

五四 明治三十九年四月十日 蘭国駐劄三橋公使ヨリ
西園寺外務大臣宛（電報）

第二回萬国平和會議開催ニ関スル在蘭各国代表
ノ意見報告ノ件

Hague, April 11, 1906, 6:45 p.m.
Rec'd, April 12, 1906, 3:7 p.m.

Saionji,
Tokio.

No. 12.

Regarding second Peace Conference, I believe you have already received full particulars of Russian proposal, as I am assured that Russian Minister to Japan has been instructed by telegraph to communicate them to you. As the time is too short for proper consideration of the programme and indeed U. S. Government had already answered to Russian Government to that effect, whilst many Powers would not be inclined to simply refuse, on that account, the invitation of the Emperor of Russia, it is thought practical and desirable that the respective Governments should instruct their representatives at the Hague, assisted by one or two technical delegates, to meet here at the date of

invitation to discuss and elaborate full programme for the conference and then adjourn it till, say, May next year, so that respective Governments could give nature consideration to the programme and send full delegates to conclude discussion of the same next year. Above is personal opinion of a number of my colleagues. I asked Dutch Minister for Foreign Affairs concerning his attitude. He answered that inasmuch as Dutch Government simply placed the Hague and necessary accommodation at the disposal of the Conference in compliance with request of Russian Government, he did not feel inclined to express his opinion, though he thought Dutch Government would certainly have no objection to the suggested procedure, if it could be agreed to among the Powers concerned. Above in submitted for your consideration.

Mitsubashi.

五五 明治三十九年四月十二日

米国駐劄日置臨時代理公使ヨリ
西園寺外務大臣宛（電報）

第二回萬国平和會議開催期日延期報告ノ件

四月十二日 後三、三〇 華府発
四月十三日 東京着

西園寺外務大臣 日置代理公使

第三八号

平和會議開会ノ期日ハ当国政府ノ意見ニ依リ延期シタル旨露政府ヨリ回答アリ國務長官ハ多分十月初旬ニ開会セラルベシト云ヘリ

五六 明治三十九年五月九日 露国公使ヨリ
(四月二十六日) 西園寺外務大臣宛

第二回萬国平和會議議案通知ノ件

第二四三号

以書翰致啓上候陳者帝國政府カ第二回平和會議ノ招集ヲ發議シタルハ千八百九十九年ノ國際の大集會ノ事業ノ基礎トナリタル人道ノ諸原則ヲシテ新クニ一段ノ發展ヲ為サシムルノ必要ヲ感シタルニ依ル次第ニ有之候尙右計劃ニ係ル會議ノ事業ニ參加スヘキ國ノ數ハ出来得ル限り之ヲ増加セサルヘカラサルコトハ帝國政府ノ同時ニ信シタル次第ニ有之候而シテ人類全体ノ福祉ヲ目的トスル諸思想ノ応用ニ對ス

第三章 平和會議ノ議題及時期、各國ノ準備 五六

ル連帶責務ノ念カ現今如何ニ深ク人心ヲ支配シ如何ニ広ク世上ニ行ハル、カハ該會議ノ招集ニ對スル諸國ノ熱心ナル回答振ニ徴シテ之ヲ知り得ルコトニ有之候
第一回會議ハ同會議ノ事業カ各國ニ於ケル規則正シキ人文ノ進歩ト漸次ニ積マルヘキ經驗トニ依リテ後日完成セラルヘキコトヲ確信シ以テ閉会ヲ告ケ候処該會議ニ於ケル最重要ノ創設物タル國際仲裁々判所ハ業ニ已ニ其良績ヲ示シ一般福祉ノ為メニ全世界ノ尊敬ヲ博スル法学者ノ集會タルニ立到申候又國際審査委員ナルモノカ國家間ノ爭議ヲ解決スルニ付如何ニ有益ナルヤモ均シク吾人ノ知り得タル所ニ有之候

乍去國際紛争平和的處理條約中ニモ種々改正ヲ要スヘキモノ有之最近數個ノ仲裁々判ノ後裁判所ニ集合シタル法学者ニ於テ細目ニ関スル問題數種ヲ提起シタルコト有之候此等ノ点ニ関シ規定ヲ設ケ以テ該條約ノ為メニ必要ナル發達ヲ計ラサルヘカラサル次第ニ有之殊ニ訴訟手續上使用スヘキ國語ニ付一定ノ主義ヲ定ムルコトハ今後仲裁々判ヲ求ムル邦國ノ漸次増加スルニ從ヒ發生スヘキ困難ニ鑑ミ最モ希望スヘキコトト被考候尙國際審査委員ノ執務方法ニ関シテモ多少改良ヲ要スルモノ可有之ト被存候

陸戰ノ法規慣例ニ關スル規定ニ付テモ第一回平和會議ニ於テ定メラレタル條規ヲ増補シテ之ヲ正確ニシ以テ一切ノ誤解ヲ防クノ必要有之候海戰ニ關シテハ各國多少其法規慣例ヲ異ニスルモノ有之候ニ付交戰者ノ權利ト中立者ノ利益トヲ調和セシムヘキ一定ノ規則ヲ制定スルノ必要有之候之ニ關シテハ畢竟一個ノ條約ヲ議定スルコトヲ必要トスヘク此件ハ次回會議ノ事業中最モ顯著ナルモノノ一ナルヘシト被存候

以上ノ次第ニ有之候得者帝國政府ハ目下ノ処陸海軍備ノ制限ニ關スル問題ノ如キハ暫ク措テ問ハス單ニ最近數年ノ經驗ニ徴シテ最モ急務トスヘキ諸問題ノ研究ヲナスニ止ムルコト可然ト思考致候ニ付目下計劃ニ係ル會議ノ議案トシテ主要ナル左記ノ諸件ヲ提議致候

第一 國際紛争平和の處理條約中仲裁裁判所及國際審査委員ニ關スル條規改正ノ件

第二 陸戰ノ法規慣例ニ關スル千八百九十九年條約中ノ規定増補ノ件就中開戰、陸上ニ於ケル中立者ノ權利ニ關スルモノ

千八百九十九年ノ諸宣言ニ關スル件

右宣言中ノ一ハ消滅ニ歸シタルヲ以テ其更新ノ件

定メ及ヒ決議ニ對シ如何ナル形式ヲ与フヘキカ即チ決議中ノ數件ヲ採テ之ヲ新條約中ニ包含セシムルカ將タ追補トシテ之ヲ既存條約ニ附加スルカノ如キハ全ク右計劃ニ係ル會議ニ於テ自由ニ之ヲ決スヘキ儀ニ有之候

帝國政府ハ前記議案ヲ編成スルニ方リ出來得ル丈第一回平和會議ニ於テ表彰セラレタル諸希望就中中立者ノ權利義務、海上ニ於ケル交戰者ノ私有財産及港灣都市等ノ砲撃ニ關スル希望ヲ參酌致候而シテ右提出ノ諸件ノ全体ニ於テ文明世界全般ノ斷ヘス目的トスル國際的正義ナル高尚ノ理想ニ近接セントノ希望ヲ表彰スルモノナルコトハ日本帝國政府ニ於テ御洞察アランコトヲ欣然希望致候

本使ハ右ノ趣本國政府ノ命ニ依リ閣下ヘ御通知申上且右計劃ニ係ル會議ノ義ハ海牙府ニ於テ來ル七月(新曆)下半ヲ期シ開催セラレ得ヘク右ノ時期ハ和蘭國政府ニ於テモ最モ適当ト認ムル所ナル旨ヲ附言致候

右ニ對シ可成迅速カニ日本帝國政府ノ御回答相煩候様致度本使ハ茲ニ閣下ニ向テ敬意ヲ表シ候 敬具

千九百零六年五月九日(四月廿六日)東京ニ於テ

バクメテフ

第三 海軍力ヲ以テスル港、市、町、村ノ砲撃水雷ノ布設等ノ如キ海戰ニ特別ナル戰闘行為、商船ノ軍艦ニ変スルコト、海上ニ於ケル交戰者ノ私有財産、開戰後中立港又ハ敵港ヲ退去スル為メ商船ニ与フヘキ恩惠期間、海上ニ於ケル中立者ノ權利義務就中戰時禁制品ノ問題及中立港内ニ於テ交戰國艦船ノ遵守スヘキ制度及捕獲物トシテ差押ヘタル中立國商船ヲ不可抗力ノ為メニ破壊スルコトニ付海戰ノ法規慣例ニ關スル條約ヲ議定スル件

右議定セラルヘキ條約ニハ陸戰ニ關スル條規中海戰ニ応用セラレ得ヘキモノヲ採用スヘキコト

第四 千八百六十四年「ゼネヴァ」條約ノ原則ヲ海戰ニ応用スル千八百九十九年ノ條約ニ對スル増補ノ件

(千八百九十九年ノ會議ニ於ケルト同様ニ)右計劃ニ係ル會議ハ各國間政治上ノ關係又ハ條約ニ依リテ既定ノ事体ニ論及セサルヘキノミナラス各國政府ニ依リテ採用セラレタル議案ニ直接關係ナキ案件ニ一切論及シ得サルヘキハ言フ迄モ無キ義ニ有之候

各國ニ於テ前記議案ヲ承認シタリトスルモ會議ニ付セラレタル案件ノ解決ニ關シ各國ノ發表スルコトアルヘキ意見ヲ秋毫モ豫斷スルモノニアラサルコトハ帝國政府ニ於テ特ニ明言セントスル所ニ有之候尙討議ニ付スヘキ案件ノ順序ヲ

五七 明治三十九年五月九日 露國公使ヨリ
(四月廿六日) 西園寺外務大臣宛

第二回萬國平和會議開催ニ關シ國際紛争平和の處理條約ニ加盟方法ニ關シ帝國政府ノ意向照會ノ件

第二四四号

以書翰致啓上候陳者本使ハ左ノ件ニ付日本帝國政府ノ懇篤ナル御注意ヲ仰クヘキ旨本國政府ノ訓令ニ接シ候間第二回平和會議々案ノ件ニ關スル本日付拙簡ノ追加トシテ茲ニ申進候

目下ノ計劃ニ係ル會議ノ事業ニ參加スル様招請セラレタル諸國中ニ千八百九十九年ノ第一回會議ニ參加セサリシモノ有之候処夫ノ一般平和ノ為メニ有益ナル協商ニ加ハルヘキ國ノ數ヲ増加スルコトハ此種ノ人道の大会議力達セントスル高尚ナル目的ニ適合スルモノニ外ナラサル義ニ有之候乍去他ノ一方ニ於テ目下ノ場合單純且ツ無條件ニテ新加入國ヲ迎フルコトニ對シ單ニ形式上ノコトニ候得共一ノ困難ノ存スルコトヲ勘考セサルヘカラサル次第ニ有之候

帝國政府ニ於テハ次ノ會議ハ千八百九十九年ノ條規ヲ完成スル為メニ招集セラル可キモノト想像致候果シテ右ノ次第

ナリトセハ今回新タニ招集セラレタル諸国ニ於テハ先ツ海牙ノ三條約ニ加盟ノ手續ヲナスコト必要ニシテ此等ノ諸国ハ右ノ手續ヲ了シタル後ニ於テ始メテ右條規ノ増補又ハ變更ニ就キ他ノ諸国ト共同シテ討議ニ参加スヘキモノト被存候

然ルニ國際紛争平和的處理條約ニハ其第六十條ニ於テ新タニ全條約ニ加盟スルモノアル場合ニ関シ「萬国平和會議ニ賛同セサリシ諸国カ本條約ニ加盟シ得ヘキ條件ハ他日締盟國間ノ協商ニ依リテ之ヲ定ム」トノ規定有之候而シテ右ノ協商ナルモノハ未タ存在セサルニ依リ右加盟ノ手續ヲ定ムルニ付一ノ便法ヲ求ムルノ必要アルヘクト被存候ニ付帝國政府ハ第二回平和會議ヲ開クニ當リ第一回會議ニ賛同シタル諸国ノ各代表者ニ於テ先ツ左記議定書ニ調印センコトヲ提議致候

「國際紛争平和的處理ニ関スル千八百九十九年條約ノ記名國ヲ代表シテ第二回平和會議ニ出席セル各代表者ハ之カ為メ正式ニ委任ヲ受ケ以テ第一回平和會議ニ賛同セサリシ諸国ニシテ今回ノ會議ニ招集セラレタルモノカ該條約ニ加盟スルコトヲ和蘭國政府ニ通告スルトキハ右ノ諸国

五八 明治三十九年五月九日 露國公使ヨリ
(四月二十六日) 西園寺外務大臣宛

第二回萬国平和會議開催期日ニ関スル件

第二四五号

以書翰致啓上候陳者帝國政府ハ寔ニ第二回平和會議開催ノ時期ヲ七月ト相定候処右ハ好意ヲ以テ該會議ヲ招引シタル和蘭國政府ノ都合ニ依リ選定シタルマデニテ帝國政府ニ於テハ勿論該期日ヲ固執スル考ニテハ無カリシ次第ニ有之候然ルニ其後和蘭國政府ニ於テ該會議力他ノ期日ニ開催セラハモ敢テ異議無之將又右示定ノ期日ニテハ若干ノ國々ニ取り都合宜シカラサル趣ヲモ承知致候ニ付帝國政府ハ此等ノ諸国ト協議ヲ遂ケタル上ニテ該會議ノ開催ヲ賛同諸國政府全体ニ取り一層好都合ナル時期迄延引スル様可致覺悟ニ有之候

