

been fulfilled by the petitioner. He married his present wife, who is a citizen of the United States, on August 26, 1925 and has resided with her continuously since then.

There is some evidence to indicate that the petitioner has represented himself as a United States citizen. The petitioner has stated, however, that he has never believed himself to be a citizen and has never willfully represented himself as a citizen of the United States.

In 1932 the petitioner made 10 or 12 trips to Mexico in connection with a contract which he had to build roads there and on these trips left and reentered the United States at Laredo, Texas. The Immigration Service has reported that it has no record of his inspection upon his returns from these absences. The petitioner states that he was never questioned as to his citizenship but was only asked where he lived and was permitted to reenter the United States.

On September 2, 1933, the petitioner arrived at San Diego, Calif. on the yacht, "Hanson", which was registered in the name of his wife, on a trip from New York. He was not listed on the manifest as a passenger or member of the crew and there is no record that he was inspected as required by the immigration law. The petitioner has stated that the immigration officers came aboard but that he was not asked any questions by them.

On January 21, 1938, the petitioner arrived at Housatonic, T. H. on the yacht, "Vega", which was registered in the name of his wife, on a trip from Jacksonville, Florida. The manifest data on file with the Immigration Service shows that he was manifested as having been born in Kansas and he was, therefore, not inspected. The petitioner has stated that he did not claim to have been born in Kansas and he was not asked any questions by the immigration officers.

All of the facts in connection with the petitioner's reentries into the United States were presented to the Department in Washington and it was decided on July 16, 1941 that, in view of all of the evidence, it was not a proper case in which to institute deportation proceedings.

The records of the Bureau of Internal Revenue show that for the past several years it has been shown on the petitioner's income tax returns that he is a citizen of the United States. The petitioner has stated that his returns were made out by an auditor; that he only went over the work sheets with the auditor and did not know that the completed forms showed that he was a citizen and that he believes the auditor assumed he was a citizen and he is certain that he did not state to him that he was. It is understood that the classification as a citizen would not have changed the amount of the tax.

The records of the Customs Service, Los Angeles, show that the Rohl-Connolly Co., of which the petitioner is the president, owned and operated a number of vessels from 1934 to 1940 in violation of the law in that the petitioner, who was the president of and a stockholder in the company, was an alien. The penalty provided is forfeiture of the vessels. The petitioner, however, made a cash settlement of the claim against the company on 9/1/41 of \$25,000. It does not appear that there was a willful violation of the law and no criminal action is contemplated.

The petitioner is the President of the Rohl-Connolly Contracting Co., located at 4354 Valley Blvd., Los Angeles, and has been awarded a secret contract in connection with a defense construction project in Housatonic. His participation in this project is being held up until he has been naturalized.

ARMY PEARL HARBOR BOARD EXHIBIT No. 7

INDEX

	Pages
Opening statement of Mr. Combs.....	3721-3722
Statement of Hans Wilhelm Rohl.....	3723-3811
Statement of Floyd Edith Rohl.....	3813-3864
Statement of Irma F. Dickey.....	3865-3878
Statement of W. Bruce Pine.....	3878-3885
	3920-3923
Statement of Max Shapiro.....	3887-3890
Statement of Ray Anderson.....	3891-3919
Statement of Harry Flannery.....	3924-3932

[3719] BEFORE CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE'S JOINT FACT FINDING COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

In the Matter of HANS WILHELM ROHL, ROHL-CONNOLLY COMPANY, HAWAIIAN CONSTRUCTORS and R. W. ROHL COMPANY. Open session

Met pursuant to the call of the Chairman at 9:30 o'clock a. m., Saturday, February 27, 1943.

Present:

Senator Jack D. Tenney, Chairman, 3207 West 77th Street, Inglewood, California.

Senator Hugh Burns.

Assemblyman Nelson S. Dilworth, Columbia St. at Crest Drive, Hemet, California.

Assemblyman Jesse, Randolph Kellems, 454 Cuesta Way, Bel-Air, California. Others present: R. E. Combs, Chief Counsel and Investigator.

Reported by: J. D. Ambrose, 322 Wilcox Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif.

[3720] PROCEEDINGS

The committee met pursuant to the call of Chairman Tenney at Room 707, California State Building, Los Angeles, California, at 9:30 o'clock a. m.

Chairman TENNEY. The committee will come to order. Mr. Reporter, will you be sworn.

(Whereupon, the Shorthand Reporter was sworn as the Official Reporter of the proceedings.)

Chairman TENNEY. We are going to excuse all witnesses and others who might be here for a few moments. The committee is going to have a short executive session.

Will the gentlemen of the press state their names for the record.

Mr. HAGADON. James Hagadon, Herald-Express.

Mr. AUSTIN. Thomas Austin.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Edward Phillips, Herald-Express.

Chairman TENNEY. Gentlemen, the committee has ruled for this hearing the public will be excluded but the press may remain. We are asking the press to be very careful in reporting anything of a military nature or that might have any bearing on military objectives or installations or anything of that nature which might be developed in the course of the examination of witnesses.

[3721] We believe we must be exceedingly careful in reference to that. I believe with that admonition you gentlemen of the press will act accordingly. In other words, we don't want to reveal any military secrets if any should be developed in the examination.

The rest of the material brought out by the examination, of course, will be matters that can be published. We are exceedingly anxious that nothing will be revealed or any secrets made public which might be helpful to the enemy.

You gentlemen are fully in accord with that statement.

Our chief counsel and investigator, Mr. Combs, can elaborate on that statement and give you a better idea of what we have in mind. Mr. Combs.

Mr. COMBS. I thought it might be well to make a brief statement as to what we expect to show by this witness.

This witness came to the United States from Valparaiso, Chile in 1913. He is a German alien born in Lubeck, Germany.

He secured military and naval contracts to build highly strategic installations for the Army and Navy while he was a German alien.

He built Red Hill which overlooks Pearl Harbor.

He did construction work at Hickam Field.

He built anti-aircraft gun emplacements in Wake Island, Midway and Guam.

He built a ring of installations around the island of Oahu, at the southern tip of which is Pearl Harbor.

He bought a yacht in the east that cost him \$40,000 called the Vega. The Vega was built in Kiel, Germany.

[3722] He later turned the Vega over to the Army for use as a patrol vessel at a cost to the Government of \$150,000 a year.

He made many statements to the effect that he was a citizen of the United States when in fact, he well knew he was an alien.

The manner in which he obtained these contracts and how he put them into effect is, of course, what we expect to develop in this examination.

We feel it will be highly important to the public of this country and certainly to this State, to frankly reveal to them that a German alien has installed these highly strategic projects in the most critical war zone that we have.

These matters have never been revealed before and we believe that the Press should slant the story of the hearing in that direction, so that we may accomplish the public service that we are trying to perform.

That is all I have to say.

Chairman TENNEY. Are we ready to proceed?

Mr. COMBS. Yes, sir.

Chairman TENNEY. You may call your first witness.

[3723] Chairman TENNEY. Mr. Rohl, will you come forward, please?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before this committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. ROHL. I do.

HANS WILHELM ROHL, called as a witness on behalf of the Committee, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

Chairman TENNEY. Will you state your full name?

The WITNESS. Hans Wilhelm Rohl.

Chairman TENNEY. Is that spelled H-a-n-s?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Chairman TENNEY. Hans Wilhelm Rohl.

The WITNESS. Yes.

Chairman TENNEY. Have you ever been known by any other name?

The WITNESS. No; only H. W.

Chairman TENNEY. What is your residence address?

The WITNESS. 8159 Hollywood Boulevard.

Chairman TENNEY. Los Angeles, California?

The WITNESS. Yes, sir.

Chairman TENNEY. All right, Mr. Combs.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. Mr. Rohl, how long have you lived in California?

A. 1914.

[3724] Q. Since 1914?

A. Yes.

Q. And have you lived in California continuously since 1914?

A. Right.

Q. You came here from Valparaiso, Chile, did you not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. On the steamship SANTA MARIA?

A. That is right.

Chairman TENNEY. Will you speak up, Mr. Rohl, so the reporter can hear you?

The WITNESS. Yes.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. And that was in 1913, was it not?

A. Right.

Q. Prior to the time that you were in Chile, had you been in any other South American country?

A. In Peru.

Q. What sort of work did you do in Peru?

A. I was employed by the American Smelting and Refining Company, at Rincagua.

Q. In what capacity?

A. As foreman.

Q. As foreman?

A. Yes.

Q. In one of their mining operations?

A. Yes.

[3725] Q. Now, did you ever hear of the Nevada Consolidated Copper Company of Ely, Nevada?

A. I worked for them.

Q. When did you start working for that concern?

A. When I arrived in the States.

Q. When you arrived in the States?

A. Yes, in 1913.

- Q. Did you go then to Ely, Nevada, to work for that company?  
 A. That is right.
- Q. And you resided in Ely, Nevada, did you not, from November, 1913 to October, 1914?  
 A. Correct.
- Q. And then you lived in Sacramento from October, 1914 until January, 1923?  
 A. I believe that is right.
- Q. And in San Francisco from January, 1923 until October, 1926?  
 A. Yes.
- Q. And in Los Angeles ever since?  
 A. Yes.
- Q. When you went to Ely, Nevada, Mr. Rohl, and were employed by the Nevada Consolidated Copper Company, what sort of work did you do there?  
 A. I was a construction foreman or superintendent.
- Q. And had you made the arrangement for your employment [3726] in that capacity before you left South America?  
 A. No.
- Q. Through whom did you obtain that employment?  
 A. Through the general manager; I don't remember his name.
- Q. Was his name Walker?  
 A. Walker?
- Q. Walker, was that his name?  
 A. No.
- Q. Now, your activities as foreman for the Nevada Consolidated Copper Company consisted of what, generally?  
 A. Of construction—of making McDougal roasters—they are furnaces.
- Q. And did you cease working for that company in October, 1914?  
 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And you then went to Sacramento?  
 A. That is right.
- Q. What sort of work did you do in Sacramento at that time?  
 A. In Sacramento?
- Q. Yes.
- A. I was employed by the Ross Construction Company.
- Q. Did you work on a causeway project there?  
 A. Yes.
- Q. In Sacramento?  
 [3727] A. Yes.
- Q. In what year was that?  
 A. (No answer)
- Q. Was that in 1914?  
 A. (No answer)
- Q. Do you recall whether that was in 1914?  
 A. I don't know.
- Q. You don't remember?  
 A. That is a long time ago.
- Q. If you don't remember, just state so, Mr. Rohl. Now, in Sacramento you resided for a time at 2371 Portola Way, did you not?  
 A. Yes.
- Q. When did you first start living there? Can you give me the year?  
 A. (No answer)
- Q. Shortly after you went to Sacramento?  
 A. Yes.
- Q. And did you acquire that property?  
 A. Yes.
- Q. Do you own it at the present time?  
 A. Yes.
- Q. Now, while you were residing in San Francisco you made a trip to Germany, did you not?  
 A. Yes.
- Q. On the steamship DEUTSCHLAND?  
 [3728] A. That is right.
- Q. You were a German citizen at that time?  
 A. That is right.
- Q. From whom did you obtain your passport to make that trip?

- A. I obtained a temporary passport from the German Consul in San Francisco.  
Q. I see.  
A. And a re-entry permit from the State Department in Washington.  
Q. Do you recall the name of the German Consul?  
A. No.  
Q. That was in 1924, was it not, that you left?  
A. Yes.  
Q. How long were you gone, Mr. Rohl, on that trip?  
A. Offhand I would say between two and three months.  
Q. And at that time did you have any relatives in Germany?  
A. Yes.  
Q. You were born in Lubeck, were you not?  
A. That is right.  
Q. What relatives did you have there at that time?  
A. Three sisters.  
Q. And did you visit with them?  
A. Yes, sir.  
Q. Did you go to any other place in Germany other than [3729] Lubeck on that occasion?  
A. No; I went to Hamburg.  
Q. You also visited in England, did you?  
A. Yes; I probably stayed a week in Hamburg and spent the rest of my time in London.  
Q. And from what port did you leave Europe to return to the United States?  
A. I left from Plymouth.  
Q. And landed where in this country?  
A. New York.  
Q. You came back on the steamship FRANCE?  
A. Yes, sir.  
Q. Did you then return to San Francisco?  
A. Yes.  
Q. That was early in 1925, was it not?  
A. (Nodding head in the affirmative.)  
Q. And after returning what sort of work did you do then?  
A. Contracting.  
Q. Your offices were where?  
A. San Francisco.  
Q. Had you met Mr. T. E. Connolly by that time?  
A. No.  
Q. When did you first meet him?  
A. Excuse me, I had met him, yes.  
Q. When did you first become acquainted with him?  
[3730] A. In either 1921 or 1922.  
Q. How did you happen to meet him? Do you recall the circumstances under which you met him?  
A. Probably at a contractors' convention.  
Q. He has been in the contracting business for many years, has he not?  
A. Yes.  
Q. And is a graduate of the College of Engineering of the University of California?  
A. Yes.  
Q. And is a member of the Rohl-Connolly Corporation?  
A. Right.  
Q. And his brother handles your insurance business, does he not, for your corporation?  
A. (No answer)  
Q. Mr. Connolly's brother.  
A. Glenn Connolly?  
Q. Yes, Glenn Connolly.  
A. Yes.  
Q. You built the Bay Shore Highway, did you not?  
A. Yes.  
Q. And you also built a road for the Mexican Government, did you not?  
A. Yes.  
Q. Where did that road have its northerly terminus?  
A. (No answer)

- [3731] Q. In other words, where did it commence?  
 A. (No answer)  
 Q. Did it run from Monterrey southerly to Mexico City?  
 A. It was the Monterrey-Mexico City Highway.  
 Q. The Pan-American Highway? Is that what it was called?  
 A. No.  
 Q. Was there any name for it?  
 A. They called it the "Laredo-Mexico City Highway."  
 Q. Did you do the work on that road in your individual capacity or as a member of the corporation?  
 A. Individual.  
 Q. As an individual?  
 A. Yes.  
 Q. The Rohl-Connolly Company was incorporated in 1932, was it not?  
 A. Yes.  
 Q. And prior to that time you operated solely as an individual?  
 A. That is right.  
 Q. When did you first enter into the contracting business?  
 A. In 1922.  
 Q. You first entered the contracting business in 1922?  
 A. Yes.  
 Q. And you have continued in the contracting business [3732] since that date?  
 A. Oh, yes.  
 Q. Until the present time?  
 A. Yes, sir.  
 Q. And you are active, of course, now, are you not?  
 A. Yes, sir.  
 Q. The Rohl-Connolly Company was incorporated in Nevada, was it not?  
 A. Yes, sir.  
 Q. Carson City?  
 A. (Nodding head in the affirmative.)  
 Q. Do you know a man by the name of S. F. Cliff or S. F. Meder?  
 A. No.  
 Q. Or L. H. Peter?  
 A. No.  
 Q. They were the original incorporators in Carson City. I presume your purpose was to form the corporation there and then set it up to transact business in California?  
 A. That is right.  
 Q. So those men were simply what is known as the "dummy incorporators"?  
 A. Yes.  
 Q. And thereafter you applied for a permit to issue stock to the Corporation Commission of California, did you not?  
 [3733] A. Yes, sir.  
 Q. And that was on May 4, 1932, according to the application.  
 The application was signed by yourself, by Irma Dickey, your secretary, and by Mr. T. E. Connolly?  
 A. Yes.  
 Q. And you applied for a permit to issue and sell 40,000 shares, did you not?  
 A. I believe that is right.  
 Q. For \$10 a share?  
 A. (No answer.)  
 Q. Is that correct?  
 A. (No answer.)  
 Q. I will say for your information that is what the application shows, Mr. Rohl.  
 A. Well, that probably is correct.  
 Q. And do you recall how many shares were issued to Mr. Connolly when the corporation was first set up in California?  
 A. Well, I would have half of it.  
 Q. Half to you and half to Mr. Connolly?  
 A. That is right.  
 Q. And a small percentage of the stock to Irma Dickey?  
 A. No.  
 Q. She held no stock?  
 A. No.

[3734] Who was the first president of that corporation?

A. (No answer)

Q. Do you recall?

A. No. We change every so often.

Q. Well, who is the president now?

A. I am.

Q. How long have you occupied that office?

A. (No answer)

Q. A matter of two or three years? I don't care about the exact date.

A. I believe we changed a year ago.

Q. And who preceded you as the president?

A. T. E. Connolly.

Q. Mr. Connolly?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, where in Los Angeles is the principal office of the Rohl-Connolly Company located?

A. 4315 Valley Boulevard.

Q. Do you have a San Francisco office?

A. No.

Q. Have you ever had one?

A. No.

Q. Do you actively attend to the affairs of the Rohl-Connolly Company in southern California?

A. I do.

Q. And you have always done that since its inception?

[3735] A. (No answer)

Q. Have you been active in handling the business down here?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. Did Irma Dickey ever occupy any official position with the Rohl Connolly Company?

A. Why, Irma Dickey is a director and secretary and treasurer.

Q. And she has been for how long?

A. Since its inception.

Q. And still is?

A. Still is.

Q. Your application for a permit to issue stock of the Rohl-Connolly Corporation was filed on May 4, 1931.

It states that you had been engaged in general construction work since 1912. That is correct, is it not?

A. Yes.

Q. What did you do prior to 1912?

A. I was still in construction work.

Q. Have you done that all your life?

A. Yes.

Q. There is also an H. W. Rohl Company, is there not?

A. H. W. Rohl Company is a fictitious name. It is H. W. Rohl operating under the firm name and style of H. W. Rohl Company.

Q. And is there anyone else interested in that concern [3736] besides yourself?

A. No.

Q. Are you familiar with an organization known as the Hawaiian Constructors?

A. Yes, I am. Rohl and Connolly are members of the Hawaiian Constructors.

Q. Is that a corporation?

A. It is a joint venture.

Q. A partnership, in other words?

A. Yes; I believe there is a little difference between a partnership and a joint venture.

Q. Well, the difference being the technical distinction between individuals as partners and an organization composed of corporations as partners engaged in a joint venture. Isn't that your understanding of it?

A. That is right.

Q. Besides the Rohl-Connolly Company, Mr. Rohl, what other concerns are engaged in this joint enterprise?

A. Callahan Construction Company.

Q. Of Los Angeles?

A. Yes, of Los Angeles. Gunther and Shirley Company, Ralph E. Woolley and Hawaiian Contracting Company.

Q. How long has that Hawaiian Constructors company been in existence?

A. I wouldn't say—I know a long time.

Q. With the same component membership?

[3737] A. Yes.

Q. Were they doing business under the name of "Hawaiian Contractors" in 1939?

A. We are talking now about Hawaiian Contracting Company?

Q. You misunderstood me. I meant Hawaiian Constructors.

A. Hawaiian Constructors were awarded, and that is all I can say, the secret contract from the War Department.

Q. About when—what year?

A. December, 1940.

Q. Prior to that time had you individually, or had Rohl-Connolly Company done any work for the Government?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. For the Army?

A. Oh, yes. Rohl-Connolly—the only work Rohl-Connolly have done in the last ten years, ten or eleven years, is work for the War Department.

Q. How much stock in the Rohl-Connolly Company do you own now, Mr. Rohl?

A. 50 per cent.

Q. And have you always owned 50 per cent?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did Rohl-Connolly Company ever own any vessels?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you describe them generally? What did they consist of?

[3738] A. Tugs and barges.

Q. Has any of the stock of the Rohl-Connolly Company been issued at any time to any other persons except you and Mr. T. E. Connolly?

A. No.

Q. Did the Hawaiian Constructors conduct any business in California at any time?

A. Of course, the Hawaiian Constructors, in connection with the Pacific Ocean contracts, had an office in California.

Q. Where was the location of the Los Angeles office?

A. In California the office was in San Francisco.

Q. Didn't the Hawaiian Constructors have a berth at Wilmington in Southern California?

A. (No answer.)

Q. Berth 145, Wilmington?

A. Hawaiian Constructors were operating that berth for the Government.

Q. They operated the berth, however, in the name of the "Hawaiian Constructors"?

A. Yes, Hawaiian Constructors.

Q. And they also maintain an office at 744 Francisco Street, Los Angeles, do they not?

A. That is right.

Q. They don't operate there any more, do they?

A. No.

[3739] Q. How long has that office been closed?

A. I don't know.—I would say a year or more than a year.

Q. A little more than a year?

A. Yes.

Q. The San Francisco office is still open, isn't it?

A. What date is this?

Q. This is the 27th.

A. It was closed day before yesterday.

Q. I see. Were you ever in the San Francisco office yourself?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. When were you last there?

A. Last Saturday.

Q. Your present wife is Floy Edith Rohl?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you married her in San Francisco on or about August 26, 1925?

A. Yes.



Q. Had you been previously married?

A. No.

Q. Do you recall asking a question set forth in your application for citizenship to which you answered that you married in March of 1941 and stated that you were divorced from your first wife?

A. Yes, which wasn't correct.

[3740] Q. That is not true?

A. No.

Q. And you have since corrected it?

A. Yes.

Q. Of whom does your family consist, Mr. Rohl?

A. (No answer.)

Q. What I mean by that is, do you have any children?

A. Yes.

Q. And they are three daughters and a son?

A. Yes.

Q. And one of your daughters lives in Sacramento?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where does your son reside?

A. Where is my son?

Q. Yes.

A. He is in Edmonton, Canada.

Q. And how long has he been in Edmonton, Canada?

A. A little over a month.

Q. And where did he reside prior to that time?

A. In Colorado.

Q. What is his business or occupation?

A. He is a construction foreman.

Q. Is he employed by any concern in which you are interested?

A. No.

Q. He operates entirely independently, does he?

[3741] A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know whether he is acquainted with a man by the name of Theodore Wyman, Jr.?

A. Theodore Wyman, Jr. is the commanding officer.

Q. Yes, I know he is. He is also in Edmonton, Canada, is he not?

A. Yes.

Q. How long has he been there?

A. Approximately a year.

Q. Do you know whether or not your son is acquainted with Colonel Wyman?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. How long has he known him?

A. Six or seven years.

Q. Did you introduce them?

A. I believe I did.

Q. And you have been acquainted with Colonel Wyman about how long?

A. Since 1936.

Q. He, at that time, was in charge of the United States Army Engineer's office in Los Angeles, was he not?

A. That is correct.

Q. And he then held the rank of major?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. He had just gotten it, as a matter of fact, hadn't he?

[3742] A. That is right.

Q. And you did not know him at all prior to that time?

A. No.

Q. Did you know him when he was a captain?

A. Well, yes, sir, I knew him when he was a captain. He was a captain when he came out here.

Q. And he came out here when?

A. In 19—I am pretty sure 1936.

Q. July 20, 1935. Do you recall he came from Kansas City to work on the flood control project here?

A. Yes.

Q. And you met him after that, did you?

A. No, when he arrived here. Rohl-Connolly Company were building the Long Beach—the Los Angeles-Long Beach breakwater which was under his jurisdiction. That is how I met him.

Q. You met him in that way?

A. Yes, that is right.

Q. And your relations with him were of a business nature, were they?

A. That is right.

A. And they continued from that time until the present date?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. Did you ever own a boat called the "Pandora"?

A. Yes.

[3743] Q. When did you acquire the Pandora?

A. (No answer.)

Q. Do you recall about how long ago?

A. 1927.

Q. Did you ever sail it to Honolulu?

A. Yes.

Q. It was anchored where?

A. Anchored? Where do you mean, here?

A. Yes.

A. At the California Yacht Club anchorage.

Q. And the boat burned, did it not?

A. Yes.

Q. Was it insured?

A. Yes.

Q. And the insurance was payable to you, was it?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you subsequently acquire any other yacht?

A. Yes, I, or my wife did. She bought the Ramona.

Q. Did she also buy the Pandora?

A. I did.

Q. Pardon me.

A. I don't remember who bought the Pandora.

Q. But you do remember the insurance was paid to you?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, the first boat after the Pandora was the Ramona, which you acquired in 1933?

[3744] A. Yes.

Q. Who paid for that boat?

A. I don't know.

Q. Don't you recall whether or not you paid for it, Mr. Rohl, or did your wife pay for it?

A. I would assume it came—I don't know who paid for it, but I assume it came out of community property and funds.

Q. To whom was the insurance payable?

A. I don't know.

Q. Of course, that boat did not burn, did it?

A. No.

Q. Who hired the crew on the Ramona?

A. The captain.

Q. Who employed the captain?

A. (No answer.)

Q. Didn't you employ him?

A. I suppose I did.

Q. And you paid him a salary, didn't you?

A. Yes.

Q. And paid a salary to the crew?

A. (Nodding head in affirmative.)

Q. Did your wife belong to the Newport Beach Yacht Club?

A. You mean "Newport Harbor Yacht Club"?

Q. Yes, Newport Harbor Yacht Club.

A. I did.

[3745] Q. You did?

A. Yes.

Q. Were you ever Commodore of that club?

A. Oh, yes.

- Q. You were?  
 A. Yes.  
 Q. Was there any regulation requiring you to own a boat in order to be Commodore of the club?  
 A. No.  
 Q. There was not?  
 A. No.  
 Q. Did you buy the provisions and pay all of the expenses in connection with the operation of the Ramona?  
 A. You mean personally?  
 Q. Yes.  
 A. No.  
 Q. Who did?  
 A. It went through the office.  
 Q. Office of the Rohl-Connolly Company?  
 A. No, H. W. Rohl.  
 Q. And you owned H. W. Rohl Company?  
 A. Community property again, I suppose.  
 Q. Pardon me?  
 A. Community property, I suppose.  
 Q. Nobody else had any interest in that but you?  
 A. No.  
 [3746] Q. So you did pay for those things inasmuch as you were an individual doing business under a fictitious name?  
 A. That is right.  
 Q. So, of course, you did pay the expenses?  
 A. Yes.  
 Q. Now, you sailed the boat—you bought the boat in New York?  
 A. The Ramona?  
 Q. Yes.  
 A. Yes.  
 Q. And you sailed it from New York to the west coast, did you not?  
 A. Yes.  
 Q. Do you recall stopping at Acapulco, Mexico?  
 A. Yes.  
 Q. Was the boat inspected by immigration officials there?  
 A. No.  
 Q. Was it inspected by immigration officials when you arrived at San Diego?  
 A. If you will go through the records of the Immigration Department here—I mean they have gone through all this before.  
 Q. Yes.  
 A. And they have.  
 Q. Well, I have gone through the records of the Immigration [3747] tion Department and there is no statement on the manifest that you were on the boat at all, and that is why I asked you that question. In other words, there is no record there that you, as a German alien, ever returned from Acapulco, Mexico, to the United States, and I am wondering whether or not the boat was inspected by immigration officials and if so, whether or not you were interrogated about your status.  
 A. No.  
 Q. You were not?  
 A. No.  
 Q. When did you first purchase the Vega or when was it purchased? I will put it that way.  
 A. In 1937.  
 Q. The Vega was built in Kiel, Germany originally, was she not?  
 A. Yes, sir.  
 Q. And owned by a person named Mr. Dicks, is that correct?  
 A. (Nodding head in affirmative.)  
 Q. And you bought it in New York?  
 A. I bought it in New York.  
 Q. Do you recall how much was paid for it?  
 A. Yes, \$45,000.  
 Q. Who put up the \$45,000?  
 A. That was the \$45,000 Mrs. Rohl got from the Ramona.  
 [3748] Q. She sold the Ramona?

- A. For \$45,000 and bought the Vega for \$45,000.
- Q. I see. Who hired the crew for the Vega?
- A. For the Vega?
- Q. Yes.
- A. Mrs. Rohl and Fred Rohl, my son, were back there.
- Q. Do you recall telling anyone in southern California that you intended to sell the Ramona and buy the Vega?
- A. No.
- Q. You never did much such a statement?
- A. I couldn't because I didn't know anything about the Vega.
- Q. Did you have some photographs of the Vega sent out here so you could look at them?
- A. Yes.
- Q. So you did know about the Vega when the photographs arrived?
- A. When the photographs arrived?
- Q. Yes.
- A. Which was some time after the Ramona was sold.
- Q. But before the Vega was purchased.
- A. Yes.
- Q. And after the Ramona had been sold and the photographs of the Vega arrived for your inspection, did you tell anyone you intended to buy the Vega?
- A. I probably did.
- [3749] Q. You probably did?
- A. (No answer.)
- Q. How large a boat was the Vega?
- A. 136 feet.
- Q. 136 feet long?
- A. Yes.
- Q. A steel vessel—
- A. Don't say "was"; I hope she still is.
- Q. The Government is using her now, isn't it?
- A. That is right.
- Q. As a matter of fact, the United States Army Engineers used it as a patrol vessel, did they not?
- A. No. The Army Engineers used it for a while as a survey boat.
- Q. How much rental did you receive for the Vega from the Engineering Corps at that time?
- A. \$1.00—I still have it.
- Q. You received \$1.00?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Did you ever receive any other compensation from the Government for the use of the boat?
- A. No.
- Q. You are quite sure of that?
- A. I am sure of that.
- Q. Did you apply for permission to have a radio telephone installed on the Vega?
- [3750] A. No.
- Q. Never did?
- A. Never did. That is, there is—not now—there was a commercial Mackay radio wireless station.
- Q. Who applied for that?
- A. Mackay.
- Q. At whose request?
- A. Mrs. Rohl.
- Q. You never participated in that at all?
- A. No.
- Q. And the station was KLVC, was it not, the Mackay station on the Vega?
- A. I believe so.
- Q. And application was also made for permission to use code, isn't that correct?
- A. Permission to use code?
- Q. Yes.
- A. Well, the Mackay code, yes.
- Q. Was that permission granted?
- A. Yes.
- Q. It was?

