

3579

三百三行  
 一百終りより五行  
 七頁末行  
 九頁終りより三行  
 十六頁六行  
 二十頁終りより六行  
 三十一頁五行  
 三十七頁終りより五行  
 四十三頁三行  
 四十四頁終りより二行  
 四十七頁二行

正

誤

表

（辯護人佐藤賢了）一九二九年、訂正の分

「逃ブテ」を「逃ベテ」に改む  
 「フオンデイルクセン」を「フオン・デイルクセン」と改む  
 「サウデセウ」を「サウデシタ」と改む  
 「賢下宿ヲ」を「賢下ニ宿テ」と改む  
 「日ソ満」を「日ソ間」と改む  
 「マセンデシタ」を「マセン」と改む  
 「賢間」を「訪問」と改む  
 「辯護人佐藤賢了」を「辯護人デ佐藤賢了」と改む  
 「及建請」の「及」を削る  
 「賢成シ」を「賢成デ」と改む  
 「リホテル」を「リ・ホテル」と改む

遠東國際軍事裁判所

アメリカ合衆国其他

對

報告者 F. M. ナイト

荒木貞天其他

證人 オイゲン。オット將軍

訊問ニ當ツタ辯護人

白鳥敏夫ノ辯護人チャールス。B. コードル

コードル氏

貴下ハ英語ガ御上手ダサウデスカラ、若シ貴下ガ御承知ナラ英

語デコノ訊問ヲ續ケタイト思ヒマス。報告者モ私モドイツ語ヲ

話セマヤンノデ。

オット將軍 大變結構ブス

質問 貴下ノ姓名、住所、現住所ヲ述ブテ下サイ。

答 オイゲン。オット。住所ハドイツ。ミューニツヒ近在ノイツキング。

現住所ハ支那北平デス。

質問 貴下ノ現在ノ政治的地位及現在又ハ今迄ニ抑留サレタコトガアルカ

ドウカ、又所謂第二次世界大戦ノ以前又ハ最中ニ貴下ガ政治的活動

カ。 タナシタタメニ起訴サレ、コトガアルカナイカラ逃ブテ下サイマセン

答

私ハドイツ國民デ、前駐日獨逸大使デシタ。現在又ハ今迄ニ抑留サレ  
タコトハラリマセン。又第二次世界大戰ノ以前又ハ最中ニ政治的活動  
ヲナシタタメニ起訴サレタコトモアリマセン。併シ檢察官側ノ訊問ヲ  
受ケルタメニ東京ニ召喚サレタコトキニ私ハ何カノ誤チデ支那警察ニ依  
リ一晚北平デ抑留サレタコトガアリマス。翌日コノ誤解ハ解ケマシタ  
貴下ガ初メテ日本ニ來朝シタ以前ニドイツ政府内デドンナ公職ニ就イ  
テキタカ述ベテ下サイ。

質問

答

私ハドイツ國防省副陸軍將校デ、政治局長デシタ。  
貴下ガ日本ニ最初ニ來タ時期及ソノ時ドンナ資格デ來タカ述ベテ下サ  
イ。

質問

答

私ハ日本陸軍ニ配屬サレテキタドイツ陸軍ノ視察將校トシテ昭和八年  
六月ニ日本ニ參リマシタ。

質問

答

當時ドノ位滞在シテキマシタカ。  
昭和八年十二月迄滞在シテ居リマシテソレカラドイツニ歸リマシタ。  
二回目ニ日本ニ行ツタノハ何時デシタカ、又ドンナ資格デ行キマシタ  
カ。

質問

答

在東京ドイツ大使館附陸軍武官トシテ昭和九年三月ニ日本ニ行キマシ  
タ。

質問

大使館に駐在武官ヲド、位ヲメマシタカ。ソノ次ニドントナ公職ニツキマシタカ。

答

昭和十三年三月迄は武官ニシタガ、フオンブイルグケン大使ガ本國ニ召喚サレタ後、昭和十三年三月迄は駐日ドイツ大使ニ任命サレマシタ。

質問

駐日ドイツ大使トシテド、位ノ期間在職シマシタカ。又職ヲ免ゼラレテカラドントナ公職ニツキマシタカ。

答

私ハ昭和十八年一月迄ドイツ大使トシテ勤シ、ソノカラ待命ヲ命ゼラレマシタ。私ノ後任デアルスターマー大使ガ私ノ地位ヲ引継イ

質問

タトキ、私ハ住所ヲ支那北平ニ移シ以後同地ニ住ンデキマシタ。當時又ハソレ以後何故ドイツニ歸國シナカツタノデスカ。

答

當時又ハソレ以後ニ於テ私ガドイツニ歸國シナカツタノハ歸國ノ許可ヲ得ルコトガ出来ナカツタカラデス。尤モ封鎖突破船ヲ歸國シド

質問

イツ陸軍ニ再ビ編入サレルヨウニドイツ外務大臣ヲ通ジテヒツトラ

テ下サイ。

費下ニ申上ゲ、日本被り、私ハ東京ノ極東國際軍事裁判所ノ裁判ヲ受ケテキル戰爭犯罪ノ人ナル白鳥敏夫ノアメリカ人辯護人ニス。貴

日本被り、私ハ東京ノ極東國際軍事裁判所ノ裁判ヲ受ケ

テキル戰爭犯罪ノ人ナル白鳥敏夫ノアメリカ人辯護人ニス。貴

答

質問

答

質問

答

質問

答

質問

私ノ記憶シテキルトコロデハ、白鳥ガ駐伊大使トシテローマニ出張スル以前、昭和十三年十月カ十一月ニ駐ロイッリー大使ガ催シタ送別會ニ於テ初メテ會ヒマシタ。

彼ガ赴任スル前ニ貴下ハ當時日本、ドイツ、イタリノ間ニ話ガ進メラレテキタ同盟ニ就テ個人又ハ公人トシテノ資格ヲ彼ト話サレタコトガアリマスカ。

白鳥ノ出發前ニ日獨伊間ノ同盟ニ就テ彼ト話ヲシタコトハアリマセン實際當時私ハ交渉ガ開始サレテキタコトヲ知リマセンデシタ。

貴下ハ何時及ドント事情デ初メテコノヤソト交渉ノ行ハレテキルヲ知リマシカ。昭和十四年四月三月初メテドイツ大使館駐在軍武官マツ

キ大佐カラカナル交渉ノ行ハレテ中ルノラ聞キマシタ。日本陸軍當局ハ同大佐ニ對シテソレニ就テノ秘密ヲ洩ラシタノデス。

貴下ハ何時ソシテドント事情デ初メテ政府カラコレニ就テノ公式ノ通告ヲ受ケマシタカ。

本件ニ就テ私ガ電報ヲ求メタノニ照シテ昭和十四年三月、下旬ニ私ハ初メテリッペントロツブカラ公ニ通告ヲ受ケマシタ。

當時貴下ノトルベキ行動及同交渉ニ關シテ貴下ノトルベキ方針ニ就テ貴下ハドント訓令ヲ受ケタカ知ベテ下サイ。

答

當時リツベントロツプハ私ニ電報ノヨコシク私ハ情ヲ極秘ニシ、若シ諺カニ訊ネラレタラ、假令駐日イタリ大使ガ訊テモ、私ハ彼等日ソレヲ耳ニシタコトガナイヤウニ行動スル様ニ訓令ヲ與ヘヨマシタ。併シリツベントロツプハ情勢ノ進展ヲ注見シソレヲ報告スルヤリニ私ニ要請シマシタ。

質問

貴下ハ何時、ドンナ事情デ最初ニコレタノ交渉ニ活躍シ、ソノ下サ

答

昭和十四年五月ニ日本政府トノコレラノ交渉ニ於テ私ハ初メテ活躍シ、ソノ時日本外務大臣ハドイツ外務大臣ヲ通シテ傳達サルルベキトイフ外、平沼首相カラヒツトラニ宛テタ書簡ヲ私ニ渡シマシタ。依テサレ

質問

曰鳥ハヨイロツバ海在中何カ貴下ト連絡ガアリマシタカ。

質問

貴下ハ何時、ドンナ事情デ二回目ニ曰鳥ニ會ヒマシタカ。彼ガ東京へ歸ツテカラ二回目ニ彼ニ會ヒマシタガ、昭和十四年ノ秋ノ季節モ中バラ過ギタ頃イタリ大使ノ備シタム式ノ祝宴會ニ於テ

質問

貴下ハソレ以後ノ數ヶ月以内ニ何度彼ニ會ヒマシタレ。

答

需ニシカ會ヒマヤンブシタ。

質問

答

貴下ハコノ期間ニ政治問題、殊ニ日獨伊同盟ニ就テ論ジマシタカ。  
我々ノ會合ハ社交的ノモノデ、ソノ期間内ニコレ等ノ問題ニ就テ論  
證シタコトハナカツト馬ヒマス。

質問

白鳥ガローマカラ東京ニ歸ツル時ドンナ公蔵ニルイ  
ナラシメテ下サイ。

答

白鳥ハ從茲遠リ名譽上ハ駐伊大使デシタガ、實ニハ職ニハ免ゼラレ  
キマシタ。

質問

白鳥ハ東京ヘ歸ツテカラ昭和十六年ノ初メニ公式ニ大使ヲ免ゼラレ  
ル迄ノ期間ニ日獨伊間ノ交渉ニ當リマシタカ。

答

イ、エ、昭和十四年八月ノ獨ソ不可侵條約ノ締結スベテノ交渉ハ  
停止サレテ中マシタ。

質問

獨ソ不可侵條約ノ締結後及爾後ノ數箇月間ニ於ケル日獨間ノ  
ハドンナ状態ニアツタカシベテ下サイ。

答

獨ソ不可侵條約ノ締結ハ日本ニトシテハ非常ナ訂結デアツタノデ日  
本ノ事情マヤ、ソノ結果平滿内閣ハ解任シマシタ。同盟ニシドイッ

質問

ト送メラレテキタ凡テノ交渉ハ停止サレ、日獨間ハ非常ニ冷却シ  
マシタ。コノ情勢ハ昭和十五年ノ春ノ終頃迄ニキマシタガ、ソノ時

質問

答

ヨーロッパハニ於テ其ノ状況ノ進展ガ日本人ノ變化シタ心境ニ反映  
サレ始メマシタ。

アメリカ合衆國政府ガ日本ニ對シテトツタ強硬ナ經濟的措置モマダ  
コノ様ニ日本人ノ心境ニ變化ヲ齎ラシタノアルト云ヘマセウ。  
白鳥ガ大使ノ職ヲ免ゼラレタトキ白鳥ハドント公使上ノ地位ニアツ  
タカ又ドノ位ノ間又ハ何時マデカ、ル地位一居タカ御存知ナラニ  
テ下サイ。

彼ガ東京ニ歸ツテ三ヶ月経ツテカラ待命ヲ命ゼラレ減俸サレタコト  
ヲ私ハ知リマシタ。彼ハソノ後待命デシタガ、昭和十五年八月、終  
リニ外務大臣顧問ヲ命ゼラレマシタ。家計ノ再調整ヲ助ケル爲ニ、終  
在外公館長召見後三ヶ月間ノ舊地位ニ留マラセテ儘クコトハ普通ノ  
手續ダト云ヘマセウ。私ガ退職シタトキモソワデセウ。



質問

貴下ハコノ間彼ト公務上何カ關係ガアリマシタカ。

答

私ハコノ間公務上白鳥トハ何等關係ガアリマセンデシタ。私ハ個人ノ資格デ時々彼ニ會ヒマシタ。

質問

ソノ時迄ノ期間内ニ各政府ガ締結シヨウト努力シタ同盟ハ締結サレマシタカ。

答

ソノ時迄締結ノ交渉ノ進メラレテキタ同盟ノ主目的ハ對ソ防禦協定ニ在リマシタ。カカル同盟ハ一度モ締結サレマセンデシタ所謂三國條約ノ名テ通ツテキル同盟ハイツ締結サレマシタカ。又ソノ目的ハ何デシタカ。

答

三國條約ハ昭和十五年九月二十七日ニ締結サレマシタ。ソノ主目的ハ加盟國ニ加ヘラレル攻撃ニ對スル防禦協定ニ在リマシタソ聯トノ現存ノ關係ハコノ條約ニ依ツテ影響ヲ受ケナイコトガ特ニ明記サレテキマシタ。從ツテ當時ノ情勢ノ下デハ該條約ハ第一ニアメリカ合衆國ヲ目的トシテキマシタ。

質問

三國同盟チ生ンダコノ條約ノ意圖ト目的トハ各加盟國ガ互ニ協力シテ全世界ヲ征服スルコトニアツタノデスカ。私ハコノ様ナ意圖ニ就テ聞イタコトハアリマセン。

答

質問

答

白鳥ハ昭和十五年八月ノ終リニ日本外務省ノ顧問トナリ三國同盟ハ昭和十五年九月下旬ニ締結サレタノデアルカラ、彼ハ同條約締結前ノワズカーケ月同タケ新シイ地位ニキタトイフノハ本當デハアリマセンカ。

