

re 9947

see 2696

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al

-vs-

Sadao, et al

SWORN DEPOSITION

Deponent : MAKINO, Nobuaki

Having first duly sworn an oath as on attached sheet and in accordance with the procedure followed in my country I hereby depose as follows.

Affidavit

I, MAKINO, Nobuaki, make oath and say as follows:

1. I am in my eighty-sixth year. I am Count and holder of the First Class Order of Paulownia and senior grade of the second class Court rank.

The principal posts of my official career were:

After being accredited to Italy and Austria conjointly with Switzerland as Minister, I was appointed Minister of Education in 1906 a Privy Councillor in 1909, Minister of Agriculture and Commerce in 1912 and Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1913. In 1919, I was appointed Delegate to the Paris Peace Conference, representing Japan. I was appointed Minister of the Imperial Household in February, 1921. In March, 1925 when I resigned as Minister of the Imperial Household, I was appointed Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal. IN April, the same year, I was created Count in recognition of my services. On December 26, 1935 when I resigned as Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, owing to ill health, I was accorded the honorable treatment due to the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal. In January, 1936, I was appointed Economic Advisor to

Def, Doc. #2247

the Imperial Family, which post I still hold.

2. The post of Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal (Naidaijin) was set early in the Meiji era for the purpose of investing the late Prince SANJO, Sanetomi with a court office. It had its inception, therefore, in the creation of a court office for the sake of an eminent retiring court noble. The statute governing the organization of the office of Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal stipulated that the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal take custody of the Privy Seal and the State Seal and offer joji hohitsu (constant advice) to the Emperor. The statute was in force till the office of the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal was abolished following the termination of the war. It is true that the office of Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal took charge of affixing the Privy Seal and the State Seal to documents under legal provisions, but it was nothing more or less than a formality to mark as original copies Imperial Rescripts and legislations which had already been approved by other machineries of the state. It was entirely a formalistic act. In affixing the Privy Seal or the State Seal to documents, the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal legally had no

Def. Doc. #2247

authority or duty to examine their contents. And as a matter of fact, there was no case of such examination done, still less the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal's refusal to affix the Privy Seal or the State Seal to documents. Therefore, the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal was not expected to assume any responsibility for the Imperial Rescripts or legislations to which he affixed the Privy Seal or the State Seal. During my tenure of office as Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, I discharged my official duty in accordance with this guiding principle.

3. The Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal was called upon to offer koji hohitsu or advice to the Emperor on His Majesty's command. In the conduct of State affairs in general, however, the Constitution (old), Article 55 provides that all Ministers of State shall advise the Emperor; in matters pertaining to the High Command or the fighting services, the regulations pertaining to the Army General Staff and the Navy General Staff stipulate that the Chiefs of Staff of the Army and Navy of the fighting services shall have direct access to the Throne and offer advice to His Majesty; and in the conduct of Imperial Court affairs, the organization of the Imperial Household Department provides that the Minister of the Imperial Household advise the Emperor. The Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal was not in a position to offer advice to the Emperor on those affairs. As a matter of fact, during my eleven-year tenure of office as Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, I never went beyond this limit in offering advice to His Majesty. If the Emperor

Def. Doc. #2247

asked the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal for his advice on any state matters and the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal is obliged to give his private opinion but it is understood that it is no concern of actual affairs. It is part of the Lord Keeper duties to relate to the Emperor any information the Lord Keeper may receive with respect to public affairs. Inasmuch as Marquis KIDO who was Chief Secretary to me when I was Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal was fully acquainted with my way of offering joji hohitsu or advice to the Emperor, it is my firm belief, on information I have received, that he strictly observed this limit in offering advice to the Emperor during his tenure of office as Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal.

4/ It was the late Prince SAIONJI who rendered the most substantial services in educating the present Emperor. Prince SAIONJI thought it most important for the Emperor to guard his position as constitutional monarch zealously. In pursuance of this principle he guided the Emperor, vigilantly guarding against any responsibility being shifted on to the Emperor for political action taken by the Government. I pursued the same principle as the Prince. And it has been the policy, steadfastly followed by the Imperial family since the Emperor MEIJI. The present Emperor has never rejected a petition, filed by the Government authorities. And on the strength of my 15 year service close to the Throne, I positively believe that the present Emperor has never followed political views offered by those other than the Government authorities.

