

Doc. 1915

(100)

EVIDENTIARY DOCUMENT # 1915

This Document is not to be checked out.

Information contained in this document can  
be located in case file and exhibit file.  
Enclosed is paper listing interrogation by  
original exhibit number and date.

*Wesley Subington*

TESTIMONY OF HOSHINO

File #69, Serial 18

January 28, 1946

Page 1

Q. Where did you go in 1932, Mr. Hoshino?

A. I went to Manchuria in 1932.

Q. What date, if you remember, did you go to Manchuria?

A. I left Japan on the 12th of July 1932.

Page 3

Q. Mr. Hoshino, when did you first know that you were going to be sent over to Manchuria?

A. At the end of June.

Q. And who told you?

A. The Private Secretary of the Minister of Finance told me of this trip.

Page 4

Q. What, if anything, did he say to you as to why you were going over there?

A. I was considered competent for the position of Chief of the General Affairs Board.

Q. Did you select the men that went with you in your party?

A. The Private Secretary of the Finance Minister consulted with me and competent persons were picked.

Page 10

Q. When you were Chief of the General Affairs Bureau from 1932 to 1936, during that period of four years, did you have any dealings with the Kwantung Army?

A. There was constant liaison between the two.

Q. What did you have this liaison about?

A. There were many matters that came up for question, and as a result of the Japan Manchurian Treaty, liaison was established with the Kwantung Army to deal with these matters.

Q. Give us some examples of the matters.

A. One instance was in connection with the taxation or taxing of Japanese nationals who enjoyed extra territoriality in

Manchukuo, also the railway zone which was under direct Japanese control. In connection with the abolition of these extra territorial privileges and special privileges in the railway zone, matters had to be referred to various organizations, and amongst these was the Kwantung Army.

- Q. Did the Kwantung Army have jurisdiction over the territory of the South Manchurian Railway, or were they restricted to the Kwantung leased territory?
- A. The Kwantung Army had no jurisdiction over the South Manchuria Railway zone, but the Commander in Chief of the Kwantung Army was also Chief of the government of the Kwantung leased territory, and in this capacity he had jurisdiction over the railway zone and leased territory.
- Q. In such cases as you had to deal with the Kwantung Army, who did you take them up with?
- A. This also depended upon the matter under question and the person or persons concerned with these matters and questions.

## Page 11

- Q. Who was chief of the Kwantung Army during the period 1932 to 1936?
- A. At first it was Lt. General HONJO, followed by Generals MUTO, HISHIKARI, MINAMI, and UEDA -- these four Generals.
- Q. Can you give me an example of any time when you personally took any matters up with these Generals or Heads of the Army?
- A. For instance, I discussed with General UEDA the question of the abolition of extra-territoriality.
- Q. Are there any other cases that you remember?
- A. Another instance was in 1932 in connection with the flotation of Manchukuo public bonds in Japan and the moral support of the Kwantung army under General MUTO was requested for the flotation.
- Q. Why was it necessary to take the flotation of bonds of Manchukuo up with the Head of the Kwantung Army?
- A. As Manchukuo had just been established as a nation and the people in Japan were not well acquainted with Manchurian affairs, it was deemed advisable to obtain the support of the Kwantung Army who were the most powerful Japanese organization in Manchuria. The support was deemed necessary in order to insure the success of the flotation.
- Q. Were these the bonds of Manchukuo?
- A. Yes.

## Page 15

Q. Did you know Mr. KISHI, Shinsuke?  
A. Yes.

Q. When did you first meet him?  
A. It was either in 1934 or 1935 when he came to Manchoukuo.

Q. Did he have any position or office in Manchoukuo at that time?  
A. He was Vice Minister of the Commerce and Industry Department.

Q. And he came there from Japan for that office in 1935?  
A. Yes about that time. I am not sure about the exact date. I might have met Mr. KISHI before, but I do not remember the occasion.

## Page 16

Q. When he was Vice Minister of Commerce and Industry you were then Vice Minister of Finance. Did your departments have a great deal to do with each other in connection with the government business?  
A. Yes.

Q. Give us examples of matters that you had under consideration?  
A. An instance is the five-year plan. This plan would be formulated by the Commerce and Industry Ministry and assistance on financial questions would be given by the Finance Ministry.

Q. In connection with the five-year plan, did you have a great deal to do with the drawing up of the plan?  
A. Yes. On financial matters.

Q. Who else besides yourself and Mr. KISHI took part in the development of the five year plan for Manchoukuo?  
A. There were many people from the South Manchuria Railway Company and the General Affairs Board who took part.

Q. What was the purpose of this plan?  
A. Instead of the haphazard development that took place during the four or five years after the establishment of Manchoukuo, it was deemed necessary that a concrete, co-ordinated plan be formulated. It was thought extremely important that the plans for the development so far as the Manchoukuo government was concerned should be coordinated with the developments that were being planned and carried on by the South Manchurian Railway Company; and in making up this plan it was the purpose to co-ordinate these two different branches so that they would work as an integrated whole.

## Page 1

- Q. Mr. KISHI was Vice Minister of Industry and Commerce when you were there. Did he ever become connected with the General Affairs Board?
- A. Mr. KISHI became Vice Chief of General Affairs Board.

## Page 2

- Q. Did he work under you as Chief of the General Affairs Board?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Did you and Mr. KISHI work together in working out the economic plans for the development of Manchoukuo?
- A. Yes I worked together with Mr. KISHI.
- Q. What was the plan that you worked out for the economic development of Manchoukuo?
- A. We worked on the five year plan for the Manchoukuoan industry and the development of Manchurian national resources, and in connection with agriculture, reforming the variety of agricultural crops and the increase in their production.

## Page 8

- Q. Did he (General ITAGAKI) work with you in connection with the development of the five-year plan?
- A. At the time we worked together.
- Q. Who had the final say so far as the Kwantung Army was concerned? What officer? That is in making decisions on matters that were put in the five-year plan or left out of it.
- A. The Commander of the Kwantung Army.
- Q. Did the Chief of Staff have the final say in most matters?
- A. I don't think so. I think the Commander of the Kwantung Army. The Kwantung Commander had been serving for a long time, so he knew the actual conditions and the situations and therefore he had the final say.

## Page 10

- Q. What was the Manchurian Heavy Industrial Company?
- A. It was a corporation to combine and develop the heavy industries of Manchukuo.
- Q. Do you know when it was formed.

- A. The plan was formulated in 1937, but the corporation was formed in the early part of 1938.

## Page 11

- Q. What was Mr. MATSUOKA's position so far as the Industrial Development Corporation was concerned?
- A. The industries of Manchuria were formerly under the South Manchurian Railway, and to form a new corporation brought a certain amount of hesitancy from Mr. MATSUOKA. However, with the development of railroads in north China, the South Manchurian Railway had to give aid to the North China railways. So Mr. MATSUOKA agreed to the formation of the Manchurian Industrial Development Corporation.

## Page 12

- Q. What was the disagreement between Mr. MATSUOKA and the Kwantung Army as to the formation of this Manchurian Industrial Development Corporation.
- A. There was no special reason, except as I stated above, the one just mentioned.
- Q. Did the Kwantung Army insist upon this plan being carried out?
- A. The Kwantung Army agreed upon this plan and supported the plan.

## Page 13

- Q. In December 1937 Manchukuo promulgated the Industrial Development Corporation Administration Act. Do you know why that was promulgated?
- A. The ordinary laws were not appropriate, so they established this special administrative law.
- Q. Do you mean to establish this company?
- A. This law took in the matters concerning the investments by the government, the profit sharings, and supervision by the government of this corporation.
- Q. Did these matters come within the jurisdiction of the General Affairs Board?
- A. The Director of the Industrial Department has the responsibility over this industry. However, the General Affairs Board assisted in making up the laws in the operation of the company.

## Page 15

- Q. When did you leave Manchukuo?
- A. July of 1940.

- Q. And why did you leave Manchukuo?
- A. I left Manchukuo to become the director of the Enterprising Bureau under the Second Konoye Cabinet.
- Q. Is the Enterprising Bureau the same as the Cabinet Planning Board?
- A. It is the same and I prefer "Cabinet Planning Board".
- Q. How large a board was the Cabinet Planning Board.
- A. About one hundred persons were in the Cabinet Planning Board.

## Page 16

- Q. Did the Planning Board undertake to work out an economic plan for Japan while you were connected with the Cabinet Planning Board?
- A. Yes it made economic plans for Japan.
- Q. Did your Board under your direction as Chief prepare an economic plan for business, manufacturing, and industry in Japan?
- A. Yes there was a plan made in the Cabinet.
- Q. What did the plan provide for?
- A. The industries dealing in the same line should organize and make a solid group, and through this group they should undertake to carry on their duties. And the government control should be through this group.
- Q. Was the government to appoint the directors and managers of this organization?
- A. The government was to nominate the head of the group.
- Q. Was this plan after the plan that had been adopted in Manchukuo?
- A. This plan was different from the one adopted in Manchuria.
- Q. How did it differ from the one adopted in Manchuria?
- A. The fundamental difference is that the one in Manchuria was a corporation and not trying to organize all the industries -- just one big corporation by itself -- and aside from that there were other independent corporations. In Japan it was a group, and not a corporation, just an association or a sort of medium for holding together.

## Page 17

- Q. In Manchuria did the government appoint the President of the big corporation?
- A. Yes.



- Q. In Japan did the government form a control association and appoint the director and President of that control association?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Did that association include the corporations in the same line industry as members of the association?
- A. Yes.

Page 11

File #69, Serial 21

Feb. 7, 1946

- Q. What did you do in making up this plan looking towards the development in East Asia?
- A. It was a plan envisaging the development of the resources of Manchuria, China, and East Asia in general since Japan itself did not have all the necessary resources.

Page 17

- Q. Who was the foreign minister of the second KONOYE cabinet?
- A. MATSUOKA.
- Q. MATSUOKA announced a new foreign policy after he became foreign minister, did he not?
- A. I don't remember exactly.
- Q. Do you know what the foreign policy for Greater East Asia of MATSUOKA was, and if so, state what it was.
- A. It was pretty much what I have said before - it was to establish cordial relations among the various nations in East Asia.
- Q. Did MATSUOKA's plan contemplate more than Japan and Manchukuo?
- A. It included China at least.
- Q. Did the MATSUOKA plan contemplate treating the new Nanking China Government in the same way as it did Manchukuo which had been established by Japan?
- A. No, in a different way.
- Q. How?

Page 18

- A. Well the difference lay in the fact that under the Japanese-Manchuria Treaty very close military and political ideas were formed, whereas the Japanese relations with the Nanking government were not as close.

Page 2

File #69, Serial 24

January 31, 1946

- Q. When were you appointed Vice Minister of the Finance Department; what date?
- A. 1936.
- Q. Do you remember the date?
- A. I do not remember.
- Q. When did you become Chief of the General Affairs Board?
- A. I became Chief of the General Affairs Board in December 1936.
- Q. What were the duties and what did the General Affairs Board handle in connection with the Government of Manchukuo?
- A. It was directly under the Premier of the Manchukuo Government. This Bureau took charge of budget enterprise statistics, personnel, legal matters, and information.
- Q. Did they have general control and supervision over the affairs of the other bureaus, too?
- A. This Bureau under the control of the Premier had some control over the other bureaus. The Premier controls this Board and through this Board controls the other bureaus under the order of the Premier.
- Q. It was one of the most important divisions of the Manchukuo Government, was it not?
- A. Yes.
- Q. When you became Chief of the General Affairs Board did you take Mr. SAKIYAMA's place?
- A. Mr. SAKIYAMA was Vice President. The first chief was KOMA, the next chief was ENDO; following that NAGAOKA; following him came ODATE and I succeeded Mr. ODATE as chief.
- Q. How long did you continue as the Chief of the General Affairs Board?
- A. Three and one-half years approximately.

Page 3

- Q. Until the end of 1939?
- A. Until July of 1940.
- Q. And where did you go?
- A. I returned to Japan.
- Q. And did you have an office with the Japanese Government then?
- A. I was head of the Enterprising Bureau.

- Q. Under what department of the Japanese Government or was that a separate department?
- A. This Department came directly under the control of the Premier.
- Q. Who was the Premier?
- A. Prince KONOYE. I became a minister without portfolio under this Department, the Enterprising Bureau.
- Q. And did you continue as minister without portfolio to the KONOYE Cabinet from its beginning until the end which would include the second and third cabinets?
- A. I resigned April 1941 during KONOYE's second cabinet.
- Q. Were you at all times the head of the Enterprising Bureau while you were acting as minister without portfolio?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Did you have charge of any other bureaus or departments as minister without portfolio?
- A. No other bureau.
- Q. What did the Enterprising Bureau do, Mr. HOSHINO? What was its duties and how did it function?
- A. This Department was formed to collaborate the various departments and to make future plans for the coming year.
- Q. In so doing did they have any connection with the Manchoukian Government?
- A. No connection with the Manchoukian Government.
- Q. So that the Enterprising Bureau was making plans for Japan proper?
- A. Yes, just plans for Japan proper. It made plans to export and import from Manchukuo; made plans as to just what to send to Manchukuo and what Japan imported from Manchukuo. The General Enterprising Bureau made plans for the coming year

Page 4

only so far as Japan was concerned but there was included necessarily in those plans the relationship between Japan and Manchukuo so far as the importation of goods and raw materials from Manchukuo and what Japan would send to Manchukuo by way of export.

- Q. Did any dispute ever arise between your Bureau and the Manchoukian representatives as to what these plans would cover -- exports and imports?
- A. There were no special disputes between the Manchoukian Government and the enterprising Bureau.

- Q. Did the Enterprising Bureau have anything to do with the financing of industries in Manchukuo?
- A. There was a financial plan set up within the Japanese plans. There was a certain amount allotted to assist Manchoukuo. However, I cannot say that it was directly appropriated to the financing of industries.
- Q. Was it loaned or advanced to the Government?
- A. In the plan there is a certain amount to be invested in Manchoukuo. It does not concern industry alone; but just so much investment in Manchoukuo. It included industry and other governmental requirements. There was so much allotted to Manchoukuo industry and other governmental functions. However, our Bureau did not concern itself with how it should be used by Manchoukuo. It was the Finance Department which took care of such matters.

## Page 5

- Q. Was the Kwantung Army separate from the railroad zone?
- A. It was separate but the Kwantung Army head was the Governor of the Kwantung territory.
- Q. The consulates also had their separate functions at that time, did they not?
- A. Yes.
- Q. After you went there in 1932 was a change made?
- A. Yes, a change was made.
- Q. And what did they have then?
- A. The Kwantung Army Commander is the Ambassador to Manchukuo and the Ambassador controlled the consulate, the Manchurian Railway and the Kwantung Government.
- Q. When did that take place? Was that after you went to Manchukuo?
- A. Yes.
- Q. In 1932.
- A. Yes.
- Q. Was there any change in this arrangement in 1934?
- A. There were some changes made.

## page 6

- Q. What were the changes? Maybe I can help you by asking you whether in 1934 the Commander of the Army and the Ambassador were combined into one man so that the Ambassador represented the Japanese Government in the carrying on of the functions of Government as far as the Kwantung leased territory and the South Manchurian Railway Company zone were concerned. Is that

correct?

A. Yes.

Q. When they combined the Commander of the Army with the Ambassadorship it became necessary that they always have a military man as the Ambassador to Manchukuo? Is that right?