サウデス。  
 檢察側ガ證據書類トシテ裁判所ニ提出シタ各道ノ書類ノ寫ヲ私ハ持ツテキマスガ、ソレラハ貴下トベルリン政府トノ間ノ通信デス。ソレラノ寫ノ一々ヲ貴下ニオ目ニカケマスガ、貴下ノ御承諾ヲ得タ上デソレラノ文書ニ關係ノアル若干ノ質問ヲシタヒト思ヒマス  
 目下進行中ノ裁判ノ各段階ニ於テソレラノ文書ハ證據書類トシテ提出サレソシテ、文書ノ日附ノ順序ト一致シナイデ證據番號ヲ附シテアリマスガ、貴下ガ返答ヤ批評ヲスルノニ明瞭デ便利ナヤウニ日附順ニ貴下ニオ目ニカケマス。ドイツ外務大臣リツベントロツブカラ貴下宛テ昭和十四年四月二十六日附ノ通信デアル書證第五〇二號ノ寫ヲオ渡シシマス。本文書ヲ讀ンデソノ内容ヲ説明シテ頂ケマセンカ。同文書ノ寫ハ同證人ニ渡サレ

答

ル

質問

答

質問

答

コレハ前ニ私ガオ話シタ文書デス。私ハコノ文書ニヨツテ始メテ日獨伊ノ間ニ防禦同盟締結ノ交渉ガ行ハレテキルコトヲ知リマシタ。從ツテ私ハソレ通知リマセンデシタガ、コノ交渉ガ昭和十三年ノ夏ニ既ニ開始サレテキタコトハ明カデス。次ニコレハ交渉ニ關スル貴下ノ照會ニ對スル返事トシテ貴下ガリツベントロツブカウ受取ツタメツセーヂデス。貴下ハコノ通信ヲ受理シタトキニドンナ行動ヲトリマシタカ。私ハ何等ノ行動モトリマセンデシタ。既ニ説明シマシタ様ニ、情勢ノ進展ヲ觀察シ報告スル以外何等行動シテハイケナイトイフ訓令ヲ受ケテキマシタ。コノコトハ本文書ノ最後ノ部ヲオ讀ミニナレバ分リマスガ。貴下ノ觀察ニヨレバ東京ノ日本政府ハコノ點ニ關シ白鳥ノ行動又ハ報告ノ結果トシテ何等カノ行動ヲトツタコトガアリマシタカ。私ハ日本側ガ白鳥ノコトニ言及シタノヲ聞イタ記憶ハアリマセ

質問

貴下カラドイツ外務省ニ宛テタ通信  
日附書證第五〇三號ノ寫ヲオ渡シシマス。  
コノ文書ハ何デアツ  
テ、

答

テ下サイマセンカ。一寫ヲ證人ニ渡ス

質問

コレハ前ニ申上ゲマシタガ、私ガ日本政府トノ交渉ニ始メテ當  
ツタトキノ平沼首相ノメツセーザデス。コレハ日本ノ外務大臣  
ノ要請ニ從ヒ、交渉ノ行話リヲ打開シヨウトシテ昭和十四年五  
月四日ニ發送サレマシタ。

答

昭和十四年五月五日附ノ書證第五〇四號ノ寫ヲオ渡シシマス。  
短イノデ引用スルソノ中ノ一節ニ就イテ貴下ノ御注意ヲ促シタ  
イト思ヒマス。ソレニハ次ノヤウナ箇所ガアリマス。「外務省  
ノ一高官デ特ニ白鳥大使ニ感ナ者ガ全政府部内ノ同盟ニ對ス  
ル贊成派ト反對派トノ間ニ深イ溝ガデキタコトヲ私ニ個人的ニ  
知ラセマシタ。」  
コレガ只今申上ゲタ行話リノ原因ノ一ツデアツタト私ハ思ヒマ  
ス。一寫ヲ證人ニ渡ス  
私ハサウ思ヒマス。

質問

答

質問

答

質問

答

質問

答

質問

ソノ人ハ証デシタカ。

私ノ記憶シテキルトコロデハソノ人ハ松島カ葉原デシタ。二人

トモ日本外務省ノ高官デシタ。

何處<sup>デ</sup>彼ガコノ情報ヲ入手シタカ御存知デスカ。

イイエ、知りマセンガ、東京ノ外務省デ行ハレタ討議ガ右ノ情

報ノ源ダト思ヒマス。

當時白鳥ハ歐洲ニ居リマセンデシタカ。

ハイ、居リマシタ。

ソレデハ何故貴下ハコノメツセーヂニ於テ白鳥ノ名前ヲ出シタ

ノデスカ。

私ガ白鳥ノ名前ヲ出シタノハ、サウスレバ報告ガ重大ナモノデ

アルトドイツ外務大臣ガ考ヘルカモ知レナイト思ツタカラデス。

昭和十四年八月十一日附審證第二一九八號ノ寫ヲオ渡シシマス

コレハ日露伊係ニ就テノ當時ノ内閣ノ内情ニシテハ千尻將軍

ガ貴下ニ與ヘタ情報及當時ノ日本ノ内閣大臣カラノ通信ノ傳

デアツテ貴下ガドイツ外務省ニ送ツタモノデス。本文審三項ニ

即ニハ次ノコトガ記載サレテアリマス。即チ本通信ニ述ベラレ

答 質問

テアル埋田ニ依リ陸軍大臣ハ關係ヲ一層好薄サセルタメノ最後ノ手段トシテ賭ヲ賭シテ居リソノタメ大島大徳及白鳥大使モ勿論辭職シナクテハナラヌヨウニナルダラウト。一寫ヲ證人ニ渡ス。

本文書二頁ノ二節ニ、安永セラレタ讓歩ニ應ジテ昭和十四年八月十五日迄ニ決定スルノガ緊要デアリソレハ四日間シカ時間ノ余裕ガナイ、ソレデ陸軍大臣ハ外務大臣ヲ經由スルコトナク直接大島及ビ白鳥ニ右措置ヲ通報スルダロウト貴下ガ述べラレタノヲ御存知デセウ。元ツ第一ニ前ニ述べタ貴下ノメツセーヂノ第二部ニ就テオ訊ホシマスガ、ソノ前ニメツセーヂノ全文ヲ讀ンデ下サイ。

陸軍大臣ハ何時モ外務省ヲ經由スニ白鳥ニ通信シテイタカドウカ貴下ハ御存知デスカ。

コレラノ交渉ニ就テ陸軍大臣ガ外務大臣ヲ經由スルコトナク白鳥ニ通信シタトイフコトヲ私ガ聞イタノハコレガ唯一ツデス。何故コノ様ナ異例ノ手續ヲ踏ンダノデスカ。

答

四日以内ニ返答スルコトヲ要求シタノデ、コレハ緊急ノ事柄ダ  
ツタノハ聞カデス。  
首通ノ経路ヲタドツテ送達シタノデハ遅延スル可能然ガアツタ  
ノデス。

質問

前ニ述べタコノメツセーデノ第一部ニ就テハ、ソノ後ドンナコ  
トガ起リマシタカ。

答

ソノ直後ニドンナコトガ起ツタカ知リマセンガ猶ソノ不可侵條約  
ノ締結ニ引續イテ八月二十九日ニ日本ノ内閣ハ辭職シマシタ。  
前ニ私ガ指摘シマシタヨウニ、三國間ニ行ハレテイタ總テノ交  
渉ハ爾後停止サレマシタ。

質問

昭和十四年九月八日附書證第四九八號ノ寫ヲオ渡シマス。同  
文書ハ貴下カラ貴政府ニ宛テタ通報デス。ソノ最後ノ四行ニ次  
ノ事ガ記載サレテアリマス。

モスコ一駐劄大使へ誤植一ローマ一ヨリハ當時日獨伊軍等同盟  
ヲ締結スルノニ成功スルダロウト全ク諒解シテ大使ノ職ニ就イ  
タノデアルカラ、ローマヲ引上ゲルデアロウ。  
コノ特別ノ目的ノタメニ彼ガ任命サレタコトヲ貴下ハ自分デ知

答

質問

ツテイマシタカ。或ハ公式的ニ又ハ半バ公式的ニ通報ヲ受ケテ  
イマシタカ。(一寫ヲ證人ニ候ス)

答

質問

白鳥ガコノ同盟ノ締結ヲ以テローマ駐劄大使ノ職ニ就イタ  
コトハ、貴下自ラ知ツテイマシタカ、又ハ公式的、或ハ半バ公  
式的ニ通報ヲ受ケマシタカ。  
イイエ

答

ソレデハ本文書中ニ傳達サレタ情報ハ、又聞ダツタニ違イナイ  
ノデスネ。  
私ハソウ思イマス。



質問。昭和十四年九月九日附書證第五〇七號ノ寫ヲオ渡シマス。

コレハ「リツベントロツブ」カラ東京ニ送附シテイタ貴下ニ宛テメ週報デ。第二頁第二節ノ終リノ万ニ次ノコトガ記載サレテアリマス。一ローマ駐司大使ノ地位ヲ去ツア間モナク東京ニ歸ル白鳥ハ、同様ニコノ考ニ基ツイテ行動スルタロウ。一本文書中ノ他ノ記載箇所カラ推シテコノ考トイフノハ私ハロソ爾ノ關係ヲ改善スルコトダト思イマス。  
(寫ヲ證人ニ渡ス)

貴下ハ極ク稀ニシカ白鳥ニ言ハズ、言ツタノモ社交的ノ祝宴習テ、コレラノ場合ニハ政治上ノ話ヲシタコトハナク。又「スターマー」氏カ東京ニ來メ昭和十五年二月ノ夜半ニ、貴下ハ白鳥ト始メテ私的會談ヲナシタト前ニ述べラレタノタカフ。「リツベントロツブ」ノ豫期ニ反シテ、白鳥ハ酒醉シナカツタ事ヲスネ。

答。私ノ知ツテイル範圍内デハ、又ドイツ大使館ニ離スル限り、彼ハ活進シマセンデシタ。

質問。昭和十五年二月二十三日附書證第五一一號ヲオ渡シマス。同文書

ハ「スターマー」オツト「ト」者名サレタ貴國ノ外務省宛ノ通報テス。第一節ノ最初ノ文章ハ次ノヨウニ書イテアリマス。  
「當地ニ到着シテ、私ハ前カラツアイタ大島、白鳥、寺内、石井等ノヨウ

「日本人カ、私ニ對シテ從來通りノ友好的態度ヲ示シ、アラユル援助ヲ與ヘヨウトシテイル等ヲ見シタ。」（寫ヲ證人ニ渡ス）

答、メツヤ「デハ「スターマー」氏カ送リマシタガ、在外公館カラ本館ヘ

ト署名サレテイマス、ドウイフ事情テコウイフコトニナツタカ説明シテ下サイマセンカ。

質問、當時賈下ハ近日ドイツ大使テシタネ。

質問、賈下書ハドウイフ事情テ日島ニ送ハレタノテスカ。

質問、私カ記憶シテイル所アハ、日本ニ於ケル「リツペン」ノ訓令ニ基イテ、「スターマー」氏ハ私ト一緝ニ日島ヲ個人的ニ訪問シタノテス。

質問、「從來通りノ友好的態度」及「凡ユル愛切ヲ與ヘヨウトシテイル」トイフ用語ハドンナ意味テスカ。

答、當時日本ニ送ツテキタ狗迷ニ對スル冷淡ナ態度ニモ拘ハラズ、コノメ

ツ「チニ言及サレテキル人々ノ態度ハ與ハラナカツタ事ヲ「スターマー」ハ「リツペン」トロツブ」ニ確言シタカツタノテス。ソレテ何等

特別ノ工作ヲシナクトモ、彼寺ハ日獨關係ヲ好轉サセルタメニアラユル援助ヲ與ヘヨウトシテキタコトヲ強調シタノデス。

質問・「スターマー」氏ハドウイフ事情ヲ東京ハ來マシタカ。

答・「スターマー」氏ハ當時日本及アメリカ合衆國ハ派遣サレタ「サツク

ス。コーフルグ。ゴーマ」公ノ使節團ニ「リツベントロツブ」ノ代理ト

シテ配屬サレテキマシタ。日本帝國建國二千六百年祭ニ臨ンデ「ヒツ

トラ」ノ祝辭ヲ捧呈スルタメニコノ使節團ハ日本ニ派遣サレ、又赤

十字社ハノ親善使節團トシテアメリカ合衆國ハ派遣サレマシタ。

質問・白鳥ハソレ以後ニ於テ日獨關係ヲ改善スルタメニ以前ヨリモ一層活

躍シマシタカ。

答・私ノ知ツテキル限りテハ、前ニ述べマシタヤウニ、歐洲ニ於ケル取手

及アメリカカカ日本ニ對シテ強行シタ通商上ノ指圖ノタメ日本ノ心境カ

漸次變ツテ來タ昭和十五年ノ晚春迄ハ假ハ活躍シマセンテシタ。

質問・前ニ明カニサレマシタヤウニ、コノ期間中及昭和十四年八月末迄白

鳥ハ特命大使アツタ外ニ何等公職ニツイテ居ラズ、コノ點ニ關シ何

等公人トシテ活躍出來ナカツタトイフノハ本當テハアリマセンカ。

答・サウデス。

質問・貴下ヨリ貴政府ニ宛テタ昭和十五年六月十二日附書證第五一六號ノ

答、昭和十五年六月十二日附ノコノ報告書ノ背景ヲナスモノハ次ノ通りナ  
ス。

寫ヲオ渡シマヌ。頁下ハ同又書ニ於テ就中日本關係ニ付テハ「ジテ后  
ラレマスカ私ハソノ第一節、第三節、第四節ニ對シテ頁下ノ御注意ヲ  
喚起致シマス。蓋其の背景。日本人ノ心理及石通報ガ送付サレタトキ  
ノ情勢等ヲモ言メテ右箇所ノ意味ヲ詳シク説明シテクレマセンカ（寫  
シテ證人ニ渡ス）