本使ハ右ノ趣ヲ本國政府ノ命ニ依リ閣下ヘ御通知ニ及ヒ且當國政府ハ該會議ガ九月下旬ニ開催セラハコトニハ同意ス可キ趣ナレトモ海牙ヨリ最モ遠隔ナル日本帝國政府ノ御都合ニ依リテハ該期日モ尙延期シ得ヘキモノナルコトヲ併テ玆ニ申添置候

本使ハ玆ニ閣下ニ向テ敬意ヲ表シ候 敬具

ハ直ニ該條約ニ加盟シタルモノト看做サルヘキコトヲ協定セリ」

若シ日本帝國政府並ニ第一回平和會議ニ賛同シ且ツ前記旨趣ノ通知ヲ受ケタル他ノ諸國政府ニ於テ右ノ方法ヲ採用スルコトニ同意ヲ表セラルヘニ於テハ帝國政府ハ早速其旨ヲ新タニ第二回平和會議ニ招集セラレタル諸國ニ通知可致候

國際紛争平和的處理條約第六十條ノ如キ規定ハ千八百九十九年ノ他ノ二條約中ニハ無之ニ付帝國政府ハ新タニ招集セラレタル諸國ニ對シ右ノ二條約ニ加盟スルコトヲ今ヨリ和蘭國政府ヘ通知スル様勸誘致置候

以上國際紛争平和的處理條約ニ新タニ加入スル諸國ノ加盟方法ニ関スル發意ニ付日本帝國政府ノ懇篤ナル御回答相煩度本使ハ玆ニ重テ閣下ニ向テ敬意ヲ表シ候 敬具

千九百六年五月九日(四月廿六日)東京ニ於テ

バクメテフ

千九百六年五月九日(四月二十六日)東京ニ於テ

バクメテフ

五九 明治三十九年五月十一日 蘭國駐劄三橋公使ヨリ
(西園寺外務大臣宛)

第二回萬国平和會議ニ関スル經費予算ヲ蘭國政府ヨリ同國議會ヘ提出ノ件

公信第二三三号

六月二十五日接受

第二回萬国平和會議當府ニ於テ開催ノ件ニ付テハ客歲以來追々及具報置候処蘭國政府ハ右會議ニ参列ノ各國代表者接待並同會議開催ニ要スル經費トシテ蘭貨七萬五千夫ノ高ヲ追加豫算トシテ本月八日第二議院ニ提出致候而テ該予算提出ノ理由トシテ蘭國外務大臣ノ説明スルトコロニ依レハ露國皇帝陛下ノ政府ハ蘭國政府ト協議ノ末本年七月下半月ヲ以テ第二回萬国平和會議ヲ海牙府ニ於テ開催スルノ件ヲ列國政府ニ提議シタリ尤同會議カ露國政府提議ノ時期ニ於テ開催セラルヘキヤ否ハ事未定ニ屬シ又タ果シテ本年中心ニ開會ノ運ニ至ルヘキヤ否ヤモ今日之ヲ明言スル能ハスト雖モ政府ハ豫メ之カ為メ必要ナル經費ヲ準備シ何時開會ヲ見

ルモ差支ナカラシコトヲ期ス是千九百六年度經費豫算外務省ノ款ニ七萬五千夫ノ高ヲ追加スルノ案ヲ提出スル所以ナリ右ハ千八百九十九年第一回萬國平和會議開催ノ節同年度豫算ニ追加ヲ為シタル例ニ倣ヒ之ト同一ノ金額ヲ概算シタルモノニシテ其實際支出ヲ要スル金額ハ本豫算ニ比シ増減アルベシト雖モ政府ハ列國代表者ニ満足ナル接待ヲ為シ得ル限り充分本經費ノ節約ヲ努ムヘシ云々ニ有之候而テ平和會議ヲ當府ニ於テ開催スルノ儀ハ當國朝野一般ノ大ニ歡迎スル処ニ有之候間本豫算ノ如キハ兩院共無異議可決可相成ト存候

右及具報候 敬具

明治三十九年五月十一日

在蘭 特命全權公使 三橋 信方(印)

外務大臣侯爵 西園寺公望殿

六〇 明治三十九年五月十五日

伊國駐劄大山公使ヨリ
外務大臣宛

伊國外務大臣ノ萬國軍備制限ニ關スル議會演説ノ件

任者ノ放言壯語以テ其交情ヲ疎遠セシメントセル狡策ヲ水泡ニ帰セシメタリト云ヘリ予ハ右外相ノ言ノ如ク伊國ノ對外政策ハ議會及國民ノ多數ガ信任ヲ表セル方針ニ準拠シ無責任者ノ言動ニ左右セラル、ヲ許サズ英國ノ萬國軍備縮少ノ提議ガ具體的ニ各國ニ採用セラル、迄ハ如上ノ外交方針コソ歐洲平和ノ保障タルベキ最良方法ナリト

右及報告候 敬具

明治三十九年五月十五日

在伊 特命全權公使 大山 綱介(印)

外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

六一 明治三十九年六月九日

林外務大臣ヨリ
西園寺總理大臣宛

第二回萬國平和會議議題開會期日及國際紛爭平和的處理條約加盟方法ニ關スル露國政府ノ題案ニ付請議ノ件並ニ決裁

明治卅九年六月九日附

西園寺總理大臣宛

林外務大臣

機密送第四九号

公第四九号

七月二十五日接受

本月十四日伊國下院ノ一議員ハ外務大臣ニ對シ「過般英國下院ニ於テ議決シタルヘーグ次回ノ平和會議ニ提出スベキ萬國軍備制限案ハ英政府之ニ同意シタリ伊國政府ハ之ニ對シ如何ナル考察ヲ有スルカ」ノ質問ヲナシ外務大臣ハ之ニ對シ答ヘテ曰ク「予ハ英國下院ガ該議案ヲ議了セル當時駐英大使トシテ倫敦ニアリテ英外相ガ該議決ニ對スル答弁ニ付滿腔ノ同情ヲ表シタリキ而シテ右ニ關シ予ハ在外公使トシテ我政府ニ向ヒ注意ヲ促ガシ置キタルガ今ヤ予ハ外相トシテ政府ノ名ヲ以テ右萬國軍備制限ニ同意ヲ表ス予ハ一面ニハ平和ヲ名トシテ現時各國ガ軍備擴張ニ熱中セルニ拘ラズ頻ニ軍備縮少說ヲ主張セル者ニ反對スルト同時ニ各強國合同一致ノ軍備縮少ニ對スル提議ニ贊同スルヲ憚ラズ平和ハ實ニ伊政府ガ年来希望セル処ナルガ故ニ政府ハ該平和會議ニ出席スベキ委員ニ訓令シ英政府ノ提議ニ贊同セシムベシ左レトモ各國一致ノ下ニ軍備ヲ縮少シ平和ヲ図ルベキ形式ヲ発見スル事極メテ困難ナルベキヲ知ルガ故ニ予ハ現時ニ於ケル各國政治家カ國交艱難ノ危機ニ処シ調和ト交談ノ精神ヲ以テ之ニ當リ平和ヲ維持スヘキヲ望ミ且ツ信ズ塙外相ハ頃日伊國ノ關係ヲ述ベ兩國間ノ忠實ナル交情ハ無責

第二回萬國平和會議ニ關スル件

和蘭國海牙府ニ於テ第二回萬國平和會議開催ノ義ニ關シ本邦駐劄仏國公使ヨリ照會ノ件ニ付テハ義ニ關議決定ノ上帝國政府ニ於テ贊同承諾ノ旨ヲ回答シ同時ニ該會議ノ時期及議案ニ關シテハ帝國政府ニ於テ更ニ意見ヲ提出スルノ權利ヲ留保スル旨ヲ申入置候処今回本邦駐劄露國公使ヨリ本國政府ノ命ニ依リ該會議ノ議案及時期並ニ國際紛爭平和的處理ニ關スル條約加盟ノ方法ニ關シ別紙原訳文甲乙丙号ノ通照會有之候ニ付テハ該會議議案ノ義ニ關シテハ前キニ閣議決定ノ通帝國政府ニ於テ更ニ意見ヲ提出スルノ權利ヲ留保スル旨ヲ回答致度會議ノ時期ニ至テハ之ヲ本年九月ニ開催スルコト實際不可能ナルノミナラス各國モ亦其延期ヲ希望シ居ルコト明瞭ナル次第ニ付帝國政府ニ於テハ明年四五月ノ交ヲ以テ該會議ノ開設アランコトヲ希望スル旨ヲ回答シ又國際紛爭平和的處理條約加盟ノ件ニ關シテハ加盟國ハ加盟後周旋及居中調停ニ關シ特別ノ地位ヲ有スルニ至ルノミナラス仲裁々判所裁判官指定ノ權等ヲモ有スルコト、相成國際上重大ナル關係ヲ生スル次第ニ有之候ニ付露國提案ノ如ク或ル國力單ニ露國ヨリ第二回平和會議ニ招請セラレタリトノ事由ヲ以テ原締約國ノ同意ヲ得ス蘭國政府ニ對シ

一片ノ通知ヲナスニヨリ直チニ該條約ニ加盟シ得ルコトノ
ナスハ適當ニアラスト相認候間右ノ趣旨ヲ以テ露国政府ノ
提議ニ同意致難キ旨回答スル様致度右至急閣議ヲ請候也

註 別紙省略

(右決裁)

内閣批第一四号

明治三十九年六月九日機密送第四九号

第二回萬国平和會議ノ議案及時期並國際紛争平和的处理ニ
関スル條約加盟ノ方法ニ関スル在本邦露国公使ノ照会ニ対
スル回答ノ件請議ノ通

明治三十九年六月十八日

内閣総理大臣侯爵 西園寺公望(印)

六二 明治三十九年六月十三日

林外務大臣ヨリ
露国公使宛

韓国ヲ第二回萬国平和會議ニ参列セシメサル儀ニ関
シ在本邦露国公使ノ回答ノ件

His Excellency Mous. Bokhmeteff, the Russian
Minister at Tokyo, &c., &c., &c.

六三 明治三十九年六月十五日

林外務大臣ヨリ
露国駐劄本野公使宛(電報)

韓国ヲ第二回萬国平和會議ニ参列セシメサル儀
ニ関スル在本邦露国公使ノ回答要旨通知ノ件

Motono,

Petersburg.

No. 49. In reply to a verbal inquiry adressed to me
by the Russian Minister to Japan whether the Japan-
ese Government would accept for Corea an invitation
to take part in the proposed second Conference of the
Hague. I sent him a note verbal June 13th substan-
tially as follows.

The Imperial Government would feel obliged to
decline for Corea the invitation in question, believing
that participation by Corea in the work of the Con-
ference would give rise to serious misconceptions.
Each of the Powers represented at the first Hague
Conference occupied, so far as foreign relations were
concerned, an independent status, and it is assumed
that the states to be invited to participate in the new
meeting at the Hague will have the same standing.
In consequence of the international position occupied
by Corea, she is unable at this time to claim for her-

The Minister for Foreign Affairs, replying to the
verbal inquiry adressed to him by His Excellency
the Russian Minister under instructions from his Go-
vernment, has the honor to say that the Imperial
Government would feel obliged to decline for Corea
an invitation to take part in the proposed second
Conference of the Hague, believing that participation
by Corea in the work of that Assembly would give
rise to serious misconceptions.

Each of the Powers represented at the first Hague
Conference occupied, so far at least as foreign rela-
tions were concerned, an independent status, and it is
assumed that the States to be invited to participate
in the new Meeting at the Hague will have the same
standing. In consequence of the international position
occupied by Corea, she is unable at this time to claim
for herself any of the rights or to fulfill any of the
obligations which would be implied by representation
at the proposed Conference.

self any of the rights or to fulfill any of the obli-
gations which would be implied by representation at the
proposed conference. The above for your information.

Hayashi.

Transmit 六公使

Sent June 15th 1906, 10-10 p.m.

