

5695

Def. Doc. No. 1545

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al )

- vs -

ARAKI Sadao, et al

No. 1

A F F I D A V I T

SATŌ NAOTAKE

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

1. I was Ambassador to the Soviet Union from March 1942 until the outbreak of war between Japan and the U S S R in August 1945, and am at present President of the Foreign Ministry's Training Institute in Tokyo.
2. In 1944, in response to the Japanese request concerning the arming of fishing-craft as a defensive measure, Vice-Minister Lozovsky on 3 June, in saying that the Soviet Government did not wish armed merchant vessels to enter Soviet ports, stated that the U S S R maintained strict neutrality in the war between Japan and the United States and Britain. A written protest lodged by Zhukov, Director of the Second Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs of the Soviet Foreign Office, with Kameyama, Counsellor of the Embassy, on 27 June, concerning the arming of the Kanazu Maru, a Japanese tanker engaged in the transport of oil stocked in Northern Sakhalin, contained the positive statement that the Soviet Government maintained such neutrality.
3. On 19 July 1944, at a conversation concerning Japanese-German and Anglo-American-Soviet relations, I stated that the Japanese Government was determined to maintain a faithful attitude of neutrality in future as in the past, and had the expectation of a similar attitude from the U S S R. Lozovsky replied to the effect that the government of the U S S R at all times took the existence of the Soviet-Japanese Neutrality Pact into consideration, and acted in accordance with it in dealing with all problems.
4. On 16 September 1944, in the course of a conversation on the China question, I requesting confirmation of the Soviet Union's neutrality in the Sino-Japanese hostilities, Foreign Minister Molotov replied that there was no change in the U S S R's relations with Chungking. He further stated that Soviet-Japanese relations were in a normal condition, and even tending toward the better.
5. On 17 November 1944 I said that while it was assumed that the question of Siberian bases must have been discussed at the Anglo-American-Soviet Moscow Conference, nevertheless it was expected that the U S S R would offer confirmation that there was no change in its attitude toward Japan. In reply, Molotov said that the Siberian-base question was by no means new, having come up for discussion even before the Moscow Conference, but that the policy of the Soviet Union was clear from the fact that Marshal Stalin, in his address of 6 November, had made no reference to any change in Soviet policy toward Japan.
6. On 22 February 1945 I inquired of Foreign Minister Molotov whether the Yalta Conference had dealt with Far-Eastern

questions, to which Molotov replied that the result of the conference was as had been published, and that the discussion was limited almost wholly to European problems, with some discussion of post-war questions, but that Far-Eastern questions had been entirely excluded. Soviet-Japanese relations, he pointed out, were a matter exclusively between the U S S R and Japan, who maintained relations of neutrality; whereas Anglo-American-Japanese relations were a matter concerning those powers exclusively, they being in a state of war.

7. At various times from 22 February 1945 I had discussions with Molotov or Lozovsky concerning the Neutrality Pact, expressing the desire of the government of Japan that it be continued in force and requesting a similar statement of the U S S R. On 5 April Molotov, receiving me, stated that he was about to convey the statement of the Soviet Government on the question, and read a memorandum notifying the Japanese Government of the Soviet denunciation of the Neutrality Pact as of its expiration date, 25 April 1946. I inquiring what attitude would be adopted by the U S S R during the remaining period of the Pact, Molotov replied that the intention of the Soviet Government was to return, after the expiration of the Pact, to the conditions prevailing before its execution; that the Soviet denunciation was made in accordance with the provisions of the Pact itself, but that needless to say it was only after the expiration of the full term of five years that conditions were to revert to the status quo ante; and that the outbreak of the Russo-German and Japanese-Anglo-American wars after signature of the Pact had altered conditions, and that the Soviet Government's reasons for abrogation were clearly expressed in the prepared statement. I said that the statement was received with regret, and that the government of Japan hoped to have the former relations continued, and the peace of the Far East remain undisturbed as before, even after the denunciation of the Pact. Molotov replied that, as to conditions after the denunciation, it was recognized that the Pact continued in force for another year, and that the attitude of the Soviet Government would be determined by this condition.