フランスノ崩壊ハ明ラカニ差違ツテ居リ。英ノ情勢ハ「ダンケルグ」  
ヲ中心トシテ極メテ不安定テアリマシタ。英ノ抵抗力ヲ持續サセ、或  
チノ早期終了ヲ期ゲルニ有效ナル唯一ノ救済ハアメリカカダケニ求メルコ  
トガ出來且ツ該救済ハ緊急的ニ要請サレマシタ。從ツテドイツ政府ハカ  
カル救済ノ供與ヲ希望スルコトニ努メ。太平洋方面ノ情勢ヲ緊迫サセテ  
置クノガ有效ナ一手段テアルト考ヘタノテス。

ソワスレバアメリカカ合衆國ハ太平洋カラ大西洋ヘソノ關心ト雖刀ヲ移ス  
コトガ出來ナイカモ知レナカツタノテスカラ。

私ノ報告書ノ最初ノ箇所テ說明シマシタヤロニ日本人個人ノ誤度ハ區々テ  
シタカラ。日本ニ對シテアカル政策ヲ是唱スルノニハ事情ガ複雑過ギマ  
シタ。コノ情勢ノ下ニアツテ。アメリカ合衆國ニ好意ヲ寄セ且イタリ。

ノ利益ニ反スル日本ノ或ル措置ニ對スルイタリ一側ノ抗議ヲ支持スベシ  
 トイフ訓令ヲ私ハ受ケマシム。コノ件ハハツキリ思ヒ出セマセン。私ガ  
 ドイツ政府ノ意向ニ對シ反對意見ヲ出シタトキ、私ハ「リツペン」ト  
 フト「目的遂行」ヲ所望スル傾向ガアルト彼ガ私ニ對シテ常ニ抱イテキ  
 不信ノ念ヲ抱カセナイヤウニ努メナケレバナラナカツタノデス。夫故私  
 ハ彼ヲ動カシテ私ノ反對論ヲ採用サセルタメニ報告書ノ三節及四節ニ於  
 テ私ガ獨自ノ行動ヲトツテ平ルコトヲ強調シ。且「リツペン」ト「ロツブ」  
 ノ知ツテ居ル白鳥及真ノ他ノ日本人ノ協力ヲ指摘シマシム。

質問、本文書ノ第四節ニ於テ、大使館。大島及白鳥ハ相互ノ理解及一致シ  
 ヲ協定ニシツキ共進ノ計畫ニ從ツテ協力シタト真下ハ言ハレルノデス  
 カソシテソレカ若シ本宮ナラ其ノ目的ハ何デシタカ  
 カカル協定ハアリマセンテシタカラ、サウイフ意味テ言ツタ事デハア  
 リマセンデシム。

質問、コノ點ニ關シ白鳥ハドワイフ行動ヲトリマシタカ  
 答、私ノ知ツテ平ル限リテハ白鳥ハ個人的談話トシテ又時々新聞紙上ニ於  
 テ、アメリカ合衆國ノ日本ニ對シテ苛酷ナ經濟的措置ヲ強行シテ來タ  
 以後ニアメリカノ御機兼ヲ向フコトニ付イテ警告シマシタ  
 質問、コレハ彼、大島及真下ノトツタ共同作戦ノ一部デシタカ

答、イエ、ソレハ共同作戦テハアリマセンデシタ。私ハ彼等ト別個ニ個人

的ニ談合シタケデシタ。大島ハ日本艦在中政治的活動カラウント遠

ザカツアキマシタ。

質問、コノ所謂政治的協力の遂行スルタメニ貴下ハ會テ同時ニ白鳥及大島

ト一諸ニヤリマシタカ。

答、イエ、サウテハアリマセン。

質問、ソレテハ何故貴下ハ貴下達カ緊密ニ協力シタト言ハレルノテスカ。

答、前ニ述ベマシタヤウニ、私ハメツセーチニ重ミヲ加ヘ且私ノ反對論ヲ

貫徹サセルタメニコノ言廻シヲ用ヒマシタ。同シ理由ニ依リ私ハ近衛

公及末次ノ名前ヲ用ヒタ事ヲ附ケ加ヘマス。

質問、昭和十五年六月二十四日附音證第五二三號ノ寫ヲオ渡シシマス。コ

レハ貴下カ貴下ノ外務省ニ宛テ々通信テス。ソノ三節ニ於テ貴下ハ次

ノヤウニ述ベアキマス。

「同様ニ將來ノ外務大臣トシテ屢々呼聲ノ高カツタ白鳥大使ハ昨口

實ニ與ヘタ見談ニ於テロシヤト不可傳信約ヲ締結スルコトヲ提唱シ

タ。一（寫シテ證人ニ渡ス）

讀賣トハ何アツア又誰ノコトテスカ。

讀賣トハ東京ノ一新聞ノ名前テス。

質問、ソノ當時ノ白鳥ノ公職ハ。

答、白鳥ハ依然トシテ待命大使テナ。

質問、昭和十五年八月二日附替證第五三八號ノ寫ヲオ渡シシマス。コレモ貴下ガ貴政府ニ宛テ々通信テス。ソノ第二節ニハ次ノヤウニ記載サレテキマス。

「白鳥大使ハ外務次官ノ地位ニ就クノヲ拒絕シタト内密ニ告ゲタ。彼ハ外務大臣ノ常任顧問ニ任命サレルテアラウト患ハレル。彼ハコノ資格ニ於テ廣汎ナ影ヲ及ボスコトガ出来ルト信ジテキル。」

(寫ヲ證人ニ渡ス)

彼ハコノ任命ヲ受ケマシタカ、モシ受ケタトスレバ貴下ノ知ツテキル範圍内テ彼ハ何等カソノ資格ニ於テ廣汎ナ影ヲ及ボシマシタカ。

答、ハイ。彼ハ外務大臣ノ常任顧問ノ任命ヲ受ケマシタ。シカシ私ノ知ツテキル限りテハカカル資格ニ於テ廣汎ナ影ヲ及ボシマセンデシタ。コノコトハソノ後ニ於ケル情勢ノ進展、特ニ三國條約締結ノ交渉中ニ於ケル情勢ノ進展ヲ見レバ明ラカテス。

質問、外務次官ト外務大臣顧問トノ間ノ重要性ノ差異、即チコノ二ツノ地位ノ職務、責任、及影ヲ御存知テスカ。若シ御存知ナラ述ベテ下サイ。

答。私ハ自分ノ經驗カラソノ差異ヲ知ツテキマス。私ハ日本ノ數人ノ外務  
 次官ト公務上關係カアリマシタノテ、外務次官ハ外務大臣ガ自ラ行ハナ  
 イ外國大公使館トノスベアノ交渉ニ於テ外務大臣ヲ常ニ代理スルモノデ  
 アルコトヲ知リマシタ。ソノ上外務次官ハ外務省ノ行政及人事ニ付責任  
 カアリマシタ。外務次官ノ地位ハアメリカ合衆國ノ國務次官ニ儼ヘルコ  
 トガ出來ルト私ハ思ヒマス。顧問ハコノ様ナ職務ヲ持ツアキマセンデシ  
 タ。ソノシヤドレタケノ剛キヲナシ得ルカハ外務大臣ヲ動かスコトノ出來  
 ルソノ個人的勢力ニ掛ツアキマシタ。



質問、白鳥ハ當時ノ外務大臣デアル松岡ヲ動かスダケノ個人的勢力ヲ持

ツテキタカドウカ御存知デスカ、若シソウナラ述ベテ下サイ。

答、三國條約締結ノ交渉ガ行ハレテキタ間デサヘ私ハ彼ガカ、ル勢力

ヲ持ツテキタトハ見マセンデシタ。

質問、貴下ハ松岡ト白鳥トノ間ノ個人的關係ノ性質ヲ知ル機會ガアリマ  
シタカ。

答、松岡ト白鳥トガオ互ニ私ニ洩ラシタ相手ニ就テ批評シタ言葉ニ依

ツテ私ハ二人ノ間ニハドコカ信頼ノ情ガ缺ケテキルトイフ印象ヲ  
受ケマシタ。

質問、將軍、ソレハ松岡モ白鳥モ貴下ト個人的ニ談話ヲ交ヘテキル間ニ

オ互ニ就テ批評シタトイフ意味デスカ。

答、ハイ、サウイフ意味デス。

質問、昭和十五年八月二十三日附書證第五四八號ノ寫ヲオ渡シシマス。

コレハ貴下ガ貴國ノ外務省ニ宛テター一週ノ電報デス。私ハ特ニ第  
二節ニ就テ貴下ノ御注意ヲ促シマス。

ソレハ次ノヤウニ記載サレテアリマス。

「權力主義的の体制ニ基イテ國勢ヲ調整スルタメノ適當ナ行動ヲ更

ニ準備スル目的ヲ以テ政府ハ二十四人ノ指導的人物ヲ以テ構成スル委員會ヲ組織シタ。白鳥大使ハ同委員會ニ於テ外交政策問題ニ關スル代表者トシテ任命サレタ。同委員會ハ革新運動及コノ運動ガ常ニ要求シテキタ樞軸國トノ協力政策ノ追隨者ヲ大部分構成サレテキル。

(寫ヲ證人ニ渡ス)

貴下ハドコデコノ情報ヲ入手シマシタカ。

答、

ソノ時迄ニ新内閣ノトル對内政策ニ就テイロイロ噂ガ飛ンデキマシタ。委員會ノ組織ニ就テノ情報モソレラノ噂ノ一ツデシタ。

質問、

外ニ誰カコノ委員會ヲ構成シタカ少シデモ知ツテキマスカ。

答、

イ、エ、私ハソレニ就テハ聞イタコトハアリマセン。

質問、

コノメッセーヂノ發送後、貴下ハ再ビカ、ル委員會又ハソノ活動ニ

答、

ニ就テ何カ耳ニシマシタカ。

質問、

イ、エ、私ハ報告シタ情報ハ誤チデアツタト考ハナグテハナリマセン。

質問、

昭和十六年一月三十一日附書證第五六二號ノ寫ヲ渡シシマス。

答、

レハドイツ外務大臣ニ宛テタモノデ、ソノ三節ニハ次ノヤウニ記

載サレテアリマス。

コレト對蹠的ニ行動派ハ西部太平洋ノ樞要地點デアアルシソングポ  
ルニ對スル豫防的攻撃ヲ要求シテキル。

行動派ハ奇襲行爲ニヨツテアメリカガ將來太平洋ニ於テ以國行動チ  
ナスコトガ出來ナイヨウニサセ又ハ夫ヲ困難ナモノニサセルコト  
チ予期シテキル。コノ少教派ハ末次海軍大將及ビ白鳥大使ガ指導シ  
青年將校團及個々ノ陸海軍ノ高イ地位ニキル指導者達ノ支持ヲ得テ  
キル。

(寫チ證人ニ渡ス)

ソレテハシソングポールニ對スル豫防的攻撃トハ攻撃スルコトニ依ツ  
テアメリカガ太平洋ニ於テ開始スルコトガ出來ナイヤウニサセ又ハ  
少クトモアメリカガ戰爭ヲ開始スルノコト一層困難ニサセルトイフ意  
見ヲ持ツテキル譯デスネ。

質問、  
賈下ハ何處デコレラノスペテノ情報ヲ入手シマシタカ。

答、  
私ハ昭和十六年一月中ニドイツ大使館員達及私ガ個人的ニ話チシタ  
各方面ノ多クノ日本人カラコノ情報ヲ入手シマシタ。報告書ノ第一  
節デ指摘サレテキルヤウニ、ソノ時ハ非常ニ政治的ニ緊迫シタ時期

デシタノデ、政治的論議ガ各方面デ激シク行ハレマシタ。

質問、コレラノ論議ハ公的ナモノダト看做サレマシタカ。

答、イ、エ、ソレラノ論議ハ個人的ノモノデシタ。

質問、白鳥ガカ、ルグループノ指導者デアルトイフ何ラカノ證據ヲ貴下

ハ入手シマシタカ。

答、私ハカ、ル證據ヲ入手シマセンデシタ。

質問、ソレデハコノ情報ハ事實デアルトイフ根據ハナイ譯デスネ。

答、サウデス。

質問、昭和十六年五月十八日附書謄第一〇七三號ノ寫チオ渡シシマス。

コレモ貴國ノ外務大臣ニ宛テタ通信文デス。

(寫チ謄人ニ渡ス)