六四 明治三十九年六月二十五日

林外務大臣ヨリ
露国公使宛

第二回萬国平和會議開催期日ニ関シ我方ノ意向
通知ノ件

明治卅九年六月廿五日

送第六八号

在本邦 露国公使宛

林 大 臣

第二回萬国平和會議ニ関スル件回答

以書翰致啓上候陳者第二回萬国平和會議開催ノ時期ニ付客
月九日付第二四五号貴翰ヲ以テ御申趣ノ趣致敬承候然ルニ
本年九月ニ於テ該會議ヲ開催致候義ハ目下ノ所到底実行致
難ク被存候付テハ帝國政府ニ於テハ今暫ラク之ヲ延期シ明

年四五月ノ交ヲ以テ該會議ヲ開催セラレ候ハ、最モ好都合ニ可有之哉ニ相認候間右様御承知相成度此段回答旁本大臣ハ茲ニ重テ閣下ニ向テ敬意ヲ表シ候 敬具

六五 明治三十九年六月二十五日 林外務大臣ヨリ 露国公使宛

第二回萬国平和會議議題ニ付テ之ヲ提出スルノ
權利ヲ留保スル回答通知ノ件

明治卅九年六月廿五日
送第六九号

在本邦 露国公使宛 林 大臣

第二回萬国平和會議ニ関スル件回答

以書翰致啓上候陳者第二回萬国平和會議ノ件ニ関シ客月九日付第二四三号貴翰ヲ以テ御申越ノ趣致敬承候帝國政府ニ於テハ該會議ノ開催ニ対シ全然同意ヲ表スル次第ニ付欣然之ニ參同可致コトハ曩ニ在本邦公使へ及回答置候通ニ有之候処該會議々案ニ関シテハ更ニ充分ノ攻究ヲ遂ケタルヒニテ何等意見ヲ提出スルノ權利ヲ留保致置度候間右様御

テ御同意致兼候ニ付右様御承知相成度此段回答旁本大臣ハ茲ニ重テ閣下ニ向テ敬意ヲ表シ候 敬具

六七 明治三十九年十月九日 露国公使ヨリ 林外務大臣宛

第二回萬国平和會議開催ニ関シ日本ノ回答ニ対
シ照覆ノ件

一千九百〇六年十月九日

ジョージ、バクメテフ

外務大臣子爵 林 董閣下

第七〇八号

海牙會議ニ関スル本年六月二十五日付第七〇号貴翰ノ趣ハ本使ヨリ之ヲ聖彼得堡ヘ伝達致候本件ニ関シ本使ハ茲ニ若干ノ増補の説明ヲ閣下ニ提示スルノ光榮ヲ有シ候而シテ前記貴翰ニ開陳セラレタル日本帝國政府ノ御見解ハ該説明ニ依リテ之ヲ變更セラルヘキハ本使ノ疑ヲ容レサル所ニ有之候

第二回平和會議開催ガ明春マテ延期セラレタルコトハ既ニ閣下ニ於テ御承知ノ通ニシテ右ハ六月二十五日付第六八号

第三章 平和會議ノ議題及時期、各國ノ準備 六七

承知相成度此段回答旁本大臣ハ茲ニ重テ閣下ニ向テ敬意ヲ表シ候 敬具

六六 明治三十九年六月二十五日 林外務大臣ヨリ 露国公使宛

國際紛争平和的處理條約ニ加盟方法ニ関スル回
答通知ノ件

明治卅九年六月廿五日
送第七〇号

在本邦 露国公使宛 林 大臣

第二回萬国平和會議ニ関スル件回答

以書翰致啓上候陳者國際紛争平和的處理條約加盟ノ件ニ関シ客月九日付第二四四号貴翰ヲ以テ御申越ノ趣致敬承候然ルニ新タニ該條約ニ加盟スル諸国ハ加盟後周旋及居中調停ニ関シ特別ノ地位ヲ有スルニ至リ候ノミナラス仲裁々判所裁判官指定ノ權等モ亦之ヲ有スルコト、ナリ國際上重大ナル關係ヲ生スル次第ニ有之候ニ付貴國政府御提案ノ如ク原締約國ノ同意ヲ得ス蘭國政府ニ対シ通知ヲナスニヨリ直チニ該條約ニ加盟シ得ルコトトナス義ハ乍遺憾帝國政府ニ於

貴翰所載ノ御希望ニ合ヘル義ニ有之候

右ニ付テハ關係諸國ノ間ニ同會議々案ヲ遲滞ナク決定スルコトヲ必要ト被存候右諸國（總テノ大國ハ此内ニ含マレ居レリ）ハ露國政府ヨリノ提案ヲ全然採用致候モ日本政府ニシテ何等變更ヲ提議スルノ希望ヲ有セラル、ニ於テハ可成速ニ之ヲ通告セラル、ヲ要スル義ト被存候是レ斯ル變更ハ豫メ他諸國ノ考量ニ供スルヲ要スルガ故ニ有之候從來充分ニ意義貫徹シ居ラサリシ如ク思料セラル、左記ノ点ニ関シ本使ハ閣下ノ御注意ヲ喚起セサルヲ不得候即チ貴翰中閣下ハ

「原締約國ノ同意ヲ得ズ蘭國政府ニ対シ通知ヲナスニ依リ直チニ該條約ニ加盟シ得ルコト、ナス義ハ乍遺憾帝國政府ニ於テ御同意致兼候」

ト御陳述相成候義ニ関シ本使ハ左ノ如ク閣下ヘ説明スヘキ旨訓令セラレ候

新タニ第二回平和會議ニ招待セラレントスル諸國即チ議案確定次第蘭國政府ヨリノ公然ノ招待ヲ受クヘキ諸國ガ第一回會議ノ結果タル條約ニ加盟スルコトニ対シ第一回會議ニ参与シタル諸國ノ豫諾ヲ求ムルコトハ正ニ露國政府公文ノ目的トスル所ナリキ而シテ會議ニ参与スルコトヲ既ニ拒絕

シタル諸国並ニ何等理由ニ依リ之ニ参与スルノ見込ナキ諸国ニ対シテハ右公然ノ招待ヲナサザルヘキハ勿論ニ有之候從テ露国ノ提議ニ係ル議定書ノ調印ニ対スル日本政府ノ拒絕ハ第一回會議ニ参与セザリシモ第二回ニ招待セラレムトスル南米諸共和国ノ加盟ニノミ其影響ヲ及ボスヘキモノニ候是レ韓國、「バナマ」及ヒ「アビシニア」諸国ハ既ニ他ノ理由ニ依リ問題外タルガ故ニ有之候
新タニ加盟スル諸国ガ常置仲裁裁判官ヲ指定スルノ権ニ關シ日本政府ノ豫想セラル、難点ハ露国政府ニ於テハ毫モ之ヲ豫想スル能ハサルニ付右難点ハ果シテ如何ナル意義ニ於テ存在シ得ヘキヤヲ閣下ニ質問スヘキ旨露国外務省ヨリ本使へ訓令セラレ候
日本帝國政府ハ全文明世界ノ為メ斯ク貴重ナル事業ヲ阻礙シ以テ総テノ大国トノ提携ヲ辞セント欲セラル、ニハ非ズ反テ露国政府ヲシテ該國際大會議ノ準備ヲ進行スルヲ得セシムル様遲滞ナク回答ヲ与ヘラルベキハ露西亞帝國政府ノ確信スル所ニ有之候
終ニ臨ミ本使ハ重テ閣下ニ対シ敬意ヲ表シ候

六九 明治三十九年十月十六日 林外務大臣ヨリ
米國駐劄青木大使宛（電報）

第二回萬國平和會議ニ關スル露国ノ回答要旨通
知並任国政府ノ回答振問合ニ付在英埃伊大公使
ノ電方訓令ノ件

Aoki,

Washington.

No. 106. In reference to the proposed peace conference. In May last the Foreign Office received three Notes from the Russian Minister. First Note contained programme of second Conference as proposed by Russia. Second suggested conclusion by Powers signatory to Hague Arbitration Convention of a Protocol allowing Powers not represented at first Conference but invited to second Conference by Russia to adhere to said Convention by giving notice to the Netherlands Government and Third dealt with question of date of meeting of conference. Replies to the following effect were made to those Notes.

1. The Japanese Government would carefully study the programme before expressing any opinion regarding it.

2. The Japanese Government regretted that they

六八 明治三十九年十月十二日

蘭國駐劄龜山臨時代理公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

蘭國政府ヨリ同國議會へ提出セル第二回萬國平和會議ニ關スル經費豫算撤回ノ件

公信第五十一号

十一月十三日接受

曩ニ第二回萬國平和會議ニ要スル經費トシテ七万五千夫ノ追加豫算ヲ蘭國政府ヨリ第二議院ニ提出セル儀ニ關シテハ去ル五月十一日付公信第二十三号ヲ以テ及具報置候処本月五日外務大臣ヨリ右追加豫算撤回ノ旨第二議院へ通牒有之候右ニ就キ右ハ第二回萬國平和會議力無期限ニ延期セラレタルカ故ナリトノ風説伝ハリ候へ共是一種ノ臆説ニ過キスシテ政府力右ノ举措ニ出テタルハ本年内ニ萬國平和會議ノ開催ナキ事確定シ本年度ニ対シ追加豫算ノ必要ナキニ至リシカ故ニ有之從テ將來萬國平和會議開催ノ時日トハ何等ノ關係ナキ義ニ有之候
右及具報候 敬具

明治三十九年十月十一日

在蘭 臨時代理公使 龜山松次郎（印）

外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

were unable to consent to adhesion to Arbitration Convention of non-signatory Powers in the manner proposed by Russia, because Powers thus permitted at this time to adhere would not only be placed in special position as to good offices and mediation but would be invested with right to name members of Permanent Court of Arbitration.

3. I suggested that the meeting of the Conference be adjourned until April or May next. I have just received another Note from the Russian Minister urging the Japanese Government to make an early reply regarding the programme and saying that a majority of the interested Powers had adopted entirely the programme proposed by Russia. The Russian Minister also states in said Note that the refusal of the Japanese Government to sign the proposed Protocol would only have influence upon the adhesion of the South American Republics which not having been represented at the first Conference are to be invited to the second Conference. He adds that Corea, Panama and Abyssinia are out of question for other reasons and he asks what difficulties Japan foresees in admitting the right of adhering Powers to designate members of the

Permanent Court of Arbitration. You are instructed to communicate confidentially the substance of the foregoing to the Government to which you are accredited and ask the Minister for Foreign Affairs what action his Government has taken respecting the programme and the proposed Protocol. You are authorized to state that the Japanese Government have no objection whatever to the proposed adhesion of the South American Republics.

Transmit the above to our Ambassador in London as my instructions, adding that he is to transmit the same to Charges d'Affaires at Rome and Vienna as my instructions.

Hayashi.

Sent Oct. 16, 1906, 3-5 p.m.



40 明治三十九年十月二十日 米国外務大臣宛（電報）
林外務大臣宛（電報）

第二回萬国平和會議開催ニ関シ露国政府ノ提案
ニ対スル帝國政府回答ニツキ疑義問合セノ件

Washington, Oct.——
Rd. Tokio, Oct. 21st. 1906. 2.00 p.m.

Hayashi,
Tokio.

No. 88. Your telegram 106 has been transmitted to our Ambassador in London, but before conferring Secretary of State I wish to be instructed for my own guidance whether, practically speaking, the object of your answer to Russian second Note is to exclude any possibility of Corea's becoming, by adhesion, member of the Hague Convention. Furthermore, whether your objection is based on the ground that conclusion of protocol in the sense suggested by Russia will enable her to create complicated situation by issuing invitation to States having no international status.

Aoki.



41 明治三十九年十月二十日 米国外務大臣宛（電報）
米国外務大臣宛（電報）

第二回萬国平和會議開催ニ関スル露国ヘノ回答
ニツキ疑義問合セニ対スル回答ノ件

Aoki,

Washington.

No. 107. In reference to your telegram No. 88. Your two questions are answered in the affirmative. It is hoped that you will confer with Secretary of State as soon as possible.

Hayashi.

Sent Oct. 23, 1906. 3-30 p.m.



42 明治三十九年十月二十四日 米国外務大臣宛（電報）
使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛（電報）

第二回萬国平和會議ニ関スル露国政府ノ提案ニ
対シ任国政府ノ回答振リ答申ノ件

十月二十四日 後七、二二五 維納諾
二十五日 後二、二二五 本省着

林 大臣 西 代理公使

第六〇号

在英大使ヨリ転電貴電第一〇六号第二平和會議ニ付露国ト
ノ交渉ニ関スル件ノ本日（廿四日）埃匈帝国外務次官ニ面

会ノ上電訓ノ趣ヲ申入レシニ同国政府ハ追テ取調ノ上回答
ニ及ブベキ旨ヲ答ヘタリ



43 明治三十九年十月二十四日 伊国駐劄日下部臨時代
理公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛（電報）

第二回萬国平和會議ニ関スル露国政府ノ提案ニ対シ
任国政府ノ回答振答申ノ件（一）

Rome, Oct. 24, 1906, 3:50 p.m.
Rec'd, Oct. 25, 1906, 1:25 p.m.

Hayashi,
Tokio.

No. 35.

In accordance with your instructions transmitted by Zaipei Taishi, I saw Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs October 19th. He told me that, since his return to Foreign Office, he had never entered into any communication with Russian Government, but that he will look into correspondence that took place during the former Ministry and let me know in the course of a few days. Then I saw Vice Minister for Foreign

Affairs who said that he and Italian Ambassador to France were appointed as the Italian Plenipotentiaries to the Second Conference when it was proposed by Russian Government. I called on Secretary-General Oct. 23rd. He was just engaged in drafting answer to me. He showed me all communications in that matter and said that his Government has committed itself already by answering Russia accepting programme in its entirety as well as Protocol, but made no answer as to the date on which Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs verbally replied to Russian Ambassador to Italy. He added, showing me list sent by Russia, that Abyssinia is among those accepted invitation to Second Conference, Panama being only country declined and Corea is among those that have not yet answered. Having already invited these three countries, Russia says now that they are out of question. He did not understand what Russia really means.

Kusakabe.

