao, Hata Shunroku, Itagaki Seishiro, Minami Jiro.
- 2 former Ministers of Navy: Nagano Osami, Shimada Shigetaro.
- 6 former Generals in the Imperial Japanese Army: Doihara Kenji, Kimura Heitaro, Matsui Iwane, Muto Akira, Sato Kenryo, Umezumi Yoshijiro.
- 2 former Embassies: Oshima Hiroshi, Shiratori Toshio.
- 3 former Economy and Finance Leaders: Hoshino Naoki, Kaya Okinori, Suzuki Teiichi.
- 1 Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal: Kido Koichi, 1 Japanese Nationalist and Extreme War Theorist: Okawa Shumei. 1 Vice-Admiral in the Imperial Japanese Navy: Oka Takasumi. 1 soldier in the Imperial Japanese Army: Hashimoto Kingoro.

All of the defendants, except for Okawa and Shiratori were charged with two major offenses: Crimes of War and Crimes Against Humanity as ruled by The Hague Convention and the Geneva Conventions. All the defendants also faced minor charges such as conspiring war; murder; mistreatment of prisoners of war; imprisoning civilians; robbing; destroying cities/towns/ villages for non-military purposes; massacre and rape etc.

The 124th Emperor of Japan, Hirohito, who signed on every Japanese war plans in WWII to authorize the implementation of each military action, was not listed among the accused and thus never faced a trial. Instead, Kido Koichi, the only defendant with any relation to the Japanese Emperor, was brought to the trial and was charged for 3 major crimes: Crime Against Peace, Crime of War and Crime Against Humanity. As a result, the Prosecution team made sure the presentation of the Japanese Emperor in trial was shady and not particularly emphasized. However, the public still viewed the absence of Hirohito in trial as an obvious fault of the Tokyo Trial. Even if the judges and prosecutors did not approve of his absence.

Keenan planned to sue Emperor Hirohito but was stopped by General MacArthur who pointed out that if Hirohito were to stand at the trial, the turbulent reactions of the Japanese civilians would be immeasurable. General MacArthur even filed a document in Washington D.C that indicated that if an individual tried to sue Hirohito, he would need at least 100,00 people to support him and an oversea military supplement base in order to maintain the current occupation that U.S. had in Japan. Thus, due to political consideration, Hirohito would not be brought to trial in any shape or form and definitely could not be sued by the prosecution team.

Australia was also unhappy with the decision of freeing Emperor Hirohito from trial, since it specifically requested a trial for Emperor Hirohito on the day Japan surrendered. Without denying any laws against suing Hirohito, Australia included the statement made by prosecutor Jackson in Nuremberg in its Canberra Statement. Jackson had claimed: “the heads of every states that started aggressive wars are automatically accused of war crime without any doubt”.

Due to the reality and capacity of the tribunal, there was also a long list of war criminals who could not be listed as defendants in this trial. This was a regret for many judges, prosecutors and personnel who were involved in this trial and a many civilians who were harmed in the war.

Major Charges and Accusations

The “Class A” criminals were charged with three major crimes: Crime Against Peace, Crime of War and Crime Against Humanity. There were also 55 additional minor accusations listed in the indictments that fell under each of the three major crimes.

The 1st count of offense that many defendants were accused for is expressed as follows: “As leaders, organizers, instigators, or accomplices in the formulation or execution of a common plan or conspiracy to wage wars of aggression, and war or wars in violation of international law.” This count pairs with the 27th count which indicated that Japan “[waged] unprovoked war against China”. These two counts of offense, which both fall under the Crime Against Peace category, referenced the 18 years long Second Sino-Japanese War and also the Japanese invasion of Northeast China, Manchukuo after the Mukden Incident on September 18th, 1931. Colonel Itagaki Seishiro, Lieutenant Colonel Ishiwara Kanji, and Colonel Doihara Kenji planned this incident and an explosion beside the Japanese owned South Manchuria Railway, which “allowed” Japan to launch a full invasion of Manchuko with the Imperial Japanese Army in response to this small explosion, which Japan claimed China was responsible for.