本通信ノ最後ノ文章ニ於テ行動派ハ現在白鳥ノ重病ノタメ勢力ガ衰ハテケルト貴下ハ述ベテ中ラレルガ、書謄第五六二號ニ關スル私ノ質問ニ答ハテ、白鳥ガ行動派ノ指導者デアルトイフ證據ヲ擧ツタリテハナイト貴下ハ述ベテ居リ、最後ニ貴下ノ入手シタコノ趣旨ノ情報ハ事實デアルトイフ根據ガアルコトデハナイト結論ヲ下シテキマスガ、ソレハ正シイノデスカ。

答、ハイ、ソウデス。

質問、昭和十六年七月七日附寄野第一一三號ヲオ渡シシマス。コレモ貴國ノ外務大臣ニ宛テタ通信デス。

(寫ヲ野人ニ渡ス)

答、前ニコレヲ注意シテ讀ンデ下サイ。

答、訪問ノ際白鳥ハ何處ニ住ンデキマシタカ

答、白鳥ハ東京カラ自動車テ約二時間ノ距離ニアル避暑地ノ葉山ニ住ンデキマシタ。

質問、コノ訪問ハ特別ノ目的ヲ持ツテキマシタカ。

答、イ、エソウデハアリマセン多クノ外國ノ外交官ガリウデアルヤウニ私ハ自分ノ別荘ノ所在地デアアル葉山近在ノ海濱ニ夏季ニハ幾度モ行キマシタ。私ガ別荘ニ行ツタ時ニ一度白鳥ヲ訪問シマシタ。彼ノ住宅ハ私ノ別荘ノ途中ノ道カラ丁度時間ニシテ五分迂回シタ距離ニアリマシタ。

質問、貴下ノ通信カラ見ルト白鳥ノ病氣全快ヲ祈ル旨ヲ白鳥ニ傳ヘルヨウニ貴國ノ外務大臣カラ貴下ハ指令ヲ受ケテホタヤウニミエマス。

答、ソレハ正シイト思ヒマス。

質問、并シ、貴下ガ述べラレタヤウニ、貴下ハコノ目的ノタメニコノ場所

へワザ々々旅行シタノデハナクテ貴下ノ別荘ニ行ツタ序ニ偶然彼ノ家ノ前チ通りカ、ツタノデセウ。

答、私ハサウ思ヒマス。

質問、貴下ガ白鳥ニ會ハレタ時白鳥ハ真病デアツタト貴下ノ通信文ノ中デ

述ベラレ且白鳥ノ病氣ノ性質ニ就テ貴下ハ白鳥ガ貴下ニ述ベタ通りニ詳細ニ述ベテキマス。コノ訪問デ實際ハ彼ノ最モ重イ病氣ハ精神

的ナモノデアルトイフコトヲ貴下ハ知りマシタカ。

答、イ、エ、私ハ聞イタ通りニ白鳥ハ腎臟病ニ罹ツテケルコトヲ報告シマシタ。ガ後ニナツテ實際ハ病氣ハ精神的ナモノデアルコトヲ知りマシタ。

質問、ソレデハ最初彼ノ病氣ノ性質ニツイテ貴下ノ入手シタ情報ハツマリ

病氣ノ本當ノ性質ヲ隠蔽シヨウトシテ彼及彼ノ友人ガバラマイタモノデスネ。

答、コノ情報ガ誤ツテキタノハ衆知ノヤウニ、自分ノ病狀ニ就テ詳シイ

コトヲ述ベナイトイフ日本人ノ内氣ナ性質ガ主ナ原因ダツタト思ヒマス。

質問、貴下ハコノ時彼ノ精神的狀態ハドウデアツタト觀察リレマシタカ。

答、私ハコノ時位ガ精神的ニ疲勞シテキルトイフ印象ヲ受ケマシタ。

質問、昭和十六年八月一日附書第第八〇〇號ノ寫ヲオ渡シシマス。ドウゾ

注意シテ讀ンデ下サイ。附下ノ報告シタコノ談合ハ誰ト行ハレマシ

タカ(寫ヲ證人ニ渡ス)

答、外務次官事務取扱デアツタ大臣書記(官)山本トコノ談合ヲ行ヒマシタ。

問

問

答

質

問

答

質

問

コノ時白鳥ハ居合ハセテキマセンデシタカ。  
 イ、エ、私ハ過日彼ノ病氣ヲ養ツテキル處へ白鳥ヲ訪問シタ事ヲ  
 本報告書中デ指摘シマシタ、ソシテ私ノ知ツテキル限リデハ、コ  
 ノ時彼ハマダソコニ居マシタ。  
 コレハ特別ノ目的ヲモツタ質問デシタカ、又ハ前ト同ジ性質ノ訪  
 問デシタカ  
 ソレハ前ト同ジ性質ノ訪問デシタ  
 山本ノ提唱シタ思想デ實現シタモノガアリマスカ  
 私ノ知ツテキル限リデハ實現シマセンデシタ  
 昭和十六年十二月五日附書證第六〇八號ノ寫ヲオ渡シシマス。  
 コレモ貴下カラ貴國ノ外務省ニ宛テタ電報デ、ソノ第四節ニハ次  
 ノヤウニ記載サレテ居リマス  
 「今ヤルーズベルトハ極東ニ於ケル紛争ヲ媒介トシテ戦争ヲ開始  
 スルコトヲ欲シテイルト日本ノ指導層ハ漸定テ下シタコトヲ白鳥  
 ハ私ニ説明シタ。アメリカ合衆國ハ過去十年間以上努力シテ來タ  
 A・B・C・D・ノ諸國ト露西亞トノ合作ヲ今ヤ確信シテキルト  
 イフ意見ガ各方面デ述ベラレタ。ソシテ將來コレ等ノ諸國ノ參加  
 ガ確實デアルトハ期待出來ナイノアルカラ、解決ノ時期ガ今ヤ



到來シタトルーズベルトハ信ジテイル。』

(寫チ證人ニ渡ス)

コノ中ニ記載サレテイルコトハ皆白鳥ガ言明シタノデアアルカ否カニ就テハ本節ノ内容ハ少シ紛ラハシイヤウニ私ニハ思ハレマス。本節ノ全内容ハ白鳥ニ關係ガアルカドウカ、又若シサウデナイナラ、内容ノドノ箇所ガ白鳥ニ關係ガアルカ述ベテ下サイ

答 最初ノ文章ダケガ白鳥ニ關係ガアリマス

質問 ソノ時貴下ハ何處デ白鳥ニ會ツタカ思ヒ出セマスカ

答 思ヒ出セマセン

質問 ソレハ彼ノ海岸ノ別荘ニ別ノ時ニ訪問シタトキノコトデスカ

答 サウデセウ

質問 貴下ノ意見ニ依レバ白鳥ハ精神的ノ病氣ガ全快シタトソノ時貴下

答 ハ考ヘ且貴政府ヘ報告シマシタカ

質問 彼ハ未ダ療養中デアツタ様デ、彼ガソノ時又ハソレ以前ニ全快シ

答 タト私ハ我政府ニ報告シナカツタト思ヒマス

質問 コレ等ノ事情ノ下ニアツテ且特ニ彼ハ當時政府部内デ何等ノ地位

答 ニ就イテイナカツタノデスガ彼ノ所謂「指導層」トハ政府ノ公式

質問 的態度ヲ意味スルモノデアルト彼ガ貴下ニ傳ヘヨウトシタノダト

答

質問

貴下ハ考ヘラレマシタカ  
サウデハアリマセン、サウデハナイコトハ本報告書中ノ他スベテ  
ノ箇所ニ於テ私ガ外務省ノ情報ト態度トヲ引用シタトイフ事實カ  
ラ見テ明カデセウ

將軍、私ハコレ等ノ各書證ヲ通讀シタ際、ソノ一部デアル昭和十  
六年三月二十五日附書證第五七六號一コレハ貴下ノ「日本ニ於ケ  
ル情勢ニ關スル覺書」デ、ドイツノ列車乗車中ニドイツ外務大臣  
ニ宛テテ、發送サレタモノデソノ中デ貴下ハ日本ガ企圖シテイル  
シソガポール攻撃トイフコトニ觸レテイマスガ一ハ不注意ニモ他  
ノ書證ト日附順ニ綴ニ合ハセテアリマセンヲシタ。貴下ノ御承諾  
ヲ得テ、今コノ文書ニ就テ貴下ニ御訊ネシマス

(寫テ證人ニ渡ス)

貴下ハ本書證ニ於テ次ノヤウニ述ベテキマス

「白鳥大使ハ同様ニ英國艦隊ヲ束縛スルノ必要ヲ強調シタ。」

私ガ申シタ通り、コノ覺書ハ貴下ガドイツニ居ル間ニ發送サレタノハ本  
當デスカ

答 サウデス

質問 貴下ハコノ時トウイフ理由デドイツニ居マシタカ

答 日本ノ外務大臣松岡ノベルリン訪問中居合ハセルタメニ政府ニ依

リ召還ヲ命ゼラレタノデス

質問 ソノ時白鳥ハ何處ニ居リマシタカ

答 白鳥ハ日本ニ居リマシタ

質問 コノ點ニ關シテ貴下ガ彼ト會ツテ談合シタ場所時期及事情ヲ述ベ

テ下サイ

答 私ハイツカ、多分昭和十六年二月ダツタト思ヒマスガ、私ガドイ

ツニ向ツテ出發スル前ニオ別レノ挨拶ノタメ 訪問シタ際彼ニ會

ヒマシタ

質問 コノ面會ハ公的ノモノデシタカ

答 イ、エ、ソレハ公的ノモノデナク、益ク私的ノモノデシタ

質問 白鳥ハ外交畑デ育ツタ外交官デ日本陸軍又ハ海軍部内デ職ヲ奉ジ

タコトハナイトイフノハ本當デハアリマセンカ

答 私ノ知ツテキル範圍内デハ、ソレハ本當デス

質問 ソレデハ彼ノ表現シタ意見ハ素人ノ意見ニ過ギズ、軍事上ノ戰術

ニ通曉シテイル人ノ意見デハナイノデスネ

答 サウデス。ソノ期間中私ハ他ノ素人カラ同様ナ意見ヲ聞キマシタ

質問 將軍、昭和十七年五月十七日附書證第一二七二號ノ寫ヲ御渡シシ

答

質問

マス。ソレハドイツノ各種勳章授與ヲ推薦シテキル貴政府宛ノ通信デス。外國人ニ勳章ヲ授與スルドイツ儀典方式及コノ推薦チメグル事情ヲ述ベテ説明シテ下サイマセンカ（寫ヲ證人ニ渡ス）

ドイツ勳章ヲ授與スルタメニハドイツ外務省、陸軍省等ノヤウナ各省カラ提案ガアツタ後宰相官房ガヒットラーニ對シテ推薦チシナクテハナラナカツタノデス。リツペントロツプ外務大臣ハ彼自身及彼ノ氣ニ入りノ部下ノタメ外國ノ勳章ヲ得タイト隨分望ンデキマシタガ、日本政府ガドイツ國民ニ十分ナ數ノ勳章ヲ授與スルノヲ濫ツテキルノヲ考ヘテ大變立腹シテキマシタ。彼ハ獨逸政府ガ日本人ニ勳章ヲ授與スルノヲ相當ノ期間阻止スルノニ成功シマシタ。ソノ結果日本側ハ大變意地ニナツテ、非常ニ多ク勳章ヲ授與スルイタリノ場合ト著シイ差異ガアルコトヲ強調シマシタ

東京ノ空氣ヲ混迷サセテキルコノ行詰リヲ打斷スルタメニ、私ハ結局リツペントロツプニ表ヲ提出シマシタガ、ソレニ於テ昭和十七年九月ノ三國條約ノ二周年記念日ニ際シテ勳章被授與者ヲ推薦シマシタ