スルコト故同會議ニ對スル行動ニ就テハ貴我充分研究シ意見ヲ交換スベシ杯懇話有之

其後外務大臣ヨリ何等ノ返事無之候ニ依リ小官ハ私書ヲ書記官長代理ニ裁シ其發送方ヲ促シ置キ候処直ニ返事アリテ未タ何等大臣ヨリノ命ニ接セス然シ直ニ面会シ速ニ貴意ニ応スベシトノ事ニ有之候仍テ昨廿三日午後書記官長代理ヲ尋ネ候処同氏ハ返翰起草中ニ有之伊露間ノ往復文書ノ印刷物杯ヲ示シ之ヲ読上テ杯致シ伊國ハ何等ノ異議ナク全然露國ノ提案及議定書訂結ノ件ヲモ承諾シタル次第ニテ已ニ伊國ノ態度一定シ今更貴邦ト同一ノ態度ヲ取ル能ハサルハ遺憾ナリ杯ノ挨拶アリテ猶露國ヨリ送付セル國名表ニ依レバアビシニヤハ第二回ノ案内ヲ承諾シタル國ノ内ニ記入セラレ居リバナマハ案内ヲ断リタル唯一ノ國ニシテ朝鮮ハ未タ何等ノ回答ヲ為サザル數ヶ國ノ一トナリ居レリ然ルニ露國力是等ノ三國ニ對シ已ニ案内狀ヲ發シタル今日ニ於テ他ノ理由云々ヲ以テ此三國ハ問題外ナリト云フハ如何ナル意味ナルヤ了解ニ苦シム云々相話シ有之候

小官ハ伊國力露國ニ發シタル回答ノ写ヲ貰フ詎ニハ不參ヤト相尋ネ候処同官ハ自分ノ一慮見ニハ不參然シ返翰中ニ可

七四 明治三十九年十月十四日

伊國駐劄日下部臨時代理公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

第二回萬國平和會議ニ關スル露國政府ノ提案並ニ右ニ對スル任國政府ノ回答振答申ノ件 (二)

機密第拾貳号

十二月十日接受

第二平和會議ニ關スル件

第二平和會議ニ關シテハ本日御電報申進候次第ニ有之候処其後未ダ外務大臣ヨリノ機密覺書接到不致候ヘ共大体ニ於テ右電報ノ通ニ可有之ト信シ候

當國外務次官嘗テ初回ノ會議ニ伊國ノ委員トシテ參列シタルハ閣下ニ於テモ御承知ノ通りニ有之候処第二回ノ會議ニモ又委員ニ任命セラレ駐仏伊大使トルニエリ伯ト共ニ出席スルコト成リ居ルモ内閣麥動ハ目下欧州ノ流行病ナレバ來年トナリテ果シテ自分力依然任命セラレ居ル訳ナルヤ覺束ナク又平和會議ノ果シテ成立スルヤハ尤測知スベカラズ元來平和會議ノ後ニハ常ニ戰爭ヲ見ルコト故寧ロ忌ムヘキ會議ナリ杯談笑致居候

小官ハ露國ノ提案等ニ就テ氏ノ意見ヲ尋ネシニ未タ其提案ナルモノヲ見タル事ナシトノ返事ニ有之候猶次官ハ仮令第二回ノ會議成立スルコトナルモ夫迄ニハ充分ノ時日ヲ存

成其全部ヲ記載スル様ニス可シトノ事ニ有之右ニテ相分レ申候

目下當府ニ独逸外務大臣來遊中ニテ外務大臣チトニー氏ハ日夜來訪頻繁ヲ極メ居リ從ツテ覺書添附モ遲延致ス事ト被察候故不取敢今朝電報差進候次第ニ御坐候
此段及具報候 敬具

明治三十九年十月廿四日

在伊 臨時代理公使 日下部三九郎 (印)

外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

七五 明治三十九年十月十五日

伊國駐劄日下部臨時代理公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛 (電報)

第二回萬國平和會議ニ關スル露國政府ノ提案ニ對シ任國政府ノ回答振回申ノ件 (三)

Rome, October 25, 1906, 2 p.m.
Recd. " 26, " 2:25 p.m.Gaimudajin,
Tokio.

No. 36. Just received note from Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs, substantially as follows:

Italian Government has also received three notes from Russia and answered April 12th,

(1) that adhesion of Italian Government to the program drawn by Russian Government has already in principle been accorded (having) made a reserve as regards possible suggestion that the Ministers of War and of Navy might consider themselves to be obliged to propose concerning matters of their respective competence;

(2) that Italian Government shared in every point opinion of Russian Government whether it concerns opportuneness of considering as granted the adhesion of those states invited to Second but which took no part in the First of the program to be followed in order to attain this result.

Kusakabe.

七六 明治三十九年十月二十六日

米國駐劄青木大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛（電報）

第二回萬國平和會議ニ関スル露國政府ノ提案ニ
對シ任國政府ノ回答振回申ノ件

七七 明治三十九年十月二十六日

英國駐劄小村大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛（電報）

第二回萬國平和會議ニ関スル露國政府ノ提案ニ
對シ任國政府ノ回答振回申ノ件

London,

Recd., Oct. 26 1906 10-20 a.m.

Hayashi,

Tokio.

No. 97. In reference to your telegram No. 106, I communicated its purport to the Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs October 24th. He gave me a copy of confidential note sent to Russian Ambassador to Great Britain by the Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs under date July 25th, in response to the Ambassador's note stating inability of the Russian Government to fix date for the meeting of the peace conference until all the great Powers have signified their consent to programme of subjects proposed for deliberation at conference. Substance of note is as follows:

"British Government conclude that Russia does not intend to exclude the question of international limitation or reduction of armament from the subjects to

1111

Washington,——

Rd. Tokio, Oct. 26th 1906. 5.10 p.m.

Hayashi,

Tokio.

No. 90. In reference to your telegram 106. On hearing my statement 25th October, Mr. Root said he thoroughly understood significance of Japan's objection which he thought natural, but thought proper course for Japan would be to communicate explicitly reasons of her objection to Russia. He gave me an impression without saying so directly that he thought second peace conference would not lead to important results, even if it should meet at all, which was doubtful. He said that as United States had no question similar to that of Corea it did not occur to her to make any comments on protocol proposed by Russia. As regards programme he dismissed subject by telling me that the last thing he heard from Baron Rosen was that no word had come from St. Petersburg. Such being general attitude, I thought it better to pass over to the next subject of conversation, but if desired I can ask him again for more positive answer.

Aoki.

be discussed at conference, which (while?) she wishes to guard herself against the conclusion that she is committed to such a discussion. Understanding language of the Russian Government in the above sense, British Government desire that the question of reduction of armament should be included in the deliberation of conference. Further British Government consider that subjects enumerated in programme may, as the whole, be freely discussed with advantage. In accepting, however, programme as a basis for discussion, British Government think it advisable to reserve generally right to abstain from partaking in the discussion of any of the subjects contained in the programme, if the discussion should take a form unlikely, in their opinion, to lead to any useful issue. British Government note with satisfaction that the programme proposed by Russia is of comprehensive nature, but they think that list of subjects mentioned under the third heading as desirable to be included in a convention, regarding the laws and customs of maritime warfare, is not exhaustive enough, and they therefore reserve right to suggest for discussion at a later state and within a reasonable time before date eventually

fixed for meeting of the conference other kindred subjects not at present mentioned in the list".

Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs further told me that the British Government have already signified their approval of the proposed protocol.

Komura.

七八 明治三十九年十二月八日

奥国駐劄西代理公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議ニ関スル露国政府ノ提案ニ
対シ任国政府ノ回答振申ノ件

十一月八日 後二、三〇 維也納發
九日 前八、四〇 本省着

林外務大臣

在奥 西臨時代理公使

第七〇号

第二平和會議ノ件ニ付当国政府ノ意見ヲ確カムルコトニ関
シ往電第六〇号ヲ以テ及報告置シ後未タ当国政府ヨリ右ニ
対シ何等回答ニ接セサルニヨリ十一月七日外務大臣旅行中
ニ付代理次官ニ面会シ回答振ヲ問合ヘヤシニ奥国政府ノ

In reply to the note from the Russian Minister to Japan, mentioned in my telegram No. 106 in continuation of the subject of the proposed Second Peace Conference, I sent him a note dated November 10th substantially as follows:—

Touching the question of the conclusion, by powers signatory to Hague Arbitration Convention, of Protocol allowing Powers not represented at the First Conference but invited to the Second, to adhere to the said Convention, the Imperial Government infer from the Russian note that in addition to the Powers represented at the last conference, only the South American Republics are to be invited to take part in the forthcoming meeting. If that inference is correct, the Imperial Government, upon being assured that the invitations to the proposed new Conference are limited and to be limited as above indicated, will withdraw their objection to the proposed protocol and signify their approval of the same.

In reference to the programme of the Conference, as outlined in the Russian note of May 4th the Imperial Government accept that project in principle as a basis of discussion. The programme as it stands

數々月前露国政府ヨリ帝国政府へ提議セシト同様ノ議案ヲ
領收セシ際同政府ハ第二平和會議ノプログラムハ大体ニ於
テ異議ナシ但其内容ニ関スル詳細ノ事項ハ追テ調査ノ上回
答ヲナスコトヲ留保シ置ケリ又プロトコルニ関シテハ別ニ
異議ナキ旨並ニ開会ノ時期ハ明年春頃ヲ賛成スル旨ヲモ併
セテ回答セシ趣同次官ハ答ヘリ又同次官ハ奥国政府ハ既
ニ来年度豫算ニ東京大使館設立ニ関スル經費ヲ編入シ十二
月初旬ニ開会スヘキ帝国共同豫算会ニ提出スヘキ手筈トナ
リ且充分通過ノ見込アル旨ヲ内話セリ右御参考迄

七九 明治三十九年十二月九日

林外務大臣ヨリ
米国駐劄青木大使宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議ニ関スル露国政府ノ回答
覺書要旨通知並右在欧大公使へ転電方訓令ノ件

Sent, Nov. 9, 1906, 5.20 p.m.

Aoki,

Washington.

No. 121.

embraces many important points, respecting which widely varying views are entertained and equally divergent practices prevail. The Imperial Government hope that it may be found possible to discuss freely and to resolve satisfactorily all conflicting issues. At the same time they are unable to conceal from themselves the possibility that deliberations may, in some respects, take an undesirable course and in order to be able to contribute the weight of their influence to prevent such a conjuncture, they reserve the right abstain or withdraw from any discussion which takes or promises to take a direction not likely to lead to any useful result. On the other hand while the Imperial Government fully recognize the extensive character of the programme elaborated by the Russian Government, they nevertheless believe that some questions which are not specifically enumerated in the programme, but which have of late been brought to prominence especially respecting the rights and duties of neutrals or correlatively the duties and rights of belligerents, might with advantage be included among the subjects to be examined. In this conviction the Imperial Government, in the interest of a more com-

plete international understanding, reserve the right to suggest thereafter but within a reasonable time before the meeting of the Conference other cognate subjects which in their opinion equally call for adjustment.

The above for your own information. Transmit Zai-Teishi, adding that he is to transmit by mail this telegram to Zai-Futsu, Doku, Oh, I, Ro Taishi Koshi and my telegram No. 106 to Zai-Futsu, Doku Taishi Zairo-Koshi simply for their own information.

Hayashi.