A. Yes.

Q. Are you quite sure of that?

A. The only thing I am sure of is that Mackay Radio furnished the operator.

Q. But you don't know whether or not you were permitted to use code, do you Mr. Rohl?

[3751] A. No; that is up to Mackay.

Q. As a matter of fact, the records show, those that I have seen, that the application was made and denied you for permission to use code. Why was it desired to use code on the Vega?

A. I don't know.

Q. Do you know who is listed in Lloyd's register as the owner of the Vega?

A. No.

Q. Did you apply to Lloyd's for them to make periodic inspections of the Vega's machinery and equipment and anchor chains, and so forth? I mean you personally?

A. That was probably handled as a matter of routine on the boat itself. The inspections were generally made once a year.

Q. Automatically, or at somebody's request?

A. Automatically.

Q. Is it a free service?

A. No.

Q. But you don't have to apply for it; they just keep giving you the service periodically and send you a bill, is that it?

A. (Nodding head in affirmative.)

Q. How many members of the crew were there on the Vega?

A. (No answer.)

Q. How large a crew did she carry?

[3752] A. It depends.

Q. Did you ever carry as many as 16 in the crew?

A. Oh yes, on long trips.

Q. Did you ever have a captain on the Vega called "Mathias"?

A. Yes.

Q. What was his first name?

A. Was it "Mathias" or was it "Matthews"?

Q. Matthews, I guess it was.

A. Otto.

Q. Was he a citizen or an alien?

A. A citizen.

Q. Of what extraction?

A. I don't know.

Q. Were there any aliens in the crew?

A. (No answer.)

Q. At any time?

A. I don't know that.

Q. Now, who directed the sailing of the Vega? Who determined where she would go and when?

A. The owner.

Q. Your wife?

A. (Nodding head in affirmative.) Or I did—probably both of us did.

Q. Probably both of you? Now, you sailed the Vega from Jacksonville, Florida, to Honolulu, did you not?

[3753] A. Yes.

Q. Shortly after you purchased it?

A. That is right.

Q. And you arrived in Honolulu on the 21st of January, 1938, didn't you?

A. Yes.

Q. At this time, for your information, the Immigration manifests shows you to have been born in Iola, Kansas, on September 26, 1886.

How did the Immigration officials get that information?

A. I don't know.

Q. Have you seen that manifest?

A. No.

Q. Did anybody ever tell you that that information appeared in it?

A. No—yes, yes.

Q. The Immigration inspector—

A. Here after I had applied for my citizenship.

Q. They told you that on that occasion you had been manifested as having been born in Iola, Kansas?

A. That is right. They called it to my attention.

Q. As a matter of fact, that was the birthplace of your wife?

A. Yes.

Q. But she wasn't born there on September 26, 1886, was she?

[3754] A. No.

Q. You were born in 1886, were you not?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. When you went to Honolulu did you go through the Panama Canal?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And at Balboa you were examined by an Immigration inspector?

A. I don't think so.

Q. Well, the manifest shows there was an examination made but you were not listed there either as a passenger or a member of the crew, but it shows there were five aliens in the crew.

Does that refresh your memory at all?

A. No.

Q. Do you recall a fight that occurred among the members of the crew while the boat was anchored off Honolulu?

A. (No answer.) (Witness laughing.)

Q. Do you remember that?

A. Not anchored; tied up alongside of the pier.

Q. Tied up alongside of the pier?

A. Yes.

Q. By the way, did you know Mr. Wyman at that time?

A. Colonel Wyman?

Q. Yes.

A. Oh, yes.

[3755] Q. Was he in the Islands then?

A. (No answer.)

Q. You don't recall?

A. (No answer.)

Q. You have no recollection at all of that matter?

A. No.

Q. Is it possible that you may have met him there in 1938?

A. He was still there, wasn't he?

Q. I don't know; I am just wondering whether you know or not.

A. I don't remember.

Q. I see. Now, as a matter of fact, you were negotiating with the Army at that time for contracts with reference to installations in several of the Pacific Islands, were you not?

A. No.

Q. You were not?

A. No.

Q. When did those negotiations commence?

A. December of 1940.

Q. December, 1940?

A. Yes; and they ended in December of 1940.

Q. They were consummated?

A. Yes.

Q. You got the contracts?

[3756] A. Yes.

Q. And those contracts included work on the Island of Oahu, did they not?

A. Yes.

Q. And Midway?

A. No; but I can't tell you what it included.

Q. Well, the records, of course, are available.

A. The records are available.

Q. There is nothing secret about that.

A. I am not permitted to say.

Q. There is nothing secret about the places, is there?

A. There is to me—I mean I am not permitted to tell that.

Q. You are not permitted to say you did any work on the Island of Oahu?

A. Yes.

Q. Are you permitted to say whether you did any work on Wake, Guam, or Midway?

A. I can say I didn't.

Q. You did not?

A. I did not.

Q. Did anyone with whom you were connected do any work on the Island of Midway?

A. No.

Q. Never did?

A. Never did.

[3757] Q. You did work on the Island of Oahu, isn't that true?

A. That's right.

Q. And other islands?

A. Yes.

Q. You worked on other islands?

A. But if you want the specific islands, the Hawaiian Constructors operated on, you will have to get that information from someone else but me because I am not permitted to divulge it.

Q. How about your employees? Are they permitted to disclose where they worked?

A. Not supposed to, but I suppose they do.

Q. They not only do but they have?

A. I suppose they have too.

Q. Do you know Harold Cramer?

A. Harold Cramer?

Q. Yes, Harold Cramer?

A. No.

Q. He was employed on some of those islands by the Hawaiian Constructors.

Now, how long did you remain in Honolulu after you sailed over there on the Vega? Did you stay there, Mr. Rohl, about two weeks?

A. About two weeks.

Q. When you left Honolulu to return to the United States who were the passengers on the boat besides yourself? [3758]

A. Well, there was Dr. Lewis.

Q. What is his full name?

A. Carl Lewis.

Q. Who else?

A. And his wife.

Q. What is her first name?

A. Virginia.

Q. Yes; anyone else?

A. Mrs. Winne.

Q. How do you spell that?

A. Ilene Winne, W-i-n-n-e.

Q. She boarded the boat at Honolulu?

A. At Honolulu, yes.

Q. And returned with you to San Diego?

A. Los Angeles.

Q. Pardon me.

A. San Pedro.

Q. Excuse me, San Pedro. Was anybody else on the boat as passengers the time you left Honolulu and you returned to California?

A. No; of course Mrs. Rohl.

Q. Yes.

A. That is all.

Q. Nobody else boarded the boat between Honolulu and San Diego?

[3759] A. No; the boat didn't go to San Diego.

Q. I mean San Pedro.

A. San Pedro.

Q. Nobody else boarded the boat between the time it left Honolulu and the time it arrived at San Pedro?

A. Yes, that is right.

Q. Do you know Mr. E. J. Crouse?

A. Yes.

Q. Didn't he board the boat between the time it left Honolulu and arrived at San Pedro?

A. No.

Q. He did not?

A. (No answer.)

Q. Were you ever familiar with his boat, the Marlin?

A. Yes.

Q. Didn't his boat, the Marlin, hail the Vega in the vicinity of Catalina Island, and didn't Mr. Crouse come on board the Vega?

A. No, sir.

Q. You are positive of that?

A. I am positive. He came aboard inside the breakwater.

Q. Where was that?

A. Los Angeles breakwater.

Q. Wasn't that before your boat docked at San Pedro?

A. Before it docked, yes.

[3760] Q. And before it was inspected by Immigration officials?

A. There was no Immigration officials.

Q. Well, didn't somebody tell him that he had better get off the boat because he had no business on there and that you had not cleared Immigration yet?

A. That must have been the bug inspector.

Q. Didn't somebody tell him that, or do you know?

A. I don't know. There is no Immigration inspection.

Q. He did get off the boat, didn't he, before she docked?

A. I don't remember that.

Q. Now, when you went to work—strike that.

When you went in to Mexico to work on this road from Monterey to Mexico City, you went in usually through Laredo, Texas, did you not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many times did you go across the border at Laredo?

A. I don't know—frequently.

Q. More than 10 times?

A. Yes.

Q. Is there an Immigration office at Laredo, Texas?

A. I don't know.

Q. Well, there is one there?

A. Well, on the train—

[3761] Q. You were going to say something about "on the train"?

A. (No answer.)

Q. Go right ahead, Mr. Rohl.

A. On the train someone asks you where you live, that is all.

Q. Do you know Mr. F. H. Crockett who was in charge of the Immigration and Naturalization Service at Laredo?

A. No.

Chairman TENNEY: Mr. Combs, I think we had better take a five-minute recess for the sake of the reporter at this point.

We will stand in recess for about five minutes.

(Short recess.)

Chairman TENNEY: The hearing will come to order.

Mr. COMBS: Will you read the last question and answer?

(Question and answer read.)

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. I believe you stated that to your knowledge there was no Immigration office at Laredo, Texas?

A. I have never seen one. As a matter of fact, I have never been in Laredo, Texas.

Q. How did you go into Mexico?

A. On the train.

Q. Across the border from the United States?

A. (Nodding head in affirmative.)

Q. You were never asked your citizenship status?

[3762] A. No.

Q. Do you recall stating during an interview with the Naturalization Examiner on April 30, 1941, that you had renounced your German citizenship in 1908 or 1909?

A. Yes.

Q. And your reason for that was because you refused to return to Germany for military service?

A. Yes, sir.



Q. And you felt then you were no longer a citizen of Germany?

A. That is right.

Q. Of what country did you believe you were a citizen from that time on?

A. None.

Q. You had no citizenship status?

A. That is right.

Q. And you thought you had none since 1908?

A. 1908 and 1909.

Q. However, when you returned to Germany in 1924 you obtained a temporary passport from the German consul?

A. That is the only way I could do it.

Q. Did you ever make application—

A. I might add to that that after the last war the citizenships—German citizenships had been revoked—I mean reinstated. I couldn't go back there until after the war anyway.

[3763] Q. You couldn't return to Germany until after the first World War?

A. That is right.

Q. And you felt that because you had refused to return to Germany for military service in 1908 or 1909 that you were from that time on no longer a citizen of Germany?

A. That is true.

Q. Now, did you ever make application for admission to citizenship in the United States prior to 1941?

A. I believe in 1915 or '16, or thereabouts.

Q. You made application?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall stating on your preliminary application for citizenship on March 10, 1941, that you had never made any prior application?

A. No.

Q. You did not so state?

A. No.

Q. Your application shows that you stated that you had never made a prior application?

A. (No answer.)

Q. That was your preliminary application on March 10, 1941?

A. No.

Q. If you examine it you will find that is the fact.

A. Because I showed them my declaration of intention [3764] at the time.

Q. You remember signing the application, of course?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever do any work for the United States Navy?

A. No.

Q. Never did any?

A. Never did.

Q. Now, when you first met Colonel Wyman he was then a major, I believe you testified?

A. (Nodding head in affirmative.)

Q. And that was about 1936?

A. 1935. I must have met him the day he arrived here because at that time Rohl-Connolly, I believe, were the only contractors in this engineering district, or I would say, the only contractors of any consequence.

Q. Did you ever have any private transactions with Major Wyman?

A. No.

Q. Did you ever lend him any money?

A. No.

Q. Did you ever have any social contact with him?

A. Yes.

Q. He came on board your yacht, the Vega, on many instances, did he not?

A. I wouldn't say "on many"—several times.

[3765] Q. Did you ever entertain him in your home?

A. Yes.

Q. Several times?

A. Yes.

Q. During the time that you first knew Major Wyman, say in 1935, '36, and '37, do you know whether or not he was having any domestic difficulties?

A. (No answer.)

Q. Did he ever tell you about any domestic troubles he was having?

A. No.

Q. You knew nothing about that?

A. I know he got a divorce and re-married.

Q. Were you acquainted with his present wife?

A. I am now.

Q. Did you know that her sister was at one time his private secretary?

A. I know that now.

Q. And her name was Perry?

A. I don't know—I don't remember the name.

Q. Was Major Wyman a rather heavy drinker when you knew him?

A. No.

Q. He wasn't?

A. (Shaking head in the negative.)

Q. Did you ever see him intoxicated?

[3766] A. No.

Q. Never did?

A. (Nodding head in the negative.)

Q. Do you recall an instance when you were entertaining some people on your yacht, some women guests, and that Major Wyman was intoxicated and embarrassed those present in your main salon?

A. (No answer.)

Q. Do you recall that instance?

A. No.

Q. Are you quite sure that you have never seen Major Wyman or Colonel Wyman intoxicated?

A. I have seen him drinking.

Q. But you never saw him intoxicated?

A. No. That goes back again, of course, to the old question.

Q. You mean the difference between—

A. I drink myself. I am not intoxicated until I fall down.

Q. Would you apply that same rule to Major Wyman's drinking activities?

A. I apply that same rule to everybody.

Q. Do you remember when Major Wyman was working on the San Pedro breakwater?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you do any part of that work for the Army?

[3767] A. I did all of it.

Q. Do you recall—

A. Long before—long before Major Wyman was ever here.

Q. I see. There was an ammunition anchorage in conjunction with that breakwater, was there not?

A. No.

Q. Explosives anchorage?

A. No.

Q. You are sure of that?

A. I am sure of that. That explosives anchorage has been there long before they built the breakwater.

Q. Did you work on that at all?

A. No.

Q. Now, in some of your income tax returns, Mr. Rohl, you stated, did you not, that you were a citizen of the United States?

A. (No answer.)

Q. Federal income tax returns.

A. Yes; I found that out—I was told that by—

Q. By the Immigration officials—pardon me, Naturalization officials?

A. Yes.

Q. And did you examine the copies of your Federal income tax returns to ascertain whether or not you had made such a statement?

[3768] A. I did after they—

Q. After they called it to your attention?

A. After they called it to my attention, yes. I don't sign—I do sign it, but I don't prepare my own income tax.

Q. You don't pay any attention to it?

A. I don't prepare them myself.

Q. Did you find that on one or more of those income tax returns there was a statement to the effect that you had been naturalized in 1921?

A. No.

Q. You never found any such statement?

A. No.

Q. Did you examine your California State income tax return since 1935 to ascertain whether or not a similar statement was made on that?

A. No, I have never seen them.

Q. You own an automobile, do you not?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. And you own it individually?

A. Yes.

Q. You never made application for an operator's license in California, did you?

A. Many years ago. I haven't been driving a car for better than 10 years.

Q. How long has it been since you had an operator's [3769] license?

A. I believe somewhere in the '20's.

Q. Now, when did you obtain your first contract to do construction work for the United States Army?

A. In 1932 or 1933.

Q. And when did you obtain your first contract to do construction work for the Army on the Island of Oahu?

A. 1940.

Q. And how long did that construction work continue from and after 1940?

A. 1940 until January 31, 1943.

Q. Was all of that work done through the Hawaiian Constructors?

A. Correct.

Q. Were you active in the enterprise at all?

A. Quite so.

Q. Made several trips there, did you not?

A. No; I spent most of my time there for a period of 14 months.

Q. Where, on the Island of Oahu, was the main office of the Hawaiian Constructors?

A. Punahou Camp.

Q. Now, your main office was located there?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you know Mr. C. C. Middleton?

A. Yes.

[3770] Q. Who is he?

A. He is the administrator for the Hawaiian Constructors; he is in charge of all of the offices.

Q. Now, at that time—strike that.

Do you know where Schofield Barracks are located?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. And do you know that Wheeler Field is a part of or an adjunct to Schofield Barracks?

A. Yes.

Q. And you are familiar with Kapopu Gulch just below Wheeler Field—you know where that is?

A. (No answer.)

Q. Did you ever hear of that?

A. Did I ever hear of it?

Q. Yes, Kapopu Gulch.

A. Yes, near Schofield Barracks.

Q. Do you know where Ewa is?

A. Yes.

Q. There is an airfield there, is there not?

A. Ewa.

Q. Yes.

A. Now, listen, I can't tell you where any airfields are.

Q. Well, it is a matter of common knowledge there is one under construction there.

A. Where?

[3771] Q. Ewa.

A. (No answer)

Q. You don't know?

A. (No answer)

- Q. Do you know where Bellows Field is?  
 A. Oh, yes.  
 Q. And that is on the east coast of the Island of Oahu, is it not?  
 A. Yes.  
 Q. And you know where Hickam Field is?  
 A. Oh, yes.  
 Q. And do you know where Red Hill is?  
 A. Yes.  
 Q. Do you know where Kahuku is?  
 A. Yes.  
 Q. And do you know where the Waialeale Base yard is?  
 A. Yes.  
 Q. At the extreme northwesterly tip of the Island of Oahu?  
 A. Yes.  
 Q. Do you know where all of those places are?  
 A. Oh, yes.  
 Q. And you know where Barber's Point is?  
 A. Yes.  
 Q. Now, as a matter of fact, you can answer this question yes or no: The Hawaiian Constructors did work on [3772] Bellows Field, Hickam Field, Red Hill, Wheeler Field, Ewa and Kiena?  
 A. The answer is no.  
 Q. They did not do work at any of those places?  
 A. Oh, yes.  
 Q. But they didn't do work at all of them, is that it?  
 A. That is right.  
 Q. They did work at Red Hill, did they not?  
 A. No.  
 Q. No work at all there?  
 A. No.  
 Q. You are quite sure of that?  
 A. Why, certainly.  
 Q. Did they do any work at Hickam Field?  
 A. Yes.  
 Q. At Bellows Field?  
 A. Yes.  
 Q. At Kiubla Bay?  
 A. Kiubla Bay?  
 Q. Yes.  
 A. No.  
 Q. At Kihuko?  
 A. Yes.  
 Q. At Hiena Point?  
 A. No.  
 Q. At Ewa?  
 [3773] A. At Ewa? You have got that mixed up. It isn't called "Ewa." You are thinking about something else. I am not going to tell you what you are thinking about.  
 Q. You are quite sure—are you very positive that they did not work at all at Red Hill?  
 A. Yes, because that is a Navy job.  
 Q. I know it is.  
 A. And we are not Navy contractors.  
 Q. You never did any work for the Navy?  
 A. No; Army contracting.  
 Q. Did any concern with which you have been connected now, or in the past, ever do any work for the Navy?  
 A. No. Oh, ever-do any work for the Navy?  
 Q. Yes.  
 A. That, I don't know. The Hawaiian Constructors were the only Army contractors in the Pacific Ocean.  
 Q. As I recall your testimony, you said that the Hawaiian Constructors did no work at all at Wake, Guam, or Midway?  
 A. That is right.  
 Q. Did they do any work at Canton and Johnson Islands?  
 A. Now, what is this?  
 Q. Pardon me?

A. What is this? I don't know how much I can tell you—I am going to be frank with you.

Q. Yes, I understand, but we have information that you [3774] did do work at Canton and Johnson Islands from several witnesses.

A. All right. We didn't do any work at Johnson Islands; we did not.

Q. Did you do any work at Canton Island?

A. Yes, we did.

Q. You are sure you never did any work at Johnson Island?

A. That is right.

Q. Did you do any work in Australia?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, at the headquarters of the Hawaiian Constructors there is a parking space delineated outside, is there not, with the names of the owners of the various cars that are privileged to park there?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that correct?

A. That is correct.

Q. Did you have such a parking space?

A. There was a name on one, but I never used it.

Q. Your name was on it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. But you never used it?

A. No; I had another place to park.

Q. What share did Rohl-Connolly Company own in the Hawaiian Constructors? [3775] A. It varied.

Q. Well, what share did you own in 1940?

A. 40 per cent.

Q. What share did you own in 1941?

A. 40 per cent.

Q. What share do you own now?

A. 24 per cent.

Q. Does the Hawaiian Constructors have any officers—president, secretary, and so forth?

A. No; it is a joint venture.

Q. I understand that.

A. Can't be any officers or directors.

Q. Well, I am not so sure about that, but at least there are none.

A. I am sure about it,—there can't be any.

Q. Who was in charge of construction on the Island of Oahu at the time the contract was first awarded?

A. Now, do you mean?

Q. For the Army.

A. Colonel Wyman.

Q. And was Colonel Wyman in charge of the work there during all the time that these construction enterprises were in progress for the Army?

A. No.

Q. When did he leave there?

A. He left, I believe, the latter part of April, 1942.

[3776] Q. And he was superseded by whom?

A. He was superseded by Colonel Lyman—one is Wyman and the other one is Lyman.

Q. General Lyman—wasn't he a general?

A. Well, he was—he was notified that he would be made a general, but he died the next day.

Q. Do you know whether or not he did anything about the contract that you had for the use of the Vega by the Army engineers? Do you know whether or not he canceled that contract?

A. Whether he canceled the contract?

Q. Yes.

A. Yes.

Q. He did cancel it?

A. Yes. Now that is all.—That is good enough.

Q. Now, the employees who worked on these various military installations that we have mentioned here, were employees of the Hawaiian Constructors, were they not?

A. That is right.

- Q. And they were employed originally by Hawaiian Constructors, weren't they?  
 A. Oh, yes.  
 Q. Were they paid by the Hawaiian Constructors?  
 A. No.  
 Q. They were paid by the Army engineers, weren't they?  
 A. By the Army engineers.  
 [3777] Q. That was the invariable practice, wasn't it?  
 A. That was the practice at that time.  
 Q. And is that the practice now?  
 A. You mean on Army contracts?  
 Q. Yes.  
 A. No.  
 Q. What procedure do they follow now, Mr. Rohl?  
 A. The contractor pays the men.  
 Q. How long has that been in effect?  
 A. I don't know.  
 Q. Now, who negotiated originally with Colonel Wyman for the initial, basic contract between the Army and the Hawaiian Constructors?  
 A. Mr. Grafe and Mr. Connolly.  
 Q. Mr. Paul Grafe?  
 A. Yes.  
 Q. And Tom Connolly?  
 A. And T. E. Connolly of Rohl-Connolly.  
 Q. Did you introduce Mr. Grafe to Mr. Connolly?  
 A. No.  
 Q. He had an independent acquaintanceship with him?  
 A. Callahan built the Prado Dam under Colonel Wyman—  
 Q. Which was under the jurisdiction of Colonel Wyman?  
 A. That is right.  
 Q. Now, do you recall receiving a letter from [3778] Colonel Wyman, dated January 24, 1941, addressed to you and which reads as follows:

Via Clipper.

Address reply to District Engineer, U. S. Engineer Office,  
 P. O. Box 2240, Honolulu, T. H.

Refer to File No. Contract No. W-414-Eng-602.

JANUARY 22, 1941.

Mr. H. W. ROHL,

*Rohl-Connolly Company, 4351 Alhambra Avenue,  
 Los Angeles, California.*

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to secret Contract No. W-414-Eng-602, with the Hawaiian Constructors for work in the Hawaiian Islands.

As you are actively interested in this venture, I desire you to proceed to Honolulu at your earliest convenience to consult with the District Engineer relative to ways and means to accomplish the purpose of the contract.

You will be allowed transportation either by Clipper or steamboat both ways, and travel allowance not to exceed \$6.00 per day while en route in accordance with existing laws and regulations.

[3779] You will make application to either the District Engineer at Los Angeles or the Division Engineer, South Pacific Division, San Francisco, for transportation.

Very truly yours,

THEODORE WYMAN, JR.,  
*Lt. Col., Corps of Engineers.  
 District Engineer.*

You recall receiving that letter?

- A. Yes.  
 Q. And in response to it did you go to the Hawaiian Islands?  
 A. I went to the Hawaiian Islands.  
 Q. The date of that, Mr. Rohl, was January 22, 1941.  
 A. I went to the Hawaiian Islands the last week of September.  
 Q. 1941?  
 A. 1941.  
 Q. How did you travel on that trip—by water or by air?  
 A. I went by air.  
 Q. And did you confer with Colonel Wyman there about the work?  
 A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever make an inspection of the work with him?

[3780] A. Oh, yes.

Q. On one occasion or more than one occasion?

A. More than one occasion.

Q. And as a matter of fact, you were in Pearl Harbor on December 6th, were you not?

A. I wasn't exactly in Pearl Harbor, but I was close to it.

Q. Too close?

A. I don't know about "too close." It missed me by about 100 feet.

Q. Were you present there all during the attack on Pearl Harbor?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. And immediately afterwards you directed the restoration of some of the damage that had been done, did you not?

A. Yes, all of it except Pearl Harbor proper.

Q. But the other areas that I have mentioned, and that has all been in the newspapers, Mr. Rohl.

A. That is all right; anything in the newspapers I can talk about.

Q. There is nothing strategic about this.

A. But when you talk about the Islands—

Q. That is something else?

A. Yes.

Q. I will stick to the Island of Oahu, is that all right?

[3781] A. That is all right, because that has all been in the papers.

Q. All right. Now, you did repair work at Hickam Field?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. At Bellows Field?

A. Yes.

Q. At Wheeler Field?

A. Yes.

Q. At Kakuku?

A. Kakuku wasn't built at that time.

Q. Were there any other installations that were damaged that I haven't mentioned?

A. Well, on December—of course martial law was declared on December 7th in the afternoon.

Q. Yes.

A. And immediately all work on the Island of Oahu was turned over to the Hawaiian Constructors, being the Army contractors.

Every contract was canceled. I mean other contracts, and it was all turned over to the Hawaiian Constructors.

Q. Under your direction?

A. Yes.

Q. And were you there while all of this work of repairing was under way?

A. Oh, yes.

[3782] Q. How long did you stay on that occasion? I mean immediately after the bombing occurred.

A. Immediately after the bombing? I believe I got out approximately the first of June.

Q. And were you there continually from December 7th?

A. I made—I went over there the latter part of September and I made one trip back here.

Q. Well, the Hawaiian Constructors had all of the work at that time under the 1940 contract, didn't they?

A. No.

Q. Well, who turned all of the work over to them?

A. Well, there were other contractors on the Island.

Q. Yes.

A. I mean there was a contractor building a street, maybe.

Q. Yes.

A. And a contractor building a building here.

Q. I see.

A. And a contractor doing something else.

Q. But those contractors did not participate in any of the reconstruction work?

A. We took over all the contractors and their organizations.

Q. So that all of the other contractors turned the work over to you—that is, turned it over to the Hawaiian Constructors, is that it?

[3783] A. Hawaiian Constructors, yes.

Q. At whose instance did they do that?

A. At the instance of the Commanding General.

Q. And all of that work was under the supervision of Colonel Wyman?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. Now, was the first contract for installations on the Island of Oahu with Rohl and Connolly?

A. No.

Q. Wasn't with Rohl and Connolly.

A. The Hawaiian Constructors.

Q. The Rohl and Connolly Company never had any contracts at all with the Army for installations?

A. In the Pacific Ocean?

Q. Yes.

A. No. When I say "the Pacific Ocean," I mean any islands in the Pacific Ocean.

Q. I understand. After you returned to this country in June of 1941 did you subsequently make another trip to the Island of Oahu?

A. Yes. If I recall right, I stayed over here about two weeks and I immediately returned.

Q. Well, were you requested to go back to do more work?

A. Now, you are talking about 1942?

Q. No, I am talking about—well, strike that.

[3784] As I understand your testimony you said that after the bombing of Pearl Harbor you stayed over there until June?

A. 1942.

Q. Then you returned to the United States.

A. Yes, for two weeks.

Q. I understand.

A. On business.

Q. Then you went back?

A. Immediately.

Q. How did you go back that time—by boat or by Clipper?

A. Now, wait a minute—I made three trips back.

Q. You mean you made three trips from the United States back to Oahu?

A. No, no, from Oahu over here and back, because my work was all in the Hawaiian Islands and not here.

Q. Yes.

A. I made three trips over here and on one of them I returned on the transport.

Q. Did you maintain a residence on the Island of Oahu?

A. Yes.

Q. A home or a hotel, or where?

A. No, we operated a hotel.

Q. And you stayed there, did you?

[3785] Chairman TENNEY. By "we," whom do you mean?

The WITNESS. Hawaiian Constructors for the Army.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. I show you the Encyclopedia Britannica World Atlas, Mr. Rohl, 1942 edition, Map No. 91. Map No. 91 is a map of the Hawaiian Islands, is it not?

A. Yes.

Q. In the upper left-hand corner in green is there delineated the Island of Oahu?

A. Yes.

Q. I want to take my own map and indicate on the Atlas map the various localities which I have designated, so we will have them accurately in the record.

Schofield Barracks is shown on the Atlas map.

A. Yes.

Q. Bellows Field is not shown on the Atlas map?

A. No.

Q. But it is shown on this map which I have prepared and which I now show you. (Handing drawing of map to the witness.)

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that the approximate location of Bellows Field?

A. Yes, that is right.

Q. Hickam Field is not shown on the Atlas but I show it to you on the map which I have prepared and ask you if that is the approximate location of Hickam Field.



A. You are doing pretty good.

[3786] Q. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. I show you Red Hill on the map which I have prepared, and which is not shown on the Atlas map, and ask you if that is the approximate location of Red Hill.

A. Yes.

Q. I show you Wheeler Field, which is designated on the map which I have prepared, and which is not shown on the Atlas map, and ask you if that is the approximate location of Wheeler Field.

A. Well, more or less.

Mr. COMBS: And let the record show I am showing the map which I prepared, to Mr. Rohl, while asking these questions.

Mr. Chairman, this map was prepared by me from data which we have received from an informant, who will later be sworn to testify, and I offer this as Exhibit No. 1 in evidence in connection with the testimony of this witness.

Chairman TENNEY. The map will be marked Exhibit 1 in connection with the testimony of Mr. Rohl.

(The map referred to was marked Committee Exhibit No. 1, Hans W. Rohl.)