貴下ノ述ベラレタコトカラ推シテ兩政府ノ官吏達ハ各自ノ諸省ニ對シテ嫉妬心ヲ抱イテ居リ、既ニ所有シテキル多クノ勳章ノ外ニ

答  
質問

答

誰ガ一番多ク勳章ヲ得ルコトガ出來ルカトイフコトニ就テ多少競  
争ガアツタヨウニ見エマスネ

サウデス。ソレハ私ノ經驗カラ推シテ證明サレマス

ドイツ勳章ノ大十字章ヲ白鳥ニ授與スルコトヲ貴下ガ推薦シタ事  
情ヲ説明シテ下サイマセンカ

大十字章ハ大使級ノ人物ニ授與シ得ル唯一ノ勳章デアルコトヲド  
イツ儀典方式ハ規定シテイマシタ

日本ノ賞勳局ハコノ事實ヲヨク知ツテキマシタカラ、私ノ永々間  
ノ經驗カラ見テ明カデアルヤウニ、ソレ以下ノ階級ノ勳章ヲ授與

サレルコトハ非常ニ不利デアルト日本側ハ看做シタデセウ

白鳥ハ個人的ニリツベントロツブト知合デアリ、三國條約締結ノ

トキ外務大臣顧問デアツタノデ、三國條約ニ關聯シテ勳章ヲ授與

サルベキ人々ノ表ノ中ニ私ハ白鳥ヲ推薦シマシタガ、ソノ目的ハ

勳章授與ノ全問題ニ對スルドイツ外務大臣ノ反對的態度ヲ緩和サ

セルコトニアツタノデス

將軍、其後ノ情勢ノ進展カラ見テ、白鳥ノ努力、特ニ日獨關係ヲ

一層緊密ニシヨウトイフ努力ノ實シタ結果ハ勳章ヲ白鳥ニ授與シ

タ程價値ノアルモノダツタト貴下ハ考ヘマスカ

遺憾ナガラ私ハサウハ考ヘナイト申上ゲネバナリマセン

答

質問

質問

答

質問

答

質問

答

三國條約締結ヲ記念シテ外ニ勳章授與ノ推薦ヲナシマシタカ、ソ  
シテソレヲノ勳章ハ授與サレマシタカ

サウデス。例ヘバ外務大臣松岡ハソレ以前ニ勳章ヲ授與サレマシ

タ。三國條約ノ交渉中松岡ノモウ一人ノ顧問デアツタ齋藤良衛ハ

白鳥ト同時ニ推薦サレ、且ツ大十字章ヲ授與サレマシタ。他ニモ

勳章ヲ授與サレタ者ガアツタト思ヒマスガ、ソノ人々ノ名前ヲ思

ヒ出スコトガ出来マセン

日本人ガ勳章授與方ヲ指名又ハ推薦スル人々ニ關シテ彼等ハ普通

ドシナ手續ヲトリマシタカ

推薦狀ヲドイツ政府ニ送附スル前ニ吾々ガ日本人側ト内密ニ論ジ

タトキ、不平ヲ起サセナイヨウニ高イ地位ニ居ル者ト低イ地位ニ

居ル者トノ間ニ勳章ヲ分配シタラ宜イダラウト大抵日本人ハ申シ

マシタ

將軍、私ノ同僚デアルアメリカ總領事ノ總領事人デアル、ジエムス

N・フリーマン氏ハ星章附ノ勳功十字章ヲドイツガ佐藤將軍ニ授

與スルヨウニ貴下ガ推薦シタ事請ヲ調べルヤウニ私ニ依頼シマシ

タ。コノ推薦ヲナシタ理由ト事情トヲ述べテ下サイマセンカ

佐藤將軍及其他ニ對スル推薦ハ日本ノ陸軍ノ請求ニヨリ大使館附

ドイツ陸軍武官ニヨツテナサレマシタ。相當ノ期間ドイツガ勳章ヲ日本人ニ授與シナカツタノデ日本ノ陸軍ハ大變立履シテキマシタ。佐藤將軍ノ官界ニ於ケル地位ニ鑑ミ、私ハ彼ヲ推薦スルコトヲ支持シマシタ。吾々が共同シテ戰爭ヲ遂行シテキル時ニ彼ハドイツ大使館トノ連絡ヲ主ナ職務トシテキタ日本陸軍部内ノ課長デシタ。

質問

貴下ガベルリンニ送附シタ電報ノ中デ白鳥ノ名前ヲ擧ゲタコトハ擧  
ゲタガ、誰カ外ノ人ノ名前ヲ擧ゲタ方ガ役ニ立ツタダラウトイフヨ  
ウナ電報ガアリマシタカ。

答

アリマシタ。

白鳥ガ貴下ノ大使館ヲ通ジテ重要ナ情報ヲドイツニ提供シタト檢察  
團側ハ白鳥ヲ咎責シテイマス。白鳥ハ日本政府ノ重要ナ政策、又ハ  
決定、又ハ一般的ニ云ツテ國家機密ニ關スルニユース、又ハ情報ヲ  
貴下ニ提供シタコトガアリマスカ。

答

彼ハソノヨウナニユース又ハ情報ヲ、ドイツ大使館ニ提供シタコト  
ハアリマセン。

質問

貴下ガ日本ニ滞在シテイタ全期間ヲ通ジテ白鳥ハ何カ東京デ重要ナ  
地位ニ就イテイマシタカ。

答

私ガ彼ト個人的ニ附合ツテイタ間外務大臣顧問デアツタコトヲ除キ  
ソウイフコトハ私ハ知りマセン。

質問

彼ハ重要ナ國務ヲ左右スル勢力ヲ多少持ツテ居リ、又ハ顧問トシテ  
松岡外務大臣ヲ動かス勢力ヲ持ツテイルト貴下ハ見マシタカ。  
私ハ前ニ指摘シタ通り、ソウハ見マセンデシタ。

答



質問

彼ノ立場ハ寧ロ當時ノ政府ニ反對シテイタ人ノ立場デアリマセ  
ンデシタカ。

答

彼ガ態度、非常ニ露骨ナ態度デ日本政府ガ公表シタ方策ヲ批判シ  
タノヲ私ハ聽キマシタ。

質問

彼ハ自分カラ運ンデ自己ノ個人的見解ヲ表スルヨウナコトハナ  
カツタノデスカ。

答

ハイ、彼ハ時々寧ロ非常ニ鋭舌的デアルヨウニ見エマシタ。  
現在貴下ガ御存知デアルトコロノ後ノ情勢ノ進展及現トナ

質問

ツタ事實及事件カラ推シテ、貴下ガ白鳥ト附合ツテイル間ニ、白  
鳥ハ日本政府部内デ重キヲナシテイマシタカ、又ハ日本政府ノ對

答

外政策カ對内政策ニ影響ヲ及ボシマシタカ。  
私ガ東京デ彼ト交際シテイル間ニハ、ソナナコトハナカツタト申

質問

上ゲネバナリマセン。  
費下トリツベントロツブトノ個人的關係ニ就テ概略述ベテ下サイ

答

ソシテソノ個人的關係ガ貴下ガ彼ニ宛テテ發送シタ通信ニ何カ  
影響ヲ及ボシタカドウカ又何故影響ヲ及ボシタカヲ述ベテ下サイ

答

私ガ經驗シタ昭和九年カラ昭和十八年迄ノ期間中、日獨關係ハ數  
度好轉シタリ逆シタリシマシタ。ドイツガ劇的ナ政策ノ變更ヲ

年イ且行動シタ事實ニ錯ミ日本政府ガ獨自ノ行動ヲトツタ時、リ  
 ツベントロツプハ屢々ハツキリト不信ノ念ヲ表明シテ、斷固トシ  
 テソレヲ反撥シマシタ。リツベントロツプハ希望的ニ測ヲ下シタ  
 リ、又日本政府ガソノ決意ヲ固メル爲ノ基礎トシテイタ事實ト勢  
 カトヲ看過シタリスル傾向ガ甚シカッタノデス。  
 私ガリツベントロツプガ穩健ナ見解ヲトリ、穩健ナ訓令ヲ發スル  
 ヨウニ屢々努力シタ時ニ私ハ次ノヨウナ非常ナ不信ト猜疑トヲ喚  
 起シマシタ。即チ日獨ノ友好的關係ニ無頓着デアルカ、又ハソレ  
 ニ反對シテイル日本側ノ傾向ヲ私ガ不啻ニ斟酌スルコトニ依ツテ  
 私ガソウイフ態度ヲトルヨウニ影響サレ又日本ノ政界ノ他ノグル  
 ープト私ガ十分接觸シテイナイト云フヨウニ彼ヲシテ猜疑サセタ  
 ノデス。リツベントロツプガコノヨウナ意見ヲ持ツテイルノデハ  
 私ガ彼ノ見解ヲ穩健ナモノニシヨウト努力シテイルコトガ不盲尾  
 ニ終ルダロウシ、彼ハ、愈々彼ノ思想ト一層合致シタ他ノ情報ヲ  
 求メルヨウニナルダロウト私ハ推量シナクテハナリマセンデシタ  
 コノヨウニナラナイヨウニスルタメニ、リツベントロツプト個人  
 的ニ知己ノ間柄デアリ、且私ガソレ以前ニ接觸スルヨウニ訓令ヲ  
 發ケタ少數ノ日本人ト、私ハ個人的ニ交際ヲ續ケマシタ。

## 質問

## 答

私ハソレ等ノ人々ニ就テ言及シマシタガ、白鳥大使モソノ一人デシタ。ソシテリツベントロツブノ意思又ハ訓令ト異ナツテイル私ノ意見又ハ及建議ニ重ミヲ加ヘヨウト努メタ時、又ハ私ノ報告ガ眞テノ眞實カラ情報ヲ把握シタモノデアルト、リツベントロツブニ信サセルコトガ必要デアルト思ハレタ時ハ時ニ、私ハコレ等ノ人々ガ協力シタコトヲ強調シマシタ。

戦争遂行ニ當リ、軍事上及經濟上ノ作戰ニ就テ、ドイツ政府ト日本政府トハ眞ニ協力シマシタカ。

イ、エ、特ニ連合國側ノ協同戦路及ビ武器貸與法ノ實施ト比較スルト右何レノ點デモ眞ノ協力ハアリマセンデシタ。三國條約ハ一ツノ委員會ニツキ規定シテイマスガソレハ日本ガ戦争ヲ開始シタ迄ハ、仕事ヲ始メマセンデシタ。ソノ後昭和十七年一月ニベルリンニ於テ協定ガ結バレマシタガ、ソレニヨツテ日本、ドイツ、イタリヤ等ノソレゾレ別ノ軍事上ノ作戰ノ範圍ガ決定サレマシタ。軍事上ノ方面ニ於テハ、新シク發見シタ武器、又ハソノ他ノ戦争ニ使用スル器械ノ實寫眞、又ハ見本ノ交換及專家ノ交換ガ私ノ日本駐在中時々行ハレタケデス。經濟上ノ方面ニ於テハ、シベリヤ鐵道ヲ經由シテ原料ガドイツニ運送サレソノ後加ソ戦争ノタ

質問

メシベリヤ鐵道デ輸送ガ出來ナクナツタノデ、ドイツ及イタリ  
ノ對領突破船デ輸送サレマシタ。私ノ歸イタ範圍内デハ、昭和十  
八年ノ終リ迄ニハ、コノ輸送ハ重大ナ損害ヲ受ケテ出來ナクナリ  
マシタ。

答

昨三、被告ノ一人デアリ前内大臣デアツタ木戸侯爵ノ辯護人デア  
ルウイリアム・ローガン氏ハ辯護國ニ屬スル辯護人デスガ侯爵ト  
ドイツ政府トノ間ノ關係ノ性質ニ就テ調査スルヨウニ私ハ同氏カ  
ラ依頼ヲ受ケマシタ。貴下ハ侯爵ヲ御存知デアルカドウカ及公人  
トシテノ資格デ貴下ハ彼トドンナ關係ニアツタカヲ述ベテ下サイ  
彼ノ公人ハ外國大公使館トハ接觸面ガ少シモナカッタノデスカラ  
私ハ公人トシテノ資格テ彼ト何等關係ガアリマセンデシタ。

質問

私ノ記憶シテキル範圍内デハ宮中デ行ハレタ儀式又ハ日本政府ガ  
僞シタ社交的ノ大祝軍會ニ於テ時々彼ニ會ヒマシタ  
ドイツ政府ハ侯爵ニ對シテドンナ態度ヲトツタカ御存知ナラベ  
テ下サイ。

答

ドイツ政府ハ木戸侯爵ニ對シテ不信ノ態度ヲトツテキマシタ。彼  
ハ主トシテ松平宮内大臣ノ指導下ニ在ル日獨關係ノ改善ニ達成シ  
ナイグループニ屬シテキルト看做サレテキマシタ。

Dof, Doo, #1929

本戸ハ松平ト同ジ見解ヲ抱懷シテキルト私ハ考ヘマシタガペルリ  
ンデモソウ感ジテキマシタ。

オイゲン・オット

(署名)

自分 オイゲン・オットハ先ツ所定ノ方式ニ従ヒ宣誓シタ上、チャール  
ス・B・コールドルガ自分ニ對シテ訊問シタ等項ヲ記載シタ頁ヨリ成ル前  
述ノ訊問書ヲ通讀シ各頁ニ自分ノ姓名ヲ附シ且本文書ニハ提出サレタ  
ト同一ノ質問及ソレニ對シテ與ヘタノト同一ノ答ガ記載サレテ居リ、尙  
自分ノ知り得ル限り左ノ答ハ眞實デアルコトヲ保證シマス。

オイゲン・オット (署名)

昭和二十二年五月十八日自分ノ面前ニテ宣誓シ且署名セリ

大尉ラルフ・E・デヨンソン (署名)

○二九五八六四 アメリカ合衆国

自分 F. M. ナイトハ元ヅ所定ノ方式ニ從ヒ官シタ上、自分ハ在北平  
ヴアゴン・リホテルノ管理部長記デアルコト、チャールス・B. コード  
ルノ依頼ニ依リ十八頁ヨリ成ルオイゲン・オット將軍ニ對スル上記ノ試  
問ヲ報告シ且オット將軍ハ自分ト熟知ノ關係デアルコト向附和二十二年  
五月十五日日カラ十七日ニ至ル期間中ニ提出サレタノト同一ノ質問及ソレ  
ニ對シテ與ヘタノト同一ノ答ヲ本文ニハ裏實且正確ニ報告サレテアル  
コトヲ世述シマス。

フレンス・M. ナイト (署名)

二十二年五月十八日自分ノ面前ニテ宣誓シ且署名セリ

大尉 ラルフ・B. チョンソン (署名)

○二九五八六〇 アメリカ合衆国

Def. Doc. # 1929

Exh. No. 3579

ERRATA SHEET  
(Def. Doc. # 1929)

Page 1:

Line 3, read "reporter, Miss F. M. Knight".