A. Yes.

## Page 13

Q. What did you have to do with the Five Year Economic Plan that was drawn up in 1936?

A. When the Five Year Plan was drawn up I was in the Finance Department, therefore, I was connected on the finance side of the plan.

Q. When did the five year plan become effective; when did it go into effect?

A. From 1937.

Q. As Chief of the General Affairs Board did you have anything to do in connection with it?

## Page 14

A. After I became the Chief of the General Affairs Bureau I had general connection with it.

Q. Whom did you work with in connection with the five year plan?

A. I worked with Finance Minister and its Vice Minister; the Industrial and Agriculture Minister and its Vice Minister; the head of the Enterprising Bureau, the Communication Minister and the Vice Chief of the General Affairs Bureau.

Q. Did you work with Mr. KISHI, Shinsuke (Nobusuke) ?

A. Yes.

Q. What position did he hold then?

A. Vice Minister of the Industrial Department.

Q. At that time Gen. ITAGAKI was the Chief of Staff. Did you work with him?

A. I consulted Gen. ITAGAKI on various matters.

Q. What matters did you take up with him?

A. I do not remember very clearly but we discussed various matters including the five year plan.

## Page 16

- Q. Do you have any knowledge as to how Mr. MIKAWA came to come over there at that time to Manchukuo?
- A. I believe he was encouraged by the Japanese Government to go to Manchukuo

## Page 17

- Q. Do you know why?
- A. Several enterprisers were sent to Manchukuo to study and investigate the economic state in Manchukuo. Mr. MIKAWA was one of them.
- Q. During that time was there any opposition on the part of the Kwantung Army to the Zaibatsu making an investment in Manchukuo?
- A. At first there seemed to have been an opposition from the Kwantung Army but I do not think there was any special objection.
- Q. What was the reason that the Kwantung Army made any objection to the Zaibatsu making investments in Manchukuo?
- A. The army in general did not oppose the Zaibatsu but there existed such an atmosphere among the Kwantung officers. The Kwantung officers believed that since the Zaibatsu monopolizes industry in Japan such should not happen to the industries in Manchukuo. Therefore, the opposition on the part of the army.

## Page 18

- Q. Was there any differences of opinion as to the handling of industries between the Kwantung Army and the South Manchuria Railway?
- A. There was no particular difference between the Kwantung Army and the South Manchuria Railway. However, the South Manchuria Railway advocated a Japanese corporation, while the Kwantung Army advocated a Manchoukian corporation.
- Q. Why did the Kwantung Army advocate having a Manchoukian corporation rather than a Japanese corporation?
- A. The Kwantung Army advocated the Manchoukian corporation because as long as the industry was Manchoukian it should be controlled by the Manchoukians in all affairs. This was not a Kwantung Army policy but a tendency towards that aim.
- Q. Was the tendency to develop Manchoukuo as a self-integrated unit or a self-supporting unit of government? Was this policy on the part of the Army to make Manchoukuo self-controlled so far as materials and manufactures were concerned?

- A. Yes, it was. The industries in Manchoukuo should be controlled by the Manchoukians and in order to communicate with Japan, the Manchoukuo-Japan Economical Committee was formed to act sort of as a liaison.

## Page 19

- Q. When did you next see Mr. AIKAWA?  
 A. I do not remember.
- Q. Did you see him more than once in Tokyo?  
 A. I met him two or three times in Tokyo.

## Page 20

- Q. Did you talk with him about the possibility of his coming over to Manchukuo and interesting himself in the development of the country?  
 A. We did discuss about such matters.
- Q. What particular matters did you discuss?  
 A. Mr. AIKAWA stated that in order to develop Manchukuo Japanese machinery and financial aid was insufficient. Therefore, other foreign investments were necessary in order to establish the industry in Manchukuo, particularly American aid, investment.

## Page 21

- Q. What was Mr. AIKAWA's plan?  
 A. In order to develop the industries in Manchukuo various industries, such as coal, steel and machine industries, must be consolidated. This consolidated industry should be controlled by the Japan Industrial Corporation. Japan alone cannot finance this big project so they need outside help, preferably United States investments.
- Q. Was Mr. AIKAWA's plan in writing?  
 A. There may have been a pamphlet published by Mr. AIKAWA.
- Q. Did you discuss this plan when you were in Manchukuo with Mr. KISHI?  
 A. Yes.

## Page 22

- Q. When was the Manchurian Heavy Industries Corporation formed?  
 A. I believe it was formed in the latter part of the fall of the year 1937.
- Q. Did the General Affairs Board have anything to do in connection with the organization of that Corporation?

- A. In order to make the special laws or decrees for the Manchurian Heavy Industries Corporation there was the conference of various ministers and the General Affairs Bureau had connections in this conference. In order to formulate a treaty between Manchukuo and China, the Japanese Manchurian Economical Commission has to make liaison between the two countries and the Chief of the General Affairs Bureau is a member of that Liaison Economical Committee, so, therefore, the General Affairs Bureau has connection.

Page 23

- Q. You were the representative of the General Affairs Board upon this liaison committee?
- A. Yes.
- Q. As such representative what did you do with the preparation of this treaty or this agreement?
- A. I was present at the conference and I agreed upon the plan.
- Q. And did you draw up the agreement?
- A. I did not draw up the agreement, I merely agreed upon this.
- Q. Did you make any suggestions or changes in it before it was finally signed?
- A. I did not make any changes or suggestions.
- Q. Was Mr. IKEDA at these conferences.
- A. He was not present.
- Q. Who were present at these conferences?
- A. Those present at the conference were Foreign Minister, Finance Minister, Industrial Minister, and Chief of the General Affairs Bureau from Manchukuo. And from the Japanese side there were the Chief of Staff.
- Q. Was that TOJO the Chief of Staff?
- A. Yes. (resuming) Consular from the Embassy.
- Q. Who was he?
- A. MORIYA or SAWADA. (resuming) And experts nominated by the Japanese Government and the Governor of the Kwantung Prefecture.

File #69, Serial 27

February 26, 1946

Page 1

- Q. Just what was the purpose and duties of the Planning Board, Mr. Hoshino?



A. The general duties of the Cabinet Planning Board are mainly in two parts: The general arrangement of the various departments and the formation of yearly plans.

Q. And what do you mean by the formation of yearly plans?

A. By that I mean the production plans and material distribution plans and various other minor details such as for transportation to carry out the material distribution.

## Page 2

Q. And during that period of time you not only made the necessary plans for the administration of the Empire of Japan but also plans required for the supply of munitions and materials for the Japanese Army in China? Is that not correct, Mr. Hoshino?

A. In this Planning Board, the only plans made for material distribution is an over-all plan and it does not go into any detail matter. For instance, if the Navy and Army and the civilian populace submit certain plans to carry out their needs, the Cabinet Planning Board makes the necessary plans with respect to the amount of material available. The Cabinet Planning Board is not concerned as to whether the amount of material is to be used by certain forces in China or another certain amount will be used by certain forces in Japan Proper. It only takes in the over-all estimates from the various demands.

Q. And from what source, Mr. Hoshino, would you receive the various demands and estimates of materials and supply that would be needed in connection with your yearly plan?

A. They are submitted by the various departments such as the Army, the Navy, or the Agriculture, and so forth.

Q. Is it not a fact, Mr. Hoshino, that over the years before you became president of the Planning Board and thereafter that the demands of the Army and Navy had constantly increased?

A. Yes, it has increased.

Q. And is it not a fact that in 1939 and 1940 and prior thereto the Army and Navy were increasing their demands for supplies not only for the war in China but in contemplation of the possibility of war with other powers?

A. That I cannot say. The increase in material distribution was for the purpose of carrying on the war in China, however, the exact contents and the reason therefore, was kept a secret by the Army and the Navy and, therefore, the Cabinet Planning Board knew nothing as to their use.

Q. But you did know, Mr. Hoshino, did you not, as stated a moment ago that the demands of the Army and Navy for supplies increased each year?

A. Yes, that is certain.

(Doc. 1915)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, E. E. DANLY, hereby certify:

1. That I am Chief of the Document Division of the International Prosecution Section, G.H.Q., S.C.A.P., and as such have possession, custody and control of original or copies of documents obtained by the said Section.

2. That Document 1915 contains seven interrogations of Hoshino, Naoki taken on the following dates:

28 January 1946  
31 January 1946  
4 February 1946  
7 February 1946  
11 February 1946  
26 February 1946  
1 April 1946

3. That the interrogations of Hoshino, Naoki above referred to on the 28 January 1946, 31 January 1946, 4 February 1946, 7 February 1946 and 11 February 1946 were delivered to me by Henry A. Hauxhurst, interrogator, duly certified, and that the interrogations on 26 February 1946 and 1 April 1946 were delivered to me by Valentine C. Hammack, interrogator, duly certified, and that the original or a copy thereof has at all times been in my possession as Chief of the Document Division of the International Prosecution Section, G.H.Q., S.C.A.P.

7/30/46 /s/ E. E. Danly  
E. E. DANLY

Feb. 1945

HOSHINO, Naoki Testimony.

Interrogation dated January 28, 1946, File 69, Serial 18;

I, Denis Kildoyle, being sworn on oath, state that I truly translated the questions and answers given from English to Japanese and from Japanese to English, respectively, and that the above transcription of such questions and answers, consisting of seventeen pages, numbered 1 to 17 inclusive, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

/s/ Denis Kildoyle

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 2nd day of February 1946.

/s/ Henry A. Hauxhurst  
(Name and Rank)

Duly Detailed Investigating Officer  
International Prosecution Section, GHQ, SCAP

I, Edna M. Hickam, hereby certify that I acted as stenographer at the interrogation set out above, and that I transcribed the foregoing questions and answers, and that the transcription is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

/s/ Edna M. Hickam

I, Henry Hauxhurst, certify that on the 28th day of January 1946, personally appeared before me Naoki HOSHINO and according to Denis Kildoyle, interpreter, gave the foregoing answers to the several questions set forth therein.

Tokyo, Japan  
2 February 1946

/s/ Henry A. Hauxhurst

\*\*\*\*\*

Interrogation dated February 4, 1946, File 69, Serial 19

4 Feb 1946

I, T/3 Ben Oshita, Serial Number 38668931, being sworn on oath, state that I truly translated the questions and answers given from English to Japanese and from Japanese to English, respectively, and that the above transcription of such questions and answers, consisting of 17 pages numbered 1 to 17 inclusive, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

/s/ Ben Oshita

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 6th day of February 1946

/s/ Henry Austin Hauxhurst (Name and Rank)  
Duly Detailed Investigating Officer  
International Prosecution Section, GHQ, SCAP

I, Edna M. Hickam, hereby certify that I acted as stenographer at the interrogation set out above, and that I transcribed the foregoing questions and answers, and that the transcription is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

/s/ Edna M. Hickam

Doc. 1915

Interrogation dated January 31, 1946, File 69, Serial 24.

I, Ben Oshita, 38668331, being sworn on oath, state that I truly translated the questions and answers given from English to Japanese and From Japanese to English respectively, and that the above transcription of such questions and answers, consisting of twenty-four and one-quarter pages, are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

/s/ Ben Oshita  
(Interpreter's Signature)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of Feb. 1946

/s/ Henry A. Hauxhurst  
(Name and Rank)  
Duty Detailed Investigating Officer  
International Prosecution Section, GHQ,  
SCAP

I, Jewel E. Newman, hereby certify that I acted as stenographer at the interrogation set out above, and that I transcribed the foregoing questions and answers, and that the transcription is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

/s/ Jewel E. Newman  
(Stenographer's Signature)

I, Henry Austin Hauxhurst, certify that on the 31st day of January, 1946, personally appeared before me Naoki HOSHINO, and according to Ben Oshita, Interpreter, gave the foregoing answers to the several questions set forth therein.

/s/ Henry A. Hauxhurst  
(Name and Rank)

2-27-46  
(Date)

Doc 1915

I, Henry Austin Hauxhurst, certify that on the 4th day of February 1946, personally appeared before me HOSHINO, Naoki, and according to T/3 Ben Oshita, interpreter, gave the foregoing answers to the several questions set forth therein.

Tokyo, Japan  
6 Feb 1946

/s/ Henry Austin Hauxhurst

\*\*\*\*\*  
Interrogation dated February 7, 1946, File 69, Serial 21.

I, ROBERT M. BOYD, Lt. USN, 236713, being sworn on oath, state that I truly translated the questions and answers given from English to Japanese and from Japanese to English respectively, and that the above transcription of such questions and answers, consisting of thirty (30) pages, are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

/s/ Robert M. Boyd  
Robert M. Boyd, Lt. USN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 12th day of February, 1946.

/s/ Henry Austin Hauxhurst  
HENRY AUSTIN HAUXHURST  
Duly Detailed Investigating Officer  
International Prosecution Section, GHQ,  
SCAP

I, DINAH BRAUN, hereby certify that I acted as stenographer at the interrogation set out above, and that I transcribed the foregoing questions and answers, and that the transcription is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

/s/ Dinah Braun  
DINAH BRAUN

I, HENRY AUSTIN HAUXHURST, certify that on the 6th day of February, 1946, personally appeared before me HOSHINO, Naoki, and according to LT. ROBERT M. BOYD, USN, Interpreter, gave the foregoing answers to the several questions set forth therein.

Tokyo, February 12th, 1946.