The 45th count of offense specifically accused the leaders of Imperial Japan Army of committing the Nanking Massacre. This count falls under the Crime of War and Crime Against Humanity categories. 12 of the defendants were charged with this count. The International Tribunal for the Far East decided the Nanking Massacre lasted for 7 weeks: from December 13th, 1937 to February 1938. The first three weeks of the massacre targeted strictly humans and later extended destruction to the entire area. During these seven weeks of these atrocities, there were more than 300,000 Chinese civilians slaughtered. Within the first month of the massacre, almost 20,000 Chinese female civilians were raped and 1/3 of Nanking city was burned to ashes.

There were 17 defendants charged with the 39th count of offense. This offense was the attack on Pearl Harbor. The United States ruled this offense regarding the unwarranted destruction of Pearl Harbor on December 7th, 1941 as an action that was against facets of The Hague Conventions that Japan had signed. The 39th count was often tied to the 29th count which accused Japan of waging aggressive war against the United States.

Another count that was often discussed throughout the trial was the 54th count of offense. This offense accused Japan of “[Ordering, authorizing, and permitting] inhumane treatment of prisoners of war and others”. This count was highly relative to the atrocities Japan committed in the Philippines. From 1942 to 1945, Imperial Japanese Army occupied and controlled the Philippine Islands. Countless war prisoners and Filipino civilians were forced into heavy labors, imprisoned and tortured. There were a minimum of 131,000 people killed in Philippine Island in those three years.

Other than these aforementioned counts, there were also several other significant accusations against these Japanese leaders. The 31st count accused Japan of “waging aggressive war against the British Commonwealth (Crown colonies and protectorates of the United Kingdom in the Far East and South Asia, Australia and New Zealand)”. The 32nd count accused Japan of “waging

aggressive war against the Netherlands (Dutch East Indies)". The 33rd count accused Japan of "waging aggressive war against France (French Indochina)." The 35th and 36th counts accused Japan of "waging aggressive war against USSR". And the 55th count accused Japan of "deliberately and recklessly disregarded their duty to take adequate steps to prevent atrocities".

Japanese Defenses and the Difficulties of Trial

Even though the public believed the results of the Tokyo Trial would be set in stone, reaching a verdict still proved extremely difficult. In fact, the process last for more than 2 years. This is because the vast majority of direct evidence, such as war plans, were destroyed by the Japanese. Furthermore, witnesses were spread across the world, which created numerous difficulties in the collection of testimonies.

The lawyers for the Japanese defendants, led by Kiyose Ichiro also provided strong arguments in favor of the Japanese criminals. Their main defense revolved around the fact that Germany surrendered unconditionally but that the Japanese surrender was not unconditional. There were conditions attached to the Potsdam Proclamation. The Potsdam Proclamation clearly stated that the punishments of War Criminals would be based on a common understanding by the public of "War Crimes." Essentially, this statement, according to defense counselor Ben Bruce Blakeney, meant that all the defendants could be charged with the Crime of War. However, the accusations of Crime Against Peace and Crime Against Humanity are not a part of International Law and therefore, according to the defense, could not be used. Thus, the trial charged the defendants for crimes that were beyond the clauses of International Law. In another words, the trial was applying *ex post facto* laws to the defendants' condition. The Japanese side also consistently attacked the legitimacy of the trial. Since none of the countries involved with prosecution and judgement processes were neutral throughout the war, the defense counsels affirmed the trial was a political production and not a fair, unbiased tribunal. Regarding the details and data within the evidence, the Japanese side chose to deny them all.

The Allies had issues with the prosecution as well. There were only two official working languages used in the trial ---- English and Japanese. But, French prosecutor Robert L. Oneto insisted on using French to state the accusations that France had against Japan. Oneto's insistence postponed and created difficulties for the operation of the court, since the personnel of the court needed to translate the documents from Japanese into French and then translate the French documents into English. Thus, when the prosecutors and judges from the USSR required the use of Russian to state their accusations against Japan and tried to introduce Russian as one of the working languages for the trial, they angered the entirety of the court. There was also a principle in the trial that the prosecution team should bring all of their witnesses to the trial itself and make them testify in front of the defendants themselves. However, due to political reasons, some of the witnesses were never brought to Tokyo to provide their testimonies on the trial. Additionally, the trial did not adopt any order. The progression of trial was not based on the numerical order of counts. Instead, the court

tried the defendants for each count based on the severity of each count of offense and sometimes, even based on whether the witnesses could prove that the certain count of offense actually occurred. All these problems further diminished the legitimacy of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East, and made the trial as Kiyose Ichiro suggested—chaos.