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. Mr. Rohl, the contract that you had with the Army Engineers for the use of your yacht, was that a contract entered into by Hawaiian Constructors and the Army or by Rohl-Connolly and the Army, or by you individually?

[3787] A. No. Well, sometimes I hesitate because—

Q. Well, it is perfectly all right; I am asking you a great many detailed questions.

A. There are things that I am not permitted to say, I mean you can get the information from another source, but I don't want to be the guilty one.

Q. I don't want you to be.

A. But I can say this, that contracts of that magnitude are handled by "supplements."

Now, a supplement to a contract, cost plus, straight, fixed fee contract means additional work—call it a job or whatever you might call it, but it is handled by a supplement, and the case of the Vega a supplement was issued to the Hawaiian Constructors to charter the Vega as a survey boat from Floy E. Rohl, which is my wife's name.

Q. For a consideration of \$1.00 a year?

A. For consideration of \$1.00 a year; to Hawaiian Constructors to maintain, hold the owner harmless and return it to the owner in as good shape as it was received by them.

Q. Was the Vega to your knowledge ever used by the Navy?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. Was that by a supplement to the basic contract?

A. No.

Q. Who was that contract with—

A. You mean over there?

[3788] Q. Yes.

A. No, no, the Navy didn't use it over there.

Q. Did the Navy use it over here?

A. The Navy requisitioned the Vega last July, shortly after she came back from Honolulu.

Q. Did Floy Rohl assign the Vega to the Hawaiian Constructors?

A. No.

Q. Merely leased it?

A. For a dollar.

Q. Mr. Rohl, do you know of any arrangement whereby \$150,000 a year was paid for the use of the Vega?

A. Well, as a matter of fact, it wasn't.

Q. It wasn't?

A. No. Somebody got themselves twisted again. Now, I might explain that.

Q. Yes.

A. We will have to come back again to what a supplement is. When a supplement on a cost plus fee contract—on each supplement issued—you might have 100 of them. You might have 100 of them in one month.

There is an estimate made—an estimate is made and in the supplement it says there was a supplement issued for Hawaiian Constructors to operate,

maintain, return to the owner the survey ship Vega, at a cost not to exceed \$150,000 a year—operation costs.

[3789] Q. And that was the contract?

A. That was the supplement and it was amended, and it was decided—and I can't tell you the reasons why. It was decided not to use the Vega on that particular survey. I mean the survey was abandoned so then the Vega was ordered to be returned on that supplement, and then part 2 was issued to that supplement—that for the period that the Vega was in service to the War Department, Hawaiian Constructors were authorized under Part 2 of the supplement—43, or whatever it was, to do all that and return it to the owner for a cost not to exceed \$75,000, for which Hawaiian Constructors would receive a fee of, I believe, \$570.

Q. And all of that data was contained in the supplemental contracts to the basic contract?

A. To the Hawaiian Constructors Contract No. 602.

Q. Yes.

A. That is right.

Q. Now, going back for the moment to the time when you were working in Sacramento.

Did you ever do any work up on the Bear River?

A. (No answer.)

Q. Strike that. Was the contract for the use of the Vega made between Hawaiian Constructors and Floy Rohl, or was the War Department a party to that contract also?

A. No, the War Department doesn't enter into a contract except with the principal.

[3790] Q. I see.

A. The Hawaiian Constructors.

Q. I see.

A. From then on the Hawaiian Constructors or the contractor, whoever it might be, is ordered to do certain things.

Q. By the Army Engineers?

A. By the Army Engineers, yes.

Q. And was Colonel Wyman the head of the Army Engineers at that time?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. And would actually control the movements of the boat, would he not?

A. Oh, certainly.

Q. And did that condition exist until he left the Island of Oahu?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, going back to the time you were working at Sacramento, Mr. Rohl, did you ever do any work on the Bear River?

A. Bear River?

Q. At Sacramento.

A. Where is that?

Q. I don't know; it is in Sacramento County.

A. Bear River in Sacramento County?

Q. Yes.

[3791] A. (No answer.)

Q. Did you ever know a man by the name of William Henry Enright?

A. William Henry Enright?

Q. Yes.

A. I don't know.

Q. You don't remember any such name?

A. No.

Q. Did you ever know a man by the name of Werner Plack?

A. Who?

Q. Werner Plack?

A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. You never knew Werner Plack?

A. No.

Q. Don't you remember going into the Swing Club with Werner Plack during the summer of 1938?

A. No, I don't.

Q. You have no recollection of Werner Plack at all?

A. No, I don't.

Q. Do you know where the Swing Club is or was?

A. I know where it was.

Q. 1710 North Las Palmas Avenue, Hollywood.

A. 1710 North Las Palmas, Hollywood? That was down here?

Q. Yes.

[3792] A. Down near S33 Spring, wasn't it?

Q. Well, you know it was a club that opened, usually, after 2:00 o'clock in the morning. Do you remember that?

A. (No answer.)

Q. A night club.

A. (No answer.)

Q. You remember the Swing Club, don't you?

A. Yes, I remember the Swing Club. Wasn't that at S33 Spring, or some place?

Q. I don't know.

A. I don't know myself.

Q. When were you last there?

A. I don't know that.

Q. Well, were you ever there?

A. I suppose I was.

Q. Within the last 10 years says, or can you give us a general idea of when you were last there?

A. (Nodding head in the negative.)

Q. Have you been there within the last five years?

A. Five years—I was younger then.

Q. It was afterwards called the "1710 Club."

A. I probably have been there.

Q. They had a special song, didn't they? Do you remember the song they used to sing about you?

A. No. You must have been there yourself.

Q. I talked to some people that were very recently.

[3793] Now, do you keep copies of your Federal income tax returns, Mr. Rohl?

A. Why, certainly.

Q. Pardon me?

A. Certainly.

Q. You do?

A. Yes. I mean my office does—I do, yes.

Q. Who has the custody of them?

A. Copies of my income taxes?

Q. Yes.

A. It is either Miss Dickey or Mr. Bontems.

Q. What are his initials?

A. (No answer.)

Q. What is his first name?

A. James.

Q. And he works where—where is his office?

A. He has offices in the Security First National Bank Building.

Q. Los Angeles?

A. Los Angeles.

Q. Did he prepare your income tax returns for you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Under your instructions?

A. No.

Q. I mean—

A. I pay him for doing it.

[3794] Q. Who tells him to do it? That is what I am getting at.

A. Well, he has been doing it for so many years.

Q. Oh, I see.

A. More than 10 years.

Q. Yes.

A. He is the auditor.

Q. So those copies of those returns would either be in his possession or in the possession of Irma Dickey?

A. That is right.

Q. Now, you applied for admission to citizenship in 1941, in March, did you not?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall Rohl-Connolly paid a fine to the Federal Government of \$25,000 about five days before you were admitted to citizenship?

A. I remember that very well.

Q. That was for what reason?

A. That was a fine because I was, during that time—we owned that building equipment at one time and I was president of the Rohl-Connolly Company which I had no right to be.

Q. And wasn't it because you were an alien and owned more than 40 per cent of the stock, or pardon me, 25 percent of the stock of the Rohl-Connolly Company?

A. Yes.

[3795] Q. That was the reason, wasn't it?

A. Yes. I mean the fine was assessed and paid and everything forgiven.

Q. I understand. The original penalty was confiscation of all of the boats and launches and tugs and so forth that were registered in the name of Rohl-Connolly, wasn't that it?

A. Yes; but it was at the secretary's discretion.

Q. And the case was settled?

A. Assessed a fine.

Q. For \$25,000?

A. Yes.

Q. And that was paid about five days prior to the time you were admitted to citizenship?

A. That's right.

Q. Now, Mr. Rohl, I am going to ask you a question but I am not going to amplify it. I merely want to get the basic data in the record and I am doing it only for that purpose. I am not going into detail.

When did you first become acquainted with Marian Henderson?

A. In 1914.

Q. And she is now Mrs. Marian Clark or Mrs. Clark?

A. Yes.

Q. And she lives in Sacramento too, does she not?

A. Yes.

[3796] Q. Were you ever acquainted with Lemuel B. Schofield.

A. Schofield? Is it Lemuel B.?

Q. Yes.

A. Yes—I mean—pardon me. I just want some information. That is the Schofield who was superintendent for the contractors in San Pedro?

Q. No, this was the Immigration Commissioner for the Pacific Coast.

A. No.

Q. You never knew him?

A. No.

Q. Did you ever know Mr. Shumaker in the Immigration Department?

A. I believe he—I don't know who had my case up there.

Q. I did not mean in that way. I meant did you have any personal acquaintance with him?

A. No.

Q. That is what I mean.

A. No, I didn't.

Q. Now, you testified, I believe, that you inspected the various projects that were under construction on the Island of Oahu with Colonel Wyman several times. About how many times would you estimate?

A. I made an inspection trip with him the day after I arrived in Honolulu in September—the last part of September.

[3797] Q. What year?

A. 1941.

Q. And was that quite an extensive inspection?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. And then did you make other inspections?

A. Yes; made several inspections.

Q. When did you make the next inspection?

A. The next inspection—of course, you must remember after the seventh there were—

Q. You were making inspections all the time, I guess?

A. Making inspections all the time if and when you were able to.

Q. And you made many of them?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. Which took you all around the place, I presume?

A. (No answer.)

Q. Your base yard was up in the northwest part of the Island, wasn't it?

A. No.

Q. Your base yard No. 2?

A. No.

Q. Wasn't it?

A. No.

Q. I show you this map, marked Exhibit 1. Isn't this where the base yard was located that was used by the Hawaiian Constructors? (Indicating on exhibit.)

[3798] A. You have got it wrong. It is not there.

Q. Will you indicate where it is on the map (Handing exhibit to the witness and the witness placing a mark near the center of the map).

Q. A little to the west of the center of the Island.

A. (Nodding in the affirmative.) You are talking about base yard No. 9.

Q. Where was your base yard No. 2?

A. There is no such.

Q. Did you start out with No. 9? How did you get No. 9? Where was No. 1, for instance?

A. (No answer.)

Q. I am very serious in asking these questions, Mr. Rohl.

A. Base yard No. 1 is at Fort Camp.

Q. And where is that—what part of the Island?

A. Fort Camp adjoins Hickam Field—Fort Camp is between Hickam Field and Pearl Harbor.

Q. That is where your No. 1 base was?

A. Yes.

Q. Where was your No. 2?

A. (No answer.)

Q. Our information is, and I will tell you frankly, that your No. 2 base yard was up at the northwesterly tip of the Island of Oahu.

A. No, we have no base yard there.

[3799] Q. No base yard at all?

A. No. I mean—now, it all depends on what you call "a base yard."

Q. Well, I mean a base yard—a place where you kept your supplies and equipment for work on these various projects.

A. Well, we probably had 40 of them.

Q. You don't recall, independently, where your yard No. 2 was?

A. No, because it was not a base yard—what we call a base yard. We might take a, which we did take over, a Japanese department store, and called it "a base yard."

Q. And you didn't have any such—

A. Not on that end of the Island.

Q. On that part of the Island?

A. No.

Q. But the others—you had 40, you say?

A. (Nodding in the affirmative.)

Q. Scattered all around?

A. Scattered all over. Even if we find a vacant lot we will grab it and make a base yard out of it.

Q. I understand. In the Hawaiian Construction, Mr. Rohl, you have a general superintendent of construction?

A. Yes, we have had several of them.

Q. And did they work under your supervision?

A. Oh, yes.

[3800] Q. And did you personally direct the activities of the construction in the Island?

A. While I was there, yes.

Q. While you were there?

A. Yes.

Q. And in doing so, did you consult with him from time to time as to the technical engineering problems that were involved?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. Did you go over the plans and specifications with them—with your construction superintendents?

A. No.

Q. Never did?

A. I don't think I ever did. The plans were plans issued to us by the Corps of Engineers.

Q. I see. Then they went to your construction superintendents, did they?

A. Well, they went through the executive committee and then handed down to whoever was in charge of that phase of the work.

Q. And those who were in charge of the separate phases of the work would, I suppose, be your superintendents of construction or construction engineers in charge of those various projects?

A. Yes.

Q. And they, in turn, worked under your supervision?

[3801] Yes. We had a general superintendent there.

Q. Was that the gentleman whose name I mentioned—Mr. Middleton?

A. No, Middleton is the—he is on the administrative end.

Q. And is his office—was his office at your headquarters?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. And there was a Mr. Stewart in charge of the Hawaiian Constructors office in San Francisco?

A. Stewart?

Q. Yes; was he in charge up there or down here?

A. Stewart? To my knowledge he wasn't any place.

Q. You never heard of him?

A. I never heard of him.

Q. Did you ever use the name of John William Rohl?

A. John William Rohl?

Q. Yes.

A. Yes.

Q. When was that? When did you use that name?

A. I used that when I made my—declared my intention for citizenship in 19—when did I say—1915 or '16.

Q. I have forgotten but you went over that.

A. The County Clerk didn't like the name "Hans." He said I better call myself "John."

Q. Well, did you have your name changed to John by any [3802] proceedings?

A. No.

Q. You just used it for a while?

A. Yes.

Q. How long did you use it?

A. For about an hour.

Q. For an hour?

A. Yes.

Q. For what purpose?

A. Because the Clerk told me I should write down "John."

Q. What clerk was that—what County Clerk was that?

A. That was at Marysville.

Q. Marysville?

A. Yes—wait a minute.

Q. Marysville is in Yuba County.

A. Yuba County?

Q. That was about when did you say?

A. '15 or '16—I am sure it was Yuba County—no—it was either Yuba County or Sacramento County.

Q. It doesn't make any difference.

A. It was in that neighborhood.

Q. And you signed your application, did you, at that place—your application for citizenship?

A. Yes.

Q. Before the County Clerk in either Sacramento or [3803] Yuba County?

A. Yes.

Q. I suggest to you, Mr. Rohl, very sincerely, for your sake, just to keep the record straight, that you might have somebody examine your application over at the Federal Building and correct the statement that you never made any prior application for citizenship.

I just looked at it yesterday.

A. I had it with me and I showed it to them, I believe they have it over there.

Q. Is it on file in the Immigration Department?

A. Yes, it is on file. I showed it to them.

Q. You stated you never made any prior application?

A. But my prior application is on file over there, too. It is in their records. I am sure it is there or they gave it back to me.

Q. I don't know—it isn't in the file over there now. I have examined the file two or three times.

Now, Mr. Rohl—

A. May I interrupt—

Q. Surely.

A. I remember now. They discounted that over there because I never made an application for citizenship. I declared—I signed a declaration of intent at that time over there.

Q. You mean over in Yuba or Sacramento County?

A. No, here.

[3804] Q. When did you sign that—

A. No, I told them over there.

Q. Told them that you did?

A. That I did, and they said, "Well, that doesn't make any difference."

Q. You are presently engaged, are you not, in negotiating contracts with the Government for the installation of military and naval construction?

A. You mean I am negotiating today?

Q. Yes.

A. No; I have been awarded a contract.

Q. When was that contract awarded?

A. February 9.

Q. And that work will be done throughout the entire Pacific area, will it not?

A. Canada and Alaska.

Q. Colonel Wyman is now stationed at Canada?

A. He is stationed in Canada, yes.

Q. And will go on to Alaska?

A. Yes, Alaska comes under him.

Q. Now, you have visited Schofield Barracks many times, have you not?

A. Oh, yes—not the barracks, no, but we are doing work—

Q. I mean there in the vicinity.

A. Yes.

[3805] Q. You are familiar with the general physical setup there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And Wheeler Field and Schofield Barracks are close together?

A. Yes.

Q. And you are familiar with them?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever go to a place there by the name of Bert Hasby—Bert Hasby's place where they have a bar and the store and all that sort of thing—where they operate the station wagons out of that sell supplies and it is a sort of post exchange?

A. No.

Q. You never did?

A. No.

Q. Did you ever see a man by the name of Bert Hasby?

A. No.

Q. Never knew such a man?

A. Never.

Q. Did you ever visit the post exchange at all at Schofield Barracks or Wheeler Field?

A. No.

Q. Do you know whether or not they ever had one there?

A. Yes; driving by there I could see a post exchange.

Q. A post exchange?

[3806] A. Yes.

Q. Will you describe him, please—will you describe his appearance?

A. I don't know him.

Q. Is it a separate building, or a main building, or is it right at Schofield Barracks?

A. I don't know.

Q. But you know there is a post exchange there?

A. There is a post exchange in every post.

Q. Well, I am only interested in this one. When did you last see it?

A. (No answer.)

Q. How long ago?

A. You mean when did I last drive by there?

Q. Yes.

A. I don't even know that.

Q. Well, certainly it was either in 1940 or '41 or '42, wasn't it? You were there in 1942, weren't you?

A. I was there in 1942.

Q. Were you out to Schofield Barracks in 1942?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. When were you last there in 1942?

A. At Schofield?

Q. Yes.

A. You mean when did I last drive through Schofield?

Q. Yes.

[3807] A. I would say August or September.

Q. Last August or September?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you hear anything about Bert Hasby being shot on the night of December 7, 1941?

A. No.

Q. Never heard anything about that at all?

A. No.

Mr. COMBS. I believe that is all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman TENNEY. Any further questions of Mr. Rohl by the committee?

Assemblyman KELLEMS. No questions.

Chairman TENNEY. Do you have any questions, Senator Burns?

Senator BURNS. No.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. One more question.

Mr. Rohl, why didn't you apply for citizenship between 1931 and 1941?

A. Negligence—busy traveling—never gave it a thought.

Q. When you first obtained the contracts for the construction of military installations, did you tell Major Wyman that you were an alien?

A. I did on the Hawaiian Constructors.

Q. But you didn't on any other projects?

A. We don't have it—there are no restrictions—I mean on a Government contract you are not questioned as to [3808] whether you are a citizen or not, but on this particular contract, Contract 602, being a secret contract, of course, I told him—I had to tell him.

Q. Are you familiar with the provisions of the law regarding such contracts?

A. Secret contracts?

Q. Well, secret, confidential, or restricted contracts.

A. Yes.

Q. I will read the law to you and see whether or not this is your understanding of it.

"No aliens employed by a contractor in the performance of secret, confidential, or restricted Government contracts shall be permitted to have access to the plans or specifications, or the work under such contracts, or to participate in the contract trials, unless the written consent of the head of the Government Department concerned has first been obtained.

"Any alien who obtains employment on secret, confidential, or restricted Government contracts by wilful misrepresentation of his alien status, or who makes such wilful misrepresentation while seeking such employment, shall be penalized by a fine of \$10,000 or five years in the Federal Penitentiary.

"For the purpose of this section the term [3809] 'person' shall be construed to include an individual, partnership, association, corporation or other business enterprise."

Is that your understanding of the law?

A. Absolutely.

Now, as a matter of fact, before we took this contract the War Department was told, and I didn't see the contract or the plans or specifications purposely until after I was a citizen.

Q. Did you ever make any inspection of the work before you became a citizen?

A. No.



Q. Never did?

A. Never.

Q. But you repeatedly made inspections of it afterward?

A. Naturally.

Q. Who did the actual bidding on the contract?

A. You have it in your record. The negotiations were conducted by Paul Grafe and T. E. Connolly.

Q. Are you familiar with the correspondence between Paul Grafe and Major Wyman?

A. You mean pertaining to Contract 602?

Q. Yes.

A. Well, it is in the files—I might.

Q. Are you familiar with it?

[3810] A. I am familiar with the file.

Q. Are you familiar with the correspondence in the file between Paul Grafe and Major Wyman?

A. I am supposed to be.

Q. Well, are you?

A. I don't know.

Q. Your employees, the employees who worked under your direction were working on these very projects, were they not?

A. Yes.

Q. And they were working under your direct supervision, were they not?

A. After October 1, 1941.

Q. And you had nothing to do with them prior to that time at all?

A. Never.

Q. Never had anything to do with the employees at all?

A. No, never, nothing.

Q. You are quite positive that you never made any inspections of any of that work prior to September 15, 1941?

A. I am certain of it because I was not over there.

Q. Did you do any work at Oxnard Beach for the Army?

A. Oxnard?

Q. Yes.

A. Beach?

Q. Yes.

[3811] Do you mean Hueneme? Rohl-Connolly built the jetties for the Oxnard—the Oxnard Harbor District.

Q. And under whose direction was that done?

A. That was under the direction of the—(witness snapping fingers.) A firm of consulting engineers—Hill, Barnard.

Q. Did Major Wyman have anything to do with that work at all?

A. No. That wasn't Army work at all.

Q. Did you build the Newport Beach breakwater?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. Was that an Army project?

A. Yes.

Q. Under whose direction was that done? Major Wyman?

A. Yes.

Q. When was it constructed?

A. (No answer.)

Q. About when?

A. '36 or '37—in that neighborhood, I would say.

Q. In 1936 or '37, is that right?

A. I think that is correct.

Mr. COMBS. That is all, Mr. Rohl.

Chairman TENNEY. Thank you very much, Mr. Rohl. We are sorry to have inconvenienced you. We hope you catch your plane.

Before we adjourn for lunch Senator Burns has a motion.

[3812] Senator BURNS. I move, Mr. Chairman, that the chairman of the committee be appointed a sub-committee of one to continue with this investigation this afternoon and Monday, even though the other members of the committee may not be able to attend.

Assemblyman DILWORTH. I second the motion.

Chairman TENNEY. All those in favor signify by saying Aye; contrary, No. It is unanimously carried that the chairman be appointed a sub-committee of one

to carry on this investigation and hearing in the absence of the other members in the event they are not able to be present.

We will recess at this time until 1:30.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 o'clock p. m., a recess was taken until 1:30 o'clock p. m.)

[3813]

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA,  
February 27, 1943, 1:30 o'clock P. M.

Chairman TENNEY. The committee will come to order. Is Mrs. Floy Rohl here?  
Mr. ROHL. Yes.

Chairman TENNEY. Will you please come forward, Mrs. Rohl. Will you be sworn, please? Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before this committee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. ROHL. I do.

FLOY EDITH ROHL, called as a witness on behalf of the Committee, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

Chairman TENNEY. Will you state your full name, please?

The WITNESS. Floy Edith Rohl.

Chairman TENNEY. Where do you reside, Mrs. Rohl?

The WITNESS. 8159 Hollywood Boulevard.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. Mrs. Rohl, you are the wife of H. W. Rohl?

A. Yes, sir; I am.

Q. Who testified this morning?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When were you and Mr. Rohl married?

A. In 1925, August, 1925.

Q. In San Francisco?

[3814] A. Yes, in San Francisco.

Q. Had you been married previously?

A. Yes, I had.

Q. To a man by the name of Hubert?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was his first name?

A. William

Q. How did you happen to meet Mr. Rohl?

A. Well, I met him in Sacramento through my sister and her husband. They knew him.

Q. And that was when?

A. About 1922. That was 1922.

Q. What was his business or occupation at that time?

A. He was a contractor.

Q. Was he engaged in any construction work in Sacramento?

A. Yes, he was. He was doing what they called reclamation work out of Sacramento—around Marysville and Colusa and that part of the State.

Q. And do you recall when he left for Germany in 1924 on the Steamship DEUTSCHLAND?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. How long was he gone on that occasion?

A. Well, I think he left New York around Thanksgiving and was back here the first of January.

Q. 1925?

A. Yes.

[3815] Q. Shortly after your marriage in San Francisco you and Mr. Rohl established a residence in Los Angeles, did you not?

A. Yes, I think about that year. We came down here in 1927, yes, in the spring of 1927.

Q. And have you resided here ever since?

A. Yes.

Q. Your sister's name is Edna McMorey?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where does she reside?

A. On Catalina Street, 9th and Catalina Street, Los Angeles.

Q. At the time that you and Mr. Rohl were married did you know that he was an alien?

A. I did, yes.

Q. And did he ever tell you that he had applied for citizenship in the United States?

A. Yes.

Q. When did he make application?

A. I really don't know. It was before we were married.

Q. But he told you that he had made application for citizenship?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did he tell you why it was it was never consummated?

A. No, he did not.

Q. Did he tell you or did you know that he had resided [3816] at one time in Chile?

A. Yes.

Q. And did he tell you what his business was there?

A. Yes.

Q. What was it?

A. Well, he was in the mining business—building mines.

Q. Yes.

A. Copper mines, and as near as I understand it he did some road work—a survey of a road through—down the Amazon.

Q. Did he do that for the government, or did he do it for some private concern?

A. It was for some concern. I don't—for the Anaconda Copper Company—isn't it the Anaconda Copper Company? That is the way I understand it.

Q. Do you recall his work in Mexico in 1932?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. Do you remember he was building a road from Monterey, Mexico to Mexico City?

A. Yes.

Q. Did he ever mention to you any difficulty he had with the immigration inspectors in going in and out of the United States and to and from Mexico?

A. No, he didn't. I didn't know he had any difficulties.

Q. Did he tell you about any difficulties he had with [3817] the Mexican government while working on that project?

A. No.

Q. Do you know whether or not that project was ever completed?

A. No.

Q. By him?

A. No, it was not.

Q. It was not completed?

A. No.

Q. And why wasn't it completed, if you know?

A. Well, I really don't know why.

Q. Did you, yourself, Mrs. Rohl, invest any of your own assets or capital in the Rohl-Connolly Company?

A. Well, no, I didn't invest any, but I have a share of the company that Mr. Rohl—is it community property, yes.

Q. You mean you have an undivided half interest?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Of whatever part he has?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. But none of the actual stock is in your name?

A. Oh, yes, there is stock in my name.

Q. How many shares?

A. Well, half of Mr. Rohl's—25 per cent I would say. Mr. Rohl owns 50 per cent—I mean Mr. Connolly owns 50 per cent and there is 50 per cent that Mr. Rohl and I own.

Q. I see. What you mean, in other words, Mr. Connolly [3818] owns 50 per cent of the stock?

A. Yes.

Q. And Mr. Rohl owns 50 per cent and under the community property law you would own an undivided half of what Mr. Rohl owns?

A. No, Mr. Rohl doesn't own 50 per cent. Mr. Rohl owns 25 per cent and I own 25 per cent.

Q. I see. 25 per cent actually stands in your name?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you pay anything for that 25 per cent of the stock?

A. No, I didn't pay anything for it, not for mine.

Q. Was that 25 per cent transferred to you by Mr. Rohl?

A. Yes.

Q. When was that transfer made, about?

A. Well, I think it was at the beginning of the Rohl-Connolly Company—when they organized.

Q. The Rohl-Connolly Company was originally incorporated in Carson City, Nevada, in 1932, and the permit to issue 40,000 shares of stock was granted in May of 1932, in California. It would be somewhere around there, wouldn't it?

A. Yes, it would.

Q. And you have continued in the ownership of that 25 per cent?

A. Yes.

[3819] Q. Ever since that?

A. That is right.

Q. Now, do you recall when Mr. Rohl purchased his first boat, the Pandora?

A. The Pandora

Q. Yes.

A. Yes; I think it was in 1927. I think it was in the fall of 1927—around October of 1927.

Q. And that boat was destroyed by fire, was it not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then did he buy another boat after that?

A. Well, we got the Ramona after that in 1933.

Q. And after the Ramona did he buy a subsequent boat?

A. We got the Vega, yes.

Q. That was in 1937, was it not?

A. '37, yes.

Q. Did you pay for any of those boats yourself?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Which ones?

A. Both of them.

Q. Which ones?

A. The Ramona and the Vega.

Q. Well, the Pandora was insured, was it not?

A. Yes, that is right.

Q. And the insurance was payable to your husband?

A. No, it was payable to me.

[3820] Q. So, the insurance company delivered you a check, did they?

A. Yes.

Q. For the amount?

A. Yes, they did.

Q. And did you use that money for the purpose of purchasing the Ramona?

A. I used that, yes, and other moneys, of course.

Q. And those moneys were your own funds, were they?

A. Well, it was the community funds from Mr. Rohl. I have no funds of my own.

Q. And you maintained a community account, did you, a joint account?

A. Not in the bank that we both checked on, but I would get my money from his bank, of course, through his secretary.

Q. And you obtained the funds from his secretary?

A. Yes.

Q. And used them to purchase the Ramona?

A. That is right.

Q. And did you follow the same procedure in purchasing the Vega?

A. Yes. When I sold the Ramona I used the money to buy the Vega, that is right.

Q. Do you recall sailing on the Vega from Jacksonville, Florida, to Honolulu shortly after the Vega was purchased in [3821] the latter part of 1937?

A. Yes.

Q. How many men comprised the crew on that occasion?

A. I think 16. I am not sure, but I think it was 16.

Q. And about how many men normally comprised the crew on the Ramona?

A. About eight here on the California coast.

Q. Who employed the crew on the Pandora?

A. The Pandora?

Q. Yes.

A. Well, we only had two men on the Pandora, and we always had sort of a captain, a head man, but he always hired the crew.

Q. The captain did?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And who employed the captain?

A. I did.

Q. You originally employed him?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you also employ the Captain on the Ramona?

A. Yes.

Q. And on the Vega?

A. I signed them on as captains.

Q. Did you pay the crew?

A. No, I didn't personally.

Q. Who did?

[3822] A. Miss Dickey from the office—Mr. Rohl's office.

Q. And did she also pay the captains?

A. Yes.

Q. And paid for the upkeep and maintenance of the ship and insurance premiums and all that?

A. Yes.

Q. The Vega was registered in your name, was it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you make the application for use of a wireless telephone on the Vega?