/s/ Henry Austin Hauxhurst  
HENRY AUSTIN HAUXHURST

\*\*\*\*\*

FILE COPY  
RETURN TO ROOM 361

Ex 2225  
Evidentiary Document # 1915B

綴り番号ヲ六九号、連続番号ヲ十八号、証拠書類ヲ九一五号

星野直樹 訊問ノ抜萃

一九四六年一月二十八日、才十三頁ヨリ

x x x x x

問、總務局ハ君ガ滿洲國ニ居テ一九三二年カラ一九三六年迄ノ間個人  
會社ニシテ株式或ハ證券ノ賣却ヲ認可シテハバテリマセンデシタカ。

答、吾々ハ必要ナル時ニ株式及ビ證券ノ賣却ヲ援助シタシ。

此ハ電力會社電話會社及ビ其ノ種類ノ他ノ會社ノ株式賣却ニ関

ステ行ヒテモテス。

綴り番号ヲ六九号、連続番号ヲ十八号、証拠書類ヲ九一五号

星野直樹 訊問ノ抜萃

一九四六年二月四日、才七頁ヨリ

問、一九三七年七月七日ノ支那ヲ變即チ「マーコ・ポーロ」事件ノ當時

ハ誰ガ參謀長デシタカ。

答、東條が當時參謀長デシタ。

問、誰ガ國東軍司令官デシタカ。

答、植田大將デシタ。

問、一九三七年七月七日以前ニ、國東軍ノ兵力ニ增強ガアリタシタカ。

答、私ハ知りマセン。

問、支那ヲ變ニ於テ東條大將ハ何ウイフ役割ヲ演ジタシタカ。

答、國東軍ニ對シテ援助命令ガカリマシタ。東條ハ國東軍ノ一部ヲ

率テ司令官代理トシテ蒙古ニ援助ニ派遣サレタシ。

x x x x x x x x x x

No. 1

綴り番号六九号、連続番号オ二一号、澄次書類オ一九一五号

星野直樹顧問ノ拔萃

一九四六年二月七日、オ八頁ヨリ

1915

問、君ハオニ次近衛内閣ノ閣員トシテ、内閣企畫院總裁デシラネ、  
答、ソウデアリマシタ。

問、君ガ企畫院總裁トナラテ後、何カ日本ノ経済企畫ヲ発布スルナリ  
立テルナリシマシラカ。

答、企畫院ハ前申上テタ通り、閣議ヲ決定サレル草案ヲ作ツタリ  
テス。

問、日本ノ経済状態ハ全般ニ亘ッテ君ガ提言シタ案ヲ最初ニ内閣ヲ採  
用シタリハ何時デシラカ。

答、一九四〇年ノ十一月デシタ。

問、其案ハ何ウイフ事ヲ果シテ企図シテ居タカ、吾々ニ告ゲテ呉レマセシカ。

答、或ハ一定産業ニ従事スル諸会社ガソノ団体トシテ其ノ産業ヲ発  
展セシメ得ル様ニ之ヲソノ会、ソノ団体ニスル事デアリマシタ。

問、其案ニ依ルト、其団体ノ長ヲ政府ガ任命スル様ニナツキナラドテス  
カ。

答、政府ハ其ノ会社中カラソノヲ選ニテ其ノ長ニ任命スルコトニナツキマシタ。  
問、ソレデ政府ハ此ノ所謂「統制會」ノ長ヲ各々任命シタリ  
テスカ。

答、エ、政府ハ長ヲ任命シマシタ。此ノ様ナ長ヲ任命スル  
法律上ノ手續ハアリマセンデシタガ、通常一番古参ノ者ヲ

任命シマシタ。

No. 2

no. 3

1915

問、政府が此ノ様ナ統制會ノ長トシテ任命シタ者ハ皆、何ノ様ニ事ヲ運ブヘキカニ就テ決定的發言權ヲ有シテ居マシタカ、答、政府ガ制限ヲシテ居リマシタノデ、其ノ制限内テ其ノ統制會ヲ管理シマシタ。

問、一九四〇年十一月ニ内閣ヲ採用シタ案ハ修正サレタコトガアリマスカ、答、特ニ修正サレタ処ハアリマセンデシタ。

問、日本ノ事業ヲ処理スル其ノ方法ハ十一月カラ戰爭ガ終ルマデ繼續シテ居タノデスカ、答、大体ニ於テ、サウデス。



1915

綴り番号才六九 号連續番号才二一  
證據書類才九一五号

星野直樹訊問ノ抜萃

一九四六年二月七日、才九頁

問、ソノ計画ハドナナ方法ヲ次頁木ヲ経営カラ分離サセマシ

タカ

答、此ノ計画ハ予業ノ経営ニ関シ、資本ニ或ル新ヲ制限  
ヲ設ケマシタガ、資本側ハ尚雇傭、解雇等ニ関シ、或  
ル特權ヲ保持シテ居マシタカ、又資本ト経営ガ分離サレ  
テ居タトハ云ヘマセン

問、政府ガ之等ノ会ノ支配ニ其ノ會長ニシタ人々ハドナナ方法

ヲ其ノ工場發展ノ方式ヲ統制シマシタカ

答、ソノ計画ニハソレハ考慮サレテ居マセンデシタ。併シ商工大  
臣ニ必要ニ應ジテ各種ノ統制會長ト會議ヲ圖リ  
トシテ居マレリ。前ノ質問ニ関シ、此大ガツバナ計画ニ  
ハ統制會ノ運営ニ付テハ細イ事迄キメテ居リマセン  
デシタ。唯統制會ノ組織ヲキメタ大クデス。

問、ソノ計画ハ後ナナテ統制ヲ更ニ強化スル為改メラセシ  
タカ

答、漸次必要ニ応ジテ色々ナ法令ガ此ノ統制實施ノ為榮  
セラレマシタ

問、此ノ統制實施ハドナナ方法ヲ之等會員ノ間、原料

No. 4

配給が政府に依りて統制せられたる。

答内閣企劃院一員トシテ、私ハソレニ關係シセシテ

シタソレハ商工大臣が取扱ツテ居マシタ。内閣企劃院

が大綱ヲキメ、各省が此ノ計畫實施ニ夫々ノ權限ノ下

ニ多カレ、少カレ行動シタ訣デアリマス

綴込番号才六九号、連續番号才二二号

證據書類才一九一五号

星野直樹訊問ノ抜萃

一九四六年二月七日才十四頁

問無任所大臣トシテ席前會議ニ出席シタコトガアリマスカ

答ハイ、一度アリマス。

問何時デスカ

答一九四〇年、十月ト思ヒマス。

問其會議ハ何ニ関シテ申シタカ。

答日独同盟ニ関シタモノト思ヒマス。ハツキリハ記憶シマセン。

問ソレハ日独伊三國同盟デスカ。

答ノウデス。

問ソレヲ其ノ席前會議ハ三國同盟條約承認ノ目的デ

開カレタデスカ。

答ハツキリ記憶シマセン。條約ニ付テモ論議サレシタガ、動

員ノ様々他ノ問題モ論議サレシタ。

問其ノ會議デ下ナクモ発言シマシタカ。

答シテシタ。

同其ノ會議ニ參列シテ何ヲ言ヒマシタカ

答記憶シテガ當時ノ各種産業ノ狀況ヲ概説シテシタ。

綴込番号才六九号連續番号才二一号

証據書類才一九一五号

日星野直樹訊問ノ抜萃

一九四六年二月七日才十五頁

同貴下ニ三國同盟ニ賛成シマシタカ

答オウデスネソレハ閣議ヲ決定サレタリテ下リ、從ツテ、

当然、私ハソレニ反対シマセンテシタ。

綴込番号才六九号連續番号才二一号

証據書類才一九一五号

日星野直樹訊問ノ抜萃

一九四六年二月七日、才十八頁

同貴下ハ近衛邸ニ於ケル大政翼賛會才一回會合ニ

出席シマシタカ

答意味ガ分リマセン

同大政翼賛會才一回會合ノリス、テス、同會合ハ近衛邸

若シクハ官邸ヲ開催サレト余ハ了解シテキル

答ハイ、出席シマシタ。

綴込番号 六六九號 連續番号 第二号  
證據書類 第一九一五号

星野直樹 訊問 抜萃

一九四六年二月七日 第二十五頁

問 十二月初旬ニ御前會議が行ハレマシタカ。

答 ハイ。行ハレタト思ヒマス。

問 何日カ

答 正確ニ覺見エテ居マセン。

問 ソレハ十二月一日デシタカ。

答 十二月一日カ。二日頃デシタ。

問 同會議デ考定セラレタ事ハ何デシタ。

答 若シモ會談が十二月初旬ノ間ニ成功シナカッタラ戰爭

トナルデラウト。

問 其ノ御前會議ニ先立ツテ閣議が開カレマシタカ。

答 開カレタト思ヒマス。

問 全閣僚が出席シタハデスカ。

答 サウデス。

問 同閣議ニ貴下自身出席シマシタカ。

答 ハイ。書記官長トシテ。

問 會談が十二月初旬中ニ終了セヌ場合ノ開戦ノ決定ハ

同閣議ニ於テ決メラレタノカ。

答 ハイ。

問 貴下ハ其ノ御前會議ニ出席シマシタカ。

問 答 問 答 問 答 問 答 問 答 問 答 問 答 問 答

1915

答、ハイ。

同、天皇ハ同會議ニ臨席トサツタノデスカ。  
答、ハイ。

綴込第六九号 連續番号第二一号  
証據書類第一九一五号

星野直樹記内ノ抜萃

一九四六年 二月七日第二十七頁

同、貴下ハ東條内閣成立カラ一九四一年十二月八日後ニ至ル迄  
ニ行ハレタ總テノ閣議ニ出席シマシタカ

答、ハイ。

同、対米宣戰布告ヲナシタル枢密院會議ハ、天皇臨席ノ  
下ニ、何時行ハレタノデスカ——何日ニ。

答、十二月八日デス。

同、何時ニ。

答、九時頃。

同、貴下ハソレニ出席シマシタカ。

答、ハイ。

同、全閣僚及ビ全枢密顧問官ガ出席シタノデスカ。  
答、サウデス。

no. 8

1915

綴込番号第六九号ノ連續番号才二一号  
証據書類第一九一五号

星野直樹訊問ノ抜萃

一九四六年二月七日、第二十八頁

問、樞密院會議ハ十二月八日ノ何時ニ行ハレタトアナタハ言ハ  
レタリテス。

答、午前九時

問、天皇ハソノ會議ニ出席サレマシタカ。

答、ハイ。

問、從ッテ樞密院並ニ無任所ヲモ含ム全閣僚ハ十二月八日

午前九時ノ會議ニ出席シ、又天皇モ其処ニ居ラレタノテスネ。

答、ハイ。

綴込番号六九号連續番号二一号、證據書類才一九一五号、

星野直樹訊問ノ抜萃

一九四六年二月七日、才二九、三〇頁

問、米國ニ対スル正式ノ宣戰布告ハ何時ナサレマシタカ。

答、外務大臣ガ軍当局ト相談シテ宣戰布告ノ時ヲ決定シマ

シタ。外ニハ誰モソノ決定ニ就イテハ何モ知りマセンデシタ。

問、アタタハ樞密院ノ協賛ナキ宣戰布告ハアリ得ナイト云ツタ

ト思ヒマシタガ、ソウデスカ。

答、ソウデス。正式ノ宣戰布告ニハ、樞密院ノ協賛が必要デス。

問、十二月八日以前ニ、ソノ件ガ考慮サレ決定アレタ樞密院及

内閣ノ會議ヲ行ヒマシタカ。

答、イ、エ。

NO. 9

1915

綴り番号第六九号、連続番号第二四号、證拠書類第一九一五号。

星野直樹訊問ノ抜萃

一九四六年一月三十一日、才十五頁

問、總務局ハアタタカ「千エアマシ」ニテツテカラス、私ガ「千エアマシ」

ト言フノハ長ノ事ヲ云ツテキルノデスガ、滿洲ニ於ケル何等カノ産業ノ建設ニ何カ關係シマシタカ。

答、總務局ガ滿洲國ノ産業ニ關係シタ多クノ場合ガアリマス、

同、ソレハ諸産業ノ建設ニ關係シテキルト云フノデスカ。

答、ハイ、産業ノ建設ニ於テ——勿論直接ニテハナク、

同、ドウイフ風ニ關係ガアツタノデスカ。

答、總務局ハ産業ニ關スル多クノ重要事項ニ就テ意見ヲ求メラレマシタ。

問、總務局ハ滿洲ヲ發展サセル目的ニテ資本ヲ滿洲國ニ

投資サセヨウトスル事ニ關心ヲ持チマシタカ。

答、ハイ。

1915

綴込番号第六九号 連續番号才ニ五号  
證據書類才一九一五号

星野直樹訃向ノ披露

一九四六年二月十日、第七七八九頁

向 内閣ハ「ルースベルト」氏「ハル」氏野村氏 末栖氏、會談ノ  
報告ニ対シ、何等カノ處置ヲ取りマシタカ。

答、内閣ハ外交交渉ハ貫徹サレサリニモナイト、印象ヲ受ケ  
タルモノト私ハ思ヒマス。

向 ドノ會議 デテスカ。 其ノ期日ハ。

答、何ノ會議 デシタカ明確ニ思ヒ出セマセン。

向 當時何ノ特別ノ會議、開カレタノガアリマシタカ。

答、十二日始メ 本交渉ニ因リ會議ガアツタト思ヒマス。

向、ソレハ何故召集サレタノデス。

答、内閣ガ米國ト條約ハ結ハレル所マデ行カナイカラウト  
言フ印象ヲ得、條約ガ都合ヨク行カトカツタ際ニハ、  
何ノ様ナ處置ヲ取ラタラヨイカ、或ハ取ル意志カト言フ  
様ナ事ニテ召集サレタモノト思ヒマス。

向、若シ本交渉ガ成功シタカツタ場合、如何ナル手段ヲ  
取ル様ニ決定シタノデスカ。

答、本交渉ガ出来ナケバ、日本ハ自由行動ニ至ルト言フ様ニ。

向、米國ト戦争ヲ始ムト言フエトニ因リテ、會議ヲ大臣中  
ニ異論ガアリマシタカ。

答、イ、エ。



綴込番号才六九号連續番号才二五号  
證據書類才一九一五号

星野直樹訊問ノ抜萃

一九四六年二月十日、第十一、十二、十四頁

内、戦争ノ宣言ハ何時秘密院ニ提出サレマシタカ。

答、八日朝

内、而シテ貴下ハ該會議ニ列席シテ申マシタカ。

答、ハイ。

内、該秘密院會議ノ際、貴下ハ真珠湾ガ攻撃ヲ受

ケタカ如何カラ知ツテ申マシタカ。

答、ハイ、同キ及ンデ申マシタ。

内、而シテ貴下ハ戦争ノ宣言ガ秘密院ニ承認サレ

前ニ夫レヲ聞キマシタカ。

答、既ニ知ツテ申タト思ヒマス。

内、秘密院ガ戦争ノ宣言ヲ承認後、彼等ハ夫レヲ陛下

ニ提出シマシタカ。

答、ハイ。

内、而シテ陛下ハ夫レヲ如何ナサツタカ。

答、陛下ハ此ノ戦争ノ宣言ヲ受理サレタ時、夫レニ署名

ナサイマシタ。

綴込番号才六九号連續番号才二七号  
證據書類才一九一五号

1915

星野直樹 訊問ノ抜萃

一九一五年二月廿六日 第八九二頁

問 星野サン 貴下ハ内閣ヲ東條大將ト最モ親密ナ向柄

答 テアツタト私ハ聞イテ居マスガ、其ノ莫ハ如何テスカ。

問 書記官長トシテ私ハ東條ニ一番密接ニ關係カアリマス。

答 然レ私ガ最モ親密ナ相談役デアツタトハ言ヘマセン。

問 星野サン 対米戦争ガ日本ニ依フテ決定セシタ事ヲ

答 最初ニ貴下カ知ツタノハ何崎デアリマシタカ。

問 十一月二十七日カ二十七日ニ米國トノ戦争ハ避ケルコトガ出来

答 ト南イテ居マシタ。

問 西米利加合衆國大統領ヨリ、最後通牒ガ二十七日ニ

答 受領セシタ由デシタ。ソレテ閣僚達ノ見解ニ依レハ此

問 一事ガ日米關係ノ改善ヲ殆ト不可能ナラシメタデアリマス。

答 一九四一年十一月二十七日ノ情勢トシテ此ノ情勢ガ存在シタ

問 ト言フ陳述ヲ誰ガ内閣ニ對シテシマシタカ。

答 東條首相ガ内閣ニ此ノ事ヲ報告シタト思ヒマス。

問 此ノ會議ニ於テ全閣員ガ會議ヲ致シマシタカ。

答 此ハ正確ニ記憶シテ居マセン。然レ閣僚全部ガ出席シ

問 テ會議ガ内閣カシタユトハ確デアリマス。ソレテ其會合ハ一月

答 下旬ノ二十日初メニアツタト思ヒマス。

問 東條首相ガ此ノ陳述ヲシタ時ノ會議ニ出席シタ閣僚ハ

答 誰々テシタカ。

問 其閣僚全部ヲ記憶シテキル譯ハアリマセンガ確カニ彼等

答 ハ全部出席シマシタ。

問 東條首相ガ此ノ陳述ヲシタ時ノ會合ニ次イテ星野サン、

答 何カ起キマシタカ。

問 其ニ次イテ中前會議カアリマシタ。ソレテ其レハ陸軍

答 參謀總長・海軍々令部長各國務大臣ガ出席シマシタ。

no. 13

Doc. 1915

向、御前會議ニ出席シ、陸軍參謀總長ハ誰デシタカ。

答、陸軍參謀總長ハ杉山デ、又海軍々々令部長ハ永野デ。

向、其ノ御前會議ニ於テ東條首相又ハ其他ノ人ニ依ツテ對米  
戰爭ノ確實性ニ關シ或ハ對米戰爭ニ乘リ出ス決定ニ  
就テ何等カノ陳述ガナサレマシタカ。

答、東條首相ガ陳述ヲシタト思ヒマス、然レ如何ナル事ヲ述ベ  
タカ私ハ想ヒ起シマセン。

向、星野サン、此ノ御前會議ノ重要性ニ鑑ミテ假令、其ノ通  
リノ言系デナクテモ、如何ナル趣意ノコトガ述ベラシタカ貴下  
ハ記憶ヲタドツテ述ベルコトガ出来マセンカ。