Committee Structure

This committee will serve as the International Military Tribunal for the Far East. We decided to include the prosecution and defense counsels in this committee. The 11 defense counsels in this committee are appointed by the same 11 countries that sponsor the prosecution, in order to ensure a fair trial. Each delegate will represent a prosecutor from one of the countries of Far Eastern Commission or a defense counsel for the Japanese defendants. Together, the prosecutors and defense counsels will decide the fates for most of the Japanese “Class A” defendants.

The committee will include environments both in court sessions and outside of court sessions.

The procedure of court sessions in this committee will resemble the procedure of mock trial. Delegates will be trained upon arrival. In the court session, delegates will be able to try the defendants and execute their powers as prosecutors and defense counsels on court.

The procedure outside of court session will resemble the procedure of any typical crisis committee. Outside of court sessions, delegates will be able to discuss the things that happen in the court, the potential charges and sentences, debate which count the defendants will be tried for in next court session and draft the directives to resolve the crises that occur throughout the trial. Delegates will also draft the opening statements for the court in external session. All the delegates will have the power to draft directives in the external sessions.

The starting time of the committee will be set as February 15th, 1946. The committee will automatically start as an external session for delegates to discuss the procedure of court and try to gather the evidence they require. The prosecution and defense counsels will also be required to draft their opening statements (one for prosecutors and one for defense counsels) and decide which prosecutor and defense counsel will present the statements at the beginning of the first session of court. Once both sections of the committee feel ready to present their opening statements and reach a decision regarding who they want to bring on court, delegates can motion to call the court to order to enter the court session.

The first court session will automatically be used to present the opening statements. When delegates want to exhaust a court, they can motion to close the court. By doing so, the committee will get back to the outside of court session.

The chairs will serve as judges in this committee.

The rights of prosecutors:

1. Only prosecutors can draft and vote on the directives of suing and bringing certain defendants on trial
2. Prosecutors can investigate on cases.
3. Prosecutors can collect evidence for cases they want.
4. Prosecutors can search for witnesses. Prosecutors need to draft directives if they wish to bring any witness into the court. If the directives pass, the witness/ witnesses will be brought to the court sessions. The directive of bringing in the witnesses for prosecutors' side only need to be pass within prosecutors.

The rights of defense counsels:

1. Defense counsels can refuse to defend for certain defendants and refuse to provide any evidence that may help certain defendants as they wish.
2. Defense counsels can investigate on cases.
3. Defense counsels can collect evidences for cases they want.
4. Defense counsels can search for witnesses. Prosecutors need to draft directives if they wish to bring any witness into the court. If the directives pass, the witness/ witnesses will be brought to the court sessions. The directive of bringing in the witnesses for defense counsels' side only need to be pass within.

Questions to Consider

1. Should Emperor Hirohito be sued and viewed as a war criminal or should the Allies accept the political consequences of not listing him as a defendant in Tokyo trial? Will the decision of this influence the fairness of the trial?
2. How to define and ensure the legitimacy of the International Military Tribunal for Far East?
3. Does there need to be certain order and orientation for the court to trial each count of offence that defendants were charge for? If so, what should the order be?
4. How can the prosecutors and defense counsels eliminate the effect political action had in this court and make sure the trail can be a fair trial for all instead of the tyranny of Allies towards Japan?

Prosecutors:

Joseph B. Keenan

Joseph Keenan is the prosecutor from United States. He graduated from Brown University, and then pursued his law degree at Harvard. Keenan fought in France during World War I and involved

in the Judge Advocate General's Corp after the war end. He then served as a Special Assistant at Ohio Attorney General. Years later, Keenan was recruited to be the Special Assistant at the U.S. Department OF Justice. Appointed by General MacArthur as the U.S. prosecutor in Tokyo Trial, Keenan want to make the trials of the defendants who committed the offence of 39th count, the attack for Pearl Harbor and the 29th count, waging aggressive war against United States, as the priorities of the entire tribunal.