8. I had numerous conferences with officials of the Soviet Foreign Office concerning the landing of American military planes in territory of the U S S R. There were three such cases before the end of 1943: on 18 April 1942, one plane; on 12 August 1943, one plane; and on 12 September 1943, seven planes. In reply to the inquiries which I made on those occasions, the government of the Soviet Union replied that proper measures were being taken in accordance with the provisions of international law. In 1944 there were numerous such instances; although they were not published, I was informed by Molotov, Lozovsky and Zhukov that two planes had landed on 15 June, and one on 21 June. Inquiries were made concerning these cases and others of which we had word, the reply being given by Lozovsky on 29 August that in all such cases the government of the U S S R would act in accordance with the provisions of international law, and would furnish to the Japanese Government all information which the Soviet Government might acquire in connection with such cases. No information was ever given thereafter, nor were replies given to inquiries concerning landings reported to have occurred on 20 August, 18 November, and other dates. On 13 December Lozovsky said, upon being pressed for a reply, that the American bombers must be missing, as no report had been received from the responsible authorities.

9. The history of my efforts to secure Soviet mediation in the Pacific war at the direction of Foreign Minister Tōgō is contained in the telegrams, Defence Documents Nos. 1465, 1467, 1468 and 1469, addressed to me from the Foreign Minister, and Defence Documents Nos. 1466, 1470, 1471, 1472, 1473 and 1474, sent by me

Def. Doc. No. 1545

to the Foreign Minister, which I verify as respectively correct copies of telegrams received and as true relations of what occurred in connection with this matter.

10. Upon returning to Tokyo after the end of the war I made an official report to the Foreign Ministry concerning the delivery of the Soviet declaration of war on 8 August 1945. I have been shown Defence Document No. 1476, and verify that it is a correct copy of that report; and that it is a true statement of what occurred as therein related.

11. In passing through Manchuria in March 1942, en route to my post in Kuibishev, I had conversations with various friends, including General Umezu, Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army, and some of his high staff-officers. I told them that it was most important that the Kwantung Army should take no action which could be construed as aggressive toward the U S S R or could give them provocation in any way. General Umezu and others agreed with my opinion, and General Umezu told me that all dispositions of the Kwantung Army were defensive and that from the Kwantung Army there would be no manifestations of an aggressive attitude.

12. Prior to the Soviet declaration of war on Japan there had been in March 1944 a settlement of the Fisheries Convention question by extension of the convention for five years, and simultaneously a settlement of the troublesome Northern Sakhalin petroleum concessions question by Japan's relinquishment of its concession there. No protest was ever made during my tenure as ambassador against the maintenance of Japanese forces in Manchoukuo and Korea or along the Soviet border; and though border incidents were numerous during that time, they were very minor--involving only a few soldiers at a time--and no serious disputes ever developed from them. With removal of the long-standing sources of friction mentioned above, relations between the two countries during my tenure were good and bordering on the cordial, and no question was pending in August 1945 to suggest the possibility of an outbreak of war.

N. Sato (Seal)

Subscribed and sworn to before me, the undersigned authority, on this 13 May 1947, at Tokyo.

H. Yanai (Seal)

O A T H

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

N. Sato (Seal)

3 May 1947

Translation Certificate

I, Abe Fumio, of the Defense, hereby certify that I am conversant with the English and Japanese languages, and that the foregoing is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, a correct translation of the original document.

Abe Fumio

Tokyo  
14 May 1947

Def Doc No 1545  
1545

辯護第一五四五號左記訂正アリ度

正 誤 表

左 記

一、第二頁第六項第五行目

「限ラレテ居リ」ノ次ニ

「然ルニ英、米、日、諸國ハ三國間ニ限ラテ居リ」ヲ挿入

ニ、立會人 花井忠トアルヲ柳井恒夫ト訂正

FILE COPY  
RETURN TO ROOM 361