A. On the Vega?

Q. Yes.

A. I don't remember making it for the Vega. We had one for the Ramona.

Q. Did you have a wireless telephone on the Vega?

A. No, we didn't. We had a radio set—a Mackay radio set but not a telephone.

Q. Was that the one operated under the call letters KLVC, wasn't it?

A. I have forgotten the letters, but we had no telephone on the Vega at all.

Q. You applied for one on the Ramona?

A. Yes.

Q. And who applied for the permit from the Federal Communications Commission to operate the wireless station on the Vega?

[3823] A. Of the Mackay set, you mean?

Q. Yes.

A. Well, we put the man—the man in New York did. If there was any signing of papers, I did.

Q. You signed all the papers?

A. I signed all papers.

Q. When you went to the Hawaiian Islands in 1938, or the latter part of 1937, you arrived there about January 21, 1938, did you not?

A. That is right.

Q. And you sailed through the Panama Canal?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you recall the occasion when the immigration inspectors came on board the ship at Balboa in the Canal Zone?

A. Yes.

Q. Did they question you about your citizenship status?

A. As I remember, yes.

Q. And who were the other guests aboard the boat at that time? Was Mr. Rohl aboard?

A. Mr. Rohl was aboard and some friends of ours, Dr. and Mrs. Carl Lewis.

Q. Where do they reside?

A. In Beverly Hills.

Q. No one else was aboard as guests?

A. No.

Q. And were you all questioned by the immigration in- [3824] spectors at that time?

A. As I remember it, yes. I guess—we were late at night, very late at night. I don't entirely recall them coming aboard but it was quite late at night. I have kind of forgotten about it.

Q. Did the boat stop at Balboa for any length of time? How long did it stop there?

A. We stopped at the—it wasn't—I always forget. Is it Balboa the first one you come to on the East coast? We didn't stop there at all, we went right on through the Canal.

Q. Well, where did the immigration men interrogate you?

A. Well, we stopped outside before you go through the locks.

Q. And that was where?

A. We anchored outside. We didn't go in. They came out in a boat.

Q. You did not go ashore?

A. No.

Q. You anchored the boat and the immigration men came from shore?

A. Yes. Then we went through the locks on Christmas day and we stayed on the other side until, I think it was, the last day of December.

Q. You were born in Iola, Kansas, were you not, Mrs. Rohl?

[3825] A. Yes, I was.

Q. And your husband was born in Lubeck, Germany?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you present when Mr. Rohl was interrogated, before you went through the Panama Canal, by the immigration inspectors?

A. No, I wasn't—not right in the room, no.

Q. Were you present when Dr. and Mrs. Lewis were interrogated?

A. No.

Q. Where were you when you were interrogated?

A. Well, I imagine we were in the main salon. It was night and we should have been down below.

Q. And you recall that you were asked about your citizenship?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And all that sort of business?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You went through that routine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you naturally assumed, I take it, that similar questions were asked of the other persons aboard the boat?

A. Yes, I suppose so.

Q. Did you proceed from that point on to Honolulu?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you anchor off of Honolulu and go through a [3826] similar procedure with immigration there?

A. Yes.

Q. And do you recall that the same questions, in substance, were asked?

A. (Nodding head in the affirmative.)

Q. On that occasion were you present when your husband was interrogated?

A. No; I was on deck and we took turns going down below.

Q. You all took turns in going down below?

A. Yes; we had people waiting outside on a boat.

Q. Oh, you went down one at a time for interrogation.

A. Yes.

Q. And then you all went ashore, did you?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall the incident when the trouble occurred among the crew and they were going to throw somebody overboard and they had a fight or something?

A. That was at the dock in the harbor.

Q. That fellow was discharged, was he not, the man who made the trouble?

A. Yes, sir; the Captain discharged him.

Q. Do you know Colonel Wyman?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Theodore Wyman, Jr.?

A. Yes, sir.

[3827] Q. Was he in Honolulu on that occasion in 1938?

A. No; he was not.

Q. By the way, how long have you known Colonel Wyman?

A. I think I met him in 1933; I think shortly after we got the Ramona, as I remember it.

Q. When you got the Ramona, taking up that subject again for a moment, you sailed that boat from New York back to the West Coast, didn't you?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you remember stopping at Acapulco, Mexico?

A. I got off the boat at Panama and came up on the Steamer *Virginia*. I did not come up this side.

Q. So you were not on the boat at Acapulco?

A. No.

Q. Did you ever go aboard the *Ramona* to any other port outside of the United States?

A. No, never.

Q. How about on the *Vega*?

A. No, only to Honolulu, and I would call that the United States.

Q. Back and forth?

A. We only went there the one time.

Q. You just went over there the one time?

A. Yes; and we came back here.

Q. When you returned from the Hawaiian Islands on that occasion—you stayed there about two weeks, did you not, [3828] in 1938?

A. About two weeks, I judge.

Q. And when you returned did you have any other persons or person on board the boat except those who originally made the trip with you?

A. Yes; we brought a friend of ours back, Mrs. James Winne.

Q. And between the time you left the port at Honolulu and docked at San Pedro was anyone else on the boat?

A. No; not until we got into San Pedro.

Q. You are quite sure of that?

A. I am quite sure.

Q. So, from the time you left Honolulu until you docked in the harbor at San Pedro there were only those persons on the boat?

A. That is all, until we got into the dock at the Yacht Club.

Q. Until you docked at the Yacht Club?

A. Yes.

Q. And until after you had cleared immigration here?

A. Yes.

Q. You are quite sure of that?

A. I am quite sure. We dropped anchor out in the breakwater but the inspector came aboard. We call him the "The bug man." He came aboard to see about fruit and stuff, but that is all that came aboard.

[3829] Q. Do you know Mr. E. J. Crouse?

A. Yes.

Q. How long have you known him?

A. Let me see, probably met him in 1937. I really can't remember.

Q. Didn't he come aboard the *Vega* before it docked at San Pedro?

A. No, not to my knowledge he did not.

Q. Didn't you have a conversation with him?

A. Yes. He was on a boat—on his boat, I guess it was his boat.

Q. On the *Marlin*?

A. I don't know the name. It was a power boat and they came out to the breakwater. They had been watching for us all night, expecting us in, and he circled around and around our boat several times with his boat, and after we dropped the anchor he circled around a few times and then he went on back to their slip, I guess.

Q. But he didn't come aboard?

A. No.

Q. Did you have any conversation with him?

A. Yes. We talked back and forth—talked to him.

Q. Did you tell him he should not come aboard because you had not cleared immigration yet?

A. He mentioned that he wanted to come aboard and I called back and said, "No, you can't come aboard."

[3880] Q. Did you give any reason?

A. Yes, because I knew we had to go through immigration and I didn't think he should be aboard.

Q. When did you go through immigration? Was it that night?

A. No, early in the morning.

Q. And did the immigration inspectors board the boat while it was anchored there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And were you asked in substance, the same question that had been asked by the immigration inspectors on the two preceding occasions?

A. I imagine so—I don't remember.

Q. You were questioned?

A. Yes. We were questioned.

Q. Were you asked about your citizenship?

A. Yes, I guess so. I don't remember it very well.

Q. Were you present when any of the other passengers were questioned?

A. No.

Q. You are familiar with Lloyd's registry, are you not?

A. Well, I know you register, yes, the boat through Lloyd's.

Q. And you know that the register carries the names of the owners of the various boats—various yachts?

A. Yes.

[3881] Q. Do you know from what sources they get their information?

A. Well, no, I wouldn't know.

Q. Do you know that from time to time the representatives of Lloyd's registry make inspections on various yachts?

A. Yes, I know they make inspections.

Q. Do you know whether or not they ever made inspections of the Vega?

A. Well, I am not sure that I know. I don't remember.

Q. I show you, Mrs. Rohl, a 1941 Lloyd's Register of Shipping—Lloyd's Register of American Yachts, a list of the sailing and power yachts, yacht clubs and yacht owners of the United States and the Dominion of Canada, and call your attention to the entry on page 474.

This annual number which appears in column 1 in the left hand side of the page I would like to call your attention to, which is 6678. Following that is the word "Vega." "Steel." and in column 8, the owner is listed as H. W. Rohl. Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. And the home port is Los Angeles, and in character 10, under classification, "Character," Port of Survey—for special survey, it shows that the boat was inspected in July, 1938 and in November, 1937.

A. I see that—well, I wouldn't know.

Q. Well, did you know that all of the Lloyd Registers [3832] from 1937 down to and including 1941 have shown H. W. Rohl as the owner of the Vega?

A. Yes, they have always done that, because he belongs. The reason I figured that is because he belongs to the Yacht Club. It is always "H. W. Rohl." and everyone naturally says "Bill Rohl." It is usually called "Bill Rohl's Vega." They never say mine, and I don't go around saying, "It is not Bill's; it is mine." I don't do those things.

Q. And it is your belief that the Lloyd Registry people have just assumed—

A. Just assumed that, yes.

Q. That that must be the case?

A. They had to assume that because—

Q. And wrote that in their book?

A. Because it wasn't H. W. Rohl's—it wasn't in his name.

Q. Do you know whether or not the owner of the boat has to sign any application for periodic inspection by Lloyd's?

A. No, I don't.

Q. I was asking you some questions about Colonel Wyman when we got off on another subject. I would like to go back for a moment.

Colonel Wyman came here to work on the Los Angeles Flood Control project in 1935. Did your acquaintance with him go back that far?

A '35?

[3833] Q. Yes.

A. I thought it was before '35. I thought it was about 1933, but maybe it was 1935.

Q. Well, he came here—he was here before 1935, Mrs. Rohl, but he did come here from Kansas City in 1935 to work.

A. I did not meet him until he came here to work on the flood control, so it was '35, then, I met him, because I did not meet him before. I know that.

Q. Was your acquaintance a business acquaintance or social acquaintance?

A. Social.

Q. And did your husband also know him socially?

A. Yes.

Q. He spent a great deal of time aboard the Vega, did he not?



A. No, I would not say that. I don't think he was ever aboard the Vega but once as a guest, as an overnight guest, and I think he came aboard another time. He was a guest on another boat, and I can't think of the name of the boat or the people, but anyway his host came aboard our boat—spent an hour or so one afternoon, but I don't think he was ever aboard the Vega but once as an overnight guest.

Q. Was he ever aboard the Vega on another occasion or any other occasions, when he did not stay overnight?

A. Well, only that one time that I know of.

[3834] Q. So to your knowledge he has only been aboard the Vega on two occasions?

A. To my knowledge, that I remember.

Q. Is it possible that he might have been aboard the Vega on other occasions without your knowledge?

A. It could have been possible.

Q. Did he ever visit at your home?

A. Yes.

Q. How many times would you say?

A. Well, I could not say. He has been to the house several times—many times in the years that I have known him.

Q. Did you ever observe him in an intoxicated condition?

A. Well, I don't know what you would call "intoxicated." I have seen him have some drinks.

Q. I mean obviously under the influence of liquor.

A. No, I would not say that, no.

Q. Do you recall one occasion in your home when you were giving a Christmas party that he almost had a fight with somebody—a quarrel there?

A. No.

Q. You don't?

A. No.

Q. Do you recall an occasion aboard the Vega when a party was being given when he did have a fight with an individual aboard the Vega?

[3835] A. No, I have never known him to have a fight on the Vega or in our home.

Q. So your testimony is that you, as far as you know, he never indulged to excess?

A. Not that I know of.

Q. As far as his drinking was concerned?

A. No, he was always a gentleman. I have seen him drink, but he was always a gentleman.

Q. Did you ever tell any one of your friends that you did not like Major Wyman because he drank too much and was obnoxious?

A. No, I never have.

Q. You are quite sure of that?

A. Yes, I don't know why I should.

Q. Is it your testimony that you never did?

A. I never did.

Q. Did you know Mrs. Wyman?

A. You mean—which one?

Q. Either one?

A. Well, I knew the first Mrs. Wyman much better than I know the present Mrs. Wyman. Yes, I knew them both.

Q. Did you know his daughter?

A. Yes.

Q. Jane, wasn't that her name?

A. Jane. I have met her several times—not many because she was going to school back East when I first met [3836] her.

Q. Do you recall when Major Wyman and his wife began to have domestic difficulties?

A. No, I don't. I didn't know they were having any. They had a divorce before I knew they were having domestic difficulties.

Q. Did you know the second Mrs. Wyman prior to her marriage to Major Wyman?

A. No.

Q. How long afterwards did you first become acquainted with her?

A. I met the second Mrs. Wyman when we had them on the Vega for a weekend. That was in the summer sometime. I really don't recall.

Q. The summer of what year?

A. I don't know what year now. It was before, of course, we went to Honolulu. They left for Honolulu shortly after that trip. I really don't know what year it was.

Q. When Major Wyman and Mrs. Wyman spent a weekend on the boat, now, do you know whether or not Major Wyman was ever aboard the Ramona?

A. Oh, yes, he was aboard the Ramona.

Q. How many times was he aboard the Ramona?

A. Well, I really can't recall—possibly three times anyway. I have had them as guests—I had him as a guest [3387] one time. We had Colonel Wyman and a number of officers and their wives and families aboard, and then I think he was aboard also on—I don't know—say three or four times aboard the Ramona.

Q. Did he ever spend several days aboard the Ramona?

A. No, only weekends, was all.

Q. Did he ever take any trips aboard the Ramona with you and your husband?

A. No, no trips.

Q. Just went aboard—

A. Over to Catalina from the mainland—from the mainland to Catalina.

Q. Accompanied you over there, did he?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. About how many times would he make trips over there?

A. Well, he didn't make more than three trips.

Q. And were they simply overnight trips?

A. Possibly two nights. Possibly might have been Saturday and Sunday or Friday and Saturday and back Sunday. I really don't recall. Or come back Monday. May go out Saturday and come back Monday. I really don't recall.

Q. Did you know that the second Mrs. Wyman was the sister of his former office secretary?

A. I heard that but I didn't know because I didn't know her.

[3388] Q. You knew her maiden name was Perry, didn't you?

A. No, I did not.

Q. Are you familiar with the H. W. Rohl Company?

A. Yes.

Q. What sort of a concern is that?

A. It is a contracting company.

Q. A corporation?

A. No.

Q. A partnership?

A. No, just H. W. Rohl.

Q. H. W. Rohl, doing business as H. W. Rohl Company?

A. Yes.

Q. And that is purely a construction company?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you have any interest in that concern?

A. No.

Q. Other than—I know you have a community interest, of course, but no other interest?

A. No.

Q. Are you familiar with an organization known as Hawaiian Constructors?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. Do you have any interest in the Hawaiian Constructors, other than the interest you would have by reason of your ownership of the Rohl-Connolly stock?

A. No.

[3389] Q. Rohl-Connolly is a member of the Hawaiian Constructors, isn't that correct?

A. That is right.

Q. And do you know how much of an interest Rohl-Connolly Company owns in the Hawaiian Constructors?

A. No, I don't.

Q. Where is the Vega now?

A. United States Navy.

Q. The Navy has it?

A. Requisitioned and bought it.

Q. For what price?

- A. \$35,000.00.
- Q. Was that paid to you?
- A. To me.
- Q. And prior to the requisitioning of the Vega by the Navy had the Army made any use of it?
- A. Yes, the Army engineers had it for a short while.
- Q. With whom was that contract consummated, if you know?
- A. The Hawaiian Constructors.
- Q. Did you sign the contract?
- A. Yes.
- Q. You are quite sure of that?
- A. Well, I am not quite sure, no, but I imagine I did. I don't know—to be sure, I don't know.
- Q. If you didn't sign it who would have signed it?
- [3840] A. Well, I don't know.
- Q. You were the owner of the boat?
- A. I know it—I wasn't here at the time, however. I was in Honolulu when they made—
- Q. When the contract was made?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Who represented you in the making of that contract?
- A. Well, I suppose Mr. Rohl did.
- Q. With whom did he negotiate?
- A. I don't know—Colonel Wyman, I suppose.
- Q. Was Colonel Wyman the head of the Army Engineers at that time?
- A. In Honolulu, yes.
- Q. And there was a contract between the Hawaiian Engineers and the Hawaiian Constructors, was there not?
- A. There was a contract, yes.
- Q. The basic contract?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And the Hawaiian Constructors, of course, was subject to the supervision and control of their operations by the Army Engineers?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And the head of the Army Engineers was Colonel Wyman?
- A. That is right.
- Q. So the negotiations for the contract were made for [3841] you by your husband and you don't remember whether you signed the contract or not?
- A. No, I don't remember.
- Q. How much compensation did you receive for the use of the Vega by the Army Engineers?
- A. Got one dollar, and I have it framed at home.
- Q. How was the boat used? Do you know for what purpose?
- A. No, I don't.
- Q. Patrol boat or something of that kind?
- A. I really don't know, because—
- Q. You don't object to having your picture taken, do you?
- A. I don't know; I take a horrible picture.
- Q. I should think you would take a very nice picture, Mrs. Rohl.
- Now, when you went to the Islands in the Vega in 1937 you stayed there about two weeks and, as you testified, came back to the United States?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Did you subsequently return to the Hawaiian Islands?
- A. I went back, yes.
- Q. When did you make your next trip?
- A. I don't think I went over again until a year ago last September.
- Q. A year ago last September?
- [3842] A. Yes.
- Q. Weren't you over there in 1940?
- A. I was trying to think. I don't know—I can't remember—let me see, 1940?
- Q. Yes. You came back here in 1938 on the Vega. Now, I want to know when you next went to the Hawaiian Islands after 1938.
- A. I don't remember, but I went over in 1940. I can't remember that. It seems to me like I didn't. I don't think I had been over since we were on the Vega. Maybe I did and I don't recall it.

Q. You don't believe you have been back at all since 1937?

A. I can't remember going back.

Q. You don't believe you have been back at all since 1937?

A. I can't remember going back. I possibly have been, but I can't remember.

Q. When did Mr. Rohl next go back?

A. When did he go back?

Q. Yes.

A. Well, he didn't go back until a year ago last September. I know that.

Q. He did not go back until a year ago last September?

A. No.

Q. You are sure of that?

[3843] A. I am quite sure of that—positive, because I went to Honolulu several times alone or with other people or friends, but Mr. Rohl didn't go with me.

Q. You mean you went back several times with friends after 1937?

A. No, no, I mean I have made several trips to Honolulu.

Q. Before or after 1937?

A. No, before, but I can't think about 1940.

Q. Would it have been possible for Mr. Rohl to have returned to the Islands without your knowledge?

A. No, he couldn't possibly have gone without my knowledge.

Q. Now, when the original contracts between Hawaiian Constructors and the Army Engineering Corps were negotiated, did Mr. Rohl play any part in their negotiations?

A. Well, I really don't know.

Q. You don't know?

A. No.

Q. You do know that he was acquainted with Colonel Wyman well?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that Colonel Wyman was the head of the Army Engineers?

A. Yes.

Q. And that Mr. Rohl owned 40 per cent of the stock [3844] of the Rohl-Connolly Company?

A. (Nodding head in affirmative.)

Q. The Rohl-Connolly Company was a part of the Hawaiian Constructors and they made the contract with the Hawaiian Constructors. Who would you think would represent the Rohl-Connolly Company in the negotiations of that basic contract?

A. Well, I would imagine Mr. Rohl would be the one.

Q. He was president of the Rohl-Connolly Company, wasn't he?

A. He was for awhile. I don't know that he was president at that time.

Q. He is president now, isn't he?

A. Yes.

Q. How long has he been president, to your knowledge?

A. Well, he hasn't been president only this past year.

Q. This past year?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you recall whether or not an application was made in connection with your Mackay Radio station on the Vega to use code?

A. No.

Q. You don't?

A. No, I don't, but I imagine they used code. I don't know—I don't know. I wouldn't know if it is code.

[3845] Q. You would not know whether such an application was made or not?

A. No, I don't know how they send messages. I think it was in code though.

Q. I want to ask you a question which I covered in a general way, but I want to ask it categorically of you, Mrs. Rohl: Did you, or did you not ever say to any person or persons that you tolerated the company of Major Wyman for business reasons only?

A. Well, I may have made that statement but—yes, I could have said it.

Q. To whom did you make the statement?

A. I don't know who I said it to.

Q. Do you recall making it?

A. I don't recall making it, no, not exactly, but I have made the statement but I don't know to whom.

Q. You have made the statement but you don't know to whom?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Why did you make the statement?
- A. Well, I don't know. I just really didn't like Colonel Wyman personally so well. I liked his first wife.
- Q. Why didn't you?
- A. Oh, I don't know. He just was kind of—he was kind of bossy—he was a kind of bossy type of person.
- Q. Arrogant?
- [3846] A. Arrogant, although I never saw him fight. He was always kind of—
- Q. Quarrelsome?
- A. No, he knew it all—kind of knew it all.
- Q. I know a lot of people that fit into that same category myself.
- A. And I liked his first wife very much and I used, of course, to see them a lot and used to see her because I liked her, but I didn't particularly care about him.
- Q. Did your contacts with Major Wyman, and later Colonel Wyman and his two wives originate through the contracts that were theretofore made by your husband?
- A. Yes, that's how I met him.
- Q. Did you know that your husband had negotiated some Army contracts through Major Wyman—through his acquaintanceship and relations with Major Wyman prior to 1941?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What kind of contracts were they?
- A. He had some breakwater—harbor contracts at the Harbor here.
- Q. Which harbor?
- A. Long Beach Harbor.
- Q. Long Beach Harbor?
- A. Yes.
- Q. How about the San Pedro breakwater?
- [3847] A. That is the one I mean.
- Q. That is the one you are speaking of?
- A. I always call it "Long Beach." I guess it is San Pedro.
- Q. Do you recall any other Army projects that Mr. Rohl worked on through his relationship with Mr. Wyman?
- A. No.
- Q. Just that one?
- A. Just that one, yes.
- Q. And that was about when—what year?
- A. 1933—no, well he started work in 1933 with other engineers here before Wyman came, but he didn't negotiate the job, no, it wasn't negotiated through Colonel Wyman. He was going on with the work—the work was going on before Colonel Wyman came out here.
- Q. Have you ever been at home when Colonel Wyman called your husband on the telephone from the Hawaiian Islands?
- A. Yes.
- Q. On one occasion or more than one occasion?
- A. Well, I know one. I don't remember—I really don't remember any more.
- Q. How long ago was that conversation?
- A. That was a long time ago—long before we went over there in September a year ago.
- Q. Long before September, 1942?
- [3848] A. Yes, 1942.
- Q. You say, "long before we went over there."
- Q. Not 1942, but 1941.
- Q. That is what I thought. You said, "a year ago."
- Q. This is 1943, it was in 1941.
- Q. Long before you went over there in September of 1941?
- A. Some time before, yes.
- Q. Can you give us an estimate of how long, in months, and of course I don't expect you to be exactly accurate in these matters?
- A. Well, I think it was in the spring—possibly June.
- Q. Early summer or spring of 1941?
- A. Yes, because—
- Q. Pardon me. I think I am misleading you there. I don't intend to. My question was, how long prior to the 15th of September, 1941 was it that the telephone conversation occurred?

A. Well, that is what I am trying to think.

Q. Do I understand your answer to be the late spring or early summer of that year?

A. Summer, I think, of that year.

Q. That is close enough.

A. I don't remember—I don't remember that.

Q. That is the only occasion you recall of any tele- [3849] phonic communication between Colonel Wyman and your husband?

A. Yes; that is the only one I recall.

Q. That is, from the Islands?

A. Yes. There could be others; I wouldn't always know.

Q. I understand.

Did your husband discuss with you at any time the nature of the work that Hawaiian Constructors were doing for the Army?

A. In Honolulu? No.

Q. Never did?

A. No.

Q. How about the other Pacific Islands where there was work going on?

A. No.

Q. Never discussed those matters?

A. No. It was always "a military secret." He never discussed it.

Q. Do you know whether or not Rohl-Connolly did any work at Oxnard?

A. Yes.

Q. What type of work was that?

A. Breakwater—harbor work—a small breakwater.

Q. Was that under the jurisdiction of the Army Engineers?

A. Yes.

[3850] Q. And that was about when?

A. I can't recall.

Q. Well, I mean—

A. The years or dates either.

Q. A matter of several years ago?

A. It was several years ago, yes.

Q. Prior to 1941?

A. Yes, prior to 1941.

Q. Was that under the jurisdiction of Colonel Wyman?

A. No, I don't think so.

Q. You don't believe it was?

A. I don't think he was here.

Q. Are you acquainted with Harold Cramer?

A. Cramer?

Q. Yes.

A. No, I don't know anybody by that name.

Q. He was an employee of the Hawaiian Constructors?

A. I don't know.

Q. Are you acquainted—were you ever acquainted with Mr. Werner Plack?

A. Black?

Q. No, Plack.

A. Plack?

Q. Yes, Werner Plack.

A. No.

Q. Never knew him?

[3851] A. No.

Q. Did you ever know Mr. William Henry Enright?

A. No.

Q. What?

A. No, I don't know the name.

Q. You are acquainted with Mr. T. E. Connolly, of course?

A. Yes.

Q. And you have known him for a number of years?

A. Yes.

Q. And he is the Mr. Connolly who is the other member of—I will put it this way, the third member of the Board of Directors of Rohl-Connolly Company?

A. Yes.

Q. And maintains an office in San Francisco?

A. Yes.

Q. And does he have any active control or take any active part in the conduct of the Rohl-Connolly Corporation in Southern California?

A. Well, yes.

Q. He does?

A. Yes.

Q. Does he make frequent trips down here for that purpose?

A. Yes.

Q. Was he active in negotiating or assisting in the [3852] negotiations of the contract between the Army Engineers and Hawaiian Constructors?

A. Yes, he was.

Q. He was?

A. Yes.

Q. Did he go to the Islands for that purpose?

A. No, he didn't go to the Islands, but they held meetings. I think, in San Francisco.

Q. Did your husband go to the Islands for the purpose of negotiating the contracts or taking any part in them?

A. He went to the Islands after the contracts were negotiated. He did not go over there to negotiate them.

Q. That was the occasion you mean in—

A. September.

Q. September? Well, if he didn't go over to the Islands to negotiate them with whom did he negotiate?

A. Well, they were negotiated here in San Francisco.

Q. I see. Was Colonel Wyman then in San Francisco?

A. Yes, I think he was.

Q. So that Colonel Wyman and Mr. Connolly and your husband were negotiating in San Francisco instead of in the Islands?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you know whether or not the acquaintance between Colonel Wyman and your husband preceded or succeeded the acquaintance between Mr. Connolly and Colonel Wyman?

[3853] A. I think they—

Q. In other words, who knew him first?

A. I think they both met him at the same time.

Q. Down in Southern California?

A. Yes.

Q. Have you ever disposed of any of the stock that you acquired in the Rohl-Connolly Corporation?

A. No, I haven't.

Q. Did you know that at all the time that Mr. Rohl owned in excess of 25 per cent of the stock of the Rohl-Connolly Corporation he was a German alien and was violating the law?

A. No.

Q. Do you recall that he paid a fine to the United States government of \$25,000 because of that violation?

A. No, I did not know that.

Q. You did not know that?

Q. No.

Q. Rohl-Connolly Corporation owns several boats, tugs and barges and launches, and so forth, do they not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where were they kept?

A. San Pedro.

Q. Kept at San Pedro?

A. Yes.

Q. You are acquainted with—strike that, please. [3854] Are you acquainted with Fred Rohl?

A. Yes; he is Mr. Rohl's son.

Q. How long have you been acquainted with him?

A. Well, I have known him since he was about eight years old.

Q. Do you know where he is now?

A. Yes.

Q. Where is he?

A. He is in Canada.

Q. What part of Canada?

A. Well, he is at Dawson Creek. He is working up there.

Q. That is in the province of Alberta, is it not?

A. Yes, Alberta.

Q. What town is it near?

A. Well, it could be near White Horse.

Q. Where is Colonel Wyman now, if you know?

A. I understand he has his offices at Edmonton, Canada.

Q. Which is in the province of Alberta?

A. Alberta, yes.

Q. And do you know how long he has been there?

A. Colonel Wyman?

Q. Yes.

A. Well, I think he has been there a year—no, I guess he hasn't been there quite a year.

Q. And Fred Rohl, as I recall the testimony of his [3855] father this morning, has been there just a few months?

A. Yes. He just went up there since Christmas—in January. The 9th, in fact, I think he left.

Q. Does Fred Rohl have an interest at all in any of your husband's enterprises?

A. No.

Q. None whatever?

A. No.

Q. Did he ever own any stock of the Rohl-Connelly Company to your knowledge?

A. To my knowledge no.

Q. Of course, all of these things are of your own knowledge. I realize you would not know about all of these things.

A. No, he never has.

Q. So far as you know?

A. That is right.

Q. Did he accompany you to the Islands when you went over there on the Vega in 1937?

A. No. He left the ship at Miami and came back by train.

Q. Where did he board the ship?

A. He boarded it in New York, when the boat left New York.

Q. When the negotiations for the purchase of the Vega were in progress, did you tell anyone that your husband was [3856] buying the boat?

A. I wouldn't, no. I might say "We are buying a boat." I possibly did say, "We are buying a boat."

Q. But you don't think you told anybody he was buying a boat?

A. No, no, I didn't.

Q. Did he send back and have photographs of the Vega mailed to him in order to look at it after the Ramona had been sold, and prior to the purchase of the Vega?

A. Yes. After we sold the Ramona we had the broker in New York send us pictures. We did not solicit them, they just sent them because they knew—yacht brokers are like real estate men. They know every deal that is put over and they immediately thought, "Well, we didn't have a boat and possibly we would like another one," and they tried to sell us another one.

Q. As a matter of fact, you are negotiating for another boat right now, aren't you?

A. Well, it was about a month—

Q. Pardon me?

A. We negotiated about a month after I sold the Ramona. I sold the Ramona in September and about the 1st of November—

Q. You are negotiating for the purchase of a boat now, are you not, Mr. Rohl?

A. Oh, now?

[3857] Q. Yes.