Page 9:

Line 14, delete "the progress, and bear exhibit numbers  
at variance with".

Page 15:

Line 2, insert "C" between "relations." and "Copy".

Page 19:

Line 7, read "fourth".

Page 25:

Line 20, read "Exhibit No. 1113".

Page 33:

Last line, read "rank".

Page 35:

Line 22, read "or information".

Page 33:

Line 21, read "weapons or".



INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST

The United States of America, et al )

against -

ARAKI, Sadao, et al

DEPORTER: Miss F.M.Knight

WITNESS: General Eugen Ott

EXAMINING ATTORNEY: Charles B. Caudle, Counsel for Shiratori  
Toshio

Mr. Caudle. General, inasmuch as I understand you speak excellent English, I will carry on this interrogation in that language, in that neither the Reporter nor I speak German, if that is agreeable with you.

General Ott. It will be quite all right.

Q. General, will you please state your name, place of legal residence and place of present residence.

A. Eugen Ott. Legal residence, Icking, near Munich, Germany. Present residence, Peiping, China..

Q. Will you please state your present political status, and whether or not you are at present, or have at any time, been held in custody, or charged with any offence arising

out of your political activities prior to and during the war commonly known as "World War 2".

A. I am a German national, former German Ambassador to Japan. I am not now, nor have I ever been held in custody or charged with any offence arising from my political activities before and during the last War. However, when summoned to Tokyo by the Prosecution for interrogation, I was by mistake held in custody in Peiping for one night by the Chinese Police. This misunderstanding was straightened out the following day.

Q. Will you please state your official position with the German Government prior to your first visit to Japan.

A. I was an Army officer attached to the Reichswehr Ministry as Chief of the Political Department.

Q. Please state when you first arrived in Japan and in what official capacity.

A. I arrived in Japan in June 1933 as official observer for the German Army attached to the Japanese Army.

Q. How long did you remain at this time?

A. I remained until December 1933 and then returned to Germany.

Q. When did you next go to Japan and in what official capacity?

A. I went to Japan next in March 1934 as Military Attache to the German Embassy in Tokyo.

Q. How long did you remain as Military Attache, and what was your next official position?

A. I remained as Military Attache until March 1938 and was next appointed German Ambassador to Japan in April 1938 after the recall of Ambassador von Dirksen.

Q. How long did you serve as German Ambassador to Japan and what official position did you occupy after being relieved of this assignment?

A. I served as German Ambassador until January 1943, and was then placed on the waiting list of Ambassadors. When my successor, Ambassador Lehmann, had taken over my post, I moved my residence to Peiping, China, where I have lived continuously since.

Q. Why did you not return to Germany at that time or thereafter?

A. I did not return to Germany at that time or thereafter because I had not got the permission to do so, although I made a number of requests to Hitler through the Reich's Foreign Minister to return by blockade running ship and to re-enter the German Army.

Q. General, as I have advised you, I am American Defense Counsel for Shiratori Toshio, one of the Japanese accused of alleged war crimes, now standing trial before the International Military Tribunal for the Far East at Tokyo.

Will you please state when, where and under what circumstances you first met the said accused.

A. I met Shiratori, as far as I remember, for the first time about October or November 1938, prior to his departure for Rome as Japanese Ambassador to Italy, on the occasion of a farewell dinner given by the Italian Ambassador in Tokyo.

Q. Prior to his departure to assume this post, did you at any time discuss with him in any capacity, either personal or official, the then pending or proposed alliance between Japan, Germany and Italy.

A. I never discussed with Shiratori, prior to his departure, any alliance between Japan, Germany and Italy. In fact at that time, I know of no negotiations having been started.

Q. When and under what conditions did you first learn of such negotiations?

A. I learnt of such negotiations first in April 1939 by the German Military Attache, Colonel Matzky, to whom the Japanese Army had given a confidential hint.

Q. When and how were you first officially notified of this by your Government?

A. I was first officially notified by Ribbentrop in the latter part of April 1939 in response to my wired request for information about this subject.

Def. Doc. #1929

Q. Will you please state what instructions were given to you at that time as to the activities you should take, and the course you should follow as to the said negotiations.

A. Ribbentrop instructed me at that time to keep strictly secret the personal information which he had wired to me, and to act as if I had never heard of it, if addressed by anyone, even by the Italian Ambassador in Tokyo. He, however, requested me to observe developments and to report accordingly.

Q. Please state when and under what circumstances you took the first active part in these negotiations and what activity you did take.

A. I took the first active part in these negotiations with the Japanese Government in May 1939 when the Japanese Foreign Minister handed over to me a letter from the Prime Minister, Hiranuma, to Hitler to be conveyed through the Reich's Foreign Minister. Upon request I forwarded this message.

Q. Did Shiratori communicate in any manner whatsoever with you during his stay in Europe?

A. No, I did not hear from Shiratori at any time during his stay in Europe.

Q. When and under what conditions did you meet Shiratori the second time?

A. I think I met him the second time after his return to Tokyo some time during the latter fall of 1939, at an official function given by the Italian Ambassador.

Q. How often did you meet him within the next several months after that?

A. I met him rarely.

Q. Did you discuss any political matters, and particularly the German-Japanese-Italian Alliance during these times?

A. Our meetings were social and I think that these matters were not discussed during that time.

Q. Please state if you know what official position Shiratori occupied on his return to Tokyo from Rome.

A. Shiratori was still nominally Japanese Ambassador to Italy, but in fact was relieved of every function of his post.

Q. Did Shiratori take any part in the German-Japanese-Italian negotiations during the time from his return to Tokyo until he was officially relieved of his Ambassadorship in early 1941?

A. No. All negotiations had been stopped after the conclusion of the German-Russian Non-Aggression Pact in August 1939.

Q. Please explain the condition of German-Japanese relations immediately after the signing of the German-Russian Pact and during the months that ensued.

A. The conclusion of the German-Russian Non-Aggression Pact struck Japan as a surprising blow, and caused the resignation of the Hiranuma Cabinet. All negotiations with Germany about the Alliance were stopped, and relations between Germany and Japan cooled down to a low degree. This situation existed until about the late spring of 1940, when the development of the War in Europe began to be reflected in a changed Japanese mind. I might also say that the strong economic measures taken by the Government of the United States against Japan contributed likewise to this change of the Japanese mind.

Q. Please state if you know the official position or status of Shiratori upon being relieved of his Ambassadorial post, and further, if you know how long or to what date he remained in such a status.

A. I learnt that he was placed on the waiting list of Ambassadors about three months after his return to Tokyo, at a reduced salary. He kept this status until late August 1940 when he was appointed Adviser to the Foreign Minister. I might add that it is the normal procedure to retain Chiefs of Mission for three months after recall in their former official status in order to assist financial readjustment, as it was the same upon my retirement.

- Q. Did you have any official relations with him during this time?
- A. I had no official relations with Shiratori during this time. I saw him occasionally in a private capacity.
- Q. Was the Alliance for which the various Governments worked during the period up to this date ever concluded?
- A. The principal aim of the Alliance negotiated for up to that time was a defensive pact against Russia. Such an alliance was never concluded.
- Q. When was the Alliance known at the Tripartite Pact concluded, and what were its aims?
- A. The Three-Power Pact was concluded on 27th September 1940. Its principal aim was a defensive pact against an attack upon the partners. It was especially expressed that the existing relations with Russia would not be affected by it. Therefore, under the existing conditions, this primarily involved the United States.
- Q. Was it ever the intention and purpose of this pact which created this Three-Power Alliance that the parties thereto, in cooperation with each other, would conquer the entire world?
- A. No such intention was ever mentioned to me.
- Q. Inasmuch as Shiratori became an official advisor to the Japanese Foreign Office in late August 1940 and the



Three-Power Alliance was concluded in late September 1940, is it not true that he occupied his new position for a period of only one month prior to the conclusion of the treaty?

A. Yes.

Q. General, I have with me various copies of papers introduced as evidence before the Tribunal by the Prosecution, these being communications between you and your Government in Berlin. I will show you each of these copies and with your permission I would like to ask you some questions relating to them. Although these documents were introduced into evidence at various stages of the trial now under progress, and bear exhibit numbers at variance with the progress, and bear exhibit numbers at variance with the dates of same, I will, for the sake of clarity and expediency, present them to you in their chronological order for your answers and comments. I now hand you copy of Exhibit No. 502, a communication to you dated 26th April 1939 from the German Foreign Minister, von Ribbentrop. Will you please read this document and explain the contents thereof. (Copy of paper was handed to Witness.)

A. This is a document I referred to previously. It informed me for the first time about the negotiations for conclusion of a defensive alliance going on between Germany, Italy and Japan. It is evident therefore that these

negotiations had been started already in the summer of 1938 without my knowledge.

Q. This, then, is the message you received from Ribbentrop in answer to your inquiry concerning the negotiations. Upon receipt of this communication what action did you take, if any?

A. I took no action. As I have already explained, I had been instructed not to enter into any activities except observation and reporting of developments, as you will find in the last part of this document.

Q. Did any of your observations disclose any activity on the part of the Japanese Government in Tokyo which may have resulted from any acts or communications from Shiratori in this regard?

A. I do not remember hearing Shiratori mentioned by the Japanese side.

Q. I now hand you copy of Exhibit No. 503, dated 4th May 1939, the same being a communication from you to the German Foreign Office. Will you please explain what this document is and for what purpose it was dispatched.

(Copy handed to Witness.)

A. This is the message of Prime Minister Hiranuma, referred upon before, when I first took part in the negotiations with the Japanese Government. It was dispatched on May

Def. Doc. #1929

4th 1939, in an effort to break the deadlock in the negotiations, at the request of the Japanese Foreign Minister.

Q. I now hand you copy of Exhibit No. 504, dated 5th May 1939, and direct your attention to the paragraph thereof which I will quote, due to its briefness. It reads as follows:-

"From the Foreign Ministry a senior official who stands especially close to Ambassador Shiratori, let me know personally that, in the entire Government a deep cleft between friends and enemies of the alliance had formed."

I presume that this was one of the causes of the deadlock just referred to. (Copy handed to Witness.)

A. I think so.

Q. Who was this person?

A. As far as I can remember, this person was either Matsushige or Kurihara, both senior members of the Japanese Foreign Ministry.

Q. Do you know where he obtained this information?

A. No, but I presume it came from the discussions in the Foreign Ministry in Tokyo.

Q. At that time was not Shiratori in Europe?

A. Yes, he was.

Def. Doc. #1929

Q. Then, why did you mention the name of Shiratori in this message?

A. I mentioned the name of Shiratori for the reason that it might add to the weight of the report in the mind of the German Foreign Minister.

Q. I now hand you a copy of Exhibit No. 2198 dated 11th August 1939, from you to the German Foreign Office, relating to information given you by General Hachijiri relative to conditions in the then Cabinet as pertains to German-Japanese-Italian relations, and conveying communications from the then Japanese War Minister.

You will find that this document states in the second paragraph of Section 3 thereof that, for reasons

enumerated in the communication, the War Minister would

risk his resignation as a last resort in the furtherance of better relations, which would also certainly entail

the resignation of Ambassadors Oshima and Shiratori.

(Copy handed to Witness.)

Also on page 2 of this document you will note that you

stated in paragraph 2 thereof that it was imperative that

a decision in reply to the concessions demanded be made

by August 15th, 1939, the same being within four days

and that the War Minister would communicate the measure

he had taken direct to Oshima and Shiratori, by-passing

communications from the then Japanese War Minister.

- 12 -

You will find that this document states in the second

paragraph of Section 3 thereof that, for reasons

enumerated in the communication, the War Minister would

risk his resignation as a last resort in the furtherance

of better relations, which would also certainly entail

the resignation of Ambassadors Oshima and Shiratori.

(Copy handed to Witness.)

Also on page 2 of this document you will note that you

stated in paragraph 2 thereof that it was imperative that

the Foreign Minister.

First I will ask you about the second part of your message referred to, but please read the entire message before I proceed.

Do you know whether or not it was the usual practice of the War Minister to by-pass the Foreign Ministry in communicating with Shiratori?

A. This is the only case I was informed of when the War Minister by-passed the Foreign Minister in communication with Shiratori about these negotiations.

Q. Why was this unusual procedure followed, if you know?

A. It is obvious that it was a matter of extreme urgency because the answer had been requested within four days. By sending through the usual channels, there was a possibility of delay.

Q. As to the first part of this message referred to, what thereafter happened?

A. I have no knowledge of what happened immediately after that, but on August 29th the Japanese Cabinet resigned, following the Non-Aggression Pact between Germany and Russia. After-wards all negotiations between the Three Powers ceased, as I have previously pointed out.

Q. I now hand you copy of Exhibit No. 498, dated September 8th 1939, the same being a communication from you to your Government, wherein the last four lines read as follows:-

"The Ambassador in Moscow (misprint - 'Rome') Shiratori, will return from Rome since at that time he had taken up the post of Ambassador purely in the expectation that he would succeed in concluding an Italian-Japanese-German Military Alliance."

Do you know of your own knowledge, or had you ever been officially, or even semi-officially, advised that he was appointed for this specific purpose: (Copy handed to Witness.)