Def. Doc. #2247

And on the strength of my 15 years service close to the Throne, I positively believe that the present Emperor has never followed political views offered by those other than the Government authorities. On August 10, 1945, when I proceeded to the Imperial Palace to have an audience with the Emperor, I met Marquis KIDO. On that occasion, I obtained a full impression that the Marquis was doing his best to zealously guard the Emperor's position as constitutional monarch in accordance with the old tradition of the Imperial court.

5. A clear demarcation has been drawn between the Imperial Court and the Government since the Meiji Restoration of 1868. There would be no distinction between the Imperial Court and the Government should a court official close to the Throne take an active part in politics or should a high Government official wield a powerful influence in court circles. When the late Prince ITO, HIROBUMI, then Prime Minister, concurrently assumed the post of Minister of the Imperial Household in order to reform the Imperial court which till then followed the Kyoto tradition, and again when the late Prince KATSURA, Taro, then Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal accepted the Imperial command to form a succeeding Cabinet in 1910, they came in for hurricanes of popular denunciations. During my tenure of office as Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, I paid special attention to observe a clear demarcation between the court and the Government. Needless to say that no less close attention was paid to this point by Marquis KIDO under me during his tenure of office

Def. Dpc. #2247

Chief Secretary to the  
as Chief Secretary to the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal.

6. Affairs of State were not covered by joji hohitsu or advice, offered by the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal to the Emperor, as already pointed out. At a political change, however, it became a custom for the Emperor to ask the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal about a succeeding Prime Minister. On the part of the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, it was also customary for him to reply to His Majesty that it would be proper to seek the views of the Genro or Elder Statesmen. This reply to the Throne was nothing but a formal one. In pursuance of his reply the Emperor would send the Grand Chamberlain to the Elder Statesmen in order to seek their views on the succeeding Prime Minister.

Later Prince SAIONJI became the only surviving Genro or Elder Statesman, and when he advanced in age, he sought the views of the Senior Statesman (jushin) (former Prime Ministers for information and recommended the succeeding Prime Minister after taking into consideration their views. For instance, when the SAITO Cabinet resigned, Prince SAIONJI on Imperial sanction called a meeting of the ex-premiers, President of the Privy Council, the retiring Prime Minister and the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal and sought their views, after which the Prince recommended Admiral OKADA to the Throne as succeeding Prime Minister on his own responsibility.

It is clear that selection of a succeeding Prime Minister has never been done by an individual's private opinion, but has been traditionally made on the basis of coordinated views of several Elder Statesman or Elder Statesmen and Senior Statesmen. After the death of Prince SAIONJI, the only surviving Genro or Elder Statesman, the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal was called upon to recommend a succeeding Prime Minister to the Throne. True to tradition, however, the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal under Imperial command sought the views of the Senior Statesmen, after which it was customary for him to recommend a suitable person to the Throne as succeeding Prime Minister on the basis of their views.

During my 11-year tenure of office and also during Marquis KIDO's tenure of office as Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, a selection of succeeding Prime Ministers was done through the above-mentioned processes then observed and submitted to the Throne. Under no circumstances was a succeeding Prime Minister selected on the basis of the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal's private view.

7. Nothing would be a grosser mistake than to think that the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal must have carried favor with the military on the alleged ground that the Prime Minister, recommended to the Throne by the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal contained a high percentage of servicemen. It was at first legally provided that the Minister of War be chosen from among Generals



Def. Doc. #2247

in active service, but the provision in question was revised under the YAMAMOTO Cabinet so as to make those on the retired list eligible for the portfolio of War. Under the HIROTA Cabinet in 1936, however, the revision was repealed and the old provision was revived at the instance of General TERAUCHI, Hisaichi, then Minister of War, so that it was stipulated afresh that the Minister of War be chosen from among the Generals and Lieutenant-Generals in active service. This method paved the way for the military to effect a political intervention. In case the so-called Three Big Heads of the Army, that is, the Chief of Staff of the Army, Inspector-General of Military Education and Minister of War jointly refused to recommend a succeeding War Minister, it would disable the Prime Minister designate to form a succeeding Cabinet though he was commanded by the Emperor to form a new Cabinet. If he could not choose the candidate from among the Generals on the retired list while a Cabinet in formation required the acquiescence of the Army by custom. In the second SAIONJI Cabinet when I was Minister of Agriculture and Commerce, the then Minister of War MIYAHARA resigned when he could not get the assent of the Cabinet to his proposed increase of two new divisions. SAIONJI went to YAMAGATA asking his help to suggest MIYAHARA's successor. The latter's reply was that he could not, under the circumstances, render useful advice. SAIONJI saw that further effort was of no avail, so he resigned. As another example General UGAKI was commanded by the Emperor to form a