A. Oh, no, not now; I thought you meant then.

Q. You haven't approached anybody about the purchase of a yacht or a boat?

A. No; only I called Mrs. Converse about their boat—that the Government wants to buy a boat. They have a boat and I called her to ask her if Mr.



Converse would like to sell his boat to the Government, but not to us. We don't want it—we are not buying any boats.

Q. How did you happen to know the Government wanted to buy a boat?

A. Because Colonel Wyman, or his office in Edmonton—they are starting a new project up there and they want some boats and—

Q. You gained that information from whom?

A. From Mr. Rohl.

Q. When did you gain that information?

A. Just last week. Mr. Rohl got home a week ago today from San Francisco.

Q. And did you make a tentative appointment with anyone for Mr. Rohl to discuss the possibility of acquiring a boat for the Army Engineers?

A. No.

Q. Never did?

A. No; did not talk to anyone but to Mrs. Converse, and I asked her about her boat and that was all.

[3858] Q. Now, you say Fred Rohl boarded the Vega where?

A. New York.

Q. And left it where?

A. Miami, Florida.

Q. He did not make a trip to the Islands with you at all?

A. No.

Q. When you went back to get the Vega in 1937 did you accompany Mr. Rohl?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And did anyone go with you?

A. You mean, when we purchased the boat?

Q. Yes. When he went back to take delivery of it?

A. No.

Q. How did it happen that Dr. and Mrs. —

A. Lewis.

Q. Where did you meet them?

A. Well, we went back to New York in October and Mr. Rohl only stayed a few days and I stayed on until the month of November—practically the month of November, until I got the boat in shape and ready for the trip, and hired the captain and got all of the papers signed and had taken care of everything. Mr. Rohl wasn't there then. Fred was with me, the boy, and then I came back here to bring my trunks and New York clothes that I had, and repack for the boat and for Honolulu and we all left here together on the [3859] train for Jacksonville, Florida. In the meantime we had the captain bring the boat down to Jacksonville. It was in the wintertime and very bad weather—very stormy weather, and we boarded the boat in December—December 10, I believe, and then we went south by train from here, the four of us.

Q. Then you left for Honolulu?

A. Then we left for Honolulu.

Q. As a matter of fact you and your husband had planned to take Dr. and Mrs. Lewis on their wedding trip on the Ramona, did you not?

A. Yes, we promised them that.

Q. And this was sort of a substitute trip?

A. Yes; we promised them a trip to Honolulu on the Ramona, and we were never able to make the trip, so after several years—after they had been married several years we made the trip. It was a very nice trip, too, by the way.

Q. There was one fight; other than that it was all right?

A. That wasn't much of a fight.

Q. Did you pay for the Ramona by a check or by cash?

A. By check.

Q. Did you sign the check?

A. No.

Q. Who signed it?

[3860] A. Miss Dickey, the secretary.

Q. Of what?

A. Mr. Rohl's secretary. She takes care of our money. She issues me my money and Mr. Rohl's money—any money that we want—any money that I want I get through her.

Q. Was the check payable to you?

A. No, I don't believe it was. I think it was payable to the—I don't even know if it was payable to the former owner. I don't know who the check was payable to. It might have to be a bank. I really don't remember.

Q. Did you request Mrs. Dickey to—or is it Mrs. Dickey?

A. Miss.

Q. Did you request Miss Dickey to issue the check, or did Mr. Rohl request her to do it?

A. He probably requested it, because he was here. I talked to Mr. Rohl on the phone often and requested money to be sent to me in New York. I had a bank account at the bank there to take care of all bills and things back there, but I got, of course, all of my money through the office.

Q. Well, Mrs. Rohl, has that been the regular practice, the money that you have required you get through the office.

A. Yes.

Q. That same procedure, in other words—

[3861] A. Yes.

Q. In other words, you ask for the money and Miss Dickey makes the proper entries and issues the check and so forth?

A. That is the way we have always done.

Q. Now, you said you didn't remember to whom the check was made out?

A. No, I don't.

Q. Now, how about the Vega? Did you follow the same procedure with the Vega?

A. We were talking about the Vega—I thought we were talking about the Vega.

Q. No, were speaking of the Ramona.

A. Well, it would be the same procedure, however, but I was thinking of the Vega all the time, but it would be the same.

Q. The same thing in both cases?

A. Yes.

Q. Did anyone tell you—pardon me, strike that. How long a boat was the Ramona? Was it over 100 feet long?

A. It was 110 feet.

Q. How long a boat was the Vega?

A. 135.

Q. Do you know whether or not it was against the law for an alien to own a boat in excess of 75 feet in length?

[3862] A. No, I didn't know that.

Q. You did not know that?

A. No.

Q. You are quite positive that you paid all the bills for the upkeep of the Vega?

A. (Nodding head in the affirmative.)

Q. You paid the crew and the captain and for the provisions?

A. (Nodding head in the affirmative.)

Q. The Vega had Diesel engines, didn't it?

A. Yes, sir; the Vega had Diesel engines.

Q. Did you pay for all the Diesel fuel on the Vega and all the inspections and all of that sort of thing?

A. Well, I did in New York before we started out.

Q. Who directed the sailing of the vessel?

A. The captain.

Q. Who gave the captain his orders?

A. Well, no one. Just tell the captain where we are going and then he has charge.

Q. Who told him where to go?

A. Well, I suppose I told him.

Q. Well, did you tell him?

A. Yes, yes.

Q. Did Mr. Rohl have anything to do with that at all or did he just go aboard as a passenger?

A. He just went aboard as a passenger. He never did [3863] anything about the boat.

Q. In other words, he didn't pay the bills?

A. No.

Q. Or direct the sailing of the boat?

A. No.

Q. And he didn't do anything at all except have his name in Lloyd's Register as the owner?

A. He might direct some of the sailings, because he likes sailing, but not the actual sailing of the ship.

Q. Have you discussed Mr. Rohl's testimony with him?

A. You mean today?

Q. Yes; I saw him a few minutes after he left here. I was waiting for him and he had to go to the airport. I did not see him but a few minutes.

Q. You sold the Ramona, I believe you testified?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall to whom you sold it?

A. Yes, to a Mr. Spaulding.

Q. Did he pay you cash or check?

A. He paid by check.

Q. And the check was made to whom?

A. To me.

Q. Individually?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you put the money—what did you do with the [3867] money? What I mean by that is—I am not interested in your personal affairs—

A. I endorsed it and turned it over to Miss Dickey and she in turn deposited it in the bank.

Q. In the account of whom?

A. H. W. Rohl Company or H. W. Rohl—not company.

Q. H. W. Rohl?

A. H. W. Rohl account.

Mr. COMBS. I think that is all, Mrs. Rohl.

Chairman TENNEY. Just one question, Mrs. Rohl. As I understand your testimony you did not know that it was illegal for an alien to own a bottom of any given tonnage?

The WITNESS. No, I did not.

Chairman TENNEY. Or size?

The WITNESS. No, I did not know it until now. If it is, I did not know that.

Chairman TENNEY. That is all. Thank you very much, Mrs. Rohl. We are sorry to have inconvenienced you.

We will take a five minute recess.

(Short recess.)

[3865] Chairman TENNEY. The committee will be in order. Will you call your next witness, Mr. Combs?

Mr. COMBS. Irma Dickey.

IRMA F. DICKEY, called as a witness on behalf of the Committee, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

Chairman TENNEY. Miss Dickey, will you please stand and raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before this committee, will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

The WITNESS. Yes, I do.

Chairman TENNEY. Will you state your full name?

The WITNESS. IRMA F. DICKEY.

Chairman TENNEY. D-i-c-k-e-y?

The WITNESS. D-i-c-k-e-y.

Chairman TENNEY. Will you be seated, please. Is it Miss Dickey or Mrs. Dickey?

The WITNESS. Miss.

Chairman TENNEY. And where do you reside?

The WITNESS. 1972 Canyon Drive, Los Angeles.

Chairman TENNEY. All right, Mr. Combs.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. Miss Dickey, how long have you resided in Los Angeles?

[3866] A. Well, practically all my life. I was born here.

Q. And how long have you been acquainted with Mr. H. W. Rohl?

A. Since I first started to work for him in 1927.

Q. And in 1927 immediately prior to going to work for Mr. Rohl, what was your occupation?

A. Well, I was doing office work—stenography, bookkeeping—general office work.

Q. In what office?

A. Well, I had been working for J. J. McCarthy in New York, and then I had come out to California and was working for Pathe for one of the men who had been with J. J. McCarthy.

Q. Do you recall when Rohl-Connolly Company made application to the Corporation Commissioner of this state for the issuance of 40,000 shares of its capital stock?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That stock was issued to you, to T. E. Connolly and H. W. Rohl?

A. The stock was not issued to me.

Q. It was not?

A. No.

Q. Who prepared the application for the issuance of the stock, if you know?

A. Well, I believe the attorney did.

Q. Mr. Martin?

A. Yes, I believe so.

[3867] Q. The permit authorizes the issuance of 40,000 shares and the sale of those shares for \$10.00 each, to you and Mr. Connolly and Mr. Rohl but you have never owned any stock in the concern?

A. That is right, I never have.

Q. What are your general duties in connection with the Rohl-Connolly Company?

A. Well, I am secretary of the company, and my work is mostly bookkeeping—general work—just general, whatever there may be to do in taking care of the office.

Q. That is in connection with the Rohl-Connolly Company?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you have any duties in connection with Hawaiian Constructors?

A. No, I do not.

Q. Nothing at all?

A. No.

Q. Do the books of Rohl-Connolly Company reflect the interest of that company in Hawaiian Constructors?

A. They show the investment, yes.

Q. And you have kept all of those entries yourself, have you?

A. Yes.

Q. And at the time the 40,000 shares of the capital stock were issued, were 20,000 shares issued to H. W. Rohl and 20,000 shares to T. E. Connolly?

[3868] A. No. I believe only 10,000 shares were issued.

Q. 5,000 to each one?

A. 5,000 to each one.

Q. And what happened to the other 30,000 shares?

A. Well, they were not issued at that time.

Q. They were authorized but unissued stock?

A. Yes.

Q. How long have you occupied your present position as secretary of the corporation?

A. Since it was first formed in 1932.

Q. How long has Mr. Rohl been president?

A. Well, he has been president—not continually but at various times. He was president and then Mr. Connolly was president and then again I believe Mr. Rohl was president. They take turns.

Q. May I ask you this question: are there any provisions in the—are you familiar with the by-laws?

A. Well, I have read them—not recently. We have them there.

Q. They alternate the presidency between them at regular intervals?

A. No, no. I believe it is just as they are elected—as they choose to elect their president.

Q. Who are the members on the Board of Directors?

A. At the present time?

Q. Yes.

[3869] A. T. E. Connolly, H. W. Rohl and myself.

Q. And have there ever been any other directors to your knowledge?

A. Well, yes, sir, Mrs. Floy Rohl.

- Q. She has been a director?  
A. Yes.  
Q. When did she cease being a director?  
A. Just recently.  
Q. Do you have any duties to perform in connection with H. W. Rohl Company?  
A. Yes, I do. I keep those books.  
Q. That is owned entirely by Mr. Rohl?  
A. Yes, that is right.  
Q. Do you keep a separate account in connection with that company?  
A. A separate set of books.  
Q. And how often do the Board of Directors of—how often does the Board of Directors of Rohl-Connolly meet?  
A. Well, they have a yearly meeting, of course, and other meetings as the necessity arises.  
Q. They are called into special meetings?  
A. Special meetings are called from time to time.  
Q. Now, you have custody of Mr. Rohl's Federal income tax data, do you?  
A. Yes, I have copies of it.  
Q. Do you keep copies of the returns?  
[3870] A. Yes, I do.  
Q. Do you keep copies of the State income tax return?  
A. Yes, sir.  
Q. You have those available at the office, do you?  
A. Yes.  
Q. That is at the office of the Rohl-Connolly Company?  
A. Yes.  
Q. Are you familiar in a general way with the provisions which are undertaken from time to time by Rohl-Connolly Company?  
A. Yes, I am.  
Q. Do you know what type of work the Hawaiian Constructors engage in?  
A. Well, I have no special information on that.  
Q. I mean in a general way.  
A. Just in a very general way.  
Q. Do you know where the work is—strike that. Do you know where the work was originally performed when the Hawaiian Constructors first started to function?  
A. Where the actual work was?  
Q. Yes.  
A. No, I do not.  
Q. Do you know whether or not the Hawaiian Constructors ever did any work in the vicinity of Honolulu?  
A. No, I do not know.  
Q. Are you acquainted with Major Wyman or Colonel [3871] Wyman?  
A. No, I am not.  
Q. You have never seen him?  
A. No, I don't believe I have ever seen him.  
Q. Have you ever heard of him?  
A. Oh, yes, I have heard of him.  
Q. Do you write the letters for Mr. Rohl?  
A. Yes.  
Q. He dictates his correspondence?  
A. Frequently, yes.  
Q. Has he ever dictated to you any correspondence to Major Wyman or Colonel Wyman?  
A. No, I don't believe he has.  
Q. Never wrote any letters?  
A. I don't believe that he has.  
Q. Do you know whether or not he has received any letters that came to Rohl-Connolly Company from Colonel Wyman?  
A. No, I don't think that he has ever received one.  
Q. You don't think that he ever did?  
A. (No answer.)  
Q. Do you recall writing the checks when these boats that we have mentioned were purchased?  
A. Well, I believe I did. I rather recall—of course, I know the checks were written.

Q. Do you keep cancelled checks?

[3872] A. Well, for a certain period, yes.

Q. How long?

A. Well, about five years.

Q. You keep the checks for about five years?

A. Yes.

Q. You make regular ledger entries when the checks are drawn?

A. Yes.

Q. And you keep those permanently, do you not?

A. Keep them permanently, yes.

Q. Now, just what would the ledger entries and accounts reveal so far as to whom the checks were payable and by whom they were signed and so forth?

A. Well, I sign them. I think I sign all of the checks.

Q. Do you have power of attorney from Mr. Rohl?

A. No, I have power to sign the checks, but not the power to sign his name otherwise.

Q. Do you sign all the checks for him through the H. W. Rohl Company and Rohl-Connolly Company?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. So the books of those concerns would reflect, would they not, to whom the checks were payable and for what purpose?

A. Yes, they would—that is right.

Q. And those books are available at the office of the [3873] company, are they?

A. Yes, they are.

Q. You were employed by Mr. Rohl when the Pandora was burned?

A. Yes, I was.

Q. Do you recall to whom the insurance was paid?

A. Well, I do not know.

Q. That was a long time ago.

A. Well, the insurance papers quite often are made out incorrectly, or sometimes one way and sometimes another. I don't recall the Pandora. I can't remember how that was.

Q. Are you empowered to sign checks for Floy Rohl?

A. No, only for the H. W. Rohl Company account.

Q. And that, of course, is H. W. Rohl, an individual, doing business under the firm name and style of "H. W. Rohl Company", isn't that right?

A. That's right.

Q. Do you know whether or not there is a certificate of doing business under a fictitious name on file for that concern?

A. Yes.

Q. In Los Angeles County?

A. Yes; I am pretty sure there is.

Q. In any other counties?

A. Well, that I cannot be certain of. I don't know. I have forgotten.

[3874] Chairman TENNEY. How do you spell your name?

The WITNESS. I-r-m-a.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. Miss Dickey, did Mr. Rohl pay an income tax to the State of California in 1941?

A. Yes.

Q. He did?

A. Yes, I am sure he must have.

Q. Do you prepare those returns?

A. No, I do not.

Q. Who does?

A. James W. Bontems. He is our auditor.

Q. Is he auditor for all of the books for all of these corporations?

A. Rohl-Connolly Company and R. W. Rohl Company.

Q. There are no other concerns in which Mr. Connolly or Mr. Rohl are interested, are there, besides those two?

A. There is a joint venture in which the corporation is interested.

Q. You are speaking of the Hawaiian Constructors?

A. Yes; and there is another one, the Caddoa Constructors.

Q. What is the name?

A. Caddoa.

Q. Who are the other component members of that joint venture, if you know?

- A. Yes; W. E. Callahan Construction Company and [3875] Gunther & Shirley.
- Q. Callahan & Company is a Los Angeles concern, is it not?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Is Gunther & Shirley also a Los Angeles concern?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Both of them in the construction business?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. In what enterprise, if any, are they currently engaged—I mean as a joint venture?
- A. Aside from the one in which we are interested I really would not know.
- Q. I mean the ones in which you are interested.
- A. Well, just Hawaiian Constructors and Caddoa Constructors.
- Q. What enterprise, if any, is the Caddoa Constructors presently engaged in?
- A. What type of work are they doing?
- Q. Yes.
- A. They are building the Caddoa Dam, at Caddoa, Colorado.
- Q. The work that the Hawaiian Constructors is engaged in, is that all work for the Government?
- A. So far as I know—I don't know.
- Q. So far as you know it is?
- A. We don't have very much of that. It is an entirely [3876] confidential document and I have no information on that.
- Q. You don't have access to the basic contract?
- A. No.
- Q. You have never seen it?
- A. I have never seen it.
- Q. Do you have any correspondence as secretary for Rohl-Connolly Company with Hawaiian Constructors in San Francisco?
- A. I have had occasion to write, very little, however.
- Q. How much of an interest has Rohl-Connolly Company now in Hawaiian Constructors?
- A. Let me see, I believe it is 24 per cent.
- Q. How long have they had that interest?
- A. I think it has been that since January 1, 1942.
- Q. And prior to January 1, 1942, Rohl-Connolly Company had a 40 per cent interest, did they not?
- A. 32 per cent I believe it was.
- Q. Did they ever own 40 per cent?
- A. Now, perhaps—wait until I think. It has been changed—one-fourth of that—they took in another member and I was thinking it was 32 per cent less a fourth. Perhaps they had—I don't think they had—they may have had 40 per cent at first and then 32 per cent. Now it is 24.
- Q. Now, the reductions in the percentage that Rohl-Connolly Company owns in Hawaiian Constructors is attributable to the taking of new members into the joint venture from [3877] time to time?
- A. Yes, that is right.
- Q. What is the name of the latest acquisition to the joint venture?
- A. It is called, I believe, the "Hawaiian Contracting Company."
- Q. An Hawaiian firm?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Did Rohl-Connolly Company receive anything for the sale of a portion of its interest to the new members of the joint venture?
- A. Yes, they did.
- Q. Do you recall what the consideration was?
- A. Well, it was based on the figures according to the audit at the end of December, 1941. I have forgotten what the exact figures were.
- Q. Can you approximate it?
- A. I don't like to do that. I don't know. I am not sure enough to guess at it. I am sorry.
- Q. It shows on the books of the Rohl-Connolly Company, of course?
- A. Yes, it does. The whole record is there.
- Q. Now, they did receive adequate compensation?
- A. Well, I would not know about that. It was just based on the audit and is subject, probably, to checking again.
- [3878] Q. How often do you post your books of the Rohl-Connolly Company?
- A. Well, what do you mean?

Q. What I mean by that is, do you keep them posted currently?

A. Yes, yes.

Q. Daily?

A. Yes.

Mr. COMBS. I think that is all, Miss Dickey.

Chairman TENNEY. That is all, Miss Dickey, thank you. Miss Dickey and Mrs. Rohl may be excused at this time and we thank you very much.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Pine.

W. BRUCE PINE, called as a witness on behalf of the Committee, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

Chairman TENNEY. Mr. Pine, will you please stand and raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony that you are about to give before this Committee, will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

The WITNESS. I do.

Chairman TENNEY. Will you state your full name?

The WITNESS. Willard Bruce Pine.

Chairman TENNEY. And your residence.

The WITNESS. 320 Carolwood Drive, Los Angeles.

[3879] Chairman TENNEY. Members of the press, we prefer that Mr. Pine's name not be used for publicity because he is currently investigator for the Committee and if you would treat it simply as "an investigator for the Committee" we would appreciate it. We have some rather important reasons for that.

Mr. AUSTIN. Do you mean we are not to mention his testimony?

Chairman TENNEY. You can use his testimony but we don't want you to use Mr. Pine's name.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. Mr. Pine, you are now and have been for some time last past a duly accredited and authorized investigator for the Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities, have you not?

A. That is correct.

Q. And did you do some investigating work on the case of Hans Wilhelm Rohl?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. And when did you commence your investigations?

A. Well, in the early part of last spring—that is, the spring of 1942.

Q. So that your investigations in the case have covered a period of a little short of a year?

A. Yes, almost a year.

Q. Almost a year?

A. Yes.

[3880] Q. In connection with your investigations did you have occasion to examine the files and records in the office of the Immigration and Naturalization Commissioner in the Federal Building in Los Angeles?

A. I did.

Q. As a matter of fact on one occasion you and I went there together, did we not?

A. That is right.

Q. And examined the file for several hours?

A. Yes, that is correct.

Q. Did you read the application signed by the applicant for admission to citizenship?

A. I did.

Q. Did you read the correspondence in the files?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you read the reports from the investigative agents in the file?

A. Yes; I read them all.

Q. Did you read the interrogations of the applicants by an Immigration Inspector?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. A document comprising questions and answers of 20 pages or more?

A. Yes, sir, I read it in its entirety.

Q. As a result of reading the file are you able to testify from your own independent knowledge, gained from [3881] reading the report and recommendations of the investigators for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, as to whether they did or did not recommend that citizenship be granted to the applicant?



A. The investigator's recommendation as shown in that file, is that the applicant not only be denied citizenship but be prosecuted and deported for having entered this country without any re-entry visa on his passport.

Q. Do you recall a letter from F. H. Crocket, of the Immigration and Naturalization Service for Laredo, Texas, dated March 7, 1941, to the effect they had no record whatsoever of Mr. Rohl having been in or out of the United States at that point?

A. Yes, I remember that letter.

Q. Do you recall a statement by Mr. Wilcox Cole or any other official of the Naturalization and Immigration Service, to the effect that in 1932 it was absolutely impossible for an alien to go in and over the border of the United States into Mexico at that point without being questioned as to his citizenship status?

A. Yes, sir, that is exactly as I remember it.

Q. Do you recall a statement in the record to the effect that when the Ramona stopped at Acapulco, Mexico, where it took on gasoline and supplies, there was no record of Rohl being present on the boat either as a passenger or a member of the crew?

[3882] A. That is correct. That is exactly, from my memory, the essence of that particular paper in that file.

Q. Do you recall the letter from Lieutenant Colonel Theodore Wyman, Jr., urging that Rohl be made a citizen and that the case be expedited because he was interested at that time in secret and highly confidential contracts in the Hawaiian Islands?

A. Yes, I read that particular letter several times.

Q. And do you recollect a letter from T. B. Shumaker of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, dated February 4, 1941, asking that the case be made a special case and expediting the case?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Pine, when you examined the file you took notes, did you not?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Do you recall a letter written on the 13th day of March, 1941, by an official of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, stating, in effect, that when the Vega sailed from the west coast to Honolulu, that Rohl was not revealed on the passenger manifest as being a member of the crew or a passenger?

A. In substance that is exactly as I remember it.

Q. And do you recall that the manifest was reported—that is the manifest that was taken at the time the boat anchored off Honolulu, that Mr. Rohl gave his birthplace as [3883] Iola, Kansas?

A. Yes, because I remarked at the time, from previous knowledge, that that was his wife's birthplace, which she had used, and it was a lack of imagination that arose in my mind at the time.

Q. In giving his wife's birthplace in place of his own?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall the statement in the Naturalization and Immigration file to the effect that the Federal income tax return had been made by him under oath as a citizen of the United States?

A. I do.

Q. Do you recall that at least on one of those returns the statement appeared that he had been naturalized in 1921?

A. Yes, I recall that date, 1921, very clearly.

Q. Do you recall a statement in the file made by the applicant, Mr. Rohl, to the effect that the returns were not prepared by him but by someone for him and that he merely signed them?

A. Yes.

Q. And that you then remarked how it was that the person who prepared the returns knew that the applicant had been naturalized in 1921 unless somebody told him?

A. Yes; I remember that conversation very clearly.

Q. Do you recall an inconsistency in the file—one [3884] statement being to the effect—and I am reading from my notes a letter from William A. Carmichael, District Director of Los Angeles, to T. B. Schofield, dated March 4, 1941, regarding the Federal Communications form 501 for radio telephone on the Vega, the letter stating and quoting:

"During the course of investigation it has been learned that the subject executed a sworn affidavit in connection with this Form 501, that he was a citizen of the United States in order to secure the radio-telegraph license for the ship radio

installed on his yacht Vega, the false statement made therein being contrary to the Federal Communication Act of 1934, Section 310, Paragraph 1, wherein it specifically provides in part that 'No radio station license shall be issued to any alien or any corporation or company; any officer of which is an alien or in which more than one-fourth of the stock is owned by an alien.'

Q. Do you recall that, in substance?

A. Yes, I recall that letter.

Q. Then, do you recall also that after a form of application blank was filled, and I have a note on it stating that the yacht Vega was licensed April 1, 1939, as KLVC under the name of the owner as H. W. Rohl.

A. Yes, I recall that.

Q. Then, do you recall the inconsistent portion where [3885] a later entry in the file stated that a mistake had been made and that the applicant for the radio-telephone had actually been signed by Floy Rohl?

A. Yes, I recall that very well.

Mr. COMBS. I think that is all, Mr. Pine.

Chairman TENNEY. Thank you, Mr. Pine. I think that is all for today.

Mr. COMBS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman TENNEY. Very well. The hearing will recess until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning in this same room. It will be an open hearing.

(Whereupon, at 3:30 o'clock p. m., the Committee adjourned to 10:00 o'clock a. m., Monday, March 1, 1943.)

[3886] BEFORE CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE'S JOINT FACT FINDING COMMITTEE  
ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

In the Matter of: HANS WILHELM ROHL, ROHL-CONNOLLY COMPANY,  
HAWAIIAN CONSTRUCTORS and R. W. ROHL COMPANY. Open Session

Met pursuant to the call of the Chairman at 10:00 a. m., Monday, March 1, 1943.

Present: Senator Jack D. Tenney, Chairman, 3207 West 77th Street, Inglewood, California.

Others present: R. E. Combs, Chief Counsel and Investigator.

Reported by: J. D. Ambrose, 322 Wilcox Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif.

[3887]

PROCEEDINGS

Chairman TENNEY. We do not want to divulge the name of our first witness, so I will give you his name at this time so that it will not be necessary to have him announce it at the time he is sworn. Our first witness will be Max Shapiro. Mr. Shapiro resides at 137 South Peck, Beverly Hills, California. The second witness will be Mr. Harry Flannery.

The committee will come to order. The chairman is sitting as a sub-committee pursuant to a resolution passed by the committee at its hearing Saturday.

Will the witness come forward and be sworn? Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before this committee, will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

The WITNESS. I do.

Chairman TENNEY. You have already been identified for the record.

The WITNESS. Yes, sir.

Chairman TENNEY. All right, you may proceed, Mr. Combs.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. Are you acquainted with an individual by the name of Hans Wilhelm Rohl?

A. I know him by the name of Bill Rohl, but that is the same person.

Q. The same person?

A. Yes.

Q. How long have you been acquainted with him?

[3888] A. Since 1936.

Q. Have you been on board his boat the Vega?

A. Yes.

Q. At the time you went aboard the vessel where was it?

A. It was anchored off of Catalina.

Q. Are you acquainted with the group of people—several persons who commonly went aboard the boat on different occasions?

A. Yes.

Q. Were you acquainted with Major Wyman of the United States Army Engineers, who used to visit aboard the boat?

A. I met him, yes.

Q. About how long ago was it that you met him?

A. It was either in 1936 or 1937—the summer or fall of that period.

Q. Were the people with whom you were at that time acquainted, and who used to visit aboard the boat from time to time, also acquainted with Major Wyman?

A. Yes.

Q. How frequently, according to your best recollection, did Major Wyman visit aboard the Vega at that period?

A. Very frequently.

Q. Did you ever see him intoxicated?

A. Yes.

Q. Once or more than once?

[3889] A. Twice.

Q. Do you know what his general reputation for sobriety was among the people who used to visit aboard the boat frequently, and with whom you are acquainted?

A. Yes.

Q. What was it?

A. Not very good.

Q. Would you elaborate on that, please?

A. Well, I would say that he was considered by that group to be a heavy drinker.

Q. Have you, yourself, discussed his drinking habits with those people?

A. Yes.

Q. During how long a period of time, according to your best recollection, did the Major visit aboard the boat?

A. It was during the period of that particular summer and early fall of either 1936 or '37. I had no particular reason to make any record of it.

Q. Yes.

A. So it was either '36 or '37 during the summer and fall—it was during the summer and fall of either one of those two seasons.

Q. Were you ever acquainted with an individual by the name of Werner Plack?

A. Yes.

[3890] Q. When did you first meet him?

A. '35 or '36.

Q. And how long did your acquaintanceship with him continue?

A. During that year—the first year I met him.

Q. What was his nationality, if you know?

A. He claimed to be a Holland Dutchman, but, of course, we found out later that that was not true.

Q. And what was his nationality?

A. It was German.

Mr. COMBS. That is all.

Chairman TENNEY. You are excused. Thank you very much. We will take a few minutes recess.

(Short recess.)

Chairman TENNEY. The committee will come to order. Mr. Anderson, will you be sworn? Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give, will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do.

[3891] RAY ANDERSON, called as a witness by the Committee, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

Chairman TENNEY. Will you stake your full name, please?

The WITNESS. Ray Anderson.

Chairman TENNEY. Where do you reside?