A. No.

Q. Do you know to your own knowledge, or had you ever been officially, or even semi-officially, advised that he took this post at Rome with any expectation whatsoever of concluding this alliance?

A. No.

Q. Then this information communicated in this document must have been based on hearsay. Is that correct?

A. I think so.

Q. I now hand you copy of Exhibit No. 507 dated 9th September 1939, the same being a communication from von Ribbentrop to you in Tokyo, wherein it is stated on the second page, at the end of the second paragraph, that -- "Shiratori, who will soon return to Tokyo from his post as Ambassador in Rome, will also work in this idea," which, from the

other parts of the document, I assume the idea being of better Russo-Japanese relations. Copy handed to Witness). As you have previously stated that you only saw Shiratori very rarely, and then only at social functions, at which times no political talks of any nature took place, and further that your first private talk with him took place the latter part of February 1940 upon the visit of Mr. Stahmer to Tokyo, Shiratori did not take the active part predicted by Ribbentrop. Is that correct?

A. As far as I know, and as far as the German Embassy is concerned, he did not.

Q. I now hand you Exhibit No. 511, dated 23rd February 1940, the same being a communication to your Foreign Office signed "Stahmer-Ott", wherein the first paragraph, first sentence, reads:-

"After my arrival here I found such Japanese already known to me as Oshima, Shiratori, Terachi, Ishii, etc., in an unchanged, friendly attitude, and ready for every support."

(Copy handed to Witness.)

General, this message seems to have been sent by Mr. Stahmer, however it is signed, "Stahmer-Ott". Will you please explain how this occurred?

A. The message was sent by Mr. Stahmer, but due to the regulations for sending of cypher telegrams from the German

Mission abroad to the Home Government, the Chief of Mission had always to sign such a telegram for expedition.

Q. You at that time were the Chief of the German Mission in Japan. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Please explain under what circumstances you gentlemen saw Shiratori.

A. As far as I remember, Mr. Stahmer paid a private visit in my company to Shiratori, due to the instructions of Ribbentrop to get in touch with the personal acquaintances of Ribbentrop in Japan.

Q. What was meant by the phraseology, "in an unchanged, friendly attitude", and "ready for every support"?

A. Stahmer was anxious to confirm Ribbentrop that the cool attitude towards Germany at that time prevailing in Japan had not changed the attitude of the people mentioned in this message, and so he stressed their readiness for every support for better Japanese-German relations, without having made any special arrangement for it.

Q. What was the occasion of Mr. Stahmer's visit to Tokyo?

A. Mr. Stahmer was attached as a representative of Ribbentrop to the mission of the Duke of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, sent to Japan and the United States of America at that time. This mission was sent to Japan in order to present the



congratulations of Hitler on the occasion of the 2,000th anniversary of the founding of the Japanese Empire, and was sent to the United States as a goodwill mission to the Red Cross Society.

Q. Did Shiratori after this take any more active part in furthering German-Japanese relations than before?

A. He did not, as far as I know; until the late spring of 1940, when both the War events in Europe and the American commercial measures enforced upon Japan were changing gradually the Japanese mind, as I stated previously.

Q. Is it not true that during all of this time, and even up to the very last part of August 1939, Shiratori still occupied no official status other than that of being on the Ambassadorial waiting list, as brought out before, and could not have taken, or carried on, any official activity in this regard?

A. That is correct.

Q. I now hand you copy of Exhibit No. 516, dated 12th June 1940, from you to your Government, wherein you speak of Japanese-American relations among other matters, and call your special attention to the second, third and fourth paragraphs thereof. Will you please explain in detail just what you mean by the same, covering historical background, Japanese psychology and existing conditions

at the time the communication was sent. (Copy handed to Witness.)

A. The background of this report of June 12th 1940 is as follows:-

The collapse of France was obviously imminent, and the British situation was very precarious, centering round Dunkirk. The only effective relief which might keep up the resistance power of England, and work against the early settlement of the War, could come from the United States of America, and was asked from them very urgently. Therefore the German Government endeavoured to hamper such a relief, and considered as a useful way a continued tension in the Pacific area, which might prevent the United States from removing their attention and fighting forces from the Pacific to the Atlantic. It was a complicated matter to advance such a policy upon Japan because the Japanese attitude was much divided, as it is given in the first part of my report. In this situation I got instructions to back an Italian protest obviously against a Japanese measure in favour of the United States and contrary to the Italian interests - I do not recall the case exactly. When I presented my objections to the Reich Government's intentions I had to avoid the permanent distrust of Ribbentrop that I

was inclined to block his aims. Therefore I stressed in paragraphs Nos. 3 and 4 of my report that I was working in my own way, and pointed to the cooperation of Shiratori and other Japanese persons known to Ribbentrop in order to impress him and to succeed in my objections.

Q. Did you mean, in the fourth paragraph of this document, that the Embassy, Oshima and Shiratori worked together in a common programme, based upon a mutual understanding and common agreement, and if so, what was the aim?

A. No, I did not mean that because there was no such agreement.

Q. What, if anything, did Shiratori do in this regard?

A. Shiratori, as far as I know, warned by private talks, and sometimes by the Press, against the courting of the United States, after they had enforced hard economic measures upon Japan.

Q. Was this a part of a concerted plan taken by him, Oshima and you?

A. No, it was not a common plan. I had only private talks with each of them separately, and Oshima kept himself much apart from political activities during his stay in Japan.

Q. Were you ever in the company of Shiratori and Oshima at the same time for the purpose of carrying out this

so-called political cooperation?

A. No, I was not.

Q. Then why do you state that there was close cooperation between you?

A. As I stated before, I used this expression in order to give weight to the message, and to carry through my objections. I might add that I used the names of Konoyo and Suetsugu for the same reason.

Q. I now hand you copy of Exhibit No. 523, dated 24th June 1940, the same being a communication from you to your Foreign Office, wherein, in paragraph 3, you state:-

"Also Ambassador Shiratori, who is more frequently named as the coming Foreign Minister advocated a Non-Aggression Pact with Russia in an interview yesterday with Yomuri." (Copy handed to Witness)

What, or who, is Yomuri?

A. "Yomuri" is the name of a Tokyo Newspaper.

Q. What was Shiratori's official status at that time?

A. Shiratori was still on the waiting list of Ambassadors.

Q. I now hand you a copy of Exhibit No. 538 dated 2nd August 1940, another of your communications to your Government, wherein the second paragraph states:-

"Ambassador Shiratori informed confidentially that he had declined the post of Vice Foreign Minister.

It is to be considered that he will now be appointed permanent Adviser to the Foreign Minister. He believes that he can exercise a far-reaching influence in this capacity." (Copy handed to Witness)

Did he receive such an appointment, and if so, did he at any time, to your knowledge exercise a far-reaching influence in that capacity?

A. Yes, he did get the appointment as permanent Adviser to the Foreign Minister, but to my knowledge he did not exercise a far-reaching influence in such a capacity, as later developments, especially during the negotiations for a conclusion of the Tripartite Pact, proved.

Q. Do you know the difference in importance between Vice Foreign Minister and Adviser to the Foreign Minister, that is the duties, responsibilities and influence of the two respective positions? If so, please describe.

A. Yes, I know the difference from my own experience. By my official relations with several Vice Foreign Ministers of Japan I realized that a Vice Foreign Minister was the permanent representative of the Foreign Minister in all dealings with Foreign Missions, which the Foreign Minister did not take up personally. Furthermore, he was responsible for the administration and personnel matters of the Ministry. I think that his position is

comparable to the Under Secretary of State of the United States. The Adviser had none of these functions, and his effectiveness depended upon the personal influence he had with the Foreign Minister.

Q. Do you know whether or not Shiratori had any personal influence with Matsuoka, the then Foreign Minister, and if so, please state.

A. I did not observe such an influence, even during the negotiations for the Tripartite Pact.

Q. Did you ever have occasion to learn, or know of, the nature of the personal relationship between Matsuoka and Shiratori?

A. I occasionally got the impression of a certain mistrust between Matsuoka and Shiratori by some remarks they made to me about each other.

Q. Do you mean by that, General, that both Matsuoka and Shiratori were critical of each other during private conversations with you?

A. Yes, that I mean.

Q. I now hand you copy of Exhibit No. 548, dated 23rd August 1940, being another of your cables to your Foreign Office. I call your attention specifically to paragraph 2 which reads as follows:-

"With the aim of further preparation of suitable

action for the adjustment of state affairs on an authoritarian model, the Government had formed a commission of 24 leading personalities. Ambassador Shiratori was appointed the representative for foreign political matters in the Commission.

The Commission consists mostly of followers of the reform movement and of the policy of cooperation with the Axis Powers which is constantly demanded by this movement."

(Copy handed to Witness.)

Where did you get this information?

A. By that time there were various rumours about interior measures taken by the new Cabinet. The reported formation of a commission was one of these rumours.

Q. Were you ever informed, even remotely, who else comprised this Commission?

A. No, I was never informed in that way.

Q. After dispatching this message, did you ever hear again of such a commission or of any of its activities?

A. No, I have to consider that information reported by me was erroneous.

Q. I now hand you copy of Exhibit No. 562, dated 31st January 1941, to the Reich Foreign Minister, wherein the third paragraph states as follows:-

"In contrast to this, activistic circles demand preventive attack on Singapore as the key position in the West Pacific Ocean. They expect to deprive America by a surprise action of the possibility of military warfare in the Pacific Ocean or to render it difficult. This minority group is under the leadership of Admiral Suetsugu, Ambassador Shiratori, and has the support of the young officers' corps and individual high leaders of the Army and Navy."

(Copy handed to Witness.)

Then by a "preventive attack" on Singapore, it was the idea that, by so doing, it would preclude America from entering the Pacific War, or at least make it more difficult for her to do so. Is that correct?

A. I was informed that was the idea.

Q. Where did you get all this information?

A. I got this information during the month of January 1941, from different members of the German Embassy, and from a number of Japanese of various kinds with whom I had private talks. As the report points out in the first paragraph, it was a time of heightened political tension, therefore a lot of sharp political discussions were going on.

Q. Were these talks considered official in any way?

A. No, they were private talks.



Def. Doc. #1929

Q. Were you ever afforded any proof of Shiratori being a leader among such a group?

A. I was not afforded such a proof.

Q. Then this information is without basis of fact. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. I now hand you copy of Exhibit No. 1073, dated 18th May 1941, another of your communications to your Foreign Minister.

(Copy handed to Witness.)

General, you state in the last sentence of this communication that the Activist Group is at present weakened by the serious illness of Shiratori, yet in response to my questions on Exhibit No. 562 you state that you had no proof of Shiratori being a leader of the Activist Group, and finally concluded that information you had to this effect was without basis of fact. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. General, I now hand you Exhibit No. 113, dated 7th July 1941, which is another communication to your Foreign Minister.

(Copy handed to Witness.)

Please read this carefully before answering.

Where was Shiratori residing at the time of this visit?

- A. Shiratori was residing at Hayama which is a seaside resort about two hours drive from Tokyo.
- Q. Was this visit of a special nature?
- A. No. I went many times in the summer to the seaside near Hayama where I had my own villa, as many Foreign diplomats had. On one of these occasions I visited Shiratori. The way to his residence was a circuit of just five minutes on the way to my own villa.
- Q. It appears from your communication that you had been directed by you Foreign Minister to convey to Shiratori his best wishes for his recovery.
- A. I think that is correct.
- Q. However, as you stated, you did not make a special trip to this place for this purpose, but chanced to go by during your visit to your own villa. Is that correct?
- A. I think so.
- Q. At the time you saw Shiratori you stated in your Communication that he was very ill, and stated at length as to the nature of his illness, as explained to you by him. Did you know at the time of this visit that his real and most serious illness was of a mental nature?
- A. No, I reported his suffering from kidney trouble, as I had been informed. I found out later, however, that it was really of a mental nature.

Def. Dec. #1929

Q. Then the information you received first of the nature of his illness was, to all intents and purposes, an effort to cover up the real nature of the illness, both by him and his friends.

A. I think that this wrong information was mainly due to the well-known shyness of the Japanese with regard to giving any particulars of their personal conditions.

Q. From your observations what was his mental condition at this time?

A. At this time he gave me the impression of being mentally tired.

Q. I now hand you copy of Exhibit No. 800, dated 1st August 1941, which I ask you to read carefully. With whom was this conversation that you reported?

(Copy handed to Witness.)

A. I held this conversation with Minister Secretary Yamamoto, commissioned with the affairs of the Vice Foreign Minister.

Q. Was Shiratori present at this time?

A. No. I pointed out in this report that I had visited Shiratori during the past days in his place of convalescence, and as far as I know, he was still there at this time.

Q. Was this a special visit or another visit similar to the previous one?

A. It was another visit similar to the previous one.

Def. Doc. #1929

Q. Did any of the ideas advanced by Yamamoto ever materialize?

A. Insofar as I know, they did not.

Q. I now hand you copy of Exhibit No. 608, dated 5th Decem 1941, being another cable from you to your Foreign

Office, the fourth paragraph of which reads as follows:

"Shiratori explained to me that the leading circles of Japan have come to the conclusion that Roosevelt wants now to enter the war by means of a conflict in the Far East. From various sides the opinion has been advocated that the United States are now sure of the coalition of the ABCD States and Russia which has been striven for more than ten years. Therefore Roosevelt believes that the moment for a settlement has come since one cannot be certain of the adherence of these states in the future."