new Cabinet and this proved abortive because of his inability to obtain a War Minister of his own choice. The first important condition, therefore, for selection of a succeeding Prime Minister was that the candidate in question would be able to obtain a War Minister without difficulty. Hence a high percentage of Prime Ministers selected and recommended were service men.

8. It was on October 28, 1930 that Marquis KIDO was appointed Chief Secretary to the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, which post I was holding. His appointment was done through the intermediary of Prince KONOYE. Prior to his appointment as Chief Secretary to the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, Marquis KIDO was a divisional chief of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Marquis KIDO assisted me as Chief Secretary till December 26, 1935 when I resigned as Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal. When Prince KONOYE recommended Marquis KIDO to me as Chief Secretary to the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, I drew his attention to the fact that a comparably young man would be hardly suitable for the post of Chief Secretary to the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal which was a sinecure without any routine duty to attend to and that the Chief Secretary to the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal must be fair and impartial without any political coloring. Prince KONOYE assured me that Marquis KIDO had no political leaning and would be best qualified for the post, so that I chose the Marquis as Chief Secretary. I was highly satisfied that during my tenure of office as Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, all informations gathered by Marquis KIDO as Chief Secretary were invariably impartial and neutral, not being partial to the military or any particular political organization.

9. On the strength of my observations of Marquis KIDO made in

Def. Doc. #2247

9. On the strength of my observations of Marquis KIDO, made in my daily contact with him as Chief Secretary to the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal for five years, the Marquis was clear-headed well-developed in common sense, versed in the law and had no mean order of business abilities, Ideologically he believed in rationalism and liberalism; politically, he respected constitutional government, his ideal being a Party Cabinet, based on a sound party system. It is not the truth that he colluded with the gumbatsu or military clique of unheld militarism and aggression.

10. I myself was regarded with hostility by the military and extreme nationalists as pro-British and pro-American pacifist and advocate of the status quo with the result that the rightists of servicemen and civilians attempted to assassinate me no less than four times. The first abortive attempt at my assassination was made by the Ketsu-meidan (Blood Brotherhood) in March, 1932 when naval men and civilians, opposed to the London Naval Treaty, rose in arms. The second attempt was made on May 15, 1932 when the so-called May 15th incident broke out. The incident was started by those Army and Navy officers and men opposed to party politics. They attacked the official residence of the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal and threw bombs at it. A third attempt at my assassination which also proved abortive was made by the Shimpei Tai (Godsent troops) in 1933. The so-called godsent troops consisted of civilian rightists and servicemen, who advocated the Showa Restoration in imitation of the Meiji

Def. Doc. #2247

Restoration of 1868, denouncing liberalism and materialism. They attempted a large-scale terroristic action; but their plot was nipped in the bud. A fourth attempt at my assassination was made when the February 26th incident broke out. A party of young Army officer at the head of their men rose in rebellion in attempts to overthrow the influences already in existence, stimulated by opposition to the London Naval Treaty and advocacy vigorous action for settlement of the Manchurian Incident. A squad of them attacked a hotel at YUGAWARA where I was staying and showered machine gun bullets upon it. Fortunately, however, I had a narrow escape.

Abortive as those attempts at my assassination were, they were all made during my tenure of office as Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, and after which grim fact shows in no equivocal terms that the recalcitrant elements vigilantly watched for an opportunity to get rid of the incumbent of the post of Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal as unisance. Later, when Marquis KIDO assumed the post of Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, rightists groups attempted to assassinate him on occasions more than once

In referring to my personal affairs, in this affidavit I was prompted by the desire to clarify the traditional policy of the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal on the one hand and on the other to show what atmosphere prevailed in Imperial court circles since the day of the Emperor Meiji, builder of modern Japan.