ハ〇 明治三十九年十一月十日 林外務大臣ヨリ
露国公使宛

第二回萬国平和會議議題並ニ國際紛争平和的處理條約加盟方法ニ関スル露国政府提案ニ対シ回答ノ件

明治卅九年十一月十日發遣
送第一二五号

在本邦 露国公使 林 大臣
第二回平和會議参同ノ件

ラレ且ツ満足ニ解決セラル、ヲ得ムコトヲ切望スルモノニ有之候得共同時ニ或關係ニ於テ討議ガ望マシカラザル傾向ヲ取ル場合ノアリ得ヘキコトヲモ認メサルヲ得ズ候帝國政府ハ斯ル場合ニ立至ルコトヲ豫防スルノ目的ヲ以テ臨機其勢力ヲ用キルヲ得ムガ為メ何等討議ガ毫モ有益ノ結果ヲ奏セシメザルガ如キ傾向ヲ取リ又ハ取ラントスルコトヲ帝國政府ニ於テ認メタルトキハ帝國政府ハ該討議ニ参加セズ又ハ中途ヨリ参加ヲ辞スルノ權ヲ留保致候尙ホ帝國政府ハ露西亞帝國政府ノ調製ニ係ル議案ガ広汎ナル性質ヲ具備セルコトヲ全然認識スルト同時ニ特ニ右議案ニ載セラレザルモノ近時顯著トナリタル諸問題殊ニ中立國ノ權利及ヒ義務、之ヲ他ノ一面ヨリ見レハ即チ交戰國ノ義務及權利ニ関スル問題ノ如キハ審議ニ附スヘキ項目ノ中ニ包含スルヲ有益ナリト信スルモノニ有之候帝國政府ハ右ノ確信ヲ持シ且ツ一層完全ナル國際協約ノ成立ヲ助クル為メ他ノ同種類ノ問題ニシテ均シク整理ヲ要スト認ムルモノヲ今日以後開會迄ノ間ニ於ケル相当ノ時機ヲ以テ會議ニ提出スルノ權ヲ留保致候

終ニ臨ミ前述ノ次第八帝國政府ガ第二回平和會議ヲシテ成功ヲ收メシメンガ為メ尽力ヲ為スニ於テ他ノ諸大國ヨリ自

以書簡致啓上候陳者第二回平和會議ニ関シ本年十月九日付貴翰ヲ以テ御申越之趣致敬承候

第一回平和會議ニ代表セラレザリシモ第二回會議ニ招待セラルヘキ諸國ヲシテ蘭國政府ハ通知ヲナスコトニ依リ國際紛争平和的處理條約ニ加盟スルヲ得セシムヘキ趣意ノ議定書ヲ同條約ニ調印セシ諸國間ニ締結スルノ問題ニ関シ帝國政府ハ前記貴翰ニ依リ次ノ會議ニ招待セラルヘキハ第一回會議ニ代表セラレタル諸國以外ニ於テハ南米諸共和國ノミニ限ルコト、推定致候若シ此推定ニシテ其當ヲ得次ノ會議ニ招待セラルヘキ國ハ現ニ前述ノ通り制限セラレ居リ且ツ後日ニ至リ變更セラル、コトナキ旨ノ保證ヲ得ルニ於テハ帝國政府ハ欣然右議定書締結ニ関スル異議ヲ撤回シ之ニ對シ賛成ノ意ヲ表明可致候

本年五月四日付貴翰中ニ列記セラレタル第二回平和會議ノ議案ニ関シテハ帝國政府ハ主義上之ヲ討議ノ一基礎トシテ承諾スル旨ヲ閣下ニ通知スルヲ得ルハ是亦本大臣ノ欣幸トスル所ニ有之候

前記議案ハ現ニ多クノ重要ナル問題ヲ包含致居候此等問題ニ関シテハ世上ノ意見大ニ相分レ且ツ國際慣例モ均シク異リ居候帝國政府ハ異論アル一切ノ問題ガ自由ニ討議セ

ラ分離セムトスルノ意志ヲ有スルモノニアラザルコトノ充分ナル保證トシテ露西亞國政府ニ於テ之ヲ御諒承可相成ヲ期待致候

本大臣ハ茲ニ重テ閣下ニ向ヒ敬意ヲ表シ候 敬具

八一 明治三十九年十一月七日 米國駐劄青木大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議ニ関スル露国政府ノ提案ニ
對シ任国政府ノ回答振報告ノ件

Washington,.....
Tokio, Nov. 17th 1906. 5.38 p.m.

Hayashi,

Tokio.

No. 100. In reference to my telegram 90. At a subsequent interview with Mr. Elihu Root, I took advantage of favourable occasion in conversation to resume the question of programme proposed by Russia. He confidentially lent, exclusively for my perusal, copies of correspondences between United States and Russia

on the subject of proposed peace conference up to June 7th adding there was further correspondence from Russian Ambassador which he has not yet studied.

1. In a note of Baron Rosen of April 12th, list of States invited to second peace conference by Russia is enclosed. Abyssinia, Corea and Panama are included. There is a foot-note "State that has declined invitation is Panama; States which have not yet returned answer are: Corea, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Uruguay, Venezuela".

2. Russian proposals of programme were communicated to Secretary of State April 3rd, April 12th, Baron Rosen expounding the proposed programme more fully in the second note. In replying to the first, Secretary of state reserved to the United States the liberty to advance other similar proposals. In answering to the second note June 7th, he expressed agreement with Russian suggestion that political relations of several States and condition of things established by treaties should not be discussed by the Conference. United States Government consider that all the questions contained in Russian proposal should

be included in programme, but in addition propose to consider the question of reduction or limitation of armament. Another subject suggested by United States as an item of programme is "whether the probabilities of war could not be greatly decreased by agreement among the Powers to observe some limitations upon use of force for ordinary public debt arising out of contracts."

3. At an interview with Secretary of State Oct. (Nov.?) 15th, he told me confidentially that Russian answer to these proposals of United States was that the programme communicated by Russia to the interested Powers was the result of understanding with great Powers of Europe and could not be changed without going over the whole subject again with those Powers. Secretary of State manifested in conversation much dissatisfaction with the action of Russia who, while loudly calling for disarmament in convoking the first conference, has seen fit not only to exclude the question from proposed programme, but actually to take unfavourable attitude towards present proposal of United States. In spite of Russian attitude, United States intend to propose the two points above mentioned

as supplementary programme and United States are persuaded that the nations in conference assembled shall determine of their own accord what questions should from the subjects of deliberations of the conference.

4. Secretary of State also told me that the intention of the United States to bring these two questions was communicated to British Government which returned favourable answer.

5. He asked me what would be attitude of Japanese government to the proposal, United States firmly believing that European powers including Great Britain would not seriously entertain scheme of reduction of armament though acceding with good grace to the proposal to bring the question for discussion. I deemed it prudent to say at once as my personal opinion that it seemed to me hardly likely that Japanese Government would have any objection if an understanding has been reached between United States and great Britain. He then requested me to ascertain of Japanese Government what they thought of American proposal to bring up the questions.

Aoki.

八二 明治三十八年十一月十九日

米國駐青木大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

第二萬國平和會議開催ニ関シ米露兩國政府ノ往復文書を送付ノ件

附屬書 右往復文書

第二〇号

十二月十日接受

第二萬國平和會議開催ニ関シ露國政府ノ提供ニ係ル議題案及ビ第二平和會議ニ参列セザリシモ第二平和會議ニハ露國ニヨリテ招請セラレタル諸國ヲシテ千八百九十九年ノ國際紛争平和的處理條約ニ加盟スル事ヲ得セシムル議定書ノ締結ノ式点ニ関シ任國政府ノ執リタル処置ヲ聞合ス可キ旨客月十六日接到第一〇六号貴電來訓ノ趣承知致候然ルニ右貴電中第一平和會議ニ参列セザリシ諸國ノ加盟云云ニ関スル露國ノ提案ニ對シ帝國政府ノ同意スル事ヲ得ズト云ハルハ第一、依リテ以テ韓國ノ海牙條約ノ加盟國タラントスルモノアルヲ防止スル為メ

第二、且ツハ又タ若シ露國ノ提供スルガ如キ議定書ノ締結セラルハニ於テハ之レガ為メ露國ヲシテ國際的地位ヲ有セサル諸國ニ招待ヲ發スル事ニ依リ紛端ヲ啓カシムルノ恐れアルガ為メ

ナルヤ否ヤノ点ニ関シ本使ハ國務長官ト会谈スル前ニ於テ之ヲ確知致置度存候ニ付客月廿日附第八八号電請ノ次第有之候処同月廿三日ニ至リ右ノ二疑問ハ本使所見ノ通りナル旨第一〇七号貴電ニ接シタルヲ以テ其翌々廿五日國務長官ノ接見日ヲ機会トシテ同官ト会谈スル所アリ其結果ハ同日第九〇号電稟ノ通りニシテ國務長官ニ於テハ此問題ニ関シ未ダ十分準備シ居ラザリシモノ、如ク其回答振リ要ヲ得ザルモノ有之強テ窮問スルノ面白カラザルモノアルヲ看取候ニ付其後本月八日ノ会见ニ於テ好機ヲ捉ヘ再ビ此問題ニ言及致候処同官ハ本使限リ内閣ニ供ストテ当初ヨリ去ル六月七日ニ至ル迄ニ本問題ニ関シ米露兩國政府ノ間ニ往復シタル文書ノ写ヲ貸与セラレ尙ホ其後ニ至リ露國大使ヨリ接收セル照会アルモ右ハ未ダ同官ニ於テ考究ヲ経ザル所ナル旨附言相成候

右米露兩國政府往復文書ノ要綱ハ本月十六日第百号電信ヲ以テ及報告置候得共尙ホ御參考ノ為メ其写別冊内部密差進候間御査閱相成候様致度

而シテ右文書ノ示メス所ニ抛レバ露國政府当初ノ希望ハ赤十字條約改正ノ事業ヲモ第二平和會議ノ事業中ニ包含セントスルニ在リタルモ此希望ノ貫徹ス可ラサルニ及ンデ更ラ

米國ノ見ル所ヲ以テスレバ第二會議ニ参列スル諸國ハ宜シク其合議ニ依リ果シテ如何ナル問題ヲ以テ議題トス可キカラ決定ス可キモノナリト考フ云々内話有之候

國務長官ハ更ラニ又タ右ノ式案ヲ提出セントスル米國ノ意志ハ既ニ之ヲ英國政府ニ通牒シ其内諾ヲ得タル所ナル旨ヲ内話シ語ヲ次デ右米國ノ提議ニ對スル帝國政府ノ態度ハ如何ナル可キ旨本使ニ質問有之候

然ルニ本使ハ此兵備縮少ノ議ニ就テハ其ノ米國ノ提供ニ係ルト云フノ故ヲ以テ好シ表面上之レニ贊同ノ意ヲ表スルトスルモ歐洲諸國ノ實際真面目ニ之レヲ念トスルガ如キ事ナカル可キヲ確信スルモノナルガ故ニ此國務長官ノ質問ニ對シテハ本使一個ノ私見トシテ既ニ英國政府ニシテ同意ヲ表シタル以上帝國政府ニ於テ別ニ何等異議ヲ有ス可クモ思ハレザル旨申述ベ候儀最モ機宜ニ適シタル回答振リカト思料シ其通り相答ヘ候処同長官ハ然ラバ何卒帝國政府ノ右米國ノ提議ニ對シ有セラル、意見ヲ確メラレ度云々更ラニ本使ニ依頼相成候右ハ既ニ前願往電第百号中ニ及具報候処ニ有之候得共尙其説明旁々此段申進候 敬具

明治卅九年十一月十九日

在米 特命全權大使子爵 青木周藏(印)

外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

ニ赤十字會議及ビ第二平和會議開催ノ期ヲ切リニ急ギ赤十字會議ノ終了ト第二平和會議開催トノ間ニ可成余日ヲ存セザラン事ニ焦慮シタルノ形跡歴然タルモノアリ其間ニ何等カ趣意ノ伏在スルモノアルヲ察スルニ難ラスト存候

右ノ如ク別紙往復文書ニ抛レバ先般赤十字會議開催ノ次第ニ就テハ其間ニ幾許ノ魂胆アリタルモノナル哉ニ被相察候然ルニ該會議ハ既ニ終了シタルモ之ガ招集ニ關係シタル事態ノ経過ハ第二平和會議招集一件將來ノ發展ニ関シ參考ト可相成被存候ニ付赤十字會議ニ関シ帝國政府ト瑞西政府又ハ其他トノ間ニ於ケル往復顧末本使參考ノ為メ早便御郵示相成候様希望致候其後本月十五日ニ至リ本使ハ重ネテ國務長官ト会见致候処同長官ハ前願往電第百号三項ノ所報之通り兵備縮少及ビ國債ノ徵收上債主國ノ実力使用制限ニ関スル米國政府ノ式提案ニ對スル露國回答ノ趣意ヲ内密本使ニ語リタル上更ラニ露國ハ第一平和會議ヲ提唱スルニ当リ盛カンニ兵備解除ヲ呼号シナガラ今回ハ暫ニ自ラ此問題ヲ其議題案中ヨリ除キタルノミナラズ且ツ第一平和會議ノ精神ニ基キ今回米國ノ提議セル右ノ式案ニ對シ却リテ反對ノ態度ヲ示スガ如キハ甚ダ心得難キ次第ナリトテ真個ニ憤懣ノ語氣ヲ洩ラン尙ホ米國ハ露國ノ態度如何ニ関スル事ナク右ノ式案ハ之ヲ第二平和會議ニ提出ス可キ積リナリ將又

追テ國務長官ガ内密本使ニ貸与シタル米露往復文書ニ記載シタル事実ト日露間ノ往復ニ関スル貴電ノ事実トニ依リ本使ノ承知シタル所ヲ綜合シ露國ノ執リタル動作ノ成行全班ヲ一見スルニ便センガ為メ宮岡參事官ランテ作成セシメタル摘要録別紙乙号ノ通りニ有之御参照上多少ノ便宜可有之カト存候ニ付併セテ差進候也

(附屬書)

第二回萬國平和會議開催ニ関シ米露兩國政府ノ往復文書摘要録(別紙乙号)

NOTES ON THE ACTION TAKEN BY RUSSIA
WITH REFERENCE TO THE CONFERENCE
OF THE SECOND PEACE CONFERENCE
AND CONFERENCE RELATING TO
THE REVISION OF THE GE-
NEVA CONFERENCE.

RUSSO AMERICAN CORRESPONDENCE.

October 21, 1904. Date of circular instructions of Secretary of State, John Hay, to the Representatives of the United States accredited to the Signatories of the Hague Convention of 1899.

President suggests that Second Peace Conference may be convoked to meet at The Hague. It would be premature to couple this tentative invitation with a categorical programme of subjects of discussion; but the United States Government indicated as fitting subjects for consideration the general topics which the Final Act of the First Conference of The Hague relegated to future conference, notably the rights and duties of neutrals, and inviolability of private property in naval warfare. It was also suggested that it may be desirable to consider the procedure by which States non-signatory to the original Acts of the Hague Conference may become adhering parties.