Hsiang Che-chun

Hsiang Che-chun is the Republic Chinese prosecutor in Tokyo Trial. He finished his undergraduate degree in Tsinghua University and Yale University, and got his law degree from George Washington University. He once served as the ministries of Justice and Foreign Affairs in China. During the war, Hsiang saw a lot of barbarities committed by Japanese army, thus, he believes the justice can only be reached if all the Japanese Warlords and the Japanese emperor get the severest sentences. Hsiang also believes that China is the country that suffered the most in the Pacific area in WWII, so, he insists that the tribunal should focus more on the crimes that Japanese army committed in China, especially Nanking Massacre.

Sergei Alexandrovich Golunsky

Sergei Alexandrovich Golunsky serve as a Senior Diplomat in USSR. He doesn't have any experience to deal with legal works before, but he has strong faith in justice. Golunsky considers all the crimes Japanese army committed in China during WWII were inhumanity and believes Emperor Hirohito needs to be held accountability for all the war.

Arthur Comyns Carr

Arthur Carr is the prosecutor from the United Kingdom in Tokyo Trial. As an experienced politician and lawyer, Carr served as a volunteer soldier in the war at last month of WWII. He is super upset about Japanese invasion of the British Commonwealth, and considers the tribunal should has its focus on Japanese crime against British, instead of paying all of its attention on the offences Japan committed towards China and USA.

Robert L. Oneto

Robert L. Oneto is the prosecutor from France. He is the Minister of Justice in France. He also served as Chief Prosecutor in Versailles Special Court, during which time he married a female soldier from United States. Even though France didn't have so much to do with the battles happened in pacific area during WWII, the French government and General McArthur still consider there is political essentiality to include a French prosecutor in Tokyo Trial. Oneto, in this tribunal, really dedicate his effort to ensure the legitimacy of trial, but also, trying to ensure the important international status of France.

Alan Mansfield

Alan Mansfield is the prosecutor from Australia in Tokyo Trial. He is the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Queensland in Australia. He fought in WWII and that experience let him determine to punish the Japanese Warlords. Most importantly, bring Emperor Hirohito on trial as the government and most of the citizens in Australia wish.

Brigadier Henry Nolan

Brigadier Henry Nolan is the prosecutor from Canada in Tokyo Trial, the first Albertan appointed to the Supreme Court of Canada. He was a brigadier in Canadian army during WWII, and he is generally acknowledged by the members in International Prosecution Section as one of the smartest prosecutors and lawyers. Nolan hope to ensure the legitimacy of the tribunal and he is not sure about if Hirohito should be trialed or not.

P. Govinda Menon

P. Govinda Menon is the prosecutor from British India. He is a politician and freedom fighter in his country. Menon same as Indian government is not really happy that India was not included in the Tokyo Trial at the first place. He believes India contributed the most to defend the British properties in WWII and thus any case that is relative to India also need to be discuss seriously in this trial.

Frederick Borgerhoff-Mulder

Frederick Borgerhoff-Mulder is the prosecutor from Netherland. He served as the judge in The Hague Special War Crimes Tribunal in 1945, which experience makes him the most experienced being to deal with war criminals.

Ronald Henry Quilliam

Ronald Henry Quilliam is the prosecutor from New Zealand. He was a law professor in University of New Zealand and a brigadier of the army. As someone who fought and led in the war, he strongly believes the Japanese Warlords who conspired the aggressive war and deceived the Japanese civilians to fight in this war should receive the harshest punishments.

Pedro Lopez

Pedro Lopez is the prosecutor from the Philippines. He is an experienced lawyer. Lopez is upset about the fact that the globe tends to ignore what happened in Philippines during WWII. There were thousands of enslavements, massacres, even Human subject researches done by Japanese war criminals on Philippine civilians. Lopez determine to make the trial also has it focus on the crimes that happened in Philippines.

Defense Counsels: *In reality, all the people listed below were the judges in Tokyo Trial. However, in this committee, we changed their backgrounds and positions and make them the defense counsels for Japanese defendants.*

John P. Higgins

John P. Higgins is the defense counsel for Japanese defendants from United States. He is appointed by his government and his task is to ensure Japanese war criminals can also receive their justices. Graduated from Harvard law school, Higgins become a wonderful attorney. He then served in the United States Navy. He followed his fleet to Japan during the war few times and thus gained his understanding about Japan. He is disappointed by the fact that U.S. actually used nuclear weapons to attack Japanese civilians and this is also an important reason for him to choose to help defend the Japanese side for the justice of Japan.