(Copy handed to Witness.)

This paragraph appears to me to be a little confusing as to whether or not Shiratori gave all the expressions contained therein. Will you please state whether or not the entire paragraph relates to Shiratori, and if not, state what part of the same does relate to him.

A. Only the first sentence refers to Shiratori.

Q. Do you recall where you saw Shiratori at this time?

Def. Doc. #1929

A. I do not recall that.

Q. Is it possible that it was another visit to his seaside villa?

A. It is possible.

Q. Did you consider at this time and did you report to your Government that you thought Shiratori had recovered from this mental illness.

A. He still appeared to be in a state of convalescence, and I do not think I reported to my Government that he had recovered, at this time or before.

Q. Under these circumstances, and particularly as he occupied no position whatsoever with the Government at that time, did you consider that he meant to convey to you that "leading circles" meant the official attitude of the Government?

A. No. It will appear from the fact that I cited the Foreign Ministry's information and attitude in all other parts of this report.

Q. General, in going through these various Exhibits, I find that one of the same, namely Exhibit No. 574, dated 25th March 1941, being your "Note on Situation in Japan", sent from a train in Germany to the Reich's Foreign Minister, wherein you digressed on a proposed attack by Japan upon Singapore, was inadvertently not placed chronologically with the other exhibits. With

your permission, I will question you as to this document now.

(Copy handed to Witness.)

You state in this Exhibit, "Ambassador Shiratori stressed also the necessity to tie up the British Fleet." Is it correct, as I have stated, that this note was sent while you were in Germany?

A. Yes.

Q. What was the occasion of your being in Germany at this time?

A. I was called by my Government to be present during the visit of Japanese Foreign Minister Matsuoka to Berlin.

Q. Where was Shiratori at this time?

A. Shiratori was in Japan.

Q. Please state where, when, and the circumstances of your meeting and conversation with him in this regard.

A. I met him some time, probably in February 1941, during a farewell visit before I left for Germany.

Q. Was this meeting of an official nature?

A. No, it was not of an official nature, but purely personal.

Q. Is it not true that Shiratori was a career diplomat, and at no time saw any service either in the Japanese Army or Navy?

A. As far as I know, that is correct.

Q.- Then the opinion expressed by him was only that of a l

layman, and not the opinion of a man versed in military tactics. Is that correct?

A. That is correct. The same opinion had been voiced to me during that period by other laymen.

Q. General, I hand you a copy of Exhibit No. 1272, dated 17th May 1942, which is a communication to your Government recommending various German decorations. Will you please describe or explain the German protocol in awarding decorations to foreign nationals, and the circumstances surrounding this recommendation. (Copy handed to Witness.)

A. For awarding German decorations the recommendations had to be made to Hitler by his Chancellery, which got the proposals from the various Reich Ministries, as the Foreign Ministry, War Ministry, etc. Minister von Ribbentrop was, for himself and for his personal favorites, rather anxious to get foreign decorations, and became very angry when he considered the Japanese Government too reluctant in bestowing a sufficient number of decorations upon German people. He succeeded in blocking in the Reich Government every award of decorations for Japanese for a considerable time. Consequently the Japanese side became very insistent, and stressed the striking contrast with the Italian practice, where there

was a sumptuous flow of decorations.

In order to break this deadlock troubling the atmosphere in Tokyo, I eventually presented to Ribbentrop a list wherein I recommended decorations to be bestowed on the second anniversary of the Tripartite Pact in September 1942.

- Q. From what you say, it would appear that officials of both Governments were jealous of their respective departments, and there was somewhat of a contest as to who could get the most decorations or medals to add to already crowded tunics.
- A. Yes, it was proved from my own experience.
- Q. Please explain the circumstances of your recommendation of Shiratori for the Great Cross, the German decoration.
- A. The German Protocol had provided that the Great Cross is the only class of decoration for which a person of Ambassador's rank is eligible. As this fact was well known to the Japanese Board of Decorations, the bestowal of a lesser decoration would have been considered by the Japanese side principally as most unfavourable, as my long experience proved. I recommended Shiratori on this occasion of a decorations list for the Tripartite Pact because he was personally known to Ribbentrop, and had been the Adviser to the Foreign Minister at the time of the conclusion of the pact, in order to lessen the opposition of the Reich's Foreign Minister against the



whole matter of decorations.

Q. General, from later developments do you think that the efforts of Shiratori, and particularly the results of such efforts to further Japanese-German relations, deserved the award given to him?

A. I am sorry, but I must say that I do not think so.

Q. Were other recommendations made for awards in commemoration of the conclusion of the Tripartite pact, and were such awards bestowed?

A. Yes. For instance, Foreign Minister Matsuoka had been decorated previously. Mr. Saito Yoshie, another Adviser to Matsuoka during the negotiations for the Tripartite Pact, had been recommended and decorated at the same time as Shiratori with the Great Cross. I think that there were others but I do not recall their names.

Q. What was the usual procedure of the Japanese with regard to these people designated or recommended for consideration of awards by them?

A. When we discussed with the Japanese side confidentially before recommendations went to the Reich Government, they usually suggested the distribution of decorations among higher ranking personalities and some of lesser rank in order not to create dissatisfaction.

Def. Doc. #1929

- Q. General, one of my associate American Defense Counsels, Mr. James N. Freeman, Counsel for General Kenryo Sato, asked me to enquire about the circumstances of your recommendation of General Sato for the German award of the Distinguished Service Cross with Stars. Will you please state why and under what circumstances this recommendation was made.
- A. The recommendation of General Sato and others was made by the German Military Attache upon the insistence of the Japanese Army, which had become rather angry because no award of German decorations had been given for a considerable time. I backed the recommendation of General Sato due to his official position. He was, at that time, of our common war, the Chief of the Section of the Japanese Army where the liaison with the German Embassy was centred.
- Q. General, I have questioned you about the aforesaid communications sent by, or received by you, to or from your Government, wherein the name of Shiratori was mentioned, numbering about 16 to 18. From these communications the Prosecution has endeavoured to show the important position of Shiratori in the Japanese Government, and the influence he had on its policies. These wires covered a period of from April 1939 to May 1942, approximately

Def. Dec. #1929

three years. During this period will you please state approximately how many communications you sent from Tokyo to your Government.

A. In this period I sent about 6,000 cypher telegrams to my Government. The number of the message is given at the head of each. Every first of January the numeration began with a new No. 1.

Q. During this period approximately how many did you receive from your Government?

A. In this period I received from my Government between 3,000 to 4,000 cypher telegrams.

Q. Then is it not true that, comparable to the number of those sent and received, Shiratori was referred to in an unimportant number of the same?

A. That is correct.

Q. Did you not mention Shiratori's name in some of your telegrams to Berlin where the name of some other person would have answered the purpose?

A. Yes.

Q. The Prosecution accuses Shiratori of furnishing important information to Germany through your Embassy. Did he ever furnish you with any news of information at all concerning an important policy or decision of his Government, or any state secret in general?

A. He never furnished any news or information of this kind to the German Embassy.

Q. Was Shiratori in occupation of any important position in Tokyo during the whole of your sojourn in Japan?

A. Not that I know of, during my personal acquaintance with him, except as Advisor to the Foreign Minister.

Q. Did he appear to you to have any influence in important affairs of state, or to carry any weight with Foreign Minister Matsuoka in this position?

A. No, as I have pointed out before.

Q. Was his position not rather that of a person in opposition to the Government of the day?

A. I heard him several times criticize in a most outspoken manner measures announced by the Japanese Government.

Q. Was he not forward in expressing his personal views?

A. Yes, he appeared sometimes to be a rather talkative man.

Q. From later developments, and proven facts and events as you know them now, did Shiratori ever, during your acquaintance with him carry any weight with his Government, or influence the policies thereof, either foreign or domestic?

A. During my acquaintance with him in Tokyo, I must say "No".

Q. Will you please make a general statement as to your personal relationship with Ribbentrop, and state whether

A. He never furnished any news or information of this kind to the German Embassy.

Q. Was Shiratori in occupation of any important position in Tokyo during the whole of your sojourn in Japan?

A. Not that I know of, during my personal acquaintance with him, except as Adviser to the Foreign Minister.

Q. Did he appear to you to have any influence in important affairs of state, or to carry any weight with Foreign Minister Matsuoka in this position?

A. No, as I have pointed out before.

Q. Was his position not rather that of a person in opposition to the Government of the day?

A. I heard him several times criticize in a most outspoken manner measures announced by the Japanese Government.

Q. Was he not forward in expressing his personal views?

A. Yes, he appeared sometimes to be a rather talkative man.

Q. From later developments, and proven facts and events as you know them now, did Shiratori ever, during your acquaintance with him carry any weight with his Government, or influence the policies thereof, either foreign or domestic?

A. During my acquaintance with him in Tokyo, I must say "No".

Q. Will you please make a general statement as to your personal relationship with Ribbentrop, and state whether

or not, such relations had any bearing on your communications to him, and why.

- A. The relations between Germany and Japan went up and down several times during the years of my own experience, 1934-1943. When the Japanese Government, in the face of dramatic changes and actions in the German policy, acted in their own way, Ribbentrop reacted often with marked distrust and decision. He had a strong tendency for "wishful thinking", and for overlooking the facts and forces upon which the Japanese Government used to base their decisions.

When I often tried to moderate the views and instructions of Ribbentrop, I awakened a mounting distrust and suspicion that my attitude was influenced by undue consideration of those Japanese tendencies which were either indifferent or opposed to friendly relations between Japan and Germany, and that I had not sufficient contact with other groups of the political Japanese life.

I had to presume that this opinion of Ribbentrop would spoil the success of my moderating work, and drive him even more to other sources of information which were more in line with his own ideas.

In order to avoid such a development, I carried on personal relations with the few Japanese who were

personally known to Ribbentrop, and whom I had theretofore been instructed to contact.

I mentioned these people, among them Ambassador Shiratori, and stressed their cooperation on occasions, especially when I tried to give weight to my opinions or suggestions contrasting Ribbentrop's ideas or instructions or when it seemed necessary to confirm him that my report covered the situation from every point of view.

Q. General, was there ever any real cooperation between the German and Japanese Governments in the conduct of the War, as to Military and economic operations?

A. No, there was no real cooperation in either respect, particularly compared with the combined strategy and Lend-Lease operations of the Allied Nations. The Tripartite Pact provided for a Commission which did not set to work until Japan had entered the War. Afterwards, in January 1942, an agreement was concluded in Berlin which fixed the respective separate spheres of military operations between Japan, Germany and Italy. In the military field there was only an occasional exchange of blue prints or samples of newly developed weapons of other instruments of warfare and of expert personnel during my presence in Japan.

In the economic field there was the transport of raw materials to Germany via the Siberian Railway, and after

afterwards when this line was stopped by the Russo-German War, by blockade running German and Italian ships. This transport collapsed, after heavy losses, as far as I heard, about the end of 1943.

Q. General, I have been requested by another Defense Counsel, Mr. William Logan, Counsel for Marquis Kido, the former Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, and also one of the accused, to enquire about the nature of the relations between the Marquis and the German Government. Will you please state whether or not you knew the Marquis and what relations in your official capacity did you have with him.

A. I had no relations with him in my official capacity because his official position did not cover any contact with the Foreign Missions. As far as I remember, I met him occasionally during Imperial ceremonies or big social functions of the Japanese Government.

Q. Will you please state if you know what the attitude of the German Government was towards the Marquis?

A. The attitude of the Reich Government towards Marquis Kido was one of distrust. He was considered as belonging to the group which did not favour the improvement of the Japanese-German relations, primarily under the leadership of the Minister of the Imperial Household,



Def. Doc. #1929  
Def.

Matsudaira. I considered Kido in line with Matsudaira's views, and this feeling was shared in Berlin.

/S/ Eugen Ott  
/T/ EUGEN OTT

---

EUGEN OTT, after being firstduly sworn deposes and says that he has read the foregoing interrogation of him by Charles B. Caudle, consisting of pages, and that he has affixed to each page thereof his signature, and further that this document contains the identical questions asked and the identical answers given in response thereto; further that the answers so given are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

/S/ Eugen Ott  
/T/ EUGEN OTT

---

Sworn and subscribed to by me  
this the eighteenth day of  
May 1947.

/S/ Ralph E. Johnson, Capt, C.E.

0295864 U.S. Army

Def. Doc. #1929

MISS F. M. KNIGHT after being first duly sworn, deposes and says that she is the Secretary to the Management of the Grand Hotel des Wagons-Lits, Peiping, and that at the request of Charles B. Caudle, she reported the herein above interrogation of General Eugen Ott, consisting of 18 pages: that General Ott is well known to her, and that this document is a true and correct report of the questions asked and the answers given during the period from 15th to 17th May 1947.

/S/ Franco M. Knight

---

Sworn to and subscribed to before me  
this eighteenth day of May 1947.

/S/ Ralph E. Johnson, Capt. C.E.

0295864

U.S. Army