December 16, 1906. Date of Circular Instructions of Secretary Hay to the Representatives of the United States accredited to the Signatories of The Hague Convention of 1899.

Replies so far received from the Signatories of The Hague Convention indicate that the proposition of the United States to hold Second Conference has been received with general favor. No dissent has found expression. President considers that his

munication to be addressed by him to the Representatives of South American Governments with whom Russia has no diplomatic relation. That communication is to the effect that the Emperor of Russia "addresses to the General of.....proposal to take part in a new international peace conference which could be called together at The Hague as soon as favorable replies could be received from other Governments to whom similar proposals are communicated."

October 12, 1905. Secretary Root in a personal letter enclosed to Baron Rosen a memorandum communicating the reply of the President to the message of the Tsar.

President welcomes the offer of the Russian Emperor to again take upon himself the initiation of the steps requisite to convene a second International Peace Conference.

Note:

November 17, 1905. Treaty concluded between Japan and Korea regarding the administration of the latter's foreign relation.

task in this connection has been virtually accomplished. The further interchange of views between the signatories of the Acts of 1899 may be conducted through the International Bureau under the control of the Permanent Administrative Council of The Hague, and the way left clear for the eventual action of the Government of the Netherlands in calling a renewed conference to assemble at The Hague.

September 13, 1905. Baron Rosen presented a Memorandum to President Roosevelt in the sense that Russian Emperor proposes to the Government of the United States that the latter take part in a new international conference which could be called together at The Hague as soon as favorable replies could be secured from all other States to which a similar proposal will be made by Russia. Plenipotentiaries of Russia will lay before the Conference at its future meeting a detailed programme which could serve as a starting point for deliberation.

October 5, 1905. Baron Rosen transmitted to Secretary Root in a personal letter, text of the com-

RUSO-AMERICAN CORRESPONDENCE.

December 4, 1905. Russian Ambassador sent a memorandum to Secretary Root. Referring to the proposed revision of the Geneva Articles, the Memorandum says that the "actual convocation of the Conference" (looking to the revision of the Red Cross Convention) "has been repeatedly and arbitrarily postponed by the Swiss Government under various pretenses," and that the attitude of the Swiss Government is "hardly justifiable". "Russian Government therefore deem it essential that the great Powers, before adopting a definite programme for the Second Peace Conference should agree, after a confidential exchange of views, upon the following four points:"

1. Is it advisable to combine revision of Geneva Convention with the Second Hague Conference?
2. Or shall Swiss Government call a separate Conference for revision of Geneva Articles?

3. If the latter view prevails do the great Powers deem it possible to take a collective step to induce Swiss Government to fix in the nearest possible

future a definite term for the assembling of the proposed Conference?

4. If Switzerland is entitled to call a separate Conference for the revision of the Geneva articles shall this conference also consider application of Red Cross Convention to sea warfare, or shall this question be considered at Second Peace Conference.

The object of this Russian memorandum was manifestly to invoke the support of the United States against the Swiss Government and in favor of submitting the matter of the revision of the Geneva Convention to the deliberation of the Peace Conference.

December 13, 1905. Secretary Root sent to Baron Rosen a memorandum in answer to the above.

“The Government of the United States would be glad to see an understanding reached by the parties to the Geneva Convention by which revision thereof could be combined with the proceedings of the Second Hague Conference. It is thought that this may be accomplished by the parties to the Geneva Convention giving to their Hague Plenipotentiaries separate special powers to revise the Geneva Con-

Government to convene the Conference for revision of the Geneva Convention at a date not later than the second part of May (new style) 1906.

April 3, 1906. Baron Rosen informed Secretary Root that the Russian Government in agreement with the Government of the Netherlands proposed to call The Hague Conference during the first half of July 1906, and that Russia invited those nations which did not sign the Convention relative to the laws of wars on land or the Convention relative to the adaptation of the Geneva Convention to maritime warfare, to inform the Netherlands Government of their adhesion to these Conventions.

In the note conveying the above information Baron Rosen said that with reference to the adhesion of non-signatories to the Convention relating to international arbitration, Russia was conferring with the signatory Powers of the Acts of 1899. Russian Ambassador enclosed a summary of the programme which his Government proposes to submit to the next Hague Conference. They are as follows:

1. Amelioration of the provisions of the convention regarding the peaceful settlement of interna-

vention so that these special plenipotentiaries could confer separately from the universal peace assembly and at the same time act in harmony with the general Conference.”

March 22, 1906. The Russian Ambassador sent to the State Department Draft of a Note to be addressed to the Swiss Government by the Russian Minister in Berne. In this note the Russian Government express the hope that the Swiss Government will invite the original Signatories of the Geneva Convention of 1864 and the Powers that have adhered to it to give to their representatives at the next peace Conference special powers with regard to the revision of the Geneva Convention; which revision could be undertaken in special reunions sitting at the same time as the plenary Conference.

In this note Russia anticipates that the Swiss Government may have already decided to convene a new conference at Geneva. In that case the revision of the Convention of 1864 may be effected at Geneva before the meeting of the Peace Conference, but in that event Russia urges the Swiss

tional controversies as far as the court of Arbitration and the investigation committees are concerned.

2. Additions to the convention of the laws and usages of land warfare—among others, opening of hostilities, rights of neutrals on land, etc.; declarations of 1899—renewal of one of them.

3. Preparation of a convention regarding the laws and usages of naval warfare, concerning the special operations of naval warfare, such as the bombardment of ports, cities, and villages by a naval force; placing of torpedoes, etc.; transformation of merchant vessels into war vessels; private property of belligerents at sea; period granted merchant vessels in order to leave neutral or hostile ports after the beginning of hostilities; rights and duties of neutrals at sea, among others the question of contraband; rules to which belligerent vessels shall be subjected in neutral ports; destruction by vis major of merchant vessels captured as prizes. Into this convention would be inserted provisions relative to land warfare which would be applicable also to naval warfare,

4. Supplements to the convention for the adapta-

tion to naval warfare of the principles of the Geneva Convention of 1864.

All political questions will be excluded.

April 6, 1906. In answer to the above note of the Russian Ambassador Secretary Root stated that it was the intention of the President to appoint Plenipotentiaries to represent the United States at the next Peace Conference. The date suggested by the Russian and the Dutch Governments for the assembling of the Peace Conference would, however, be embarrassing and inconvenient not only to the United States but to other American nations as well as on account of the conference of American nations convened to meet at Rio Janeiro on July 21, 1906. Such an early date as the first half of July would manifestly not give sufficient time to the Red Cross Congress to be held at Geneva in mid June to complete its work for consideration and action by the participating Governments. Besides there would be other difficulties of a practical nature, such as representation, etc. in so far as these governments are concerned that take part in all these three important conferences at the same

time. The United States understand that the object of Russia in addressing to the interested Powers the notes such as the one just received by the Secretary of State was to invite general acquiescence in advance of formal invitations to be jointly issued later by the Russian and the Dutch Governments.

The President welcomes the suggested comparison of views looking to the conclusion of an agreement among the original Signatories with reference to the manner in which other Powers are to be permitted to adhere to the Convention of The Hague for the Peaceful Adjustment of International Differences. As regards the programme of subjects to be submitted to conference the "United States reserves consideration thereof, with liberty to advance other proposals of an allied character should its own need and experience counsel such a course".

April 6, 1906. Baron Rosen communicated to Secretary Root the text of a telegram received by him from Count Lamedorff, according to which the second half of July was proposed as time of meeting of the Hague Conference at the wish of the

Dutch Government. The latter Government believed that the Geneva Conference would have completed its labors by that time, and the palace destined for the Peace Conference at The Hague would be required by the Dutch Government in September for the meeting of the States-General. Baron Rosen added that the date intended by Russia in her proposal was the second half of July 1906 and not the first half as mentioned in his previous note.

April 12, 1906. Baron Rosen addressed a note to Secretary Root expounding more fully than he had done before, the Russian programme for the proposed Peace Conference, which are essentially as follows:

1. Improvements to be made in the Convention relating to the peaceful adjustment of international differences as regards the Court of Arbitration and the International Commissions of Inquiry.

2. Additions to be made to the provisions of Convention of 1899 relative to the laws and customs of war on land—opening of hostilities, rights of neutrals on land, etc. Declarations of 1899. One of those declarations having expired questions of reviving it.

3. Framing of a convention relative to the laws and customs of maritime warfare concerning (a) bombardment laying of torpedoes, etc., (b) conversion of merchant vessels into cruisers, (c) belligerents' private property at sea, (d) length of time to be granted to merchant ships for departure, after opening of hostilities, from neutral or enemies' ports, (e) rights and duties of neutrals at sea. In the convention thus to be framed provisions relating to war on land would be introduced that would be also applicable to maritime warfare.

4. Additions to be made to the Convention of 1899 for adaptation to maritime warfare of the principles of Geneva Convention of 1864.

Deliberations of the contemplated meeting should not deal with political relations of several states, or condition of things established by treaties, or in general with questions that did not directly come within the programme adopted by the several cabinets.

April 12, 1906.

In a second note addressed on this date to Secretary Root, Baron Rosen stated that his Govern-

ment suggested the month of July as the time of meeting of the proposed Conference simply because it seemed to be the most convenient time for Holland, but as the Government of the Netherlands found it possible to convene the conference at some other time, Russia was ready to postpone the conference until such time as would be acceptable to all the interested powers.

April 12, 1906, A third note was addressed on this date to the Secretary of State by the Russian Ambassador. In this note Baron Rosen encloses a list of the States invited to participate in the proposed Conference, among which are several States that have not taken part in the Peace Conference of 1899. It is observed that if the forthcoming conference is to be convoked for the purpose of perfecting the provisions of the Act of 1899, the newly invited States will have to adhere to the three Conventions of The Hague before they can take part in the general deliberations at The Second Peace Conference. As regards adhesion to the Convention relating to the Peaceful Adjustment of International Differences, Article 60 of that Con-

In the list enclosed in Baron Rosen's note, in which Bulgaria, Cuba, Ethiopia, Korea, Luxembourg and Montenegro are included, among the States invited to the Second Conference, the following footnotes appear:—

“State that has declined the invitation: Panama. States that have not yet returned an answer: Korea, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Uruguay, and Venezuela.”

April 13, 1906. On this date Secretary Root addressed a note to Baron Rosen commencing with “I have had the honor to receive your note of the 12th instant”. The note, the receipt of which is thus acknowledged, is apparently Baron Rosen's second note of April 12th—the one relating to the time of meeting of the Conference. Mr. Root says in reply that any date after the 20th of September will be agreeable to the United States. This note was undoubtedly prepared at the State Department before Baron Rosen's third note of April 12th, which relates to the question of adhesion, was brought to the attention of Mr. Root. Therefore without referring to that note but adverting to the declared

vention prescribes that the conditions of adhesion shall form the subject of a subsequent agreement among the signatories. In pursuance of that Article Russia proposes that on the opening of the forthcoming Conference the following Protocol be signed by the representatives of the original Signatory-States.

“The representatives at the Second Peace Conference of the States signatories of the convention of 1899 relative to the peaceful settlement of international disputes, duly authorized to that effect, have agreed that in case the States that were not represented at the First Peace Conference, but have been convoked to the present conference, should notify the Government of the Netherlands of their adhesion to the abovementioned convention they shall be forthwith considered as having acceded thereto.”

As regards adhesion to the two other Conventions of 1899 Russia has addressed to the newly-invited States “a request that they immediately forward to the Government of the Netherlands their adhesion” to the same.

purpose of Russia announced in one of Baron Rosen's earlier notes to confer with the Signatories of the Convention of 1899 looking to the conclusion of an agreement on the subject of adhesion, Mr. Root suggests “whether the status of the non-adhering States ought not to be settled before the meeting of the congress, and whether such status may not be determined by exchange of notes among the several Powers”.

April 19, 1906. The note from the Secretary of State to the Russian Ambassador of this date addresses itself to what the Secretary calls “your second note of the 12th instant”, which deals with the question of adhesion and is the third note of Baron Rosen of April 12th in the order given above. Baron Rosen's first notes of April 12th containing the programme is not answered by Secretary Root until June 7, 1906.

In reference to the Russian proposal regarding the manner of adhesion Secretary Root states in his note of April 19th that the United States understand that should the other Powers which took part in the Conference of 1899 signify their assent to the Russian proposal, the Representatives of the

States to be newly admitted can go to the Second Conference without feeling uncertain whether they can take part in the Conference convoked. Under this view the United States considers the Russian proposal as fully meeting the suggestion contained in Mr. Root's note of April 13th.

April 22nd, 1906. Baron Rosen informed Secretary Root of the receipt of a telegram from Count Lamsdorff saying that the desire to permit newly invited Powers to participate in the Conference from the outset is the basis of Russian proposal. The Count adds that "in any case Russia will use her best efforts toward the most practical and expeditious settlement of the question of the participation of all the invited Powers in the Conference." Baron Rosen further states that he has been instructed to call the attention of the other Governments, to which he transmitted Russia's invitation, to the necessity of giving forthwith to the Government of the Netherlands notice of their adhesion to the Second and Third Convention of 1899 and to be in readiness to notify the same Government of their adhesion to the First Convention as soon

as they receive telegraphic advice from Russia as to the consent of all the Signatories of that Convention.