答、其時如何ナル事ガ述ベラシタカ言フ事ハ出来マセンガ、彼ハ對  
米戰爭ノ不可避ナル事ヲ推論シテ其故ニ吾々ガ凡テ  
必要ノ準備ヲナサネバナラナイト述マク事ト思ヒマス。

向、陸軍參謀總長杉山大將及、永野海軍大將ノ兩人  
ハ陸海軍双方ガ合衆國政變ノ準備ヲナシテナルコト  
又戰爭ノ準備ニ於テ政變ノ全計畫ヲ完了シタト述  
ベタノガ事實デハアリマセンカ。

答、如何ナル事ガ確カニ述ベラシタカニ就テハ想ヒ出スコトガ出来マ  
センガ、彼ハ準備ハ既ニ完了シタト言ツタ様ニ思ヒマス。

向、貴下ハ「彼」ト言ヒマシタガ、誰ノ事ヲ言フノデスカ。

答、私ハ正確ニハ記憶シテキマセンガ、是等參謀總長軍令部  
長ノ兩人ガ其陳述ヲナシタト思ヒマス。

向、此ノ御前會議ニ陛下モ親臨サレマシタカ。  
答、サワラス、親臨サレマシタ。

No. 14

綴込番号第六九号連續番号ヲモテ号

星野直樹訊問ノ抜萃

一九四六年二月二十六日 第十一頁

問

星野サン、内閣ノ指令ニ依リ内閣書記官長トシテ此ノ宣  
戦布告ヲ貴下ガ實際ニ書上ゲ、又是ヲ準備シタコトガ  
事實デハアリマセンカ。

答

其ノ文書ヲ書イタ人ヲ確實ニ述ベルコトハ困難デステド、  
其ノ書類ハ總理大臣ノ名義ガ發スルモノデアルカラ私モ  
其ノ一部分ヲ作ルヲ傳ヒマシタ。

綴込番号ヲ六九号連續番号ヲ四二号

星野直樹訊問ノ抜萃

一九四六年四月一日 第一頁

問

星野サン、先日貴下ヲ訊問シタ時、宣戦布告書ノ一部ヲ貴  
下ガ書イタコトヲ申立テタラスガ、アレハサウワツタノデスネ。

答

全文ヲ書イタトハ云ヘマセンガ、併シ私ガソレヲ經ナタノデス。

問

星野サン、貴下ガ宣戦布告書ト云フハ、合衆國ニ交附シタ  
通牒デスカ、ソレトモ天皇ガ署名シタモノデスカ。

答

ソレハ、十二月七日合衆國ニ交附シタ通牒デナリ、宣戦ノ詔  
勅デス。

Eu 453A  
1915-1

星野直樹

書類第六十九號第十八次 一九四六年（昭和廿一年）一月廿八日

第一頁

問、星野サン、貴下ハ一九三二年（昭和七年）何處へ行キマシタカ

答、私ハ一九三二年（昭和七年）滿洲へ赴キマシタ

問、何時滿洲へ行ツタカ御記憶アリマスカ

答、私ハ日本ヲ一九三二年（昭和七年）七月十二日ニ出發シマシタ

第三頁

問、星野サン、貴下ガ滿洲へ派遣セラレルトイフコトヲ最初ニ知ツタノハ何時頃デシタカ

答、六月ノ末デス

問、誰ガ貴下ニ告ゲマシタカ

答、大藏大臣ノ私設秘書ガ此ノ旅行ノコトヲ私ニ告ゲタノデアリマシタ

1915-2

第四頁

問、貴下ノ彼地ヘノ赴任ノ理由ニ付テ其ノ秘書ハ何事カヲ告ゲマシタカ

答、私ハ總務局長官ノ地位ニ適シテイルト考ヘラレテイムカラデス

問、貴下ノ一行ノ中ニ同行サレタ人々ヲ貴下自身ガ選バレタノデスカ

答、大藏大臣ノ私設秘書ガ私ニ相談ヲシテ適材ガ選バレタノデス

第十頁

問、貴下ガ總務局長トシテ一九三二年（昭和七年）カラ一九三六年（昭和十一年）迄在職ノ四ケ年ノ間ニ貴下ハ東京駐ト何等カノ交渉ガアリマシタカ

答、爾者ノ間ニハ密ニ連絡ガアリマシタ

問、此ノ連絡ハ何ノ爲メノ連絡デシタカ

答、取上げネバナライ事項ガ擧出アリマシタソシテ日露條約ノ結果トシテ此等ノ事項ヲ處理スル爲メ東京駐トノ連絡ガ確立セラレマシタ

1915-3

同、其等ノ事項ノ例ヲ示シテ下サイ

答、一例ハ滿洲國ニ於テ又日本ノ直接支配下ニ在  
ツタ鐵道地帯ニ於テ治外法權ヲ享有シテキタ  
日本國民ニ對スル課税ニ關シセルモノニシテ  
此等ノ治外法權ノ特權及鐵道地帯ノ特殊特權  
ノ廢止ニ關聯シテ諸多ノ機關へ關係ヲツケネ  
バナラヌ事項ガアリマシタ  
同ノ中ノ一ツデアリマシタ

同、關東軍ハ南滿洲鐵道ノ地域ニ管轄權ガアリマ  
シタカソレトモ關東租借地ニ制限セラレテキ  
マシタカ

答、關東軍ハ南滿洲鐵道地帯ニハ管轄權ハアリマ  
センデシタ。然シ乍ラ關東軍司令官ハ同時ニ  
關東廳ノ長官デアリマシタソシテ此ノ資格ニ  
於テ鐵道地帯ト租借地ノ上ニ管轄權ヲ有シテ  
キタノデシタ

同、貴下ガ關東軍へ交渉ヲ爲ス要ノアツタ場合ニ  
テ相手トシマシタカ

答、之レ又同種ノ事項ト此等事項及同種ノ担当者  
次知デアリマシタ

1915-4

第十一頁

問、一九三二年（昭和七年）カラ一九三六年（昭和十一年）迄ノ期間ニ於ケル關東軍司令官ハ誰デシタカ

答、最初ハ本庄中將デ辰次武藤、菱刈、南、植田  
以上四名ノ大將デアリマシタ

問、貴下ガ此等ノ將軍達若クハ軍ノ首腦者等ト直  
接ニ何等カノ事項ヲ協議シタトキノ一例ヲ示  
スコトガ出来マスカ

答、例ヘバ私ハ植田大將ト治外法權ノ撤廢ニ付テ  
協議シマシタ

問、其ノ他ニ記憶シテキルモノハアリマセンカ  
答、モウイツノ例ハ一九三二年（昭和七年）ノコ  
トデ日本ニ於ケル滿洲國公債ノ發行ニ關シテ  
デアリマシテ武蔵大將麾下ノ關東軍ノ精神  
的支持ガ本公債發行ノ爲メ要請セラレマシタ

問、何故ニ滿洲國公債ノ發行ヲ關東軍司令官ト協  
議スル必要ガアツタノデスカ

答、滿洲國ハ國家トシテ創建セラレタバカリデ日



1915-5

本ノ國民ハ滿洲事情ヲ熟知シテキナカツタノ  
デ滿洲ニ於テノ日本ノ最モ有力ナ機關タル關  
東軍ノ支持ヲ得ルコトガ願ハシキコトデア  
ト考ヘラレタカラデアリマス此ノ支持ハ本公  
債發行ノ成功ヲ保證スル爲メニ必要ナリト考  
ヘラレタノデアリマシタ

問、此等ハ滿洲國ノ公債デスカ

答、然リ

第十五頁

問、貴下ハ岸信介氏ヲ知ツテキマシタカ

答、然リ

問、彼ト初メテ會ツタノハ何時頃デスカ

答、ソレハ一九三四年（昭和九年）カ若クハ一九  
三五年（昭和十年）ノコトデ彼ガ滿洲國へ來  
タ時デアリマシタ

問、彼ハ其ノ當時滿洲國ニ於テ何等カノ地位若ク  
ハ職務ヲ有ツテ居リマシタカ

答、彼ハ實業部ノ次長デアリマシタ

問、ソウスルト彼ハ其ノ官職ニ就ク爲メニ一九三

1915-6

五年（昭和十年）日本カラ滿洲へ來タノデスカ

答、然リ其ノ頃ニ、正確ナ日附ハハツキリ知リマ  
セン私ハ其ノ前ニモ岸氏ト會ツテキルカモ知  
レマセン然シ私ハ其レガドフイフ時デアツタ  
カハ憶出シマセン

第 十 六 頁

問、彼ガ實業部ノ次長デアツタ當時貴下ハ財政部  
ノ次長デアリマシタ、貴下等ノ部ハ政府事務  
ニ關シ相互ニ大キナ關係ガアリマシタカ

答、然リ

問、貴下等ガ熟考ヲシタ事項ノ例ヲ示シテ下サイ  
答、一切ハ五年計劃デアリマス此ノ計劃ハ實業部  
長官ニ依ツテ形成セラレ財政問題ニ關シテハ  
財務部長官ニ依ツテ形成セラレタモノデアリ  
マス

問、五ヶ年計劃ニ關シテ貴下ハ計劃ノ作成ニ大ナ  
ル關係ガアリマシタカ

答、然リ財政的事項ニ關シテ

問、貴下及岸氏ノ外ニ誰ガ滿洲國五ヶ年計劃ノ發  
展ニ關シマシタカ

1915-7

答、南滿洲鐵道ヤ總務廳カラ澤山ノ人ガ來テ之ニ  
關與シマシタ

問、此ノ計劃ノ目的ハ何デアリマシタカ

答、滿洲國建國後四五年ノ間ニ發生シタ無目標ナ  
發展ニ代ツテ具體的諧調的計劃ガ形成セラレ  
ルコトガ必要デアルト考ヘラレマシタ、此ノ  
發展計劃ハ滿洲國政府ニ關スル限り南滿洲鐵  
道株式會社ニ於テ計劃セラレ且ツ實施セラレ  
テキタ發展ト諧調的ナラシムルコトガ極メテ  
重要デアルトサレマシタソシテ此ノ計劃ノ作  
成ニ當リ此等二個ノ別兵ノ系統ヲ諧調セシメ  
以テソレ等ガ完全ナル全体トシテ作用スルヤ  
ウニスルコトガ目的デアリマシタ

警領第六十九、第十九次一九四六年（昭和二十一年）二月四日

第一頁

問、貴下ガ滿洲ニ在ツタトキ岸氏ハ實業部ノ次長  
デアリマシタ、總務廳ト關係スルヤウナコト  
ガアリマシタカ

答、岸氏ハ總務廳次長ト爲リマシタ

問、彼ハ總務廳長官トシテノ貴下ノ下デ働キマシ  
タカ

1915-8

答、然リ

問、貴下ト岸氏トハ滿洲國ノ發展ノ爲メノ經濟計  
劃ノ立案ニ共ニ働キマシタカ

答、然リ、私ハ岸氏ト共ニ働キマシタ

問、貴下ガ滿洲國ノ經濟發展ノ爲メニ作成シタ計  
劃ハ何デシタカ

答、私等ハ滿洲國産業五ヶ年計劃、滿洲國資源ノ  
開發並ニ農業ニ關シテ努力シ農作物ノ種類ノ  
改良及其ノ收穫ノ増加等ニ努力シマシタ

星 野 直 樹

警議第六十九號第十九次一九四六年（昭和廿一年）二月四日

第 八 頁

問、彼（板垣大將）ハ五ヶ年計劃ノ進展ニ關シテ  
貴下ト協力シテ行ツタカ

答、當時私達ハ共ニ働イタ

1915-9

星野直樹

警須第六十九號第十九次 一九四六年（昭和廿一年）二月四日

第八頁

問、關東軍ニ關スル限リニ於テ誰ガ最後の發言權ヲ有シテ居タカ、何ノ職ニアルモノカ。即チ五ヶ年計劃ニ入レルカ彼カスカノ諸問題ノ決議ヲ行フニ於イテデアアル

答、關東軍司令官デアアル

問、參謀長ハ大部分ノ決議ニ最後の發言權ヲ有シテキタノカ

答、私ハソウハ思ハナイ。關東軍ノ司令官ガ有シテ居タト思フ。關東軍司令官ハ長期間ソノ職ニアツタカラ彼ハ實際ノ事情、狀態ヲ知ツテ居リ又其ノ爲ニ最後の發言權ヲ有シテ居タ

星野直樹

警須第六十九號第十九次 一九四六年（昭和廿一年）二月四日

第十頁

問、滿洲重工業株式會社トハ如何ナルモノデアツタカ

1915-10

答、滿洲國ノ重工業ヲ統合シ發展サセル爲ノ団体  
デアツタ

問、貴下ハソレガ何時形成サレタカ知ツテキルカ

答、計畫ハ一九三七年（昭和十二年）ニ明示サレ  
タガ會社ガ形成サレタノハ一九三八年（昭和  
十三年）ノ初メデアル

星 野 直 樹

警類第六十九號第十九次 一九四六年（昭和廿一年）二月四日

第 十 一 頁

問、重工業開發會社ニ關スル限りニ於テ松岡氏ノ  
位置ハ如何ナルモノデアツタカ

答、滿洲ノ諸産業ハ以前南滿洲鐵道ノ監督下ニア  
ツタノデ新會社ヲ形成スルノニ松岡氏ハ多少  
關係シタ。シカシナガラ北支那ニ於ケル鐵道  
ノ開發ノ爲ニ南滿洲鐵道ハ北支鐵道ニ助力ヲ  
與ヘナケレバナラナカツタ。其處デ松岡氏ハ  
滿洲産業開發會社ノ形成ニ同意シタノデアル