Def. Doc. #2247

On this 1 day of Mar., 1947

At \_\_\_\_\_

DEPONENT /S/ MAKINO, Nobuaki (seal)

I, KIDO, Takahiko hereby certify that the above statement was sworn by the Deponent, who affixed his signature and seal thereto in the presence of this witness.

On the same date

At same place

Witness: /S/ KIDO, Takahiko (seal)

OATH

In accordance with my conscience I swear to tell the whole truth withholding nothing and adding nothing.

/S/ MAKINO, Nobuaki (seal)

極東國際軍事裁判所

亞米利加合衆國其他

對

荒木貞夫 其他

宣誓供述書

供述者

牧

野

仲

顯

自分儀我國ニ行ハルル方式ニ從ヒ先ヅ別紙ノ通り宣誓ヲ爲シタル上  
次ノ如ク供述致シマス

余、牧野伸顯ハ宣誓ノ上左ノ通り陳述ス。

一、余、牧野伸顯ノ位階、勳等、爵位ハ正二位勳一等桐花章伯爵ニシテ年齢八十六歳ナリ。

余ノ目歴ノ主要ナルモノハ特命全權公使トシテ伊太利及ビ埃太利兼瑞西ニ駐劄シタル後一九〇六年（明治三十九年）文部大臣ニ就任シ

一九〇九年（明治四十二年）樞密顧問官ニ、一九一一年（明治四十四年）農商務大臣ニ、一九一三年（大正二年）外務大臣ニ夫々就任

一九一九年（大正八年）ニハ嶺和全權委員ヲ被仰付タリ。

一九二一年（大正十年）二月宮内大臣ニ親任セラレ一九二五年（大正十四年）三月退官シ、同年同月内大臣ニ任セララル。同年四月勳功ニ依リ特ニ伯爵ヲ陞授セララル。

一九三五年（昭和十年）十二月二十六日病ノ爲内大臣ヲ辭シ同日特ニ前官ノ禮遇ヲ賜ハラル。

二、現行ノ内大臣ナル官職ハ明治時代ニ三條實美公退引ノ際待遇ノ必要上設ケラレタルモノナリ。

右ノ職責ハ内大臣府官制ニモ之ヲ規定シ、爾來内大臣府ガ廢官トナル迄存續シタリト雖、内大臣府ニ於テ御璽、國璽ヲ鈐スルハ既ニ他

ノ國家機關ニ依リテ決定セラレタル詔勅類、法令類ニ其原本タル權

威ヲ賦與スル手續タルニ留リ、即チ全ク形式的行爲ニ過ギズ。法制

上内大臣ハ御璽、國璽ヲ鈐スルニ際シテ其文書ノ内容ヲ審査スル權限モ義務モナク、又事關上未タ嘗テ審査シタル實例ナシ。況ヤ内大臣ノ御璽、國璽押捺、諾否ノ權ニ於テオヤ。故ニ内大臣ハ目ヲ御璽、國璽ヲ鈐シタル詔書類、法令類ノ内容ニ關シテ何等ノ責任ヲモ負擔スルモノニ非ズ。

余ハ此原則ノ下ニ内大臣ノ職務ヲ執リタリ。

三、内大臣ノ常侍輔弼ハ天皇ノ御行動ニ付意見ヲ奉ルモノナリ。然レドモ一般國務ニ關シテハ帝國憲法（舊）第五十五條ノ規定ニ依リ各國務大臣ガ天皇ヲ輔弼シ、統帥事項、即軍令ニ關シテハ參謀本部條例及海軍々令部條令ノ規定ニ依リ參謀總長、軍令部總長ガ帷帳上奏ニ依リテ輔弼シ、官廷事務ニ關シテハ官内省官制ニ依リ官内大臣ガ輔弼スルモノナリ。