RUSSO-JAPANESE CORRESPONDENCE.

May , 1906. (Facts contained under this heading came to the knowledge of Viscount Aoki on October 16, 1906.)

In the month of May 1906 three notes were received by the Japanese Minister for Foreign affairs from Russian Minister in Tokio.

1st Note—contained programme of Second Conference as proposed by Russia.

2nd Note—suggested conclusion among the signatories of the original Act of 1899, of a protocol according to which States not represented at the First Peace Conference but invited by Russia to the Second Conference, may adhere to the original Convention of The Hague merely by giving notice to the Government of The Netherlands.

3rd Note—related to the date of the meeting of the Conference.

Japanese Answers:—

To the 1st Note—Japanese Government will carefully study programme before expressing opinion.

To the 2nd Note—Japanese Government object to the proposed Protocol, for the reason that (a) Powers thus admitted would be placed in special positions as regards good offices and mediation, (b) such invited Powers would have the right to name members of the Permanent Court of Arbitration.

To the 3rd Note—The Japanese Government suggests the postponement of Conference until April or May 1907.

RUSSO-AMERICAN CORRESPONDENCE.

June 7, 1906. The note of the Secretary of State of this date answers the Russian Ambassador's first note of April 12th containing the programme. The United States Government agree "with the suggestions contained in the Russian note that the deliberations of the meeting should not deal with the political relations of the several States, or with the condition of things established by treaties, and that neither the solution of the questions brought up

for discussion, nor the order in which they are to be examined, nor the form to be given to the decisions reached, should be subject for determination in advance of the Conference." The United States Government also considers that all questions already proposed by Russia should be included in the programme. Secretary Root's note quotes the following from Count Mouravieff's memorandum of August 12th, 1898:

"The maintenance of general peace and a possible reduction of the excessive armaments which weigh down upon all nations present themselves, in the actual present situation of the world, as the ideal toward which should tend the efforts of all governments.

* * *

This conference will be, with the help of God, a happy augury for the century which is about to open. It will gather together in a powerful unit the efforts of all the powers which are sincerely desirous of making triumphant the conception of a universal peace. It will, at the same time, strengthen their mutual harmony by a

common consideration of the principle of equity and right, upon which rest the security of states and the well-being of nations."

The note thus emphasizes the original intention of the Czar in calling the Peace Conference, and after alluding to the exceptional position of comparative security enjoyed by the United States points out that the very absence of especial interest in a subject enables a nation to make suggestions which a more deeply interested nation might hesitate to present. "The Government of the United States, therefore, feels it to be its duty to reserve for itself the liberty to propose to the Second Peace Conference as one of the subjects of consideration, the reduction of limitation of armaments." In the opinion of the United States Government one other subject which might well engage the attention of the Conference is whether the probabilities of war could not be greatly decreased by an agreement among the Powers to observe some limitations upon the use of force for the collection of ordinary public debts arising out of contracts. (The so-called Drago Doctrine).

stated that the refusal of the Japanese Government to sign proposed Protocol would only have influence on adhesion of South American Republics, and that Korea, Panama and Abyssinia were out of the question for other reasons.

八三 明治三十九年十二月二十六日 仏国駐劄栗野大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛 (電報)

第二回萬国平和會議ニ関スル露国政府ノ提案並
ニ右ニ対スル仏国政府ノ回答振報告ノ件

十一月二十六日後八、五〇 巴里発
二十七日後二、〇〇 本省着

林外務大臣 在仏 栗野大使

第九七号

青木宛貴電第一〇六号ニ関シ政務局長ノ語ル処左ノ通

一、露国ノ「ぶろぐらむ」ハ前會議ノ決議ヨリモ其範圍
一層擴張サレ居ルヲ以テ仏国ハ之ヲ土台トシテ論議研
究スルコトニ同意シタリ且下ノ処該「ぶろぐらむ」ニ
附加若シクハ削除ヲ試ム可キ余地ヲ認メズ

二、「ぶろと」ニ付テモ仏国ハ露国ノ提議ニ同意シ

第三章 平和會議ノ議題及時期、各國ノ準備 八三 八四

RUSSO-JAPANESE CORRESPONDENCE.

June , 1906. At an interview which took place in St. Petersburg, probably in early or mid-June, the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs told M. Motono that Russia has decided to address to the Japanese Government the invitation for Korea to participate in the Second Peace Conference.

June 13, 1906. The Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs sent a verbal note to the Russian Minister in Tokio saying in reply to his verbal inquiry, that the Japanese Government decline the invitation for Korea, as in consequence of her international position Korea is unable to claim for herself any of the rights or to fulfill any of the obligations which would be implied by representation at said Conference.

October , 1906. (Before the 16th of October.) The Russian Minister in Tokio addressed a note to the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs urging for early reply as regards programme and saying that majority of interested Powers have adopted entirely the programme proposed by Russia. He

タリ尤モ「あどみつしよん」ヲ与フ可キハ南米諸國以
外ニ無之様思ハルト

「のの」博士ノ内話ニ依レン「あどみつしよん」ニ不
同意ナリシハ英國ニ非ズシテ独リ伊國ノミナリシト云フ蓋
シ伊國ハ羅馬法王ニ於テ調印國中ニ入ルヲ許サル、トキハ
同法王ガ将来ニ於テ伊國ニ対シ仲裁裁判人タルベキ位置ニ
立ツコトアルヤモ計ラレズト憂慮シ此ノ如キハ伊國ガ認容
スルコト能ハザルヲ以テナリト

八四 明治三十九年十二月三十日 林外務大臣ヨリ
米國駐劄青木大使宛 (電報)

第二回萬国平和會議ニ軍備制限問題ヲ議題トナ
スコトニ関スル帝國政府ノ意向申入方訓令ノ件

附記 十一月廿九日準備委員會決議

十一月三十日後一時三五分

在米 青木大使 大臣

第一二六号

貴電第一〇〇号ニ関シ

帝國政府モ米國々務卿ノ所見ノ如ク歐洲諸國力真面目ニ

軍備縮少又ハ制限問題ヲ考量スベシトハ思考セサルモ同問題ヲ平和會議ノ議題ト為スコトニハ毫モ異存ナキニ付其旨口上ヲ以テルート氏へ答ヘラレタシ

(附記)

準備委員會決議

「軍備制限問題ヲ第二平和會議ノ議題トナスコトニ関シテハ帝國政府ニ於テ異議ヲ申立ザルヲ適當ト認ム」

三十九年十一月廿九日議決

(棚外附記)
都筑、秋山、大井、山川、倉知、立、長岡、安達諸氏出席

八五 明治三十九年十二月三日

林外務大臣ヨリ
韓國駐劄長谷川統監代理宛

第二回萬國平和會議開催ニ関スル經過通知並ニ
露國政府ニ於テ同會議ニ韓國招請風説ニ関シ事
実取調ノ儀訓令ノ件

十二月三日付

機密送第七九号

在韓 長谷川統監代理

林外務大臣

地位ヲ有スルニ至ルノミナラズ仲裁々判官指定ノ權ヲモ享有スル事トナリ國際上重大ナル關係ヲ生スル次第ニ付單ニ蘭國政府ニ對スル通知ニ拠リ直ニ該條約ニ加盟シ得ルノ議ハ同意シ難キ旨回答致置候

在本邦露國公使ハ本國政府ノ命ニ依リ去ル十月九日付ヲ以テ右ニ對スル回答ヲ本大臣ニ送致シ其中前頭本大臣ノ異議ハ第一回平和會議ニ参与セスシテ第二回會議ニ招請セラレントスル南米諸共和國ノ加盟ニノミ影響ヲ及ボスベキモノニシテ韓國、「パナマ」及ヒ「アビシニア」等諸國ハ既ニ他ノ理由ニ拠リ問題外ナリトノ言明有之韓國ハ第二回會議ニ招請セサル様ニ相見ヘ候得共尙意義明瞭ヲ欠キ居候ニ付本大臣ヨリ去月十日付ヲ以テ第一回會議ニ參列シタル諸國以外ニ於テ第二回平和會議ニ招請セラルベキハ南米諸共和國ノミニ限リ後日變更セラル、事ナキ旨ノ保證ヲ得ルニ於テハ帝國政府ハ欣然前頭異議ヲ撤回スヘキ旨説明致置候
本大臣及露國公使間ノ往復ハ前記ノ通りニ有之候処先是去ル十月廿四日付在伊國日下部臨時代理公使ノ電報ヲ見ルニ伊國外務次官カ表ヲ示シ同代理公使ニ語リタル処ニ拠レハ露國ガ第二回平和會議ニ招請シタル諸國中「パナマ」ハ拒絶シ韓國ハ未ダ回答セサル部類ノ内ニアリトノ事ニ有之尙

機密

第二回萬國平和會議ニ関スル件

露國皇帝陛下ノ發意ヲ以テ第二回萬國平和會議ヲ和蘭國海牙ニ開催ノ議ハ既ニ昨年十一月十三日ヲ以テ在本邦仏國公使ヨリ帝國政府ニ通牒有之當時右ニ對シ帝國政府ハ大体賛同ノ意ヲ通告致置候処其後本年五月九日ニ至リ在本邦露國公使ヨリ第二回平和會議開催ノ時期、會議ニ提出スベキ議案、並ニ國際紛争平和的處理ニ関スル千八百九十九年條約加盟ノ方法ニ付三通ノ公文ヲ送附シ來リ候然ルニ右國際紛争平和的處理ニ関スル條約加盟ノ方法ナルモノハ第一回平和會議ニ參同セサリシ諸國ニシテ第二回平和會議ニ招請セラレタル節單ニ千八百九十九年ノ條約ニ加盟スル事ヲ和蘭國政府ニ通告スルトキハ右諸國ハ直ニ該條約ニ加盟シタルモノト看做スベシトノ事ニ有之候処若シ右ノ如キ簡單ナル方法ヲ採用スル時ハ韓國トノ關係ニ於テ面倒ヲ惹起ス處ナキニアラズ素ヨリ韓國ノ外交事務ハ總テ日本ニ於テ之ヲ行フコト故理論上面倒ヲ生ズベキ筈モ無之候得共好シテ權謀ヲ弄スル露國ニ對シテハ十分ノ警戒ヲ加フルコト必要ナリト存候ニ付本年六月廿五日付ヲ以テ露國公使ニ對シ新ニ該條約ニ加盟スル諸國ハ加盟後周旋及居中調停ニ関シ特別ノ

ホ去月十七日着電ノ青木在米大使ヨリノ電報ニ拠レバ同大使ニ於テ米國國務卿ヨリ秘密ニ借受ケタル本年四月十二日付在米露國大使書翰ノ附表ニ拠レバ露國ハ「パナマ」、「アビシニア」及ヒ韓國ニ對シ第二回平和會議參列ノ案内ヲ發シタルモノノ由ニ有之前記在本邦露國公使ガ本大臣ニ送リタル書翰ノ趣トハ相違致居候蓋シ露國ガ我邦ニ秘シ内密ニ韓國政府ヘ案内ヲ發シタリトハ容易ニ受取り難キ次第ニ候得共前頭伊國及米國ヘノ通知ハ毫モ疑ヲ容ル、余地無之候ニ付閣下ニ於テ相當ノ手段ヲ以テ右事實御確メ相成候様可然御取計相成度致希望候右本件成行説明旁申進候 敬具

八六 明治三十九年十二月七日

米國駐劄青木大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

第二回萬國平和會議ニ軍備制限問題ヲ議題トナスコトニ関シ米國務長官トノ談話要領報告ノ件

附屬書一 右談話要領(一)(二)

二 ドラゴードクトリンニ関スル

「スコット」氏論說

機密公第二一號 明治四十年一月九日接受

第二萬国平和會議開催ノ儀ニ関シ屢次國務長官ト会谈シタル顛末ハ客月十九日付機密公第二〇号信ヲ以テ及報告置候処其後同月三十日ニ至リ本使往電第百号ニ対シ

帝国政府モ國務長官所見ノ如ク歐洲諸国力真面目ニ軍備縮少又ハ制限問題ヲ考量スヘシトハ思料セサルモ同問題ヲ平和會議ノ議題トナス事ハ毫モ異存ナキニ付云々

貴電第一二六号回答ニ接シ閱悉致候是ヨリ先キ第二平和會議ノ件ニ付東京駐劄露国公使ノ公文ニ対シ十一月十日貴大臣ヨリ送ラレタル帝国政府回答ノ要旨貴電第一二一号ヲ以テ御通牒有之右ハ本使ノ心得マテ云々御来示有之候得共当国々務長官ニ於テハ曩ニ機密公第二〇号ヲ以テ報告セシ如ク深ク本使ヲ信任シ竊ニ露国政府ト合衆国政府トノ間ニ於ケル本件ニ関スル往復文書ノ全部ヲ貸与シテ腹藏ナク其所見ヲ本使ニ披瀝シタル参リ掛モ有之候ニ付キ当方ニ於テモ彼ト相提携スルノ誠意ヲ示ス為メ露国ニ対シ貴大臣ヨリ与ヘラレタル回答ノ要領ヲ内密ニ通告候方可然ト認メ即チ貴電第一二一号ト貴電第一二六号トノ趣意ヲ綜合シテ別紙甲号扣ノ通り心覺ヲ作り本月六日國務長官ニ面会之節口頭ニテ之ヲ陳述シタルニ該談話ノ手扣トシテ之ヲ所望致候ニ付

右ノ如ク米国政府ハ軍備縮少ノ議ヲ提議スト云フモ以別信及送付タル大統領今回ノ教書中「第二平和會議」及「平和ト正義」ト題スル諸項ニ於テ或ル場合ニ戦争ハ奮ニ正当ナルノミナラス名誉ヲ尊重スル国民ノ当サニ辞スヘカラサル所ナリト云ヒ吾人ノ応サニ努ムヘキ所ハ光荣アル平和、正義ニ基ク平和ヲ維持スルニ当リ等ノ言ヲ吐露セルニ依テ考フレハ合衆国政府趣旨ノ存スル所ハ之ヲ忖度スルニ難カラスト存候右報告申進候 敬具

明治三十九年十二月七日

在米 特命全權大使子爵 青木周藏(印)

外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

(附屬書一)

第二回萬国平和會議ニ於ケル軍備制限問題ニ関スル米國務長官ト青木大使トノ会谈要領

(一)

On November 10th the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs answered the note of the Russian Minister in Tokio on the subject of the proposed Second Peace Conference. The reply of the Imperial Government is in the following sense.