Mei Ju-ao

Mei Ju-ao is the defense counsel for Japanese defendants from Republic of China. He went to Stanford University and got his undergraduate degree there. During his undergraduate career, he joined Phi Beta Kappa Society. Mei held the belief that the trial should not be the revenge from the Allies to Japan. He believes that Tokyo Trial should be a fair trial that also defend the right for defendant. Thus, he accepts the appointment of being the is the defense counsels for Japanese war defendants by his government. But there are some conditions mentioned by China and Mei himself for him to be the defense counsel, those are, the Warlords who involved in Nanking massacres need to receive the harshest punishments as soon as they are considered fair; and the Emperor Hirohito need to be bring on the tribunal to receive the fair trial.

I.M. Zaryanov

I.M. Zaryanov is the defense counsel for Japanese defendants from USSR. Zaryanovy is a general and war hero. He decides to defend for Japanese Warlords for he believes all the people who fought in war should be respect not matter good or bad. He is also unhappy about the fact that United States is the country that conquers and controls Japan after war.

William Donald Patrick

William Donald Patrick is the defense counsel for Japanese defendants from the United Kingdom. Patrick is the judge of the Supreme Court in Scotland. Patrick cares about the legitimacy of the Tokyo Trial, so, he chooses to help defend for the Japanese Warlords. Patrick claims he saw enough inhumanity during the war, so he wants to make sure there will be no more inhumanity impose on any other human. He is a good friend of Webb. He hates medias to death.

Henri Bernard

Henri Bernard is the defense counsel for Japanese defendants from France. He used to serve as chief prosecutor in many of the French local courts. He determines to fight for the justice for all human beings and that definitely includes Japanese Warlords. Bernard also hope to help France gain more international reputation by involving in this trial.

William Webb

William Webb is the defense counsel for Japanese defendants from Australia. He is a judge in Supreme Court of Australia. He firmly believed that justice belongs to all people. However, after experiencing this huge world war, he began to consider if there are some people who really don't deserve freedom and justice. Webb was convinced by Patrick to participate in this tribunal as the defense counsel. And the only reason for him to do this is because he hopes to see the Emperor Hirohito be trialed in this tribunal. Webb also leads the investigation team which focus on investigate the war crimes Japanese army committed in Australia.

Edward Stuart McDougall

Edward Stuart McDougall is the defense counsel for Japanese defendants from Canada. McDougall is a politician and built up his great reputation of being a wonderful Judge who is fair and practice due process. He is ready to do his best to defend for the defendants and believe the trial will reach a fair judgement.

Radhabinod Pal

Radhabinod Pal is the defense counsel for Japanese defendants from British India. Pal is a member of United Nations' International Law Commission. Because of that, Pal saw a lot of powerful countries used International Law as tool to attack small countries. He despises that, and thus he really wants to make sure that Tokyo Trial will be a fair trial rather than political action. Pal dissented to view Japan as aggressor, and believe that it is hard to tell what is right and what is wrong among wars.

Bert Roling

Bert Roling is the defense counsel for Japanese defendants from Netherland. He is a jurist and law professor. Roling volunteers to be the defense counsel since he does not agree on the view that Japan was an aggressor in WWII. He believes the trial will bring back the justice for everyone.

Erima Harvey Northcroft

Erima Harvey Northcroft is the defense counsel for Japanese defendants from New Zealand. Starting as lawyer, Northcroft was appointed a judge of the Supreme Court of New Zealand. He always be known as "The Honorable Judge Northcroft" for his insistence on justice, and consistency of respecting the defendants. In Tokyo Trial, he determines to do his best to defend for all the defendants.

Delfin Jaranilla

Delfin Jaranilla is the defense counsel for Japanese defendants from Philippines. He serves as the Attorney General of the Philippines, in the Insular Government that is part of American colonial. After all his experiences in WWII, Jaranilla is pretty unwilling to be the defense counsel for Japanese Warlords. However, he believes that in order to ensure the legitimacy of the trial, it is

important for the defendants to have someone defend for them. Thus, he is trying his best to eliminate his subjectivity in Tokyo Trial.