之等ノ事項ニ關シテハ内大臣ハ意見ヲ奉ルコトヲ得サルモノナリ。事實ニ於テモ余ハ十一年ノ長キニ亘リテ内大臣ノ職ニ在リタレドモ、此限界ヲ超ヘタルコトナシ。陛下ガ國務ニ付内大臣ニ御下問アリタル場合ニハ、内大臣ハ個人的意見ヲ奉答セサルヲ得サルモ、ソハ實際ノ國務トハ實際關係ナキモノトス。内大臣ガ公務ニ關シ得ルコトアルヘキ情報ヲ陛下ニ奏スルハ内大臣ノ職務ノ一部ナリ。木戸侯ハ余ノ下ニ内大臣秘書官長ヲ勤メ、余ノ輔弼ノ在リ方ヲ充分會得シタルカ故ニ同侯ノ内大臣在職時代モ此限界ヲ嚴守シタルコトハ余



ノ聞キタルコトニ基キ余ノ確信スル所ナリ。

四、今上陛下ノ恩召ニヨリ御輔導ニ最モ力ヲ致サレタルハ西園寺公ナリ。西園寺公ハ陛下ガ立憲君主トシテノ御立場ヲ御守リニナルコトヲ最モ肝要ナリトセラレ、此方針ヲ以テ陛下ヲ御輔導申上ケ政治ノ責任ガ陛下ニ及フコトヲ極力警戒セラレタリ。余ノ方針モ亦同様ナリ。之ハ遠ク明治天皇以來ノ我皇室ノ御立場ナリ。今上陛下ニ於カセラレテモ政府責任者ノ奏上ヲ拒否セラレタルコト未ダ嘗テ無キト同時ニ、政府當局以外ノ者ノ政治上ノ意見ヲ御採納アラセラレタルコト無キハ余ノ十五年間ノ奉仕中ノ體驗ニ徴シテ確信シ得ル所ナリ。

一九四五年（昭和二十年）八月十日拜謁ノ際ニ木戸侯ニ面談シタルカ此時モ同侯カ陛下ノ御立場ヲ右ノ如ク在ラシムヘク努力セシコトヲ十分ニ感得シタリ。

五、皇室ト政府トノ關係ニ就キ明治新政府ノ樹立以來嚴ニ戒メタルハ官中、府中ノ別ナリ。

陛下側近ノ宮内高官カ現實ノ政治ニ關與シ、又ハ政府高官カ官中ニ勢力ヲ振フカ如キハ即チ官中、府中ノ別ヲ紊ルモノニシテ、嘗テ伊藤博文公カ京都以來ノ傳統ヲ持テタル宮廷ノ改革ヲ爲サンカ爲ニ總理大臣ニシテ宮内大臣ヲ兼攝シタル際、及一九一〇年（大正元年）桂太郎公ガ内大臣在職中ニ内閣組織ノ大命ヲ拜シタル際ハ與論ノ攻撃頗ル急ナリキ。余ハ内大臣在職中此點ニ關シテハ特ニ意ヲ用ヒタリ。余ノ下ニ

秘書官長タリシ木戸侯モ同様ニ之ヲ戒慎シタルコトハ言ヲ俟タス。  
 大、内大臣ノ常侍輔弼ハ國務ニ及ハサルコト前述ノ如シ。政變ノ際ニ陸  
 下ヨリ後繼内閣ノ首班者ニ關シ内大臣ニ御下問アル慣例ヲ生ジ、之ニ  
 對シ内大臣ハ元老ニ御下問被遊ルコト然ル可キ旨ヲ奉答スルヲ常例ト  
 シタリ。  
 内大臣ノ奉答ハ形式的ニ過ギズ、陛下ハ此ノ奉答ニ依リ侍從長ヲ各元  
 老ニ差遣ハサレ侍從長ハ元老ノ意見ヲ聽取シテ之ヲ奏上スルコトヲ慣  
 例トセリ。西園寺公ガ唯一ノ元老ニナリタル時代ニ公ハ晩年ニ至リ重  
 臣（前首相）ノ意見ヲ徵シ之ヲ參酌シテ奉答セラレシコトアリ。例ヘ  
 バ齊藤内閣桂冠ノ際ニ西園寺公ハ陛下ノ御許ヲ得テ前首相、樞相、現  
 首相、内府等ヲ召集シテ其ノ意見ヲ徵シタル後、岡田海軍大將ヲ後繼  
 内閣首班者ニ奏請シタルコトアリ。元老ハ以上ノ經過ヲ含メテ自己ノ  
 責任ニ於テ奏請セラレタルモノナリ。  
 以上明ラカナル如ク、後繼内閣首班者ノ選定ハ或一個人ノ私意ニ依リ  
 テ爲サルルコトナク、數名ノ元老、若クハ元老ト重臣トノ綜合的意見  
 ニ基キテ爲サルル傳統ヲ存シタルモノナリ。  
 最後ノ元老西園寺公ノ歿後ハ内大臣ガ適任者ヲ奉答セザルヲ得ザルニ  
 至リシモ、右ノ傳統ヲ重シテ内大臣ハ陛下ノ命ニ依リ召集シタル重  
 臣ノ意見ヲ聽取シタル後其總意ヲ纏メテ適任者ヲ奏請スルヲ常例トシ  
 タリ。