The WITNESS. 2249 20th Street, Santa Monica.

Chairman TENNEY. And what is your occupation?

The WITNESS. Electrician.

Chairman TENNEY. Are you presently employed?

The WITNESS. By the Douglas Company.

Chairman TENNEY. All right, Mr. Combs.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. Mr. Anderson, how long have you resided in Southern California?

A. 12 years.

Q. Prior to that time where was your residence?

A. I lived in New York City for 15 years.

Q. How long have you been engaged in the electrical business?

A. All my life.

Q. Were you ever acquainted with Hans Wilhelm Rohl?

A. Yes.

Q. When did you first make his acquaintance?

A. I think about the end of February, 1942.

Q. Are you acquainted with an organization known as the Hawaiian Constructors?

[3892] A. Yes; I worked for them eight months.

Q. When were you first employed by that concern?

A. January 14, last year.

Q. And where were you employed?

A. In San Francisco.

Q. Did you leave San Francisco and go to the Hawaiian Islands to enter into your duties for that company?

A. I did.

Q. Who employed you?

A. A man by the name of Fitzgerald, I think it was.

Q. In San Francisco?

A. Yes, in San Francisco.

Q. And when did you leave for the Hawaiian Islands?

A. Somewhere about the 6th of February.

Q. Did you go by airplane or by boat?

A. We went by boat, the Lurline.

Q. Were any other employees of the Hawaiian Constructors aboard the vessel when you were?

A. There were 1171 of us.

Q. 1171 of you?

A. Yes.

Q. And did you go from San Francisco to the Island of Oahu?

A. I did.

Q. And you were there employed, were you, as an electrician for the Hawaiian Constructors?

[3893] A. Yes.

Q. Were your pay checks drawn on the Hawaiian Constructors or on the War Department?

A. United States Treasury checks, all of them, except one. We were paid \$1.25 per day on the boat going over there and that check was a Hawaiian Constructors check, signed by Mr. Woolley,—Ralph Woolley.

Q. Will you spell that?

A. W-o-o-l-l-e-y.

Q. What was his position with the Hawaiian Constructors, if you know?

A. He was chairman of the executive board which was composed of Mr. Rohl and Mr. Benson—three of them.

Q. What were Mr. Benson's initials, do you know?

A. I don't remember.

Q. Do you remember his first name?

A. No, I don't.

Q. And other than the one check drawn on the Hawaiian Constructors all of the other checks were drawn on the United States Treasury Department?

A. All on the Treasury, that is right.

Q. Now, when you first arrived at the Island of Oahu in pursuance to your new employment, where did you go?

A. Ponahou School.

Q. Where was that located?

A. That was located in Honolulu. I think it would be [3894] called the southeast part of Honolulu.

Q. Just what did your duties comprise as an electrician for the Hawaiian Constructors?

A. Three days after I was there—after I arrived there, I was taken to General Emmon's headquarters in the mountains, about three or four miles from Fort Shafter, with a construction gang.

Q. Go ahead, Mr. Anderson.

A. And we worked there until the beginning of April, constructing electrical equipment, when they moved in there on December 7. They had thrown wire all

over the place and they brought in a couple of Diesel engines and a transformer bank and just the soldiers had hooked it up on nails and wire any way they could get it, and we went in there to clean that mess up and put it in proper order. And when we finished, I was asked by Major Henderson to remain there as maintenance electrician.

Q. Now, had the Hawaiian Constructors done any work on the Island of Oahu, to your knowledge, before you arrived there?

A. There were some men out at one or two of the fields there. Now, exactly how much they had done I don't know. They were a group that went there in October or November ahead of us.

Chairman TENNEY. That would be 1941?

The WITNESS. 1941.

[3895] By Mr. COMBS:

Q. Did your activities in pursuance of your duties take you generally around the Island of Oahu?

A. On our off days we went all over the place. We had friends at different places and they had camps scattered all over the Island.

Q. The Hawaiian Constructors?

A. They were doing all of the civilian work for the Army on the Island of Oahu.

Q. Who was in charge of those installations and the construction activities for the Army?

A. They had split it up into areas. There were 14 areas and there was a superintendent of each area.

Q. A civilian superintendent?

A. Yes, civilian superintendent, who belonged to the Hawaiian Constructors, and with him there were always officers or an engineer from the U. S. E. D.

Q. Who was that?

A. Colonel Wyman.

Q. Colonel Wyman was in charge?

A. Yes.

Q. That was Colonel Theodore Wyman, Jr.?

A. Yes.

Q. You have seen him, have you not?

A. Oh, I have talked to him.

Q. Now, I show you a sketch which is marked Committee Exhibit No. 1, and which purports to be a sketch of the Island [3896] of Oahu, and ask you whether or not that is a fairly representative map of the general configuration of Oahu.

(Handing exhibit to the witness.)

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you familiar with Pearl Harbor?

A. Yes.

Q. Which I have indicated here?

A. Yes. I was located right in front of this hill here (indicating).

Q. In front of Red Hill?

A. Yes.

Q. You know where Pearl City is?

A. Yes; I have been out there too.

Q. And you see where Hickam Field is delineated on the map?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the City of Honolulu?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And going around the Point up to the southeast coast you see Bellows Field?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the Naval Hospital?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And Kahuko?

A. They had that—

Q. The base yard was there. (indicating)?

[3897] A. That is right.

Q. Now, going down from the northerly tip of the Island in a general south-westerly direction, there is Kiema Point and Schofield Barracks?

A. And I had worked there.

Q. And Wheeler Field?

A. Yes.

Q. And Kapoku Gulch, Eva and Barbers Point?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are familiar with those places, are you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you personally visit all of those points?

A. Yes, sir; we went all over the place but not in the capacity of working, because I didn't work any place except in the headquarters. You see, as far as my actual work was concerned, I did not go to those other places, but I had friends in several of the camps that we used to visit, one and another and get around that way. Of course, it isn't much of a drive around the Island.

Q. Did you do any work at Red Hill?

A. No; the Navy had the Red Hill job but the Constructors sent men up there.

Q. The Hawaiian Constructors?

A. Yes, sir; I never did quite understand what the setup was at Red Hill. There was several men sent there. Whether they were transferred to the Naval contractors or [3898] whoever had that job I don't know.

Q. You are positive, are you not, that Hawaiian Constructors did send some of their employees to work at Red Hill?

A. They sent men in there because people out of Ponahou School went into that camp.

Q. And the school was where the Hawaiian Constructors maintained their headquarters?

A. Yes, sir, Alexander Hall was their headquarters.

Q. Do you know whether or not most of the installations at Red Hill were underground?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. They were, were they not?

A. Yes, sir; they all were underground—underground tanks and tunnels from there to Pearl Harbor.

Q. Now, did the Hawaiian Constructors put in any gun emplacements in the Island of Oahu?

A. They did work at Fort Camp and their electricians hooked up the guns there.

Q. Did they put in any ammunition dumps?

A. They handled oil dumps—all kinds of things of that kind—eight-inch guns, twelve-inch guns, which they did all of the concrete work on.

Q. Do you know whether or not they installed any underground facilities for the storage of ammunition?

A. They had some tunnels at Bellows Field and also near [3899] Wheeler Field. Now, whether they were going to be ammunition dumps I could not say.

Q. The Hawaiian Constructors did work at Hickam Field, did they not?

A. Yes.

Q. Did they do any work in Ewa?

A. That I can't say. There was a Marine Base at Ewa. There was a Marine runway and airfield near Ewa, but I never knew they did do any work on that field.

Q. Now, Mr. Anderson, did the Hawaiian Constructors do any work on the east coast of the Island of Oahu near Skailua Bay in the construction of Naval works?

A. Kahuku Point.

Q. Now, is that on the northeast coast of the Island?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was the general nature of the work done there?

A. They had a small field there.

Q. What kind of field?

A. Small airfield.

Q. I see.

A. And I think fortifications up in the hills. I didn't go up into there.

Q. Was any work done on the east coast for a Naval hospital by the Hawaiian Constructors?

A. I don't know that they did the Naval Hospital.

Q. When did you first make the acquaintance of Major [3900] Wyman or Colonel Wyman? Was he a colonel when you knew him?

A. Colonel? When we went there he was a colonel.

Q. Did you have frequent contact with him?

A. I met him three times, and it was always a battle over our food and our bedding.

Q. How were your general living conditions there?

A. Rotten.

Q. Will you elaborate on that, please?

A. Well, I will tell you. They issued us Army rations. They used Rice Hall and another hall down in the school as mess rooms. One hall had been fixed up for the men and the other evidently for the staff, but the men kept going backward and forward from one to the other, the whole gang. They would eat wherever they wanted to—in either hall. But they had eggs and meat and stuff like that that we could not eat. We would get up in the morning for breakfast and the stuff would be so cold that you could stretch the eggs like rubber and you couldn't get a second helping of food without paying 35 cents for it, so I got to Colonel Wyman on that question, and finally he turned me over to Woolley and Middleton, and Woolley and I went to it about the beds.

Now, in the meantime they had three truckloads of beds dumped into the basement of Castle Hall. I had seen the trucks going in there and empty beds and mattresses and we were sleeping on veneer boards.

Q. How many of you were quartered in that particular [3901] locality?

A. In that particular building I think there were 288—something like that—between 275 and 300.

Woolley finally—I was sent in to see Woolley, and I went in to see him and I went in and talked to him about the beds and he told me he would meet me in Castle Hall, and he came over there and Middleton came with him.

Q. That is C. C. Middleton?

A. Yes, C. C. Middleton, who was administrator for the Hawaiian Constructors in the Hawaiian Islands—he was in the headquarters.

Q. Headquarters where?

A. Alexander Hall.

Q. Yes.

A. And Middleton told me that—I was kicking about the eggs, and Mr. Woolley told me that they couldn't buy them. I told him it was not a question of buying eggs, that we had the eggs but they were being ruined the way they were cooked.

We were allowed \$75 a month for food and the civilians that did not belong to us could come in and eat in those halls for 35 cents a meal or \$1.05 a day and we were paying, roughly, \$2.50.

Colonel Wyman informed me that as far as the beds were concerned, the General had issued an order that a man could sleep on the ground like a soldier. I told him that that was O. K. with me provided we have to, but not when beds are idle [3902] in the basement. He finally told George Campbell he could do anything for us in an administrative way he liked, but not one nickel was to be spent on us.

Q. How long did that condition continue?

A. I think we got the beds about a week—I think it was Thursday I saw Wyman the last time and on the following Tuesday night the man in charge of the hall informed me that we would start changing beds the next morning. In the meantime Ralph Woolley told me to get inside somewhere, due to my cold—that it might lead to pneumonia in the Islands.

Q. Do you have a claim against the Hawaiian Constructors for Compensation?

A. Yes, \$682. They have \$125 cash of my money.

Q. In addition to the \$600?

A. They took that from my pay.

Q. What was the reason for that?

A. That was for fare home, or fare over there—expenses somewhere or other.

Q. What effort, if any, have you made to collect that sum?

A. I tried through the Attorney General, I tried through the State Compensation in this building, and they informed me here that we were out of the State, and I made a claim that the contract was drawn within this State and that whatever took place outside of the State the responsibility lay here, and then I tried to find out whether the Constructors [3903] were registered in this State. If not, it was a criminal offense to start out with, and I don't know to this day whether the Constructors ever registered in the State of California.

Q. They did not register with the Franchise Tax Commission I can tell you that.

A. I would like to mention something else. There is a contract drawn between Hawaiian Constructors and I think 449 engineers—602 or 662.

Q. 414, isn't it?

A. It might be 414. It is 400 and something. I wanted to get a hold of that contract because all of us over there thought that part of the contract had us

tied down and we thought that we had been taken there under subversive setup. Now, our contract price was \$225 a month for 44 hours, which I claim was illegal on the 40-hour basis in this State and the United States.

And further, they didn't want to pay us overtime. They tried to make us work 48 hours.

Now, Wyman was behind all of that with Rohl and Woolley and Benson backing him up.

Q. Did you see Rohl and Wyman together in the Islands?

A. No, I didn't. I will tell you—up to the time Wyman left there his office was on the sixth floor of the Young Building at the corner of King and Bishop Streets in Honolulu.

[3904] Woolley and Rohl and Benson were installed in the Alexandria Hall when I arrived in Honolulu and they were there all the time and were there when I left.

Q. When did you leave Honolulu to return to the United States?

A. Somewhere around the 9th of August.

Q. Were you discharged, or did you resign?

A. No. On the 10th of July they came out with an increase in our pay to \$1.45 an hour. You see, on the overtime we were getting \$9.00 a day and then they came out with that. They would give us the rate but would reduce our subsistence allowance to \$45.00 a month and pay us \$1.45. As we were living on soldier rations we didn't see we were losing by it, so we took that.

On the 30th of June the doctor discharged me for varicose veins and my pay stopped that day and I never had another dime out of the Constructors.

Q. Now, while you were over there, Mr. Anderson, did you ever have any occasion to see Major Wyman in an intoxicated condition?

A. Yes.

Q. When was that?

A. During February and March and five days before Colonel Wyman left his job he lay in the hotel drunk all the time.

Q. For how long a time.

[3905] A. Five days.

Q. Do you know that of your own personal knowledge?

A. Yes, I can prove it.

Q. While you were working over there, Mr. Anderson, were there any Japanese employed by the Hawaiian Constructors in executive capacities?

A. There were Japanese in the office, Japanese superintendents—that is, superintendents over—not of an area but superintendents over different constructors, such as carpenters and electricians, and gangs like that; the Merchant Electrical Contractors and Supply Company which Vera—

Q. Who is the head of that?

A. Vera. They employed 36 electricians. They came into our gang. When I left Honolulu, two days before I sailed I was at their stockroom and five of our men were in this Japanese gang. They worked out of area 10.

Q. Was a portion of the work actually supervised by Japanese?

A. Yes. The Japanese were permitted to go into every part of the Island except Pearl Harbor and Diamond Head tunnels and General Emmons tunnels, where the headquarters were.

Now, I went on to Hickam Field after I was there, I think, two weeks, with a Hawaiian Constructors' badge on me. I spent three hours in there. I went all over the hangars and everywhere and I came back up to G2 and talked to the captain there about it, asking why in the world that they permitted people [3906] with those badges to walk into a place like Hickam Field with the setup they had there, and he said he didn't know.

Q. When was that?

A. That was in the early part of March of last year.

Chairman TENNEY. 1942?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Chairman TENNEY. Let me ask a question, Mr. Combs.

Is it your statement, Mr. Anderson, that these Japanese had considerable to do with the supervision of the work on the island?

The WITNESS. They were working in the office and in places where they have the plans of the United States Engineers. They had them in the offices with them. They were in every position there except certain places. They could not go into Diamond Head Tunnel or General Emmons Tunnel or into Pearl Harbor. You had to have special passes that were good only for that particular setup in those places. They could not go there but everywhere else that I know



of on the island, including Hickam Field they could go. Last August the Japanese were working in there.

Chairman TENNEY. Were those in the category of secret installations?

The WITNESS. Well, I should say that they would be because they had the Aircobras and the Boeings and all the big airplanes scattered throughout those fields.

The men had a row at Bellows Field and refused to work [3907] for one day, or a part of a day, until certain Japanese were removed from there. That was some time last April.

Chairman TENNEY. 1942?

The WITNESS. Yes, sir.

Chairman TENNEY. It is your testimony that the Japanese had considerable to do with the supervision of the work?

The WITNESS. They tell you there that the Japanese are 90 per cent more loyal than we are ourselves.

Chairman TENNEY. That is what they tell you in Hawaii?

The WITNESS. They tell you that in Hawaii. They tell you that they don't like us there. There is no fooling about that.

Chairman TENNEY. The Japanese you mean?

The WITNESS. No, the white people that live with the Japanese. There is a peculiar financial setup in the Hawaiian Islands in which the sugar interests dictate the financial setup there. The poor man was never able to get any money there. The only place he can get money or credit is from the Japanese banks and stores and consequently he is friendly to the Japanese.

It was my firm opinion from the time I got there that they didn't particularly care whether we had the Islands or whether the Japanese had them.

Chairman TENNEY. It was immaterial?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Chairman TENNEY. Were these Japanese that you have referred [3908] to employees of the Hawaiian Constructors?

The WITNESS. Yes. You see, a civilian there, except a few engineers when we went there belonged to the Constructors—they were working under the U. S. E. D. I will tell you it is a super W. P. A. set-up.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. You mean the United States Engineer Corps?

A. U. S. E. D. Just like you had with the W. P. A. in the States. That is what they called it.

Q. What did that stand for?

A. I never did know—U. S. Engineer Department, I guess.

Q. Mr. Rohl testified, Mr. Anderson, that he was personally directing the work on the Island of Oahu and under him worked these individuals whom you have mentioned as superintendents, on the various projects. Was that the fact when you were there?

A. Mr. Woolley was considered the head.

Q. Yes.

A. He was the chairman of the executive committee which consisted of Mr. Woolley, Rohl and Benson. Now, whether Rohl—I have always believed that Ralph Woolley was the front man.

Q. A front man?

A. Yes. Ralph Woolley was the man who would do the right thing if he could. He talked very little. You could [3909] get very little out of Ralph Woolley.

Q. Who did you believe he was fronting for?

A. For the outfit that came from here. There is some connection between this gang in the States and that outfit and they wanted men from there so if there is any question raised there is a possibility that we would get out of it.

Q. In what business was Mr. Dillingham engaged?

A. They were part of the Constructors and pulled out I think in May or June.

Q. Of 1942?

A. 1942, yes. For some reason Dillingham came out and the assistant superintendent in area 10. I don't remember his name at the present time. He was taken from there and sent to Johnson Island with certain men that he took with him.

Q. Did the Hawaiian Constructors also do work on Johnson Island?

A. I don't know whether they did or not. They did work at Christmas and Canton. General Tinker ran them out of Christmas Island.

Q. For what reason?

A. Weren't getting any work done.

Q. After the battle of Midway did the Hawaiian Constructors do any work on Midway?

A. There were some men went over there. There was a fellow by the name of Miller here in Glendale who went there on the air conditioning. He was a Hawaiian Constructors man. [3910] He was over there 10 days. He came back in the same convoy. I don't know anything about him personally, but they had five or six men out there—shipped them somewhere where we didn't even know. Miller told me then that he had to go to Midway and what had taken place in Midway.

Now, there is another feature behind this whole thing of which I can only give you indirect evidence. If I can find the man today I will get him.

Last year, in March or April there were 180 men shipped to New Caledonia by the Hawaiian Constructors. They didn't even know where they were going. When they arrived there in New Caledonia they found out it was a French Possession and refused to land. They said, "Anywhere in American territory but not in foreign territory," so they came back. They brought them back to camp. They were shipped to sea in an open barge with an ocean-going tug pulling them for five and a half days to Suva. I saw the letter signed by the Governor of Suva to the effect that if those men crossed certain lines they were to be shot down. That was Governor Wild.

Q. When was that trip to Suva made?

A. Some time, I think, in March. I met the man in April.

Q. March, 1942?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was the nature of the work that that party was to do?

[3911] A. They went out there—they were building an airfield and submarine base.

Q. Building an airfield and submarine base?

A. Yes.

Q. And that was the Hawaiian Constructors?

A. Yes.

Q. On the Island of Suva?

A. No, on the Island of Canton.

Q. Canton Island?

A. Yes. They pulled them out from there to Suva.

Q. Are you acquainted with Paul Grafe?

A. Is this the gentleman here?

Q. No, No, I am just asking you.

A. No, I don't remember, but this gentleman's face is familiar to me.

Q. Did Mr. Rohl make frequent trips away from the Island of Oahu while you were there?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you explain what you observed in that regard?

A. Well, I will tell you. When Rohl left his car—he always parked his car on the lot—Rohl parked right behind Alexandria Hall when he used to go there to eat and, of course, we could always tell when he wasn't in Honolulu.

Q. You could tell what?

A. That he was gone.

Q. Rohl was gone?

[3912] A. Yes, because it was impossible to follow him. There was a rumpus raised in San Francisco when some of the men came back in regard to their pay and the claim was filed with the Compensation Commissioner here for \$8,000 and Rohl was—he flew back here. We never saw Rohl that time for three or four weeks. He disappeared completely and finally he showed up again.

Q. Now, you are speaking about the parking space which was allocated to Mr. Rohl. Where was that parking space?

A. Exactly behind the back door of Alexandria Hall, the headquarters.

Q. Was there any marking or designation on it?

A. Yes.

Q. To show to whom each individual space was allocated to?

A. Rohl, Middleton, Woolley and Benson each had a spot there.

Q. Were their names painted on the asphalt?

A. No; there was a fence rail—a one by three plank painted white there with their names on each one of them.

Q. In black paint?

A. Black paint.

Q. Were you familiar with the automobile commonly used by Mr. Rohl when he was on the Island?

A. Yes, he used a black car then.

Q. Of course you were able to observe at times, the car [3913] was occupying the space which was allocated to him?

A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN. TENNEY. Mr. Anderson, have you any further light you can throw on this matter that you think might be of interest?

The WITNESS. I would like to go into something about the plans. We never did, and to my knowledge to the day I left there, we never had a plan for the headquarters job that we did.

They left a hole in the tunnel six by seven foot that never was closed up.

Mr. COMBS. What tunnel?

The WITNESS. Headquarters of the United States Army, Hawaiian Department, and things of that kind. We couldn't get material, we couldn't get anything. You couldn't get anybody to do anything.

We believed that sabotage, in the sense that they were holding up the work and blaming the men, was going on.

Q. By Mr. COMBS. Who was holding up the work?

A. Whoever had charge of it.

Q. Of the Hawaiian Constructors?

A. Evidently, because they were our bosses.

Q. You say this tunnel was located—the United States Army headquarters tunnel was located where?

A. In that tunnel.

Q. Where was the tunnel on the Island?

[3914] A. Right in front of Red Hill.

Q. That is what I want.

A. There is a big magazine there.

Q. And Red Hill overlooks Pearl Harbor?

A. Yes, and there is a hill in front of Red Hill towards Hickam Field. This hill lays between Hickam Field and Red Hill. There were eight tunnels there and they had lateral tunnels and they had been preparing that for a year. The soldiers had driven a vehicular tunnel through the west end of it, from one end to the other of it.

We went in there and we fixed it up so it was gas-proof and installed all kinds of equipment, including air-conditioning and stuff like that. We did it without plans and without any help from anyone whatever.

Q. Who was in charge—who, individually, was in charge of that installation?

A. The superintendent was Charles Winstead.

Q. Did he work under the immediate direction of Mr. Rohl?

A. He was working under him—he was working under—I will think of his name in a minute—Frank Olmstead, or something like that. He was the Army superintendent.

Q. Under whom did Mr. Olmstead work?

A. Under headquarters at Alexandria Hall.

Q. And Alexandria Hall was where Mr. Rohl's car was parked?

[3915] A. Yes, that is where the Hawaiian Constructors headquarters were. They had all their equipment there except the personnel department, which was in a school—a grammar school.

Q. Mr. Anderson, how do you know Colonel Wyman was intoxicated for five days?

A. Well, I saw him up there three or four times and everyone that is in there—the place was run for that purpose, practically. Japanese girls hanging out there every night for that crowd and the ones that stay in the main part of the hotel—you see the hotel is split up into several large bungalows or dormitories outside, and then the hotel proper was occupied by some Army officers and Colonel Wyman.

Q. Including Colonel Wyman?

A. Yes.

Q. What was Colonel Wyman's general reputation among the employees of the Hawaiian Constructors for sobriety?

A. Colonel Wyman was a man who liked liquor exceptionally well. He may never get drunk, but he likes it.

Q. What do you mean, "he may never get drunk"?

A. A lot of them can carry a lot of liquor and you don't think they are drunk.

Q. But you testified that he was drunk for five days.

A. Yes, he was.

Q. Have you seen people in an intoxicated condition before?

[3916] A. Oh, yes.

Q. And that would be your opinion of his condition during those five days?

A. Absolutely.

Mr. COMBS. I think that is all unless you have something else to add that you think might be helpful to the committee.

The WITNESS. Well, some of the stuff wouldn't have anything on this matter, but I wish this thing could be brought to the attention of Washington.

Q. We wish so too.

A. Things are rotten out there. There is no kidding about it. I am an American 61 years old, and I went to Honolulu with the idea of helping out and I tell you honestly once I finished that job there it done no good. I tore stuff apart there five and six times and put it together. There was never any reason for it. Charlie Winstead, who I was speaking about, treated me fine but still down in a man's heart he is not an American in any sense or form because he believes the Japanese is the right fellow and I know he is not.

There isn't a question on earth but everything has been blocked up there, either from Washington or some other position, and it is about time that somebody did something about it. Emmons is absolutely helpless now. I hear a lot of things in that tunnel because I work in those offices with them while business was going on, and we hear a lot of things that we can't talk about any place unless it goes into the [3917] place where something will be done about it.

I made three reports to G2 because I would walk right into them and talk to them. They knew of the things that happened, but there was never anything done about it.

Chairman TENNEY. Was there any discussion with reference to the loyalty of these men to the United States?

The WITNESS. I will tell you candidly as far as our men were concerned, Senator, I don't think there was any of them—the majority of the men that went over there were men over 40 years old and the only reason they were there was because they could not take a gun. I have been quite a bit here in Southern California and worked on these defense jobs and I couldn't understand why the young men didn't want to go to war, but that gang of men that went there really wanted to go and do some good, and most of them were so disgusted after six weeks they didn't know what to do, and it was our idea that the thing was done with the purpose of making us disgusted, and they could put it down that we wouldn't work.

Now, I have been in defense work ever since December of last year with the idea of trying to help out. I am an electrician and a good one. I had a contractor's license in this State and I know what I am doing, and when you turn around and find things like that it hurts down deep because you know that certain men, either for money or for some other reason, are destroying the morale of the workers.

Chairman TENNEY. What I mean, Mr. Anderson, was there [3918] reflection or opinion expressed in reference to the loyalty of the men that were in charge of all this work?

The WITNESS. The men out there thought Wyman and the whole gang of them ought to be shot. That is the truth.

Chairman TENNEY. You know that of your own knowledge?

The WITNESS. Yes, I do.

Chairman TENNEY. And upon what did they base that particular opinion?

The WITNESS. The accusations of them. We couldn't get paid. We couldn't get our overtime. We couldn't get nothing at all. We would get, "This is a new setup. This is this and that is that," and other things. One man told me out of his own mouth that we were at sea four days before they knew we were coming and they didn't know how many were coming until we actually landed.

Chairman TENNEY. I am referring more specifically to the progress of the work and the way it was carried on.

The WITNESS. The work has dragged. They will be another year. They have moved hills and moved them back again, and they have filled and holes and dug them out again; and I will swear that that runway, from what I can hear of it, at Bellows Field, has been done a dozen times.

Chairman TENNEY. Do you think that has been done intentionally?

The WITNESS. I do. I honestly believe it is intentional. After the Battle of Midway it was a great thing while [3919] it happened, and those planes came in and out of there for three days. We needed those fields but they weren't ready. They sent a man from here to be a superintendent who belonged to the Musicians Local 47. They put him on the job and in three days shipped him home.

Chairman TENNEY. What was his name?

The WITNESS. I will think of it in a minute. His name is on the tip of my tongue. Going over on the boat he sent for me. He was making up a gang.

Chairman TENNEY. You can't recall his name?

The WITNESS. Not just now. He worked for the Abbott Kinney Company in 1921 as a maintenance electrician. From there he went into a band and carried a card in Musicians Local 47.

Chairman TENNEY. I think that is all, Mr. Anderson. We thank you very much for coming before the Committee.

The WITNESS. I hope you can do something about it.

Mr. COMBS. We appreciate your cooperation very much. I will call Mr. Pine for a few more questions.

[3920] WILLIAM BRUCE PINE, having heretofore been duly sworn, was recalled for further examination.

Chairman TENNEY. You have already been sworn, Mr. Pine?

The WITNESS. Yes, sir.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. You were here on Saturday, were you not?

A. Yes.

Q. Were you here during the entire time that Mr. Hans Wilhelm Rohl testified?

A. I was.

Q. Had you ever met that man before?

A. Yes, on several occasions.

Q. When did you first make his acquaintance? About how long ago?

A. I would say roughly, about 1933 or '34.

Q. And since the time that your acquaintance with him originated, have you met him on various occasions since?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you hear him testify specifically that he had never known a man by the name of Werner Plack?

A. I did.

Q. Did you ever know Werner Plack?

A. Yes, I knew Werner fairly well.

Q. When did you acquaintance with him commence?

A. I should say about the year 1935.

[3921] Q. What was his nationality, if you know?

A. He was German.

Q. Do you know whether or not Mr. Rohl and Mr. Plack were acquainted?

A. I know definitely they were acquainted.

Q. Did you see them together on several occasions?

A. I saw them together on one occasion, which naturally stands out in my mind, and the other occasions—so many years have gone by and I had no reason to mark the occasion, that I hesitate to testify definitely. But on one occasion I specifically saw them together because something occurred which made me remember it.

Q. Was that the occasion concerning which I questioned Mr. Rohl in your presence on Saturday?

A. That was the occasion.

Q. That was when Mr. Rohl and Mr. Plack came into the place commonly known as the Swing Club together?

A. Yes. It had been known as the Swing Club and then the name was changed to "1710 Club" which was the name of the same place.

Q. It was the same, identical place?

A. Yes, same identical place and the same identical building.

Q. About when was that? I mean when you saw them together there?

A. Well, I believe it was in the summer of either [3922] 1938 or 1939. The reason I recall that it must have been during the summer was because I had been to a baseball game earlier in the evening.