第 十 二 頁

問、此ノ滿洲産業開發會社ノ形成ニ關シテ松岡氏  
ト關東軍トノ間ノ意見ノ相違ハ何デアツタカ

1915-11

答、前ニ私ガ述べタ様ニ今申シタ事以外ニハ特別  
ナ理由ハナイ

問、關東軍ハ此ノ計畫ヲ遂行スル事ヲ強要シタカ

答、關東軍ハ此ノ計畫ニ同意シ又支持シテキタ

星 野 直 樹

答類第六十九號第十九次 一九四六年（昭和廿一年）二月四日

第 十 三 頁

問、一九三七年（昭和十二年）十二月滿洲國ハ産  
業開發會社管理法ヲ公布シタ、貴下ハ何故  
ソレガ公布サレタカ知ツテ居ルカ

答、通常法律ハ適切デナカツタノデ此ノ特別管理  
法ヲ制定シタノデアアル

問、此ノ會社ヲ設立スル爲ニト云フ事ヲ意味スル  
ノカ

答、此ノ法令ハ政府ニヨル投資、利益配當及當會  
社ノ政府管理ニ關スル諸事項ヲ包含シテ居ル  
ノデアアル

1915-12

星野直樹

審判第六九號第十九次 一九四六年（昭和廿一年）二月四日

第十三頁

問、コレ等ノ事柄ハ總務廳ノ管轄ニ置カレテイタカ

答、コノ商工業ニツイテハ商工課ノ課長ガ責任ヲ有スル然シ總務廳ハ會社ノ運営ニツイテノ法律ノ作成ヲ以ツテ助成シタ

審判第六九號第十九次 昭和廿一年二月四日

第十五頁

問、何時滿洲ヲ立ツタカ

答、一九四〇年六月ニ

問、ドウシテ滿洲ヲ離レタノカ

答、第二次近衛內閣ノ下デ企業局ノ監督ニナルタ  
メニ滿洲ヲ去ツタ

問、企業局ハ內閣企劃院ト同一ノモノカ

答、同ジデス ソレハ寧ロ、內閣企劃院<sup>ナ</sup>ノデス

問、內閣企劃院ハドレ程ノ大サガアツタカ

答、內閣企劃院ニハ約百人程キタ



1415-13

審類第六九號第十九次 昭和廿一年二月四日

第 十 六 頁

問、君ガ内閣企劃院ニ關係シテタ間、内閣企劃院  
ハ日本ノ經濟計畫ヲ引受ケテシタカ

答、然リ 日本ノ經濟計畫ヲ立テタ

問、企劃院ハ君ヲソノ主腦トシテ君ノ指導下ニ在  
ツテ日本ノ商業、製造工業及運輸ノ爲メニ經  
濟計畫ヲ企畫シタカ

答、然リ。内閣デ立テタ計畫ガアツタ

問、ソレハ何ノ爲メノ計畫ナリヤ

答、同一分野ニアル産業ハ組織サレ一ツノ統一体  
ヲ形成セネバナラヌソウシテ此ノ統一体ヲ通  
ジテ各自ノ任務ヲ遂行セネバナラヌ又政府ノ  
統制ハ此ノ團體ヲ通ジテナサネバナラヌ

問、コノ團體ノ理事ヤ主事達ハ政府ノ任命ニヨル  
モノカ

答、政府ハコノ團體ノ長官ヲ任命スルコトニナツ  
テイル

問、コノ計畫ハ滿洲國ニ於テ採用サレタ計畫ト同

様ナモノカ

1415-14

答、コノ計畫ハ滿洲國デ採用サレタモノトハ違ツ  
テキタ

問、滿洲デ採用サレタモノトドウ云フ違ヒガアツ  
タカ

答、根本的ナ進ヒハ、滿洲ニ於イテノソレハ一ツ  
ノ財団法人デアリ全産業ヲ組織スル様ナモノ  
デハナイ只一ツノ大キナ財団法人デアルソレ  
トハ別ニ他ニ獨立シタ財団法人等ガアツタ。  
日本デハソレガ一ツノ合同体ニナツテキタ。  
財団法人デアナイ。單ナル協會カ又ハ相提携  
スル一種ノ機關デアツタ

書類 第六九號第十九次 昭和廿一年二月四日

第十七頁

問、滿洲デハ政府ハコノ大財団法人ノ首領ヲ任命  
シタカ

答、然リ

問、日本デハ政府ガ統制會ヲ作りソノ統制會ノ理  
事ヤ會長ヲ任命シタカ

答、然リ

1915 — 15

問、ソノ統制會ハ同一分野ニ在ル商工團體ヲソノ  
統制會ノ構成員トシテ抱含シタカ

答、然リ

第十一頁

書類番號第六九號第二十一次 一九四六年二月七日

問、東亞ニ於ケル發展ヲ目途トセル此ノ計畫ノ作  
成ニ當ツテノ君ノ役割如何

答、日本自体ニハ總テノ必要資源ガ無カツタノデ  
滿洲、支那及東亞全般ニ互ル資源ノ開發ヲ具  
現スル計畫デアツタ

第十七頁

問、第二次近衛内閣ノ外相ハ誰デアツタカ

答、松岡

問、松岡ハ外相就任後新シイ外交政策ヲ發表シタ。  
ソウデセウ

答、判然トハ記憶シテハキマセン

問、松岡ノ大東亞ニ對スル外交方策ハ何デアツタ  
カ知ツテキルカ若シ知ツテイルナラソレガ何  
デアルカタ述ベヨ

1915-16

答、ソレハ前ニ随分話シタ通りデアル。即チソレハ東亞ノ各國間ニ親交ヲ結ブコトデアツタ

問、松岡ノ計畫ハ日本ト滿洲以外ノ國ヲモ考慮ニ入レテキタノカ

答、少タトモ支那ヲ含ンデキタ

問、松岡ノ計畫ハ日本ニヨツテ樹立サレタ滿洲國ニ對スルト同様ノ方針デ南京支那政府ヲ取扱フ考ヘテアツタカ

答、否、ソレトハ違フ方針デ

問、ドンナ

第十八頁

答、サウ。ソノ違ヒハ日本、滿洲條約ニアツテハ非常ニ緊密ナル軍事的政治的考慮ガ拂レタガ、コレニ反シテ、南京政府トノ日本ノ關係ハソレ程緊密デハナカツタ

1915-17

アイノル番號六九號第二四集 一九四六(昭和廿一年)一月三十一日

星 野 直 樹

問、貴方ハ何時大坂次官ニ任命サレマシタカ、ソ  
シテ其ノ日付ハ

答、一九三六年(昭和十一年)

問、月日ヲ覺エテイマスカ

答、覺エテイマセン

問、貴方ハ何時總務局長官ニナリマシタカ

答、私ハ一九三六年(昭和十一年)十二月ニ總務  
局長官ニナリマシタ

問、職務ハ如何ナルモノデアツタカ又總務局ハ滿  
洲國政府トノ關係ニ於テ如何ナル事ヲ取扱ツ  
タカ

答、其レハ滿洲國政府首相ノ直轄下ニアツタ

此ノ局ハ企業豫算ノ統計、人專、法  
制ニ關スル事項、並ニ情報ヲ擔當シテイタ

問、同局ハ他局ノ事項ニ關シテモ又一般的ニ管理  
ヲナシ監督ヲシテ居ツタカ

答、首相ノ監督下ニ在ツタ此ノ局ハ他局ヲイクラカ監督シテイタ、首相ハ此ノ局ヲ監督シ又同局ヲ遷ジ、首相ノ命令下ニ在ル他局ヲ監督シマス

問、同局ハ滿洲國政府ノ最モ重要ナ局ノ一ツデアツタノデスネ

答、：レラス

問、貴方ハ總務局長官ニナツタ時、サキヤマ氏ノ席ヲ繼イダノデスカ

答、サキヤマ氏ハ次長デアリマシタ、初代長官ハ駒井デアリマシタ、次ノ長官ハ遠藤デアリマシタ、其ノ次ハ長岡デ彼ノ後ニ大館ガ座リ、ソシテ大館ノ跡ヲ私ガ繼イデ長官ニナリマシタ

× × × ×

問、總務局長官ノ職ニドノ位ソイテ居ツタカ

答、約三年半デス

問、一九三九年（昭和十四年）ノ末迄デスカ

答、一九四〇年（昭和十五年）七月迄デス

問、ソシテ貴方ハ何處へ行キマシタ：

答、私ハ日本へ歸リマシタ

1915-19

問、ソレデハ、ソレカラ日本政府ノ公職ニ就イタ  
ノデスカ

答、私ハ企畫院總裁デアリマシタ

問、其レハ日本政府ノ何省ニ屬シテイタカ、或ハ  
其レハ獨立シタ部局デアツタカ

答、此ノ部局ハ首相ノ直接ノ監督下ニ在ツタ

問、首相ハ誰デアツタカ

答、近衛公爵デアリマシタ、私ハ此ノ企畫院ノ下  
ニ無任所大臣ニナリマシタ

問、貴方ハ近衛内閣、之ハ第二次、第三次ヲモ含  
メテノ意味デアリマスガ、此ノ内閣ノ始メカ  
ラ終リ迄ズイツト無任所大臣デアリマシタカ

答、私ハ一九四一年（昭和十六年）四月第二次近  
衛内閣ノ時辭メマシタ

問、貴方ハ無任所大臣ヲ勤メテル間ズイツト企畫  
院總裁デアリマシタカ

答、ソウデス

問、貴方ハ無任所大臣トシテ外ニ何カ部局ヲ擔當  
シタカ

1915-20

答、アリマセン

問、星野サン、企畫院ハドウ云フ事ヲシマシタカ  
職務ハドンナモノデシタカ、又ドンナ役目ヲ  
果シタカ

答、此ノ機關ハ、各省相互ノ連絡ヲ計リ來ル可キ  
年ノ計畫ヲ作ルタメニ設立サレタノデアリマス

問、ソウ云フ事ヲナシタ事ニ就テ滿洲國政府ト何  
カ連絡ガアツタノデスカ

答、滿洲國政府トハ何モ關係アリマセン

問、ソレデハ企畫院ハ本土ニ對スル計畫ヲ立テテ  
イタノデスネ

答、ソウデス、本土丈ノ計畫デス、企畫院ハ滿洲  
トノ輸出入ノ計畫ヲ立テマシタ、即チ滿洲ニ  
送り出ス可キ物ト日本ガ滿洲カラ輸入シタ物  
ニ關シテノミ計畫ヲ立テマシタ總企畫院ハ日  
本ニ關スル限りハ翌年ノ分丈ノ計畫ヲ立テマ  
シタガ、其等ノ計畫ノ中ニハ、滿洲國カラノ  
商品ト原料ノ輸入及ビ日本ガ輸出トシテ滿洲  
國ヘ送ル物ニ關スル限りハ、日本ト滿洲ノ關  
係ガ必然的ニ含マレテイマシタ



1915-21

問、此等ノ計畫ニ包含セラレタ物、即チ輸出入ニ關シテ、企畫院ト滿洲代表者トノ間ニ何カ争ヒガ起ツタコトガアリマスカ

答、滿洲國ト企畫院トノ間ニハ特ニ争ヒハアリマセンデシタ

問、企畫院ハ滿洲國ニ於ケル産業上ノ財政ト關係ガアリマシタカ

答、日本ノ計畫ノ中ニ入レラレタ財政計畫ガアリマシタ、滿洲國ヲ援助スルタメ或ル金額ガ割當テラレマシタ、然シ乍ラ私ハ、其レガ直接ニ産業上ノ財政ニ使用サレタトハ云ヒ得マセン

問、其レハ貸付カ又ハ立替デアリマシタカ

答、計畫ノ中ニ滿洲國ヘ投資サル可キ或ル金額ガアリマス、其レハ産業ノミニ關係スルモノデハナクテ、滿洲國全般ニ對スル投資デアリマシタ、其レハ産業ト其他ノ政府ノ施設ヲ含ンデイマシタ、滿洲國ノ産業ト其他ノ政府事業ニ其ダケノ金額ガ割當テラレマシタ、然シ乍ラ企畫院ハ、滿洲國ガ之ヲ如何ニ使用スルカト云フ事ニハ關與シマセンデシタ。コノ様ナ事項ヲ扱ツタノハ大藏省デアリマシタ

1915-21

問、關東軍ハ鐵道線路地帯ニ關係シテキタカ

答、關係ハナカツタガ關東軍司令官ハ關東洲ノ長官デアリマシタ

問、領事館モ又當時別個ノ機能ヲ持ツテイタノデスネ

答、ソウデス

問、貴方ガ其處ヘ行ツテカラ變更ガアリマシタカ

答、ハイ變更ガアリマシタ

問、デハドンナ事ガアリマシタカ

答、關東軍司令官ハ駐滿大使デアリ、大使ハ領事館、滿鐵及ビ關東廳ヲ支配シマシタ

問、其レハ何時ナサレタノデスカ、貴方ガ滿洲ヘ行ツタ後デシタカ

答、ソウデス

問、一九三二年（昭和七年）デスカ

答、ソウデス

問、一九三四年（昭和九年）ニコノ編制ニ何カ變更ガアリマシタカ

答、或ル變更ガアリマシタ

問、ドンナ變更デシタカ、貴方ノ返答ノ助ケニナルト思ヒマスガ關東洲ノ租借地ト南滿洲鐵道會社區域ニ關係スル限りニ於テ日本政府ノ權能ヲ行使スルニ就イテ大使ガ政府ヲ代表スル權ニスルタメ一九三四年（昭和九年）軍司令官ト大使トヲ同一人ニシタカドウカヲオ尋ネシマス、其レハ確カデスカ

答、ソウデス

問、軍司令官ト大使ノ資格トヲ結ビ付ケタ時ニ、在滿大使ハ常ニ軍人デアル事ガ必要トナリマシタ、ソウデスカ

答、ソウデス

第 十 三 頁

問、一九三六年（昭和十一年）ニ立案サレタ五ケ年經濟計畫ニ貴方ハドウ云フ關係ガアリマシタカ

答、五ケ年計畫ガ立テラレタトキハ私ハ大藏省ニ居リマシタ、從テ私ハ同計畫ノ財政面ニ關係シマシタ

問、五ケ年計畫ハイツ効力ヲ生ジマシタカ、即チイツカラ實施サレマシタカ

答、一九三七年（昭和十二年）カラデス

問、貴方ハ總務局長官トシテハ其レニ何カ關係ガ  
アツタカ

答、總務局長官トナツテカラ私ハ其レト一般のナ  
關係ヲ持ツテイマシタ

問、五ヶ年計畫ニ關シテハ誰レト一諸ニ仕事ヲシ  
マシタカ

答、私ハ大藏大臣、大藏次官、農商大臣、農商次  
官、企畫院總裁、逓信大臣及ビ總務局次長ト  
共ニ仕事ヲシマシタ

問、貴方ハ岸信介（ノブスケ）ト一諸ニ仕事ヲシ  
マシタカ

答、ソウデス

問、其ノ當時彼ハドシナ地位ニアリマシタカ

答、商工次官デアリマシタ

問、其ノ當時板垣將軍ハ參謀長デアリマシタ、貴  
方ハ彼ト一諸ニ仕事ヲシタカ

答、私ハ板垣將軍ニ種々ノ事柄ヲ相談シマシタ

1915-25

問、貴方ハドシナ事ヲ彼ト共ニ問題トシテ取上ゲ  
タカ

答、ソウハツキリト覺ニテイマセンガ、私共ハ五  
ヶ年計登ヲ含ム種々ノ問題ヲ討議シマシタ

問、當時鮎川氏ガ滿洲へ來ル様ニナツタイキサツ  
ヲ貴方ハ知ツテマスカ

答、彼ハ日本ノ政府ニ滿洲へ行クコトヲ薦メラレ  
タノダト思ヒマス

問、其ノ理由ヲ知ツテマスカ

答、數人ノ企業家ガ滿洲國ニ於ケル經濟狀態ヲ研  
究シ調査スルタメ同地へ派遣サレマシタ、鮎  
川氏ハソノ企業家達ノ一人デシタ

問、其ノ當時關東軍側ニハ財閥ガ滿洲國ニ投資ス  
ルコトニ對スル反對ハ無カツタカ

答、初メハ關東軍カラノ反對ガ出タ様デシタガ、  
特別ニ反對ガアツタトハ思ヒマセン

問、財閥ノ對滿投資ニ關東軍ガ反對シタ理由ハ何  
デスカ

答、軍全体トシテハ財閥ニ反對ハシマセンデシタ  
ガ、關東軍將校ノ中ニ此ノ様ナ空氣ガ存在シ

1915-26

マシタ、関東軍將校ハ、財閥ガ日本ノ産業ヲ  
獨占シタノデアルカラ、斯ノ様ナ事ヲ滿洲ノ  
産業ニマデ及ス可キデハナイト信ジテイマシ  
タ、ソレ故ニ反對ガ軍側ニアリマシタ