余ノ十一年間ノ内大臣在任時代及木戸侯ノ内大臣時代ニ爲シタル後繼  
 内閣首班者ノ奏請ハ夫々ノ時代ニ依リ前述ノ方法ニ依ツテ之ヲ爲シタ  
 ルモノニシテ即チ如何ナル場合ト雖、内大臣一人ノ私意、私見ヲ以テ  
 後繼首相ヲ選定シタルコトハ斷ジテ無シ。  
 七、過去ニ於テ内大臣ガ奏請シタル後繼首相ニ軍人ガ多數ナル事實ヨリ  
 シテ内大臣ガ軍部ニ迎合シタルモノト推測スル者有ラバ甚シキ誤解ナ  
 リ。  
 初メ陸軍大臣ハ現役ニ限ル法制ナリシ處、山本内閣ノ時ニ之ヲ改メテ  
 豫備役ノ者ヲモ任用シ得ルコトトシタリ。然ルニ一九三六年（昭和十  
 一年）廣田弘毅内閣ノ時ニ陸軍大臣寺内壽一ノ主張ニ依リ再ビ舊制ニ  
 復シテ陸軍大臣ハ現役ノ大、中將ニ限ルコトトシタリ。之實ニ軍部ノ  
 政治介入ヲ容易ナラシメタルモノナリ。陸軍三長官（參謀總長、教育  
 總監、陸軍大臣）ガ陸軍大臣ヲ推舉セザル場合ニ總理大臣ハ内閣組織  
 ノ大命ヲ拜シ乍ラ内閣ヲ組織スル能ハサルニ至ルナリ。總理大臣ハ豫  
 備役中ニ陸軍大臣候補者ヲ得サレバナリ。斯クノ如ク内閣組織ハ慣習  
 上軍ノ同意ヲ必要トシ、余ガ長岡藩大臣タリシ第二次西園寺内閣ニ於  
 テ上原陸軍大臣ハ二ヶ師團増設ヲ内閣ガ同意セザリシ爲辭職シタリ。  
 西園寺ハ山縣ニ上原ノ後任ニ付助言ヲ求メニ赴キタリ。山縣ハ此際通  
 常ニ助言ノ出來サル旨ヲ答ヘタリ。西園寺ハ此上ノ努力ノ無益ナルコ  
 トヲ知り辭職シタリ。

ソレヨリ後宇垣大將ガ組閣ノ大命ヲ拜シタル際ニ、同大將自身ノ選擇セル陸軍大臣ヲ得ル能ハズ、大命ヲ拜辭シテ宇垣内閣ハ流産シタル實例アリ。故ニ後繼内閣首班者選定ノ第一要件ハ其人ガ陸軍大臣ヲ得ラル、コトニアリ、之ガ爲ニ自然ノ成行トシテ軍人ガ首相トナル場合ガ多カリシ次第ナリ。

八、木戸侯ガ余ノ下ニ内大臣秘書官長トナリタルハ一九三〇年（昭和五年）十月二十八日ニシテ、近衛公ガ仲介ノ勞ヲ執リ、商工省ノ部長ヨリ轉任シタルモノナリ。爾來余ガ内大臣ヲ辭シタル一九三五年（昭和十年）十二月二十六日迄其職ニ在リテ余ヲ輔佐シタリ。