Q. Did Mr. Plack and Mr. Rohl come to that place together?

A. They came together with one other gentleman whom I did not recognize. He was a tall, distinguished looking, white haired man.

Q. What particular incident occurred at that time and place which called your attention to the fact that Mr. Rohl and Mr. Plack were together? Of course, you knew them both, did you not?

A. Yes, I knew them both. I might say I knew Plack at that time better than Rohl because I have never known Rohl intimately, although I met him many times and talked with him.

Q. What incident occurred which called your particular attention to the fact that they were together at that time and place?

A. Well, they ran a little floor show at the Swing Club and the floor show was going on when all of a sudden the orchestra leader stopped the music. He stopped the music and he stopped the floor show. The music changed, and all the girls in the floor show, including the band, sang, "Here comes Bill, here comes Bill, here comes Bill Rohl now," so that was why it was so vividly marked in my recollection, [3923] and with him were Werner Plack and the one other man who I never remember having seen before or since.

Mr. COMBS. That is all. Did they sit at the same table?

A. Oh, yes, they sat at the same table and rapidly acquired other guests.

Q. How long were they there?

A. Well, I think they were there for at least two hours, and they were still there when I left.

Q. Together?

A. Yes, together.

Mr. COMBS. That is all.

Chairman TENNEY. Thank you, Mr. Pine.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Flannery.

Chairman TENNEY. Will you please hold up your right hand and be sworn? Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before the committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. FLANNERY. Yes.

[3924] HARRY FLANNERY, called as a witness by the Committee, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

Chairman TENNEY. Will you state your full name?

The WITNESS. Harry Flannery.

Chairman TENNEY. And your address, Mr. Flannery?

The WITNESS. 6766 Milner Road, Hollywood.

Chairman TENNEY. And your occupation?

The WITNESS. Radio news analyst.

Chairman TENNEY. All right, Mr. Combs.

By Mr. Combs:

Q. Mr. Flannery, how long have you resided in southern California?

A. A little short of a year.

Q. Prior to that time where was your residence?

A. Prior to that time my residence was in New York.

Q. And how long did you reside in New York immediately prior to coming to southern California?

A. From October, 1941, until I came here, which was in March of last year.

Q. And from where did you come when you established your last residence in New York?

A. From Berlin, Germany.

Q. And how long a time did you spend in Berlin, Germany?

A. Approximately a year.

Q. How did you happen to go there?

[3925] A. I was sent to Berlin as correspondent for the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Q. And was it your business to make broadcasts from Berlin?

A. Right.

Q. Which you did, of course?

A. Right.

Q. During the entire period you were there?

A. Yes.

Q. While there did you know a man by the name of Werner Plack?

A. I did.

Q. When did your acquaintance with him originate?

A. Early in 1941.

Q. That was when you first went to Berlin?

A. I had been there several months at that time. I arrived in 1940.

Q. How did you happen to make his acquaintance?

A. I made his acquaintance through Charlie Lanius of N. B. C.

Lanius had met Plack, who had just come to Berlin and was at the time connected with the radio department for the German foreign office.

Lanius brought Plack up to my room and I met him up there, and we talked afterwards. I met Plack a number of times principally because of his connections with radio for [3926] the foreign office. He was a censor and he also arranged programs. He arranged the Wodehouse release.

Q. Spell that, please.

A. P. G. Wodehouse, an English author who was released from an internment camp and then principally because of publicity he broadcast for the Germans. Plack arranged that.

Q. Plack arranged that?

A. Yes, he got the idea it would be a good stunt to release Wodehouse and make a little publicity out of it, because Wodehouse would be more listened to than some of the Germans who were on the air, and they might, thereby be able to get over their story better.

He also planned, so far as I know, to put on Luckner, the Sea Devil—Count Felix von Luckner, who is well known in this country and who has been well liked; also the Crown Prince.

Q. The Crown Prince of Germany?

A. Yes; one of the Eckeners and a number of others of that same kind, figuring that these people would get audiences in the United States and German propaganda would be more listened to.

Q. Do you know whether or not Werner Plack had any connection with Fritz Weidemann at any time?

A. Not from personal knowledge, although I understand he was connected with Fritz Weidemann before he left California.

[3927] He principally sold wines here. He came out here to go into the movies but found out that he wasn't able to get into the movies and instead made connections by selling wine, German wines, principally.

Q. Do you know whether or not Werner Plack had any connection with Dr. Geisling, the German consul, while in the United States?

A. I know nothing of that.

Q. Now, will you please describe in detail, Mr. Flannery, just what duties Plack had to perform in connection with his position with the German foreign office while you were in Berlin?

A. Well, his principal duties were to arrange broadcasts to go to the United States.

Q. Yes.

A. He was not the head of that department. The head of that department was a fellow by the name of Lilyenfeldt. His first name escapes me—George von Lilyenfeldt. At times when Lilyenfeldt was away Plack had complete charge of the department for the foreign office.

For several months, three or four months after the Russian campaign had begun, Lilyenfeldt, who had been a resident of the Baltic States, was sent up there to do some work, and during that period Plack was completely in charge of the radio department.

Among his duties was to act as a censor for the foreign [3928] office for radio broadcasts to the United States.

I might mention that at least one-third of the times that he came out to do the censoring he was drunk and a few occasions he was so tight he could not ready my copy, and one night he asked me to read it to him, which was very foolish. I could have read him anything and he would have O. K.'d it, except he thought something should be changed in it, so he suggested, "Let us change this thing up here," and he started scratching out stuff. I had to stop him because I could not read anything after he would get through with that sort of thing.

In addition to acting as censor he was one of the contact men for us who would arrange for us to go on various trips. For instance, when Matsuoko came there he arranged the trip for me. We met Matsuoko and went down to Potsdam and he would always arrange those things, whereby we would be able to make other trips and make other contacts and so forth.

The foreign office propoganda ministry had men for that particular purpose. Their job also was trying to make us fellows feel better and thereby hoping we might be sold more on Nazi Germany.

They had men selected for that purpose to try to sell the correspondents.

Q. Was Plack one of those men?

A. Plack was one of those men. Of course Plack liked it very well because it gave him a big expense account.

[3929] Q. He was rather convivially inclined?

A. Oh, yes, he would like a job of that kind.

Q. As a matter of fact, you mentioned Plack in your books, "Assignment to Berlin," did you not?

A. That is right.

Q. How is the book doing?

A. Pretty well, thank you.

Q. A very interesting book.

A. Thank you.

Q. When did you come back from Germany?

A. I arrived back here October 14. I left Berlin September 29, 1941.

Q. Do you know at all how long it was after Werner Plack arrived in Germany that he obtained this position in the German foreign office?

A. As far as I know, it was immediately.

Q. Immediately upon his arriving?

A. I know of no lapse in between. Of course, there may have been, but I know of none.

Q. Do you know when he arrived there, about?

A. No. I estimate it was—that is pretty difficult for me to place, because I don't seem to be able to connect it with anything except the fact I mentioned Lanius—that Lanius did not arrive until early in 1941 and that I met him with Lanius, so I know it was early in 1941, but I cannot place it more definitely than that. I can't set it as to what [3930] part of January or whenever it was.

Chairman TENNEY. It was early in 1941?

The WITNESS. Early in 1941, yes.

Q. By Mr. COMBS. Mr. Flannery, in your conversations with Werner Plack from time to time, did he ever boastfully mention any of his propoganda activities in the United States—and of his pro-German activities in the United States?

A. Yes, in a certain respect. He is a peculiar fellow. He had an article from one of the magazines over here. I think it was one of the movies magazines. I am not sure of that. I remember he had it. He had all kinds of American magazines, particular Vogue, which he liked to show to the ladies, in which there was an article about German people who had operated in the United States, and accused them of espionage, and merely among the names down at the end was "Werner Plack," which he seemed to be very proud of. He took it around and showed it to everybody. It did not in any way speak very respectfully of Mr. Plack but he did not seem to be bothered by that fact.

Q. I think that is all, Mr. Flannery, unless you have something to add, which you think might be helpful to the committee.

A. I think that is about all. Oh, there is one thing we might put in. This is a story he hold us there—how he left the country.

[3931] Q. Yes.

A. He left under considerable cloud. He said that all of his telephone calls had been checked and he said that he had been making them to girls. He was always talking about how he got along with the ladies, and he had been making telephone calls all over the country to the girls he knew, but he said that the F. B. I. was suspicious and that he had been grilled so much that he had not been able to sleep one night before he left on the boat, and that when he did get on the boat the F. B. I. continued to grill him and to go over all his papers that he was taking back with him and that he had a lot of American cigarettes—the Germans like American cigarettes, and that they had broken every second cigarette in two to see whether he had anything in them. And he also told about the incident in which he was in one of the night clubs here and some resident of Hollywood came up to him and said, "There you are, you dirty Nazi," and slugged him, and Plack contends that because he was behind one of these large tables that the waiters usually move so you can't get up and, therefore, he was taken advantage of or he would have done something in return. He did nothing, apparently.

I think that is about everything.



Q. Did he tell you or didn't he tell you how he came from the United States to Berlin? Did he immediately go to Germany or did he go by way of circuitous route?

A. He went by way of Japan and Russia.

[3932] He went from Japan to Russia and then to Germany?

A. Yes, that is right. Russia wasn't in the war at that time and apparently, therefore, came from San Francisco.

Mr. COMBS. I think that is all, Mr. Flannery. We thank you very, very much for your cooperation.

[3933] Chairman TENNEY. Call your next witness, Mr. Combs.

Mr. COMBS. Dr. Lechner.

Chairman TENNEY. Will you come forward and be sworn, Dr. Lechner?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before the Committee, will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Dr. LECHNER. I do.

JOHN R. LECHNER, called as a witness on behalf of the Committee, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

Chairman TENNEY. Will you state your full name?

The WITNESS. John R. Lechner.

Chairman TENNEY. And your residence address.

The WITNESS. 332 West 64th Street, Inglewood.

Chairman TENNEY. And your business address.

The WITNESS. 838 South Grand Avenue.

Chairman TENNEY. And your occupation.

The WITNESS. Executive director of the Americanism Educational League.

Chairman TENNEY. All right, Mr. Combs.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. How long, Dr. Lechner, have you held your present position with the League?

A. Sixteen years.

Q. Sixteen years continuously?

A. That is right, yes.

[3934] Q. And during that period of time will you describe what the general nature of your duties have been?

A. Primarily the investigation of un-American activities in this area and the interpretation to the general public through public meetings and literature of those activities.

Q. How, generally, have you gained your information concerning subversive activities in this area?

A. For the most part we have very splendid sources of information through our contacts with fact-finding groups—responsible groups. For example on the Japanese situation we have worked very closely with Mr. Kilsoo K. Haan and his counter-espionage group against the Japanese.

Q. Kilsoo Haan is a Korean, is he not?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you know whether at any time he was employed by the Foreign Office of the Japanese Empire?

A. For three years, yes. He was with the consular office of the Honolulu Japanese government.

Q. During that time was he doing any espionage work?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Counter-espionage work?

A. Counter-espionage work, yes.

Q. And he has quite a large group of individual workers working as informants under his direction?

A. Yes, sir.

[3935] Q. And has had for a number of years?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And he fluently reads and writes the Japanese language, does he not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When did you last see Kilsoo Haan?

A. Friday night of this past week.

Q. Last Friday night?

A. Yes.

Q. And he left this vicinity Saturday morning, did he not, for Washington?

A. Yes; he left for Washington, D. C.

Q. And how long a time did you spend with him on the occasion of his visit here?

A. He was here four weeks this time.

Q. Were you with him in Senator Tenney's office when you and I and Kilsoo Haan had a conference?

A. Yes, I was.

Q. And was that on Thursday of last week?

A. That was Thursday of last week, yes.

Q. And were you with Kilsoo Haan and Senator Tenney when you and I and Kilsoo Haan had a conference on Friday of last week?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you present at that time and place when I put Kilsoo Haan under oath?

[3936] A. I was.

Q. And he gave his statement as a sworn statement?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that conference on Friday lasted about how long?

A. Two hours.

Q. And we discussed at that time and place the testimony which you intended to give heretoday?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you bring with you, Doctor, photostatic copies of documents which you obtained from Kilsoo Haan?

A. Yes, sir. I also brought here a report which we just had published on behalf of the American Legion. It is the inside story of the Japanese problem, which I should like to have entered in the record here.

Q. Who is the author of this report?

A. I am.

Q. The report deals with what basic subject?

A. It deals primarily with the Japanese-American situation—the Japanese-American citizen problem on the Coast.

Q. On the Pacific Coast?

A. Yes. Both the psychological aspect and the subversive organizations existing here on the Coast in which the Japanese-Americans took a primary part.

Q. When did this publication come off the press?

A. About three weeks ago.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask this report be received [3937] as an exhibit for the Committee in connection with the testimony of Dr. Lechner.

Chairman TENNEY. The report will be attached to the Committee's transcript and marked "Dr. Lechner, Exhibit No. 1."

(The report referred to was marked "Dr. Lechner Exhibit 1, and made a part hereof.)

Q. By Mr. COMBS. The material set forth in this report, Dr. Lechner, is predicated, I take it, on documents and photostats and the reports of informants, that came to you in connection with your capacity with the League?

A. Yes, sir. It came from various sources. You understand, of course, that during a long period like that we would have open to us sources of information not only from men like Haan but from Japanese themselves.

Q. And a great deal of your information did come from Japanese informants?

A. Yes, sir. We have been studying this problem for many years; long before there was a thought of war on the part of our people.

Q. As a matter of fact from some of the information you obtained you accurately predicted the occurrence of war and the attack on Pearl Harbor, did you not?

A. As a matter of fact on March 15, 1941, we released an Associated Press story, which was a front page story, that went all over the country, telling of the inevitability of the war, giving the Japanese plans of attack on Pearl Harbor [3938] and even suggested in a chronological scale the time they had set for it to take place. We stated that they had set aside December for that attack.

Q. With an alternative date?

A. In February 1942 in case that didn't work out.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Lechner, based on your experience and activities as you have related, is there a tendency now on the part of the American public to soften its attitude toward American born Japanese in internment camps—internment centers?

A. There is a tremendous movement on foot, Mr. Combs, to soften up the American people to placate the local Japanese. If I may be permitted as you ask questions, to give some of the information we have on that matter, I think it would be helpful. I would like to name some of the organization involved in that very definite program—a very definitely programmed approach to the softening up process.

Q. Before you make a statement, Dr. Lechner, let me ask you whether or not your information indicates that Japanese propagandists have taken advantage of that tendency on the part of the American public to soften its attitude toward Japanese internees.

A. The Japanese have certainly taken advantage of it. I have here the notes which were made by a Japanese-American citizen in one of the camps. These are the actual notes.

(Handing sheaf of papers to Mr. Combs.)

[3939] Q. Are these notes in your informant's own handwriting?

A. They are in his own handwriting. This is the situation, if I may explain it. The government decreed that the Japanese-American citizen and other Japanese in evacuation centers were not permitted to listen to broadcasts (but the government gave permission to small groups to appoint committees to listen and to go over the broadcasts of the day and then in turn to re-broadcast over a camp radio broadcasting station the news for the day.

These notes are most significant in that all of the information, or practically all the information, given to the Japanese evacuees in that internment camp was very much colored pro-Jap. Many of the statements which I have checked in the notes, contain conclusions that are definitely in favor of the Japanese. Such things as "Russia is ready to pull out of the war," and that Australia was going to be taken, and building up the Japanese cause so as to give encouragement in building the morale of the internees—both Japanese-Americans and Japanese aliens.

Q. You gave me this sheaf of notes last Friday, did you not?

A. Yes, sir, I did.

Q. And I have had them ever since and have just handed them back to you this morning?

A. Yes, sir.

[3940] Q. And have you read them in their entirety?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. Have you seen any single statement any place in these notes detrimental to the Japanese war effort?

A. In all those pages, representing, I should say, twenty-five or thirty pages, there is not a single statement that is detrimental to Japan.

Q. Are all of the statements made in these notes generally pro-Axis?

A. They are generally pro-Axis.

Q. And are generally anti-Ally?

A. Yes. I may point out one other very interesting thing there. You will notice on the bottom of each page there a notation of the number of ships that are lost and the number of planes that were brought down. In every case the ships are listed only on the part of the Allies.

The United States ships and the British ships and the planes reported there, are those that came down here in this country. In one instance the broadcaster has four different crashes listed. Always the losses are American planes or British planes.

Q. Never any Jap losses?

A. No.

Q. And no record of any Jap ships sunk?

A. No record of Jap ship sunk, no.

Q. Now, this individual in this Japanese internment [3941] center made these broadcasts in the American language or in the Japanese language?

A. Made them in the Japanese language.

Q. Did he make them daily?

A. Yes, he made them daily.

Q. Of course I shall not ask you for the name of the camp nor the name of the informant nor the name of the person who made the broadcasts, but you have that information available?

A. Yes, I have that information.

Q. Do you have any objection to my reading some excerpts into the record?

A. Very happy to have you do so.

Q. This particular broadcast is under date of August 6, 1942. I think you testified these are the original notes in the handwriting of the Japanese broadcaster.

A. Yes. He is a Japanese-American citizen.

Q. A Nisei?

A. Yes, a Nisei.

Q. "France might as well fly the Swastica." "Tokio is waiting for a complete collapse of the Soviet." "When the Japanese attack Siberia it will be sudden and decisive." "Japanese Russian propaganda is very active against communism and the communist United States." "When Russia is beaten she will become like China." "Britain after losing Singapore and Hong Kong cannot expect to get them back in British hands [3942] again." "Why India should remain under British rule to make India a British sphere which will eventually turn India into future British frontier?" "Unless Britain can influence Jinah and Nehru against Gandhi's idea, which is too late, Britain cannot turn India's tide to British satisfaction." "Big, important meeting in Moscow is another development of Allies discord." "Nazi blitz speed is astonishing."

On the same date: "The Australian forces are not strong enough to check Japanese invasion."

Under date of August 5, 1942: "All of the Pacific will be blacked out and the Japanese may attack the Pacific Coast with submarines."

"Japanese air forces is wiping out the United States-Chinese air force."

"Japanese activities in Australia is on increase. The Australians say the air strength is not sufficient to check the Japanese assault."

The same date: "Japanese planes attack Queensland for the first time."

"Four Japanese planes bomb Tourinville. Japanese also bomb Darwin. Japanese threat via Buna also serious."

"One-twentieth of United States population in Australia. Japanese secretly landed in Australia a month ago when Japanese landed in New Guinea. Japanese again landed at Buna. Allies have not checked their threat. New United States plane, Mustang, 1,400 horsepower, may out-do Japanese [3943] Zero. Burma Japanese may invade into China or India."

August 4th, 1942: "Japanese destroy 55,000 tons of Allied shipping in last week. Japanese sent more reinforcements. Allies blasting Buna-Gona area. Japanese submarine sinks British ship. Another large naval engagement coming. British attack Burma force and lose."

Same date: "Big quake in north island of New Zealand. Japanese cruiser was bombed for second time, but Japanese established an air field in Cocoda." Ghandi says, 'unless Allies gives complete independence India may welcome Japs. The Japanese in Burma are preparing to start fresh movement into India. Next Friday is the dead-line for India's independence. 219 Japanese planes attacked United States air base.'

July 29th, 1942: "Goebel says: 'Nazi welcomes the British in Europe; even the Yankees if they want to taste German punch.'

July 28, 1942: "Japanese landed in Australia in submarine. In New Guinea Japanese set up at Cocoda upland, fifty miles from Moresdy. Japanese attack Darwin and Tourinville. In New Guinea the Japanese are advancing by bicycle troops."

July 27, 1942: "Allies attack Buna. More Japanese landed at Buna; more at Gona, 160 miles north of Guna. Japanese attack British force near Moresby. Tojo said: 'Japan holds the initiative in western Aleuttans; Japan will [3944] go the limit to crush the United States and Britain. Chunking bombed by fifty Japanese bombers. United States planes countered.'

The same date: "United States losing this war because they cannot fill orders for spare parts. Nazi using transport planes. United States is trying to convert bombers into cargo planes. C. I. O. auto workers union demands double pay for Saturdays, Sundays and holidays. During the first six months of the war 4,000 seamen's lives were lost. Indian situation is more critical. Gandhi demands negotiation with British to grant India complete and immediate independence or India will become turmoil of trouble. Our (United States) June production is behind schedule. Gandhi says 'Britain is India's friend.' India neither sides with or rejects the United States or the Axis countries. India asks United States, China and Stalin to induce British to accept India's independence plea, but no one acts. Gandhi has political power but not military power—naturally, India relies on Japanese aid. Britain today ordered all essential commodity dealers closed. What next!'"

July 25, 1942: "United States citizens arrived in east Africa. Japanese occupies Buna-Gona. 18 Japanese bombers and 8 Zeros attack Moresby."

July 21, 1942: "Japanese attacked Port Moresby with 41 planes. 'Don't neglect Australia for Japanese pilots are darn good and are a good match for United States flyers.'"

[3945] This is under date of July 19, 1942: "Japanese carried out their plan. India will become yoke of Japan after this Friday."

August 7th, 1942: "Only one percent of United States production, or three days production in Australia. How can Australia stop the Japanese?"

Same date: "United States losing this war unless it can produce more war material, and the United States can make this a total war. Only a trickle of supplies coming to Australia. Japanese are undoubtedly occupying many important coastal regions on continent of Australia. We are beaten in India, Turkey, and losing in Siberia and Australia. If Russia gives in the United States must lose China and Australian interests. There may be a negotiated peace!"

And there are many other excerpts I could read, Dr. Lechner, but I think that will suffice to show the general character of the broadcasts which were made by this Japanese-American citizen in an American internment center.

Chairman TENNEY. Dr. Lechner, is there any censorship of the broadcasts made by this announcer in the internment center where these broadcasts were made, by the authorities?

The WITNESS. No censorship whatever on the part of the War Relocation authorities. The little group of five or six in this particular camp were given autonomous power in the matter of broadcasts.

Chairman TENNEY. Is that under the Army or under [3946] civilian control?

The WITNESS. It is under civilian control—under civilian administration.

Chairman TENNEY. Do you feel the Army would permit that sort of thing?

The WITNESS. No, sir; I think we are making a big mistake, if I may give my opinion here, in taking away the administration of these camps by the Army and placing it in civilian hands. For example on July 4th, 1942, in Inyo County, near our aqueduct, a strategic area, as far as we are concerned, Mr. Meyers came out here, who had at no time before his experience with the War Relocation Board or Authority, had anything to do with the Japanese—he came out here as an expert in charge of the Japanese in the relocation centers.

Mr. Meyers delivered an address on the 4th of July, apologizing to the 12,000 Japanese at Mansanar, for the big mistake the Government had made in evacuating them in the first place.

Chairman TENNEY. Which Meyers was that?

The WITNESS. I don't recall his first name. I have his name, however, and can supply you with it at the next session.

Chairman TENNEY. I think we are going to close after your testimony. You may proceed, Mr. Combs.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. Dr. Lechner, in your opinion should [3947] American-born Japanese be released through the relocation authority of the Federal Government any time while this war is in progress?

A. Should they be released from the internment centers?

Q. Yes.

A. I believe that every able-bodied Japanese who is not considered by the various government agencies as a real dangerous Japanese, who has not been connected in the past with propaganda activities or sabotage, should be released but placed in certain sections in the interior of the country, under Army control, and put to work in agricultural work. But they should not be released as they are being released now. 1300 of them were released to go to universities. They are absolutely free and are getting more money than they know what to do with together with free scholarships, while our boys are fighting in the Solomons and elsewhere. These Japanese are enjoying a university career with their way paid by our Government while our own boys are fighting all over the world.

I think every able-bodied Japanese male should be put to work, but under strict Army control.

At the present time there is no control. At Manzanar for example, my report shows, and I believe it was verified by Congressman Leland Ford, who issued a statement for the Congressional Record just before he finished his term, stated that groups of ten, twelve or fifteen Japanese were allowed [3948] to go

through Inyo County in trucks without restriction whatever, and the people of that county objected to there being no control of them at all.

Q. Last year, Dr. Lechner, and shortly prior to the time the Japanese in this area were interned, the Committee held a hearing in Los Angeles for the purpose of placing in its sworn records, the ideology and fanatic attitude of the average Japanese on the Pacific coast. Among the witnesses who testified were Togo Tenaga and Fred Tayama—

A. I know them very well.

Q. When did you first become acquainted with Togo Tenaga?

A. About three years ago.

Q. At that time was he one of the editors of Rafu Shimpo?

A. He was editor in Los Angeles.

Q. That was a newspaper, was it not?

A. A daily newspaper, yes.

Q. A Japanese daily newspaper, and it was published in Los Angeles?

A. Yes, in Los Angeles.

Q. And disseminated all up and down the Pacific coast?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Togo Tenaga was a Nisei, was he not?

A. Yes. A graduate of the University of California.

Q. Now, in 1941 did the Rafu Shimpo publish a directory?

[3949] A. Yes.

Q. Was the directory printed in the United States or in Japan?

A. In Japan.

Q. And the one with a cardboard slip cover the committee has a copy of?

A. Yes.

Q. I am just getting these facts in the record.

A. Yes; I understand.

Q. And it had a stamp on it "made in Japan?"

A. Yes; that is right.

Q. Now, when the committee asked Togo Tenaga to produce a copy of the 1941 Rafu Shimpo directory, he did so, but in preparing the copy which he produced with the copy of the committee already had, we found that certain pages had been taken out of the Tenaga copy, those pages being a folding page in colors of the Imperial family of Japan and on the next page there was a large Japanese ideograph which, when translated, meant "Japanese supremacy in the Pacific Sphere."

You are familiar with that?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. And do you know that that translation is substantially accurate?

A. I do; it is.

Q. Now, what did the bulk of that directory contain, if you know, Dr Lechner?

[3950] A. It comprised, of course, the names of Japanese firms in this country dealing with Japanese firms in Japan proper.

Q. Tenaga, under examination, testified that in his opinion that directory was nine-tenths subversive. Does that tally with the information in your possession concerning that publication?

A. That is right. You asked something about the spirit or morale of the Japanese. I have something here which you may be interested in.

Q. Would you like to read it into the record? How long is it?

A. It is very short.

Q. Will you read it into the record, please?

A. It is regarding the national philosophy which is injected or, rather, instilled into all Japanese, whether they be American citizens or not.

In the case of American citizens it is instilled through Japanese language schools. It is called the "Shinto Faith." It is stated to be a faith but it is not a religion. It is a State philosophy and holds, of course, that the Emperor is the direct descendant of the Sun Goddess and by virtue of that fact every Japanese is of divine origin and owes his allegiance to the Japanese Emperor.

We have read that on many occasions but have failed to look into the deeper aspects of it. It is actually the [3951] controlling force in the life of the Japanese; and that is also the case with the Japanese who are living in this country. For example, there were more than 19,000 boys and girls of Japanese parents, born in California, who attended Japanese language schools before the war. In Hawaii out of 46,670 boys and girls of Japanese extraction attending American schools, 43,000 were going to Japanese schools at the same time.

If I may give this expert's opinion and testimony of the Shinto Faith, which bears out all of the information that we have. It is by Dr. Shunzo Sakamaki, Assistant Professor of History of the University of Hawaii.

Q. When was that published?

A. This was published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin on April 25, 1942.

At the beginning of 1941 the Japanese Imperial Government issued an edict declaring all Shinto priests in the United States and Hawaii and all Japanese language school teachers were from that date (and that was in January) were to be considered as officials of the Japanese government. In other words they took them openly out of the field of religion and made them agents of the Japanese government, thereby changing their status, so far as we were concerned, of all language schools to centers of Japanese espionage and propaganda.

Dr. Sakamaki said, in part: "Why have Japanese officials for the past two generations been so eager to protect the [3952] special status of State Shinto? Why have they insisted that State Shinto is not a religion but the embodiment of Japanese patriotism?"

"Basically, the reason is that the Japanese government has been in Shinto a political tool of the greatest potency for keeping the fires of nationalism burning at white heat and making the doctrine of political absolutism in Japan virtually inviolable."

"\* \* \* Japan's constitution of 1890 guarantees freedom of religious worship, but the government has taken the position that State Shinto is not a religion and that, therefore, all Japanese must participate in State Shinto ceremonies, as part of their patriotic duty to the state."

"\* \* \* Operation of State Shinto here is inimical to American interests because it both directly and indirectly fosters Japanese nationalism, and arguments by Shinto champions that we cannot infringe their right to free worship contradict responsible pronouncements by Japanese officials denying the religious status of State Shinto."

"We are at war with Japan, and State Shinto is an arm of the government of Japan. Amputation of that arm here in Hawaii is a prerogative of our government that cannot consistently be protested by the government of Japan."

I might add that this particular philosophy of the State is so thoroughly instilled in most Japanese, regardless of whether in California or some other place, that it confronts [3953] us with a paramount problem to determine just to what degree the Japanese are loyal and to what degree they are disloyal.

An external manifestation of that problem is in dual citizenship. When Togo Tenaga and Fred Tayama admitted to me before a committee of Japanese they didn't know how many dual citizens there were, they did admit that the majority held dual citizenship.

In 1924 the Japanese government told the Japanese in this country to register their children with the Japanese consuls so that they might hold dual citizenship. In the first ten years in Hawaii, after the law was established, less than 5 percent of the Japanese were registered with the foreign office of the Territory of Hawaii. We have those figures. That is a matter of record.

Q. What other activities did Togo Tenaga engage in in southern California, in addition to being the English language editor of the Shimpo?

A. Togo Tenaga was the front man for the Japanese. We called on him and Fred Tayama and asked them to demonstrate the sincerity of their particular group by cooperating with our Federal Government.