星野直樹

審判第六十九號第二十四次一九四六年(昭和廿一年)一月三十一日

第十八頁

問、関東軍ト南滿洲鐵道トノ間ニ産業ノ處理ニツ  
イテ意見ノ相違ハナカツタカ

答、関東軍ト南滿洲鐵道トノ間ニ特別ノ相違ハナ  
カツタ、シカシ南滿洲鐵道ハ日本ノ法人會社  
ヲ主張シタノニ對シ関東軍ハ滿系會社ヲ主張  
シタ

問、何故関東軍ハ日本ノ法人會社ヨリモ滿系會社  
ノ方ニスル事ヲ主張シタカ

答、関東軍ハ産業ガ滿洲ノモノデアル以上ハスベ  
テノ事業ハ滿洲人ニヨツテ管理サルベキデア  
ルトノ理由デ滿系會社ヲ主張シタ。コレハ関東  
軍ノ政策デハナクソノ目的ニ對スル趨勢デア  
ツタ

1415-27

問、ソノ趨勢トハ滿洲國ヲ政治ノ獨立統合体或ハ獨立自營体トシテ發達サセルトイフ趨勢デアツタノカ 又コノ政策ハ關東軍ノ方カラ云ヘバ材料及ビ製品ニ關スル限り滿洲國ニ自國管理ヲサセルトイフ政策デアツタカ

答、サウデアツタ、滿洲國ニ於ケル産業ハ滿洲人ニヨツテ管理サルベキデアリ又日本ト連絡スル爲ニ日滿經濟委員會ハ連絡機關トシテノ役割ヲ勤メルベク組織サレタ

第十九頁

問、鮎川氏ニソノ次ニ會ツタノハ何時カ

答、覺エテキナイ

問、東京デ一度以上會ツテキルカ

答、東京デハ二度カ三度會ツタ

第二十頁

問、鮎川氏ガ滿洲國ニ渡ル見込及ビ氏ガ滿洲ノ發展ニ興味ヲ持チ得ルカトイフ事ニツイテ氏ト話シ合ツタカ

答、我々ハサウイフ問題ニツイテ論ジ合ツタノデアアル

問、特別ナドウイフ專柄ニツイテ議論シタノカ

答、鮎川氏ハ滿洲國ヲ發展サセル爲ニハ日本ノ機械及ビ財政上ノ補助デハ不充分デアルソレ故滿洲國ニ於ケル産業確立ニハ他ノ外國ノ投資特ニアメリカノ補助即チ投資ガ必要デアル、ト言ツタ

第二十一頁

問、鮎川氏ノ計畫トハ

答、滿洲國ノ産業ヲ發達サセル爲ニ石炭、鋼鐵及ビ機械工業ノ如キ諸種工業ガ鞏固ニサレネバナラナイ。コノ強化サレタ工業ハ日本産業株式會社ニヨリ管理サルベキデアル、シカシ日本ダケデコノ大計畫ニ資本ヲ供給スルコトハ出來ナイ、ソレデ滿洲人ハ外部カラノ助力特ニ好ンデ合衆國ノ投資ヲ必要トスル、トイフノデアツタ

問、鮎川氏ノ計畫ハ書面トナツテキタカ

答、鮎川氏自身ノ發行シタパンフレットガアツタカモ知レヌ

問、貴下ガ岸氏ト滿洲ニキタ時コノ計畫ヲ論ジタカ

答、然リ



1915-29

第二十二頁

問、何時滿洲重工業株式會社ハ結成サレタカ

答、一九三七年（昭和十二年）ノ晩秋ニ結成サレタ

問、總務廳ハソノ團體ノ組織ニ關係ガアツタカ

答、滿洲重工業株式會社ノ爲ノ特殊ノ法令又ハ命令ヲ作成スル爲ニ各大臣ノ會議ガ開カレ又總務廳ハコノ會議ト關聯ヲ持ツテキタ滿洲國・支那間ノ條約ヲ作成スル爲ニハ日滿經濟委員會ハ二國間ノ連絡ヲ取ラネバナラズ又總務廳長官ハ經濟連絡委員會ノ一員デアツタ、ソレ故總務廳ハ關聯ヲ持ツテキタノデアル

第二十三頁

問、貴下ハコノ連絡委員會ノ上ノ總務廳ノ代表デアツタカ

答、然リ

問、貴下ハソノヤウナ代表トシテコノ條約又ハ契約ノ準備ニ關シ何ヲシタカ

答、會議ニ出席シソノ計畫ニ同意シタ

問、貴下ハコノ契約ヲ作成シタカ

答、作成ハシナカツタ、タダ同意シタダケデアル

問、貴下ハソレガ決定的ニ署名サレル前ニ何ラカ  
ノ提案又ハ變更シンタカ

答、私ハ何等提案モ變更モシマセンデシタ

問、鮎川氏ハコレ等ノ會議ニ出席シタカ

答、氏ハ出席シテキナカツタ

問、誰ガ出席シテキタカ

答、ソノ會議ノ出席者ハ滿洲側デハ外交部長官、  
財政部長官、實業部長官及ビ總務廳長官デア  
ツタ、日本側カラハ參謀長ガ出席シタ

問、東條ガソノ參謀長デアツタカ

答、然リ（續ケテ）大使館カラノ領事モ出席シタ

問、ソレハ誰カ

答、守屋ト澤田デアル（續ケテ）技師ハ日本政府  
及ビ關東洲長官ニヨリ指令サレタ

1915-31

星野直樹

書類第六十九號第二十七次 一九四六年（昭和二十一年）二月廿六日

第一頁

問、星野氏、企劃院ノ目的及ビ義務ハ何デアツタカ

答、内閣企劃院ノ一般的義務ハ主ニ二ツノ部分ニ分レテキタ。各省ノ全般的契約及ビ年度計畫ノ編制デアツタ

問、ソノ年度計畫トハドウイフ意味カ

答、ソレハ生産計畫、材料分配計畫及ビ材料分配ヲ遂行スル爲ノ輸送機關ノ如キ他ノ種々ノ小細目デアツタ

第二頁

問、ソノ期間ニ貴下ハ日本帝國ノ行政ニ必要ナ計畫ノミナラズ支那ニ於ケル日本軍ノ爲ノ軍需品及ビ必要品ノ供給ニ必要ナ計畫ヲモ作成シタ、星野氏以上ノ事ニ相違ハナイカ

答、企劃院ニ於テ材料分配ノ爲ニ作ラレタ計畫ハ總体的ナ計畫デ細目ノ事柄ニハ亘ツテキナイ例ヘバ陸海軍及ビ一般民衆ガソノ要求ヲ貫徹スル爲ニ或計畫ヲ提出スルト企劃院ハ入手出

來ルダケノ量ノ原料ニ關スル必要ナ計畫ヲ樹  
テル。内閣企劃院ハソレダケノ材料ガ支那ニ  
於ケル軍隊ニ使用サレルベキデアルトカ又ハ  
別ノ或材料ガ日本本土ニ於ケル軍隊ニ使用サ  
レルデアラウトカイフ事ニツイテハ關係ガナ  
イ、ソレハ種々ノ要求カラ割出シタ全体ノ見  
積高シ考慮ニ入レテキル

問、星野氏、ソレデハ貴下ノ年度計畫ト關聯シテ  
必要トサレタ種々ノ要求ヤ材料ノ見積高及ビ  
供給ヲ如何ナル筋カラ受ケタカ

答、ソレラハ種々ノ方面 例ヘバ陸軍、海軍、農  
業部門等ニヨリ提出サレタモノデアル

問、星野氏、貴下ガ企劃院總裁就任前ノ數年以上  
又ハ就任後陸海軍ノ要求ハ絶エズ増シテキタ  
トイフノハ事實デハナイカ

答、然リ増シテキタ

問、一九三九年（昭和十四年）及ビ一九四〇年  
（昭和十五年）ニ又更ニソレニ先立ツテ陸海  
軍ハ支那ニ於ケル戦争ノミナラズ他ノ列強ト  
ノ戦争ノ可能性ヲ考慮シテ供給ニ對スル要求  
ガ増シツツアツタトイフノハ事實デハナイカ

1915-33

答、ソレハ云ヘナイ、材料分配ノ要求ノ増大ハ支那ニ於ケル戦争遂行ノ爲デアツタ。シカモソノ爲ニ正廳ナ内容及ビ理由ハ陸海軍ノ秘密トサレテキタ、ソレ故内閣企劃院ハソノ使用目的ニツイテ何モ知ラナカツタ

問、シカシ、星野氏 貴下ガ少シ前ニ述べラレタ様ニ供給ニ對スル陸海軍ノ要求ハ年々増シテ行ツタ事ヲ知ツテ居ラレタノデハナイカ

答、然リ、ソレハ確カデアル

星野直樹証言

一九四六年（昭和二十一年）一月二十八日訊問

綴六九、 綴續一八

自分、デニス・キルドイルハ、自分ガ質問及ビ返答ヲ各々英語ヨリ日本語ニ、日本語ヨリ英語ニ眞實ニ翻譯ナセシコト又上記質問及ビ返答ノ翻譯文ハ一七頁ニシテ番號ハ一巻ヨリ一七番マデアリ自分ノ知レル限り又信ズル限り眞實且正確ナルコトヲ宣誓ノ上陳述ス。

デニス・キルドイル（署名）

一九四六年／昭和二十一年／二月二日自分ノ面前ニ於テ署名、宣誓ス。

ヘンリー・A・ハクソースト

聯合國最高指揮官、總司令部、國

際檢察部

特派調査官

自分、エドナ・M・ヒツカムハ、上記特派訊問ニ於テ速記者トシテ行動ナセシコト又上記質問及ビ返答ヲ翻譯ナセシコト及ビ其ノ翻譯ハ自分ノ知レル限り又信ズル限り眞實且正確ナルコトヲ茲ニ

1915 (cont) - 1

1915 (cont) - 2

エドナ・M・ヒツカム（署名）

自分、ヘンリー・ホクソーストハ、一九四六年（昭和二十一年）一月二十八日ニ、星野直樹自身自分ノ面前ニ來リ、通譯者ナル、デニス・キルドイルヲ通ジ、上記質問ニ對シ上記返答ヲナセシコトヲ證明ス。

ヘンリー・A・ホクソースト（署名）

一九四六年／昭和二十一年／二月二日

日本、東京

\*\*\*\*\*

一九四六年／昭和二十一年／二月四日 訊問

續 六九 續續十九

一九四六年／昭和二十一年／二月四日

自分、技術曹長大下ベン（音譯）一認定番號三八六六八三三一ハ自分ガ質問ト返事ヲ英語ヨリ日本語ニ、日本語ヨリ英語ニ各々眞實ニ翻譯ナセシコト及ビ上記質問ト返事ノ翻譯文ハ十七頁デアリ、一番ヨリ十七番マデアリ、自分ノ知レル限り

cert-1915-3

又信ズル限り眞實且正確ナルコトヲ宜審ノ上陳述ス。

大 下 ベ ン (署名)

一九四六年／昭和二十一年／二月六日自分ノ面前ニ於テ署名、宜審ス。

ヘンリー・オーステン・ホクソースト (署名)

聯合國、最高指揮官、總司令部、國際檢察部正式特派調査官

自分、エドナ・M・ヒツカムハ上記特派訊問ニ於ケル遠記者トシテ行動ナセシコト又上記質問及ビ返答ヲ翻譯ナセシコト又其ノ翻譯ガ自分ノ知レル限り信ズル限り眞實且正確ナルコトヲ茲ニ證明ス。

エドナ・M・ヒツカム (署名)

自分、ヘンリー・オーステン・ホクソーストハ、一九四六年／昭和二十一年／二月四日ニ、星野直樹自身、自分ノ面前ニ來リ、通譯者ナル大下ベン技術曹長ヲ通ジ、上記ノ質問ニ對シ上記返答ヲナセシコトヲ證明ス。

ヘンリー・オーステン・ホクソースト (署名)



cert. 1915-4

一九四六年（昭和二十一年）二月六日

日本、東京

\*\*\*\*\*

一九四六年（昭和二十一年）二月七日訊問

綴 六九 繼續二下

自分、ロバート・M・ボイド、米國海軍大尉、  
二三六七—三一八、自分ガ質問及ビ返答ヲ各々英  
語ヨリ日本語ニ、日本語ヨリ英語ニ眞實ニ翻譯ナ  
セシコト又上記質問及ビ返答ノ翻譯文ハ三下頁ニ  
シテ自分ノ知レル限り又信スル限り眞實且正確ナ  
ルコトヲ宣誓ノ上陳述ス。

ロバート・M・ボイド（署名）  
米國海軍大尉

一九四六年／昭和二十一年／二月十二日自分ノ  
面前ニ於テ署名宣誓ス。

ヘンリー・オースチン・ホクソースト  
聯合國最高指揮官總司令部國際檢  
察部正式特派調査官

自分、ダイナ・ブラウンハ上記特派訊問ニ於  
テ速記者トシテ行動ナセシコト、上記質問及ビ返

ent. 1915-5

答ヲ翻譯ナセシコト、及ビ其ノ翻譯ハ自分ノ知レ  
ル限り又信ズル限り眞實且正確ナルコトヲ茲ニ證  
明ス。

ダイナー・ブラウン（署名）

自分、ヘンリー・オースチン・ホクソーストハ  
一九四六年／昭和二十一年／二月六日ニ星野直樹  
自身、自分ノ面前ニ來リ通譯者ナル、米國海軍大  
尉、ロバート・H・ボイドヲ通ジ上記質問ニ對シ  
上記返答ヲナセシコトヲ證明ス。

ヘンリー・オースチン・ホクソースト（署名）

一九四六年／昭和二十一年／二月十二日東京

\*\*\*\*\*

一九四六年／昭和二十一年／一月三十一日訊問

綴 六九 繼續二十四

自分、大下ベン（音譯）一三八六六八三三一  
ハ自分ガ質問及ビ返答ヲ各々英語ヨリ日本語ニ、  
日本語ヨリ英語ニ眞實ニ翻譯ナセシコト、又上記  
質問及ビ返答ノ翻譯文ハ二十四頁トI4頁ニシテ  
自分ノ知レル限り又信ズル限り眞實且正確ナルコ

cert-1915-6

トヲ宜密ノ上陳述ス。

六 下 ベ ン (署名)