初メ近衛公ガ木戸侯ヲ推薦シ來リタル際、余ハ近衛公ニ對シ内大臣秘書官長ノ職ハ常務ナク隱居役ナルヲ以テ比較的若キ人ニハ如何カト思ハル、コト、及秘書官長ハ政治上ノ色彩無キ公平無私ノ立場ニ在ル人ナルヲ要スル事實ヲ述ベテ念ヲ押シタル處、近衛公ハ木戸侯ハ政治的色彩ナク最適任ナル事ヲ保證シタルニ依リ木戸侯ニ決シタリ。而テ余ノ在任中木戸秘書官長ノ情報ハ軍部或ハ特定ノ政治團體等ノ一方ニ偏スルコトナク、常ニ公正、中立ノモノナリシコトハ今モ余ノ極メテ満足ニ感ズルトコロナリ。

九、余ガ滿五年間日々木戸秘書官長ト接觸シテ觀察シタル所ニ依レバ、木戸侯ハ頭腦明敏、常識發達シ、法律ニ通シ、事務的手腕ニ富ミ、其思想ハ合理主義、自由主義ニシテ、政治上ノ意見ハ立憲政治ヲ尊重シ

健全ナル政黨ヲ基礎トスル内閣ヲ理想トシタリ、軍閥ト通謀シ軍國主

義、侵略主義ヲ支持シタルガ如キ事實ハ絶対ニナシト信ズ。

十、余ハ親英米派、目重論者、平和主義者トシテ軍部及極端ナル國家主

義者ヨリ敵視セラレ、軍人及民間ノ右翼ヨリ暗殺セラレントシタルコ

ト實ニ四回ニ及ヘリ。

第一回ハ一九三二年（昭和七年）三月ノ血盟國事件ニシテ「ロンドン」

海軍條約ニ反對スル海軍々人及民間右翼ニ依リ企テラレタルモ未遂ニ

終レリ。

第二回ハ一九三二年（昭和七年）五月十五日ノ五・一五事件ニシテ政

黨政治ニ反對スル陸海軍々人ノ一隊ガ官邸ニ余ヲ襲撃シテ爆彈ヲ投ジ

タリ。

第三回ハ一九三三年（昭和八年）ノ神戶事件ニシテ、自由主義、唯物

主義ニ反對シ昭和維新ヲ唱ヘタル民間右翼及軍人ガ大規模ノ「テロ」

行爲ヲ企テタルモ未然ニ發覺シタリ。

第四回ハ一九三六年（昭和十一年）二月二十六日ノ二・二六事件ニシ

テ「ロンドン」海軍條約反對論、滿洲事變強硬解決論ニ刺戟セラレ

テ政黨其他既成勢力ノ打倒ヲ目指シタル陸軍將校ガ兵士ヲ率ヒテ叛亂

シ、其一隊ハ余ガ宿泊中ナリシ湯河原ノ旅館ヲ襲ヒ機關銃ヲ亂射シ

タルモ危ク難ヲ避ケ得タリ。

右ノ暗殺ハ悉ク余ガ内大臣ノ職ニ在リタル期間及其後ノ出來事ニシテ、

軍閥ガ内大臣ヲ邪魔物視セルコトハ是等ノ事實ニ照ラシテ明瞭ナルベク、後ニ木戸侯ガ内大臣ニ就任シタル場合ニモ同侯ハ右翼一派ヨリ暗殺セラレントシタルコトアリ。

余ガ敢テ右ノ如キ一身上ノ事件ニ關シ此ノ宣審供述書ニ於テ言及シタルハ内大臣ノ傳統的主義ヲ明カニシ、併セテ宮中ニ一貫シテ存シタル空氣ノ如何ナルモノナルカヲ明カニセ<sup>ン</sup>趣旨ニ外ナラサルナリ。

昭和廿二年（一九四七年）三月一日 於

供述者 千葉縣東葛飾郡田中村十余ニ字庚塚

牧 野 伸 顯

右ハ當立會人ノ面前ニテ宣審シ且ツ署名捺印シタルコトヲ證明シマス

同日 於同所

木 戸 孝 彦

宣  
誓  
誓

良心ニ從ヒ眞實ヲ述ベ何事ヲモ欲秘セズ又何事ヲモ附加セザルニト  
ヲ誓フ

署名  
捺印

牧  
野  
伸  
顯

Ref

辯護士文書第二二四七號

牧野伸顯供述書

第二頁一七行

公助トアルヲ願フト訂正願ヒマス

正誤表