Q. What was the name of that group?

A. Japanese-American Citizens League.

Q. The Japanese-American Citizens League?

A. That is right. And in order to put the Japanese on a test, and I was asked confidentially by a source from [3954] Washington if I would do that, we called two or three conferences of Japanese Americans under the leadership of Tayama, who was then chairman or president of the League, and Togo Tenaga as spear-head of the organization. We had two or three meetings. One was on April 15, 1941. We had a little dinner in Little Tokio to arrange a meeting. A mass meeting subsequently was held on May 10 at the Hollywood-American Legion Clubhouse. It was attended by over 1,000 Nisei—second generation Japanese.

The purpose of this meeting was to challenge the second generation Japanese, who were professing then through meetings all over, before service clubs and in publications, that they were completely loyal to the United States. We challenged them to set up an inner committee among the Japanese-Americans to give our Government information on Japanese subversive organizations within California and within this area.

In the first place, in the series of two conferences before this meeting at the Hollywood Legion Clubhouse, and my office, both Tenaga and Tayama denied the existence of any Japanese subversive organizations in California, and then I openly challenged the 1,000 Nisei and told them unless we could get that cooperation voluntarily and they cleaned up their own ranks, and because of the inevitability of war, from records we had which all indicated there would be a war, that it would be very bad and very hard on the Japanese-Americans if they did not do so. In other words, they would [3955] have to undergo tremendous changes in their whole sociological structure, and we challenged them to set up the organization for this work and we were turned down flatly.

I have here a program of that particular meeting together with the names who participated in the organizations represented.

Q. I would like to introduce this into the record as Exhibit 2 in connection with Dr. Lechner's testimony.

Chairman TENNEY. This will be marked Dr. Lechner Exhibit 2.

(The document referred to was marked "Dr. Lechner Exhibit No. 2," and made a part hereof.)

The WITNESS. I have here a list, to demonstrate the accuracy of the figures of the Hawaiian situation. These are the names of the Japanese language schools in Hawaii, with the addresses of the schools and the names of the principals. I would like to keep this for my record, but you may glance at it.

Q. Yes.

Chairman TENNEY. Are you introducing that as an exhibit?

The WITNESS. No; it is not necessary.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. What is meant by "the age of moral responsibility" in computing the percentage of loyal as contra-distinguished from disloyal American-born Japanese?

A. That is a relative matter. In the opinion of some [3956] of the experts with whom I have spoken they say, "Well, we will compute the age of moral responsibility as far as Japanese are concerned, at 17. Below 17 a Japanese-American citizen is not considered to be experienced, primarily in a political structure in this country or in Japan, although he has been given the infusion of Japanism, but he is not actively engaged in organizations."

So, if we consider that, we find that out of 96,000 Japanese-American citizens, in computing the percentage of loyalty and disloyalty among the Nisei, we must remember that approximately 45 percent of the 96,000 are below what we term there, "the age of moral responsibility," so that if, as we show in this report, have two organizations alone had over 12,000 members, then the percentage is not as 12 to 96 but as 12 to 45.

I bring that point out because we make a big mistake in all of our newspaper stories because we fail to take into consideration the fact that 45 percent are below the typical group who would be engaged in subversive activities.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. Do you have any information or any proof to the effect that plans were made in Japan to finance and direct the education of Nisei in the United States?

A. Yes, very, very definite proof on that. I have here two Japanese documents which were translated, and I have the translation of this particular report. It is on page 5 of the report.

[3957] Q. And you have a photostatic copy of the original Japanese document?

A. Yes.

Q. Which was used as a basis for those translations?

A. Yes; there are three organizations; The Institute for the Education of Oversea Japanese, the General Board of Overseas Association and Imperial Educational Association. All of these have headquarters, and the main headquarters is in Tokio. They were well financed by the Japanese government. The only purpose is to direct the education of Nisei in the United States and Hawaii from Tokio.

We uncovered a document, by the way, in El Centro, in 1941 which is called, "The Future Road of Nisei." If I may give you that, that will tell the importance of these organizations which are so well financed. This book was discovered in the hands of Japanese agents in El Centro and through one of the men with whom we worked we were able to get a copy of it.

It was endorsed by General Sugiyama, Japanese Imperial Army chief of staff, and Tokashi Zuzuki, Director of Kinmon Gakuin, one of the leading schools of Japanese language in San Francisco.



This was to show the Nisei the appreciation of the Japanese government for the work they were doing.

There was quite a bit of difficulty here in the relations between Japan and the United States after Japan stepped [3958] into China and started their aggressive program, so the Japanese government, according to the information we have, documentary information, demanded that the Nisei soften the public opinion on the part of Americans with reference to that.

"Several hundred lectures have been delivered on the China incident by Nisei in America.

"Many Nisei also returned to Japan with a mass of material collected in California.

"Things of this sort are typical of the work performed in the past by the Nisei for Japan. What they gain and what they do is by no means unimportant. The Nisei have made significant contributions to Japan, but in many cases these facts must remain hidden.

"When the China incident occurred, it became necessary to broadcast to the world the news in the English language. At this most crucial moment the Nisei did the work by assuming responsibility as is befitting great patriots.

"The role of Nisei at the present moment is of utmost importance. Nisei always take the leadership. In the world where English language newspapers and magazines are most influential, the Nisei are in an excellent position to do their share.

"We have seen to it that they shall be well prepared for their task."

And I would like to enter this as a matter of record.

[3959] (Handing paper to Mr. Combs.)

Mr. COMBS. They are in the Japanese language and I will offer them as an exhibit in connection with the testimony of Dr. Lechner.

The WITNESS. And the translation, by the way, you will find on page 5 of this record.

Chairman TENNEY. Let them be marked Dr. Lechner Exhibits 3 and 4.

(The documents referred to were marked as "Dr. Lechner Exhibits No. 3 and No. 4," and were made a part of the record hereof.)

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. Do you have any information regarding trips made by Nisei or Kibei to Japan?

A. Yes.

Q. For the purpose of indoctrination and instruction and returning to disseminate propaganda in the United States?

A. Yes. The term "Kibei" is applied to the Japanese-American who has gone back to Japan at the request of some organization connected with Japan, or directly by the Japanese government itself.

In the State of California there are eleven distinct, separate Kibei organizations, and they are listed here.

Q. On what page?

A. Page 7.

Q. Page 7 of your report?

A. Yes. There were so many Japanese in 1938—that [3960] is Japanese-Americans, who were in Japan visiting and studying in Japan, that two organizations, locally, got together because of the American situation with which they were confronted. People asked, "Where is Togo?" And "Where is Harry," and so on, and these young Japanese boys were in Japan. The record shows here that there were at one time as many as 20,000 Japanese-American boys in Japan, and the situation was so embarrassing that two organizations, the Japanese Chamber of Commerce and Japanese Association of Los Angeles, in 1938, appointed a delegate and sent him to Japan to plead with the Japanese government to send some of these boys back as fast as the Japanese government could, to avoid suspicion and embarrassment here in California. At that time, in 1938, there were 20,000 Japanese-Americans studying in Japan. It was presumably cultural training but we know in reality they were getting the final dose of Japanism preparatory to the war.

Chairman TENNEY. That was in 1938?

The WITNESS. Yes, 1938.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. Do you have in your possession any document or report setting forth what transpired when a group of Japanese went to Japan for that sort of indoctrination?

A. I have a very important document here. May I qualify the introduction of this document with this statement: Here we have pressure brought to bear on the American Government to release Japanese-Americans because there is no indication at all of any subversive activities or sabotage having been committed after Japan attacked this country. They say most of them are loyal—in fact, all are loyal.

There was a group of 400 from this country and 500 from Tokio itself and the Japanese area. These 900 Japanese-Americans were called to a conference in Japan. I have the translation here of a Japanese release. It was reprinted in English by the Hawaiian Hochi on October 8, 1940.

The Hawaiian Hochi is an agency of the Domei News Agency of Japan.

Q. It is printed in Honolulu?

A. Yes, and it elaborates on this evidence here which I should like to submit because it is quite important. At this particular conference held in Tokio, and this is a report of it, the Japanese-Americans, 900 of them, were put through a course of study for a few days and committees were appointed to lead the Japanese-Americans in preparation of this move. The course of study was the Japanese plan of attack on the Dutch East Indies, and here is a very interesting Japanese way of presenting their thoughts to the Japanese-Americans.

Page 1 contains the name of a Japanese officer and a group photograph of important officials. 2 contains a map of the Dutch East Indies and you will notice this umbrella over it all. That is the Oriental way of showing how the Japanese are going to smash whatever the British and Dutch holdings there are.

[3962] The first page shows a cartoon of how the Dutch and English will dynamite oil wells, and there is a very interesting thing here. This brings out the fact that although the British and the Dutch believe that dynamiting the oil wells in the event of a Japanese attack will cripple Japan, this report here shows that is just what they want because they would dynamite the wells themselves to get higher octane gasoline by going down to the lower levels, and that is an explanation of that.

I don't need to go into the rest of it, but I do want, with your permission, to turn it over to the Committee.

Chairman TENNEY. You are turning it over to the Committee, Dr. Lechner?

The WITNESS. Yes, sir.

Chairman TENNEY. That will be received as Exhibit No. 5 to the testimony of Dr. Lechner.

(The document referred to was marked "Dr. Lechner Exhibit No. 5 and made a part hereof.)

Mr. COMBS. Exhibit 5 is a group of photostats handed to me by Dr. Lechner with the translation in English.

Chairman TENNEY. What was the date of that conference?

The WITNESS. The conference would run the first two weeks in October. This report is dated October 18, 1940. The report of this conference that we are talking about now, and which is in the record, was published and distributed by the Japanese Overseas Association. That is the association [3963] of which we spoke a moment ago. It was distributed for the Nisei. It was published in February, 1941. (This is important, Mr. Chairman, for this reason, that the 400 Japanese-American citizens coming from this country and the 500 Japanese-American citizens residing temporarily in Tokio, knew of the Japanese plans to attack the Dutch East Indies and were given the complete details. There is nothing in the records of our Government that we can find anywhere of the so-called loyal American citizens ever reported these plans to our Federal Government.)

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. Now, Dr. Lechner, there is at the present time a definite, nationally organized movement to soften the American public against the time when the Japanese-Americans will be released from these internment centers, is there not?

A. A tremendously powerful movement.

Q. Will you describe that briefly, please?

A. Yes. There are several organizations who are now engaged in a campaign to discredit the United States Army policy to evacuate the Japanese and the entire policy of the Government holding the Japanese in concentration or restricted areas.

This group is comprised largely of church and educational leaders.

Here is an article which was written by Norman Thomas, head of the Socialist Party, and distributed by the Post War [3964] Council.

I understand that several hundred thousand were sent out. This is a scathing indictment against the United States policy employed so far as the Japanese are concerned, and he advocates the immediate release of all Japanese-Americans, the Churchmen's Committee for Christian Peace, and the president of that is Dr. Albert Palmer, the head of the Chicago Seminary. Two months ago Dr. Palmer announced that he had over 1600 leading ministers in this country who had signed up as active members. Palmer's statement on the unconditional surrender of Japan is this, and it is described. In such things as these we are getting the first announcement of a very carefully worked out plan of all of these groups I am going to mention, for a negotiated peace with Japan. In speaking of unconditional surrender he said, "This goal is not likely to be reached by any method of total military victory; some kind of negotiated peace is a desirable alternative." This statement was made in December, 1942.

They claim to have 12,000 or more active members throughout the United States. The principal theory is that war is not compatible with the teachings of Christ. In addition, to that there is the National Committee for Prevention of Wars. This organization held its national convention in Philadelphia on November 11, 12, and 13, 1942. One of the aggressively active leaders is Theodore Walser, an American missionary in Japan for 23 years.

[3965] He spoke before the members of the Pilgrim Church, one of the large churches in Washington, D. C. This was his statement: "Japan was justified in her attack on Pearl Harbor." He gave for the reasons, first, that America had no right to interfere with Japan's "Asia for the Asiatics" policy in the Far East. Secondly, Japan is only doing what America did to Mexico and to Central and South American Republics.

The National Committee for the Prevention of War, their convention adopted the following aims for 1943, and I list there five or six points. First, is a negotiated peace with the Axis powers, following Dr. Albert Palmer's idea. Second, to give financial and moral aid to conscientious objectors; three, to give financial aid and scholarships to Japanese-Americans so they may complete their university educations; four, to release the Japanese from the relocation camps and give the relocation civilian authorities more power to act, because they were, apparently, from their statements, they were already conscious of the fact that they were wielding a great deal of influence over these civilian authorities. Five, give favorable publicity to the Japanese-Americans and the Japanese point of view in the public press, and particularly stress that point of view in church publications throughout America; set up an employment agency to aid the Japanese as fast as they are released from the relocation camps.

Incidentally, one point here about the church publication. [3966] From our information it is very apparent that a definite policy is being employed to create a favorable attitude toward Japanese-Americans in this country, and so favorable that naturally we will build up a sympathetic attitude for Japan. That is what we call the "softening up process" so that these various organizations can put across with full steam by the end of 1943 a terrific campaign for a negotiated peace with Japan, and it is a very clearly worked out scheme.

As an indication of how far they will go, Senator Tenney, from December 4 to December 14 in Quebec, Canada, the Institute of Pacific Relations, which has a very powerful branch here, held what they called "A Pacific Conference" for the purpose of discussing post-war problems in the Pacific area. At that conference the leaders refused admission of a Korean participant, although they claimed that they were interested in establishing the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms in all of the subjugated nations in the world. Finally after a threat was made to expose the Pacific Conference held by the Institute of Pacific Relations, they agreed to allow a Korean as an observer. The opposition came from some of the missionaries who came from Japan, representing the Far East.

Underneath that whole conference was this underlying motive, to build there at that Pacific Conference in Quebec, the structure for the cooperation of the Institute of Pacific Relations for a negotiated peace and the leaders in that conference were former missionaries and educators in Japan. That was why they had this antipathy for the Korean, because they felt that if he were a part of the conference he would expose the things that were going on inside. That is a matter of fact that Mr. Haan testified to.

The purpose of these groups, is to soften American public opinion against Japanese and pave the way for a negotiated peace with Japan.

These are other organizations who are doing the same thing, and we have many men who feel the same way. For example, it was my experience in Bakersfield to talk to an organization there a month and a half ago, on the Japanese situation. A minister sat in front of me. I didn't know he was a minister, but I noticed that he was not reacting very well to my talk on the Japanese situation. The chairman told me that the Board had just turned him down on his application for four new tires. So after some considerable argument this prominent minister asked for retreats and they said, "No."

He said, "Why can't I have retreats? I am an important man in this community," and they said, "No, we give no man retreats or any tires of any kind who drives 400 miles every week going to Manzanar to attend to somebody else's business rather than attend to church affairs."

I debated with one man on the radio a short time ago who is interested in the Japanese problem, and he drives 600 miles [3968] every week to the internment center.

The purpose of this, Mr. Chairman, is to show that there is a lot going on underneath with which we are not familiar. We are taking a wishful attitude in this whole thing. We have got to understand the tremendous forces that underlie the whole Japanese-American groups. I believe this information should be brought out to show the public the problem is not an easy one.

Chairman TENNEY. You are also an ordained minister, are you not?

The WITNESS. Yes.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. Dr. Lechner, just one other matter I want to take up before we adjourn. You recall that on the anniversary of Pearl Harbor, that was December 7, 1942, there was a riot at Manzanar?

A. Yes.

Q. During which Fred Kayama was severely beaten?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you familiar with the general details of that occurrence?

A. I am somewhat familiar with the details. I have here a report of what transpired shortly before that, leading us to believe that a riot would occur. We had a pretty good idea two or three months before that the thing would explode from within.

Q. There is an internment center in the United States [3969] in the western part of the United States, the name of which we are not permitted to mention, at which a group of Japanese prisoners who were captured during the Solomons Island campaign were placed, is that not correct?

A. Yes; they were placed there to mingle with the Japanese-Americans.

Q. And were allowed to talk with them in the Japanese language?

A. Allowed to talk to them in the Japanese language, yes.

Q. And after those conditions had continued for a time there was a riot in that camp, was there not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Describe that riot, if you will, but first, how did you gain your information as to what transpired on that occasion?

A. Through a camp bulletin, Bulletin No. 56, and it was at Camp Lordsburg, New Mexico. It was published on October 29, 1942. It is a mimeographed news sheet issued daily.

Q. At Lordsburg, New Mexico?

A. Lordsburg, New Mexico, yes, by the evacuees themselves.

Q. English or Japanese?

A. In Japanese, and it is printed with the sanction of the administrative heads there.

[3970] CHAIRMAN TENNEY. Which is civilian?

The WITNESS. Which is civilian, yes. This Bulletin 56 described the number of Japanese prisoners who were brought into that camp as of maybe the day before or the day before that, so the news was up to the minute. They gave details as to where they came from and the boat they came in on, information which our own metropolitan papers are not allowed to use, and these men when they contacted the Japanese-American citizens gave them so encouraging a picture of the Japanese victories and their program, and they carried the story right from the inner circles of the Japanese to the Japanese-Americans and they got this particular camp all fired up. That particular attitude came out one morning shortly after this bulletin came out. There was a big demonstration in the

morning. There were several thousand Japanese participating in the demonstration. They were marching through the camp and singing and having a great time.

Our informant tells us that he happened to be with two or three of the officials—

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. Is your informant a Japanese?

A. Yes. He is placed there by the Federal Government and I don't dare tell his name. He said that the two or three civilian officials patted them on the back and said: "Our policy for the Relocation Board is pretty good, we are giving them all the leeway possible; look how happy they are," and this informant turned around and said, "Do you know what [3971] they are singing?" They said, "It doesn't make any difference. They are happy."

He said, "They are singing the Japanese national anthem."

They said: "They can't do that here," but he said, "If you will look at that flagpole you will see what they can do," and they looked at the flagpole and during the night the Japanese had lowered the American flag and had placed the Japanese flag on the pole. My report shows it took the threat of machine guns by the Army to permit a man to go up and take that flag down.

Now, during the period that these prisoners came in, the civilian authorities were permitting visitors to come into that camp from anywhere east of the Rockies. These Japanese visitors would come and get the information from these Japanese-Americans and from the prisoners and in turn visit the other camps and spread the story. Our report shows it was this type of encouragement and propaganda which started the stirring up of the situation at Manzanar.

Q. Which led to the demonstration on December 7, 1942?

A. That is right. And also a camp in Nebraska had the same difficulty.

Q. And that, of course, was before all of the Japanese were interned in that area so they could visit back and forth?

A. They took them all there first. The first group they took, I believe, down to Lordsburgh. To me that all shows, I believe, a very unrealistic attitude on the part of the [3972] civilian authorities in handling the Japanese. I think we are making a tremendous mistake in opening up channels for the inciting of feeling because, as a matter of fact, in this document here, which was brought into Los Angeles in 1941, and written in 1940. It is the war instructions by Matsuo, head of the Intelligence Department for the Japanese Navy.

Q. Entitled "How Japan Plans to Win"?

A. "How Japan Plans to Win." Matsuo mentions in there the Japanese Government does not expect sabotage from any Japanese or Japanese-Americans during the first stage of the war; describing the attack on Pearl Harbor, saying no acts of sabotage would be done then, but when Japan is ready to come in the second time and take the islands and then on to the coast, Japan expects a volunteer army be formed to assist the Japanese forces in taking over the territory.

Now, we are playing with dynamite when we release the Japanese and Japanese-Americans as we are, by the thousands, because Japan has not called for their cooperation yet, and having this information and knowing their connection with Japan it is my firm belief as a matter of our own security and national defense, that we have got to take a far more realistic attitude toward the Japs.

Q. There is one other point I would like to cover, an illustrative incident, Dr. Lechner, when you and I had the conference with Kilsoo Haan last Friday. He was relating an incident in connection with the raising of a volunteer group [3973] of Japanese to fight for the United States.

A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall that?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you briefly explain about wearing the belt of a thousand stitches?

A. Yes. This is an important thing. This is just a news release that came out on February 26, 1943.

Kilsoo Haan warned us against the very fact that you might put these men in an Army uniform but that does not necessarily mean you have established their loyalty to this country. That is very difficult for them to get away from—the old traditions and teaching of Japan. May I read this:

"America's new all Japanese Army unit will go into battle carrying the potent good-luck charm of their ancestors.

"Officials at the Heart Mountain Relocation Center disclosed today that women evacuees are making traditional Japanese belts of 1,000 stitches for their husbands and sons joining the American armed forces.

"The belts, regarded as certain charm against evil, consist of white cloth with 1,000 red stitches sewed in. Each woman adds one stitch to each belt."

This belt is passed from one woman to another, and each one adds a stitch until 1,000 stitches have been put in the belt. The theory is that this belt of 1,000 stitches ties the wearer into the whole system, Japanese ancestry and [3974] ancestor worship. In other words, it brings to the bearer all the Japanese traditions, security, and safety. So, instead of throwing that aside, the Japanese traditions, these men are actually wearing these belts. The belts are regarded as certain charm against evil.

I maintain that this is a clear demonstration of the fact, even though we organize an army of Japanese-American citizens they are still tied to their ancestors and still tied to Japanism.

Before closing I would like to read into the record the article from the Hawaiian Hochi, of October 18, 1940, that we discussed awhile ago.

Chairman TENNEY. Very well.

The WITNESS. It is entitled "Second Generation Japanese Take Part in Overseas Tokio Convention."

The article is as follows:

"The committee in charge of the Overseas Japanese Tokio Convention to be held in commemoration of the 2600th anniversary of the founding of the empire, has decided to allow about 500 second generation Japanese residing in Tokio to participate in it, and give these second generation Japanese, who have had no organ of unity and liaison in the past, a chance, and as preparation committee, members of the various second generation Japanese organization and educational agencies held a meeting with the convention committee at the Choutei of Marmouchi from 6:00 p. m. on September 26. The organizations [3975] that were represented on that day were as follows:

"\* \* \* \* Overseas Education Association, Japan-America-Hawaii Society, Nippon Home, Waseda International School, McKinley Alumni Association of the Keizen Girls School, Todo Gakuin of the North American Butoku Kai (7,000 members in Hawaii), Japanese-American Society, Pacific Young Men's Club, Japan Cultural Forum, To'kyo chapter of the Boy Scouts, P. S. P., Second Generation Japanese Society, Little Club, Second Generation Japanese Club of the Union Church, the Nisei Club of Yokahama, Sigma Kappa, Self-Supporting Students' Association of Japan, Mizuho Gakuin, Sayama Home, Gekkei Home, Shoko Girls Schools, Overseas Women's Federation, Musahino Girls School, Young Women's Federation, Musashino Girls School, Young Men Buddhist Association of Japan, Japanese-American Young Men's Federation, Foreign Ministry's Bureau of American Affairs, Foreign Ministry's publicity Bureau, Overseas Affairs Ministry's Bureau of South American Affairs and the International Division of the Japan Broadcasting Association.

"\* \* \* \* Handing the key of solution to the second generation Japanese, Lt. Gen. Kichijiro Humada, executive vice president of the convention committee, stated as follows at this meeting:

"The second generation Japanese problems [3976] should be studied and solved by the second generation Japanese, themselves, and are not matters to be coerced into the manner of thinking of a third party, regardless of whom, I think. I am only old and am saying this because I have tasted a little more worldly experience than you, young people, and I wish that the following three points will be taken into consideration in solving the second generation Japanese problems. The means of solution are all in the hands of you, people. The first is that the color of our skin, which has been derived from the Yamato race, will not change, even if it comes to the periods of the third, the fourth and the fifth generations. That they will be of yellow race ancestry will be the same. The second is that I do not think that there will be a change in the superiority complex of the white race fifty or hundred years from now. Russia was defeated by Japan, but the people of Soviet Russia are boasting that they are superior than the yellow race. The third is the world situation. It is extremely shaky, but the actual condition of the world must be considered. Well, I hope you will take into consideration the above three points.

"Then the 11 second generation Japanese, including Mr. Yu Murayama, reporter of the Domei [3977] News Agency, each stood up and expressed

his opinion. Among them Kazuma Nakayama, a native of Vancouver and presently attending the Misubo Gakuen, stated as follows:

"The key points expressed by the Honorable Mr. Hamada have certainly incited in us a certain determination. That is that we must study, learn and master the Japanese spirit and make the Yamato race into a superior one. We must compensate the great effort made by our parents by improving the level of our culture. I have become spiritually stronger since I came to Japan. I intend to study with all my effort."

"Both eyes of Lt. Gen. Hamada became red, while Mr. Goro Shakahisa of the Bureau of American Affairs wiped his tears with one of his hands when this sincere cry was made. Thus, the 11 second generation Japanese, who attended that night, were elected as members of the committee to pilot the second generation Japanese into the course they should take."

Mr. COMBS. Thank you very much.

Chairman TENNEY. I have just one question. It is your opinion, briefly, then, that the American Legion's contention that these relocation centers should be under military supervision?

[3978] The WITNESS. Under strict Army supervision, yes.

Chairman TENNEY. Thank you very much, Dr. Lechner.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read into the record in connection with the Rohl testimony, a recapitulation of certain inconsistencies that appeared in the testimony of Mr. and Mrs. Rohl.

The testimony was somewhat complex and in order to epitomize it and coalesce those inconsistencies for our record, I wish to read the following.

Chairman TENNEY. Proceed.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Rohl testified when he came to this country from Valparaiso, Chile, in 1913, that he was in the construction business, but on his statement to Immigration officials he said he was a merchant.

From the time he arrived in the United States he consistently and carefully concealed the fact that he was an alien. He told Immigration officials at least once that he was born in Iola, Kansas, the birthplace of his wife.

During the several yachting trips he made to Mexico and to Panama and to the Hawaiian Islands the names of all persons on board except his, appears on the ship's manifest.

Although he made 10 or more trips into Mexico he testified that no one questioned him about his citizenship.

He swore on his Federal income tax return that he was a citizen of the United States.

He testified that he had made an affidavit at an earlier [3979] date under the false name of John William Rohl, but he swore on his application for citizenship in 1941, that he had never made such application.

He testified that he owned the Yacht Pandora and personally received the insurance money when the yacht was burned. Mrs. Rohl testified she owned the boats and that the insurance money was paid to her.

Rohl testified that the Ramona was in his wife's name but that he hired the captain and directed the sailings; paid the crew and all expenses for the upkeep of the boat.

Membership in the Newport Beach Yacht Club was in his name.

Rohl also testified that the Vega was registered to his wife, but that he likewise controlled her movements and paid all expenses in connection with her operation.

Mrs. Rohl testified that she paid all those expenses.

Lloyd's registry of American yachts for 1941 lists the Vega's owner as H. W. Rohl.

Rohl testified that none of the stock of the Rohl-Connolly Company was ever issued to anyone but him and T. E. Connolly, but Mrs. Rohl swore she owned 25 percent of it. She also stated she didn't know that Rohl paid a \$25,000 fine to the Federal Government five days before becoming a citizen because the boats, tugs, launches, and other vessels were owned by Rohl-Connolly, a concern in which Rohl, a German alien, owned more than 25 percent of the stock.

[3980] Both Rohl and his wife swore categorically that they had never seen Major Wyman intoxicated, and that he had been aboard their vessel twice. Now, I put that in the record, Mr. Chairman, for the simple purpose of having it at the end of the testimony—the inconsistencies in the statements made by H. W. Rohl and Floy Rohl.

That is all we have at this time.

Chairman TENNEY. At this time the Committee will stand adjourned to reconvene at the call of the Chairman.

(Whereupon, at 3:30 o'clock p. m., the hearing was concluded.)

ARMY INQUIRY BOARD BOARD EXHIBIT No. 8

Vol. 40

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

HEARING HELD BEFORE EXECUTIVE SESSION, SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S., WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 24, 1944

CONTENTS

Testimony of Robert Hoffman.....	Page
EXHIBIT No. 1 (1/24/44).....	2185
	2202

[7788]

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 1944

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,  
Washington, D. C.

The special committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:40 o'clock a. m., in room 3310 New House Office Building, Honorable Andrew J. May (chairman), presiding. Present: Representatives May (chairman), Sparkman, Costello, Durham, Elston, Martin and Prouton.

Also Present: Lt. Col. Knowlce; Lt. Ralph Burton, General Counsel to the Committee; and Mr. Joseph Colgan, special investigator.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Hoffman.

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT HOFFMAN

(Mr. Hoffman was duly sworn.)

Mr. BURTON. Please state your full name.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Robert Hoffman.

Mr. BURTON. Please give your home address, your occupation, and something of the background and the experience which you have had.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The permanent address is 651 South Danamuir [2185] Avenue, Los Angeles; present address Ramon Garman 90, Mexico City, D. F.; civil engineer in field construction, railroads, tunnels, highways, utilities, hydro-lytic plants for 22 years.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I submit several letters of commendation which have reference to the capability, integrity, and responsibility of Mr. Hoffman and ask that they be spread upon the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Be it so ordered.

(The letters referred to are as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
UNITED STATES ENGINEER OFFICE,  
Honsdale, T. H., March 17, 1944.

Letter in File No. ND 3121

Mr. ROBERT HOFFMAN,

*c/o Houston Constructors,*

*Honsdale, T. H.*

MY DEAR Mr. HOFFMAN: I have your letter of March 15th and thank you for the statements contained therein. I desire to thank you for the advice that you have rendered and the support that you've given me while on duty as District Engineer.

I hope that I will again have the pleasure of working with you under conditions where we can build up an organization with the efficiency that all true construction men love.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ THOMAS WYMAN, JR.,  
Colonel, Corps of Engineers,  
District Engineer.