一九四六年ノ昭和二十一年ノ二月二十七日自分ノ面前ニ於テ署名宜密ス。

ヘンリー・A・ホクソリスト(署名)

聯合國、最高指揮官、總司令部、  
國際檢察部、正式特派調査官

自分、ジュエル・E・ニューマンハ上記特派訊問ニ於テ速記者トシテ行動ナセシコト、又上記質問及ビ返答ヲ翻譯ナセシコト、及ビ其ノ翻譯ハ、自分ノ知レル限り又信ズル限り眞實且正確ナルコトヲ茲ニ證明ス。

ジュエル・E・ニューマン(署名)

自分、ヘンリー・オースチン・ホクソリストハ一九四六年ノ昭和二十一年ノ一月三十一日ニ、星野直衛自身、自分ノ面前ニ來リ通譯者ナル大下ベシヲ通ジ上記質問ニ對シ、上記ノ返答シナセシコトヲ證明ス。

ヘンリー・A・オースチン(署名)

一九四六年ノ昭和二十一年ノ二月二十七日

cert. 1915-7

證明書

余、E. E. DANLY (E. E. DANLY) ハ茲ニ左記證明ス

記

一 余ハ聯合國最高指揮官總司令部國際檢察部ニ於ケル文書課長ニシテ且ツ本職ノ任トシテ右檢察部ノ入手ニ係ル文書類ノ原本又ハ寫本ヲ所持、保管、管理ニ當ルモノナルコト

ニ 文書第一九一五號ハ左記時日ニ於テ作成セラレタル星野直樹訊問調書七通ヨリナルコト

- 一九四六年／昭和二十一年／一月二十八日
- 一九四六年／昭和二十一年／一月三十一日
- 一九四六年／昭和二十一年／二月四日
- 一九四六年／昭和二十一年／二月七日
- 一九四六年／昭和二十一年／二月十一日
- 一九四六年／昭和二十一年／二月二十六日
- 一九四六年／昭和二十一年／四月一日

三 上記星野直樹訊問調書中一九四六年／昭和二十一年／一月二十八日、一九四六年／昭和二十一年／一月三十一日、一九四六年／昭和二十一年／二月四日、一九四六年／昭和二十一年

cert. 1915-8

二十一年二月七日及ビ一九四六年／昭和二十一年／二月十一日ニ爲サレタルモノハ、ヘンリー・A・ホークスハリスト／Henry A. Maurinau / 訊問者ヨリ正規證明ノ上余ニ手交セラレ。一九四六年／昭和二十一年／二月二十六日及ビ一九四六年／二十一年／四月一日ニ於ケル訊問調警ハヴァレンティン・C. Hammeck / Valentine C. Hammeck / 訊問者ヨリ正規證明ノ上余ニ手交セラレタルコト、及ビ右ノ原本或ハ寫本ハ常ニ聯合國最高指揮官總司令部國際檢察部文書課長トシテノ余ガ所持ノ下ニアルコト

四六・／二十七・。七・三〇

/E.E. DANLY/

E. E. Danly

文書番号一九一五(證明書) 一一一

訊問日附一九四六年二月廿六日、綴六九、集二九

通譯者証明書

私、フジイ・タツヲ、三九九二一五四のハ、訊問及  
答辯(姓 名) (番 号)  
實ニ通譯シタルコト、及ビ訊問及答辯ノ上記轉  
記十一頁ハ、私ノ知ル限り信スル限り、眞實正確  
ナルコトヲ宣誓言ノ上茲ニ陳述シマス

(署名) フジイ・タツヲ

一九四六年二月廿八日余ノ前ニテ署名宣誓言ス

(署名) ウアレнтаイン・C・ハマック

文官、聯合國最高司令官總司  
令部國際檢察部正式任命  
調査官

速記者証明書

私、ルース・アンダーソンハ、上述ノ訊問ノ際速記

文書目番号一九一五(證明書)——二

者ヲ勤メタルコト、上述ノ訊問及答辯ヲ轉記シタルコト、  
及ビ該轉記ガ私ノ知ル限り信スル限り眞實正確ナ  
ルコトヲ茲ニ証言シマス

(署名) ルース・F・アンダーソン

訊問者證明書

余、文官ヴァレンティン・C・ハマツクハ、一九四六年二月  
廿六日、星野直樹ガ自身余ノ前ニ出頭シ、通譯者  
フジイ・タツヲノ言ニヨレバ上述ノ訊問ニ對シ上記  
ノ答辯ヲ行ヒタルコトヲ証言ス

日本東京 (署名) ヴァレンティン・C・ハマツク  
(場所)

一九四六年二月廿八日  
(月日)

INTERNATIONAL PROSECUTION SECTION

Doc. No. 1915

17 June 1946

Hoshino Inter-  
view D

Liese, econ advisor  
on Draper Commission

27 Mar 48

per Maton

age:  
sh

an,

ts and  
aneous  
onality.

1915



INTERNATIONAL PROSECUTION SECTION

Doc. No. 1915

17 June 1946

ANALYSIS OF DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

DESCRIPTION OF ATTACHED DOCUMENT

Title and Nature: Interrogation and Personal  
History of HOSHINO, Naoki

Date: 1945-1946 Original  Copy  Language:  
English

Has it been translated? Yes  No

Has it been photostated? Yes  No

LOCATION OF ORIGINAL

Document Division

SOURCE OF ORIGINAL: See our Case File No. 69

PERSONS IMPLICATED: HOSHINO, Naoki

CRIMES TO WHICH DOCUMENT APPLICABLE: Five-Year Plan,  
Manchuria, etc.

SUMMARY OF RELEVANT POINTS

Case No. 69 - File on HOSHINO, Naoki

Contains records of interrogation of defendants and  
witnesses pertaining to HOSHINO, Naoki, and miscellaneous  
data and correspondence pertaining to subject personality.

Analyst: 2d Lt Goldstein

Doc. No. 1915

INTERNATIONAL PROSECUTION SECTION

*Give name the No. also 1915*

Doc. No.

Date 6/17/46

ANALYSIS OF DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

DESCRIPTION OF ATTACHED DOCUMENT

7 HOSHINO

Title and Nature:

*Interrogation and Personal History*

NADKI

Date:

1945-1946

Original (X) Copy ( )

Language: Eng.

Has it been translated? Yes ( ) No ( )

Has it been photostated? Yes ( ) No ( )

LOCATION OF ORIGINAL (also WITNESS if applicable)

*Document Division*

SOURCE OF ORIGINAL:

*See our Case File # 69*

PERSONS IMPLICATED:

HOSHINO, NADKI

CRIMES TO WHICH DOCUMENT APPLICABLE:

*Planning Five-Year Plan, Manchuria, etc.*

SUMMARY OF RELEVANT POINTS (with page references):

*Case # 69 File on HOSHINO, NADKI*

*Contains records of interrogation of defendants and witnesses pertaining to HOSHINO, NADKI, and other miscellaneous data and correspondence pertaining to subject personality.*

Analyst:

St. G. G. G.

*writer*

Doc. No.

EVID DOC 1915

HOSHINO, Naoki.

Included in this folder are interrogations for the following dates:

- 28 Jan 46	#1915 - A	Hammaker
- 31 Jan 46	#1915 - B	Hammaker
4 Feb 46	#1915 - C	Hammaker
7 Feb 46	#1915 - D	Hammaker
11 Feb 46	#1915 - E	Hammaker
26 Feb 46	#1915 - F	Valentine & Hammaker
1 Apr 46	# 1915 - G	" " "

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, E. E. DANLY, hereby certify:

1. That I am Chief of the Document Division of the International Prosecution Section, G.H.Q., S.C.A.P., and as such have possession, custody and control of original or copies of ~~captured enemy~~ documents obtained by the said Section.

2. That Document No. <sup>1915</sup> ~~1777~~ was delivered to me by Henry A. Hamhurst as being an original or copy of ~~an enemy~~ document that had been captured or obtained by military forces acting under the Supreme Commander Allied Forces and such document has been continuously in my custody since such delivery.

*containing Telenogalims of Hoshino, Naoki  
in fullness*

E. E. DANLY

*Hoshino, Naoki*

*an interrogation of Hoshino, Naoki  
~~obtained by~~*

*That the telenogalims of Hoshino, Naoki on 28, January, 31, January, 4 February, 7 February, 11, February, <sup>1946</sup> were delivered to me by Henry A. Hamhurst, Telenogalor duly certified and that the telenogalims on 26 February and 1 April 1946 were delivered to me by Valentine C. Hammack, Telenogalor duly certified*

HOSHINO, Naoki

Exhibitory Doc. 1915

**CERTIFICATE**

Included in this folder are interrogations for the following dates

I, E. E. DANLY, hereby certify:

1. That I am Chief of the Document Division of the International Prosecution Section, G.H.Q., S.C.A.P., and as such have possession, custody and control of original or copies of documents obtained by the said Section.

2. That Document 1915 contains seven interrogations of Hoshino, Naoki taken on the following dates:

- 28 January 1946
- 31 January 1946
- 4 February 1946
- 7 February 1946
- 11 February 1946
- 26 February 1946
- 1 April 1946

#1915 - B  
 #1915 - C  
 #1915 - E  
 #1915 - F  
 #1915 - G

3. That the interrogations of Hoshino, Naoki above referred to on the 28 January 1946, 31 January 1946, 4 February 1946, 7 February 1946 and 11 February 1946 were delivered to me by Henry A. Hauxhurst, interrogator, duly certified, and that the interrogations on 26 February 1946 and 1 April 1946 were delivered to me by Valentine G. Hamack, interrogator, duly certified, and that the original or a copy thereof has at all times been in my possession as Chief of the Document Division of the International Prosecution Section, G.H.Q., S.C.A.P.

\_\_\_\_\_  
E. E. DANLY

HOSHINO, Naoki

Evidentiary doc. 1915

Included in this folder are interrogations for the following dates

28 Jan. 46	#1915 - A	Hampden
31 Jan. 46	#1915 - B	"
4 Feb. 46	#1915 - C	"
7 Feb. 46	#1915 - D	"
11 Feb. 46	#1915 - E	"
26 Feb. 46	#1915 - F	Valentin C. Hancock
1 Apr. 46	#1915 - G	"

1915

INTERROGATION OF

Naoki Hoshino

Date and Time: 11 February, 1946, 0145-1520 hours

Place : Sugamo Prison, Tokyo, Japan

Present : Naoki HOSHINO  
Mr. Henry Austin Hauxhurst, Interrogator  
1st Lt. Steve Yamamoto, Interpreter  
Miss Jewel E. Newman, Stenographer

Questions by : Mr. Hauxhurst

Oath given to interpreter by Mr. Hauxhurst.

"Do you solemnly swear (affirm), by Almighty God, that you will truly and accurately interpret and translate from English into Japanese and from Japanese into English, as may be required of you, in this proceeding."

- Q. Mr. HOSHINO, when you were minister without portfolio of KINOYE'S second Cabinet did you attend all the cabinet meetings?
- A. Most of the meetings I attended except while travelling on business I was unable to attend.
- Q. Were there any other ministers without portfolio to KINOYE'S Cabinet when you were a member of it without portfolio?
- A. Only one other--Baron HIRANUMA.
- Q. Did you take part in the discussions in the Cabinet meetings?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What was your position about the negotiations between the United States and Japan which were under discussion at that time?
- A. There was no discussion at all in respect to the Japanese-American negotiations.
- Q. While you were minister without portfolio?
- A. There were no meetings at all held.
- Q. Was there any difference of opinion in the Cabinet as between the position that Mr. MATSUOKA took and other members of the Cabinet?

11 Feb 1946

- A. AS far as I know there was no difference of opinion between MATSUOKA and the other members of the Cabinet. MATSUOKA left Japan for the States in February and, consequently, until February there were no differences of opinion as far as I know.
- Q. Was that February 1941?
- A. Yes. I resigned as minister without portfolio in April and when MATSUOKA did return from the States to Japan, well, I did not hold the position as minister without portfolio.
- Q. When did MATSUOKA return from the States?
- A. The latter part of April. I resigned my position without portfolio early in April and MATSUOKA returned from the states in late April.
- Q. Well, the third cabinet resigned on October 16--TOJO was appointed Prime Minister on the 17th of October. You said the other day that on that day, i. e., the 17th of October the question of your appointment as Chief Secretary of the new TOJO Cabinet came up. What questions were there about your appointment?
- A. The TOJO Cabinet was formally inaugurated on the 18th of October instead of the 17th. It was set up on the 17th but formally inaugurated on the 18th.
- Q. Yes, that is right. Now then, on the 17th did you have any talk with TOJO about becoming Chief Secretary of the Cabinet?
- A. TOJO did talk to me on the evening of the 17th that I would be appointed Chief Secretary.
- Q. What else did he say to you?
- A. Nothing more was said.
- Q. Did anybody else talk with you about becoming Chief Secretary of the Cabinet?
- A. There was no one.
- Q. Did you discuss the matter with Mr. KISHI?
- A. No, the Cabinet was formally inaugurated on the 18th, or the Cabinet met on the 18th and he was sworn into office on that date.
- Q. Were there any other secretaries appointed to the Cabinet by TOJO other than yourself?
- A. There was only one Chief Secretary in the Cabinet.



HOSHINO - 3

11 Feb 1946

- Q. What other secretaries were there?  
A. There were about five secretaries aside from the Chief Secretary.
- Q. Who were they? What were their names?  
A. AKAMATSU, Sadao; KANOOKA, Etsui; HIRCHASHI, I don't know the given name for HIRCHASHI, and INADA, Hozoku. That is all; four secretaries and one Chief Secretary.
- Q. What were the duties of the four other secretaries?  
A. There were no specific duties of all these secretaries; just ordinary secretarial-work.
- Q. Under your direction as Chief Secretary?  
A. No, they were not all under me.
- Q. Who were they under?  
A. These all were secretaries for the Premier.
- Q. Did any secretaries other than yourself attend Cabinet meetings?  
A. No.
- Q. You said the other day that you did not keep any memoranda or minutes or notes of Cabinet meetings. Did anybody else keep them or make any notes or memoranda of Cabinet meetings?  
A. There were no notes taken in the Cabinet meetings at all.
- Q. Did you have occasion as Chief Secretary to prepare reports to the Emperor from any of the ministers in the Cabinet.  
A. No, there were no occasions that I prepared these reports to the Emperor.
- Q. Did you do most of your work under General TOJO who was Premier at that time?  
A. My duties were mostly concerning the personnel and the miscellaneous work in the TOJO Cabinet. The chief duties are to make liaison from the various ministries to the TOJO Cabinet.
- Q. Did you make any minutes or keep any records in connection with your liaison duties?  
A. Records are kept in the Cabinet but not kept individually.
- Q. Who made up these records for the Cabinet?  
A. These are more or less terse documents and properly are not referred to as records.

HOSHINO - 4

11 Feb 1946

Q. Did you have the duty of keeping them filed?

A. There was another person there that keeps these documents on file--it was not my duty.

Q. What was his name?

A. INADA.

Q. As Secretary of the Cabinet were you also Secretary of the Privy Council?

A. No.

Q. Was there a Secretary to the Privy Council?

A. Yes.

Q. Who was it?

A. HORIYE--I cannot recall his given name at the present time.

Q. Did the Privy Council ever meet with the Cabinet?

A. No.

Q. Was there a Cabinet Advisory Board? Maybe it was known as the Cabinet Planning Board?

A. I have heard of a Cabinet Planning Board but I have never heard of a Cabinet Advisory Board.

Q. As Chief Secretary of the Cabinet did you act as Secretary of the Cabinet Planning Board?

A. No.

Q. Was there a Supreme War Council when you were connected with the TOJO Cabinet?

A. No, there was not.

Q. Did the members of the Cabinet have meetings at which all the members were not present from time to time.

A. There are times when the members are absent due to various reasons. However, the members do make it a policy to attend as many as possible.

Q. And you attended as secretary at each of these meetings?

A. Yes. In the Cabinet all the ministers sit at the main-table and they have a separate table or desk where they have the meeting where the Chief Secretary, the Chief of the Legislative Bureau and the Chief of the Information Bureau sit.

HOSHINO - 5

11 Feb 1946

- Q. Who was the Chief of the Information Bureau? Is it Board or Bureau?
- A. Board of Information.
- Q. Who was the Chief of the Board of Information?
- A. Formerly it was TANI, Masayuki who was succeeded by AMO, Eiji.
- Q. Was he also known as the President of the Board of Information?
- A. You may term it "president" but I think the term "chief" was the most widely used.
- Q. And was it known as the Cabinet Information Board?
- A. Yes, Cabinet Information Board.
- Q. You said formerly it was a man by the name of TANI, and then he was followed by AMO. Were they the only Chiefs of the Cabinet Information Board during TOJO'S administration?
- A. No others.
- Q. As Chief of the Cabinet Information Board did the Chief keep any records or minutes of the meetings?
- A. The minutes of the meeting were not taken at all, but just parts of the meetings discussed were taken for publication in the newspapers.
- Q. And who was the Chief of the Legislative Board?
- A. MORIYAMA, Eichi.
- Q. Was he Chief of the Legislative Board during the entire time the Cabinet was in existence?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Did he keep any records?
- A. No.
- Q. Do you remember when Mr. KURUSU was sent to Washington?
- A. I do not recall the exact date but it was in early November.
- Q. Did the Cabinet take any action about sending Mr. KURUSU to Washington?
- A. As far as I can recall there was no discussion in the Cabinet as to dispatching KURUSU to Washington.

11 Feb 1946

Q. Do you know why he was sent?

A. KURUSU was dispatched to Washington to help NOMURA who was Ambassador to Washington at the time and to help the treaty so that the negotiation can be arrived at without too much confusion and also to convey the thoughts of the Japanese Government to Washington.

Q. What thoughts of the Japanese Government did he convey to Washington?

A. I do not know the minute details of the thoughts KURUSU was supposed to convey to Washington but he was dispatched to Washington so that the treaty would be concluded.

Q. When Mr. KURUSU got to Washington he went with Mr. NOMURA and had a conference with President Roosevelt and Mr. Hull did KURUSU or NOMURA make any report as to what that conference was about?

A. There was a report of the meeting with President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull and the report was supposed to have been sent back to Japan but as far as the contents of the report go I do not know what they were.

Q. Was the report submitted at any Cabinet meeting?

A. I do not recall any reports of the meeting at the Cabinet meetings.

Q. Do you recall the Japanese Government preparing a proposal looking towards the settlement of the negotiations between the United States and Japan some time about the middle of November 1941?

A. I do recall a revision to the former proposal being submitted.

Q. About the middle of November?

A. I believe it was in mid-November.

Q. And what was that proposal?

A. I recall parts of the proposal at the time and these were in connection with embargo and the withdrawing of troops from French Indo China, etc.--the Cabinet thought that the problems of this nature should be taken up to ease the tension in this way.

Q. Was there a record made of that proposal?

A. I do not have this record but I believe there is one in the Foreign Office.

HOSHINO - 7

11 Feb 1946

- Q. Did you see it, yourself?  
A. I believe I did see the proposal but the minute details concerning this I do not know.
- Q. Was it submitted to any Cabinet meeting?  
A. I believe it was not presented to the Cabinet meeting but it did get as far as the Foreign Minister or the Foreign office and the Premier.
- Q. Who was the Foreign Minister at that time?  
A. TOGO.
- Q. And did he make any report at any Cabinet meeting about it?  
A. I cannot recall. It was TOGO'S duty to report all foreign activities and news to the Cabinet. However, whether he reported this proposal to the Cabinet meeting or not I do not recall.
- Q. Was there any report made of a meeting between President Roosevelt and Mr. Hull and Mr. NOMURA and Mr. KURUSU about November 27, 1941?  
A. I believe it was reported to the Cabinet.
- Q. And what was that report?  
A. I cannot recall the exact contents of that report.
- Q. Was it in writing?  
A. I do not think so.
- Q. If it were in writing it would be in the Foreign Minister's Office?  
A. Yes.
- Q. Did the Cabinet take any action on the report of this conference between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull and Mr. NOMURA and Mr. KURUSU?  
A. I believe the Cabinet got the impression that the negotiation was not going to be carried through.
- Q. At what meeting? When?  
A. I do not recall exactly what Cabinet meeting it was.
- Q. Was there any special Cabinet meeting held about that time?  
A. I believe there was a Cabinet meeting in early December concerning the negotiation.
- Q. What date, do you remember, in December?  
A. I cannot recall the exact date.

HOSHINO - 8

11 Feb 1946

- Q. Was it the first or second of December?  
A. Maybe.
- Q. What was discussed at that special Cabinet meeting?  
A. I cannot recall.
- Q. Did the Cabinet agree that they would not withdraw troops from French Indo China?  
A. There was no discussion about withdrawing the troops from French Indo China at that time.
- Q. Did the Tripartite Agreement have anything to do with the withdrawing of troops?  
A. No.
- Q. Why was it called?  
A. I believe the special Cabinet meeting was called because it got the impression that a treaty would not be arrived at with the United States and in the event that the treaty did not go through well what steps they might take or would take.
- Q. What steps did they decide to take if the negotiations did not go along well?  
A. That if the negotiation could not be made then Japan would take free action.
- Q. Was a declaration of war drawn at that time?  
A. No, not at that time.
- Q. When was it decided upon?  
A. The exact decisive action was not decided upon in this meeting at all. However, it was decided that if negotiations could not be made by December 8 then HOKAMA would present the ultimatum to Washington.
- Q. Did General TOJO make any statements or talk at this Cabinet meeting at which this decision was arrived?  
A. TOJO did make a speech at that meeting but as to the contents of that speech I do not recall any specific subjects.
- Q. Had a declaration of war been drawn at that time?  
A. No.

11 Feb 1946

- Q. Do you know when it was drawn?
- A. The proclamation or declaration of war was not drawn at this meeting at all. What was discussed was that if the negotiations could not be arrived at then Japan would take steps but the declaration of war was not decided.
- Q. Was the date fixed for commencing war as of December 8 at this meeting?
- A. No, I do not think so.
- Q. Was there any disagreement among the ministers at the meeting about going to war with the United States?
- A. No.
- Q. Did TOJO say at that meeting that nothing can be permitted to interfere with this sphere because this sphere was decreed by providence to the Japanese?
- A. I do not recall TOJO making such statements.
- Q. Was the draft of the declaration of war submitted to the Emperor before the Imperial Conference on December 8?
- A. At the Imperial Conference as far as I can recall there was no declaration of war prepared but the object of the meeting was more or less the same line as the Cabinet meeting held on the second of December.
- Q. Do you know whether or not General TOJO or the foreign minister submitted the draft of the declaration of war to the Emperor prior to that meeting of the Imperial Conference?
- A. I do not recall anything to that effect.
- Q. Do you recall whether or not the Emperor made any changes in the draft of the declaration of war before the Imperial Conference?
- A. The declaration of war was not made until the 8th of December and the danger of the possibility of Japan entering the war was foreseen at an earlier date.
- Q. Yes, now at the meeting of the Cabinet which you were talking about a little bit ago held about the first part of December, was there another Cabinet meeting before the meeting of the Imperial Conference, if you remember?
- A. The regular sessions were possibly held but I cannot recall any special sessions being held aside from those two mentioned.

11 Feb 1946

- Q. Would it be unusual for the Emperor to make any changes in a draft of the declaration of war?
- A. I do not know if the Emperor would make any revisions or changes.
- Q. Did you know, as a matter of fact, that he did make a change in the declaration of war which TOJO took to him before the Imperial Conference?
- A. There was no draft of the declaration of war made prior to the Imperial Conference.
- Q. Was it drawn on that day?
- A. The declaration of war was drawn on the 8th of December.
- Q. When was the meeting of the Imperial Conference, what time on Monday, the 8th?
- A. The meeting of the Privy Council of the Cabinet was held on December 8.
- Q. When was the Imperial Conference held? Wasn't the Emperor present at the meeting on the 8th?
- A. I believe it was a few days after the special Cabinet of early December or immediately after the special Cabinet.
- Q. Who were present at the meeting of the Cabinet, the Privy Council and the Emperor on December 8?
- A. All the members of the Cabinet and the members of the Privy Council.
- Q. Were all of the members of the Privy Council there?
- A. Yes. Possibly there may have been a few absentees due to sickness, etc., but as far as I can recall they were all present.
- Q. Was MR. HATA there?
- A. Who is HATA?
- Q. He was President of the Privy Council?
- A. It is HARA--not HATA. Naturally, he would be there.
- Q. Do you remember whether MR. SHIWADA was there?
- A. There is no one by the name of SHIWADA.
- Q. Was General SUGIYAMA there?
- A. No. He did not attend the meeting of the Privy Council.
- Q. Was Admiral NAGANO there?
- A. No.



HOSHINO - 11

11 Feb 1946

- Q. Was Rear Admiral OKA there?  
A. No, I do not think so.
- Q. Was Vice Chief ITO there?  
A. ITO did not attend the meeting of the Privy Council.
- Q. Was Admiral TERASHIMA there? Was he at the meeting?  
A. Which one do you mean?
- Q. Vice Admiral IMA TERASHIMA.  
A. He was present. He was Minister of Communication at the time.
- Q. Was the declaration of war submitted at that meeting?  
A. Yes.
- Q. And did the Emperor add anything to the declaration of war or make any changes in it?  
A. No.
- Q. Were you present at all times during this conference or meeting?  
A. I believe I was.
- Q. Did the Emperor add in his own handwriting to the declaration of war, "It is our purpose to go to war with America but it is unavoidable"?  
A. I have not heard anything to that effect.
- Q. Well, did he say anything to that effect?  
A. No.
- Q. When was the declaration of war submitted to the Privy Council?  
A. The morning of the 8th.
- Q. And were you present at that meeting?  
A. Yes.
- Q. What action did the Privy Council take?  
A. There were two or three queries to the effect...
- Q. What were they and who made them?  
A. There were two meetings which constituted this meeting of the Privy Council--one the preparatory and the other formal. At the preparatory meeting where the Privy Council meets the Emperor does not attend this; he attends the formal meeting. At this

HOSHINO - 12

11 Feb 1946

preparatory meeting there was the query made by IKEDA to the effect on the proclamation of war it stated that "Bei-oi" be changed to "America Gasahu-koku."

- Q. As a matter of fact you testified the other day that the change was to read--that "Anglo-American" should be changed to read "United States and Great Britain". Were there any other changes made?
- A. The suggestion was brought up but it was not actually changed to read as stated above.
- Q. So that there were no changes <sup>made in</sup> the declaration of war which was submitted to the Privy Council?
- A. No change at all.
- Q. Did General TOJO submit that declaration of war to the Emperor before he submitted it to the Privy Council?
- A. I cannot say definitely but it is possible that he did present such a bill to the Emperor before being presented to the Privy Council. I am not definitely sure but it is possible that it was.
- Q. But of your own knowledge you don't remember it?
- A. No.
- Q. At the time of the meeting of the Privy Council did you know whether or not Pearl Harbor had been attacked?
- A. Yes, I had heard.
- Q. And did you hear it before the declaration of war was approved by the Privy Council?
- A. I believe that I had learned it.
- Q. Did the Emperor know that the attack on Pearl Harbor had taken place before this Imperial Conference meeting?
- A. I am speaking of the meeting of the Privy Council and not the Imperial Conference. The statements made heretofore were all concerning the meeting of the Privy Council and not the Imperial Conference.
- Q. And was the fact that the attack on Pearl Harbor had taken place discussed in the Privy Council before the Imperial Conference? Did they know that Pearl Harbor had been attacked?
- A. This Privy Council meeting was held on the 8th day of December and the meeting of the Imperial Conference was prior to that.

11 Feb 1946

Q. And on what date was that held, the Imperial Conference?

A. The Imperial Conference was held approximately a week prior to the meeting of the Privy Council at about the second or third of December.

Q. When was the Imperial Conference held at which the Privy Council and all of the Cabinet were present--what date?

A. That was on the 8th.

Q. And had the Privy Council had a meeting before the 8th of December at which the question of the declaration of war was considered?

A. No.

Q. Now, about what time did the Privy Council meet on the 8th of December?

A. About 9 a.m.

Q. And at that time they knew Pearl Harbor had been attacked?

A. Yes.

Q. And then after they had the meeting of the Privy Council at what time did the Imperial Conference meet on that day of the 8th, December 8th?

A. I do not think there was a meeting of the Imperial Conference on that day; I have no recollection to that effect.

Q. Was the Chief of the Information Board present at the meeting of the Privy Council?

A. I believe he was present though I cannot say definitely that he was. As the Chief of the Cabinet Information Board and myself as well are not members would not have to attend the meetings except those that pertained to our duties so that possibly he may have attended this. If they were all ministers it would be compulsory, more or less, to attend these meetings, but as these people are merely in line of duty only and not as a member I would not be able to say definitely that they were.

Q. Would you say that there was no meeting of the Imperial Conference on Monday, December 8?

A. I have no recollection that there was an Imperial Conference on the 8th.

Q. What date was it held then?

A. I believe it was on the second or third of December. I don't know definitely the exact date.

HOSHINO - 14

11 Feb 1946

- Q. Were you present at this Imperial Conference?  
A. Yes, I was but not as a member.
- Q. Did the Emperor submit any questions in writing to any of the ministers or members of the Cabinet?  
A. I do not think he made any statements or put anything in writing at that meeting.
- Q. Was there an Imperial Conference held for the purpose of determining upon the kind of notice that would be given to the Japanese people that a state of war had arisen?  
A. Nothing to that effect was decided upon at that meeting.
- Q. After the Privy Council had approved the declaration of war did they send it to the Emperor?  
A. Yes.
- Q. And what did the Emperor do with it?  
A. He signed it as he received this declaration of war.
- Q. And then did he send it back to the Cabinet?  
A. Yes.
- Q. And did the Cabinet have a meeting about it after it came back?  
A. Yes.
- Q. Was the attention of the Cabinet called to the fact that the Emperor had added some language to this declaration of war?  
A. No.
- Q. Do you know whether he had added any words to it?  
A. No, I do not.
- Q. Who would have charge of the copies of this declaration of war?  
A. I believe it will have been kept in the Cabinet.
- Q. And where would it be kept or filed?  
A. There is a reference section in the Cabinet and I believe it will have been kept there.
- Q. Well, I think we will stop here. I think that is all.

WITNESSES DISMISSED AT 1520 HOURS