其意ニ任セ之ヲ交付致置候然ルニ其後國務省ニ於テハ之ヲ以テ一個ノ覺書ト誤認シタリト見エ別紙乙号寫ノ通り覺書ノ様式ニテ之ニ対スル請書ヲ郵便ニテ差越候間此成行御含迄申進候將又貴電第一二六号中國務長官第二ノ提案タル國債ノ徵收上債主国ノ実力使用制限ニ関スル議ニ就テハ何等御回示無之候処右ハ問題ノ性質上帝国政府ニ於テ別ニ異存ヲ有セラレザル儀ト承知シ可然ト存シ其旨併テ國務長官ニ通告致置候間是亦御承知有之度候

右國債ノ徵收上ニ於ケル債主国ノ兵力使用制限ノ議ハ即チ所謂「ドラゴ、ドクトリン」ノ適用ニ外ナラス候処右「ドラゴ、ドクトリン」ニ関シ去十月発行ノ北米評論ニ掲ケラレタル「スコット」氏ノ論説ハ御參考ノ価値モ可有之ト存シ候ニ付別冊右一部供貴覽候

將又前顯貴電ニ依レハ「歐洲諸国力真面目ニ軍備縮少又ハ制限問題ヲ考量スヘシトハ思考セザル」云々ハ当国々務長官ノ所見ナルカ如クニ御了解相成リタルモノナルヤニ相見エ候処本使往電第一百号末段「歐洲諸国力真面目ニ考量セサルベシト」云々ト云ヘルハ機密公第二〇号中ニモ及報告置候通り本使ノ所見ニシテ國務長官カ斯ル意見ヲ述ヘタル次第ニハ無之候ニ付為念申添候

In reference to the subject of the proposed conclusion of a Protocol among the Signatory Powers of the Convention of the Hague for the Peaceful Adjustment of International Differences, the Japanese Government understands from the note of the Russian Minister that the South American Republics are the only States which Russia intends to invite to the Second Peace Conference besides the Powers that were represented at the First Peace Conference. Therefore, upon the understanding that the invitations to the proposed Conference are to be so limited the Japanese Government withdraws its objection and signifies its approval of the proposed Protocol relating to the adhesion of States not represented at the First Conference.

With reference to the programme of the Conference as proposed by Russia in the note of May 4, 1906 of the Russian Minister in Tokio, the Japanese Government accepts the same in principle as the basis of discussion. The proposed programme includes many important subjects on which widely divergent views are entertained and on which practice greatly varies. It is the sincere hope of the Japanese Government

that all conflicting issues may be freely discussed and satisfactory solution arrived at. Nevertheless the Imperial Government cannot dispel apprehension that such discussion might in some cases take undesirable direction. In order, therefore, to provide for such eventual possibilities the Japanese Government reserves the right to abstain or withdraw from any discussion not likely to lead to useful results.

On the other hand, the Japanese Government believes that some questions which are not enumerated in the Russian programme but which have become prominent of late years might very appropriately be included in the programme. One important example of such subjects would be the questions relating to the rights and duties of neutrals and, correlatively, the duties and rights of belligerents. The Japanese Government, believing in the efficacy of international understanding on such subjects, reserves the right to suggest hereafter but within a reasonable time in advance of the meeting of the Conference, such subjects as appear to them to be appropriate for the examination and deliberation of the Conference.

program of the Conference as proposed by Russia, but reserves the right to abstain or withdraw from any discussion not likely to lead to useful results. The Japanese Government also reserves the right to suggest hereafter, but within a reasonable time in advance of the meeting of the Conference, such subjects as appear to it to be appropriate for examination and deliberation by the Conference.

The memorandum states, in addition, that the Japanese Government has no objection to the proposal of the United States Government to submit to the deliberations of the Conference the question of the reduction or limitation of armament.

(註釋一)

國債ノ徵收上ニ於ケル債主國ノ兵力使用制限
(「モントロー・ドクトリン」ニ關スル「スロマン」
氏ノ論說通報ニ付)

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND THE DRAGO

DOCTRINE.

BY GEORGE WINFIELD SCOTT, LL.B., PH.D.,
CARNEGIE INSTITUTION, WASHINGTON.

The above is the resume of the reply of the Japanese Government to the Russian note.

The Japanese Government has no objection to the proposal of the United States Government to submit to the deliberations of the forthcoming Conference the question of the reduction or limitation of armament.

(11)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington.

Memorandum.

December 12, 1906.

On the 6th instant the Japanese Ambassador handed to the Secretary of State a memorandum giving the resume of the answer made by the Japanese Government on the 10th ultimo to the note of the Russian Minister in Tokyo on the subject of the proposed Second Peace Conference at The Hague.

The Japanese Government signifies its approval of the proposed protocol relating to the adhesion of states not represented at the First Conference; and accepts in principle as the basis of discussion the

On July 21st, the representatives of twenty-one American States convened at Rio de Janeiro for the third session of the International Conference of American States.

The last Conference was held in Mexico City, and lasted from October 22nd, 1901, to January 22nd, 1902—just three months. At that Conference, three important agreements were formulated relative to arbitration and the peaceful settlement of international disputes: First, a protocol to adhere to the Hague Convention of 1899 (it will be remembered that Mexico and the United States were the only American states invited to the Hague Conference); second, a treaty of compulsory arbitration, which was signed by ten delegations and has since been ratified by six of the Republics; third, a treaty for the arbitration of "all claims for pecuniary loss or damage," which was afterwards ratified by six of the states, including the United States. This treaty was to be operative for five years from the date it could be ratified by five of the American states. It went into force March 24th, 1905.

At the recent Conference at Rio de Janeiro, only

one new question relative to the modes for settling international disputes was scheduled for discussion. It read:

“A resolution recommending that the second Peace Conference at The Hague be requested to consider whether and, if at all, to what extent the use of force for the collection of public debts is admissible.”

This question may be said to have had its origin in the war which Great Britain, Germany and Italy made against Venezuela, in 1902, to force the acknowledgment and payment of the pecuniary claims which their respective subjects held against Venezuela.

At that time, Dr. Luis Drago, Minister of Foreign Relations of the Argentine Republic, addressed a communication to the United States relative to the forcible collection by a foreign state of the public debt owned by its subjects. Dr. Drago seems to have expressed no doubts about the legal right of creditor states to force the payment of those pecuniary claims which have their origin in the ownership of the bonds of a debtor state. He merely sought to have the United States adopt, as supplementary to its Monroe Doctrine policy, a further policy to the effect

requires subjects to exhaust the judicial remedies of the debtor-state before their state interposes to present their claims diplomatically. It was urged by Señor Calvo, for many years the distinguished Minister of the Argentine Republic at Paris, that this rule should be observed by the first-class Powers in their transactions with the Latin-American states.

consideration at Rio de Janeiro involved the submission to the next Hague Conference of a question of law, to which, it is respectfully submitted, there can be but one answer.

Law and Practice.—When it is recollected that states are in legal theory equally independent; that the rules which regulate their relations are supposed to afford to one the same general rights and obligations that are afforded to another; that these rules have, as yet, developed no formal, superior judicial or administrative authority; that, in consequence, to every state is accorded the right to determine for itself when its rights have been invaded; that every state which considers itself aggrieved enjoys the sole right to decide the redress which it shall exact, and whether in the given case it has exhausted all the peaceful remedies to secure redress; that the use of force or

“that the public debt (of an American state) cannot occasion armed intervention, nor in any wise the actual occupation of the territory of American nations, by an European power.”

Dr. Drago called attention to the fact that “the collection of loans by force implies territorial occupation to make it effective; that territorial occupation means the suppression of the Governments of the countries on which it is imposed”; that there was considerable European expression in favor of establishing colonies in South America; and that, he feared, under the guise of “financial interventions,” the yearnings, evidenced by that expression, might be suddenly stimulated and gratified.

Without commenting on the grounds, or lack of grounds, for such anxiety or on the wisdom of the proposal, attention is called to the difference between the proposition originally urged by Dr. Drago and the question formulated for discussion at Rio de Janeiro. Señor Drago proposed a question of policy for the Pan-American states.* The resolution under

*The Calvo Doctrine has to do with the principle of law, observed between the first-class Powers, which

war is a recognized legal remedy by which states may settle their differences; that every state is, in legal theory, accorded complete sovereignty over the persons and properties within its jurisdiction; that, as a consequence of this, every injury to the person and property of foreign subjects within its jurisdiction may be legally ascribed to the act of the state itself; that an injury to the subject of a state is to that extent, in law, an injury to the particular state; that states, like individuals, are entitled to maintain a reputable existence, and to protect themselves from debilitation and destruction, that their dignity and reputation, their economic and social welfare, are so intimately bound up in the maintenance of the persons and property of their subjects that they are compelled to guard jealously every invasion of their international rights—when these facts are recollected, it would seem that the answer to the question, “whether and, if at all, to what extent the use of force for the collection of public debts is admissible,” must be that, as a matter of legal right, each state determines for itself both the conditions under which it is justified in using force, and the extent to which it shall go in

the use of force, to collect the public debts due its subjects by another state.

States have, from time to time, and generally, declined, for reasons of domestic expediency, to exercise their legal right to collect the public bonds of foreign states due their subjects, but they have never admitted that they did not have the right to do so.

It is the general practice of states in these matters to afford to their subjects only their unofficial good offices. They have desisted from giving further help: sometimes to encourage their subjects to invest their capital at home or in the colonies, sometimes because it was considered incompatible with the dignity of the state to allow itself to become a debt-collection agency for unprincipled speculators, sometimes for fear their motives might be misunderstood by sister states, and unforeseen international complications thereby raised.

But, as pointed out in the oft-cited circular of Lord Palmerston in 1848 to the British representatives in foreign states, "it might happen that the loss occasioned to British subjects by the nonpayment of interest upon loans made by them to foreign Govern-

ments might become so great that it would be too high a price for the nation to pay.....and in such a state of things it might become the duty of the British Government to make these matters the subject of diplomatic negotiations."

The year before, in 1847, Lord Palmerston had taken occasion in Parliament to indicate the right of the British Government to make war against Spain for the recovery of the public debts due British subjects; and, in connection therewith, he stated: This is a question of expediency, and not a question of power; therefore, let no foreign country which has done wrong to British subjects deceive itself by a false impression either that the British nation or the British Parliament will forever remain patient under the wrong."

In declining, in December, 1861, to participate in the concerted action of Great Britain, France and Spain to force Mexico to settle the claims, including public debts, due their respective subjects, Mr. Seward, as Secretary of State, said: "The President does not feel himself at liberty to question, and he does not question, that the sovereigns represented have un-

doubted right to decide for themselves the fact whether they have sustained grievances, and to resort to war with Mexico for the redress thereof, and have a right, also, to levy the war severally or jointly."

Further, it should be noted that the International Arbitration Tribunals, which have held that they had no jurisdiction to receive and decide bond claims "in the absence of express language to that effect" in the treaty establishing the Tribunal, have expressed no doubt whatever as to the legal right of a state to press such claims for payment by any means which its own domestic and foreign policy might dictate. Such, for example, was the opinion of Sir Frederick Bruce, who acted as umpire in the arbitral settlement between the United States and Colombia under the Convention of February 10th, 1864.

It can probably be stated without fear of contradiction that no state has ever resorted to force to collect from another state the public debt due to its subjects, where the acknowledgment and payment of the debt was the sole subject of difference between them. Nations are not likely to make war for such a cause

alone. One day's war would cost more than the whole debt due.

Perhaps the instances in which the deferred payment of the public debt has been most nearly the sole cause for resorting to force, are the intervention of 1861 by France, Great Britain and Spain in Mexico, and the intervention of 1902 by Germany, Great Britain and Italy in Venezuela. In both instances, the subjects of the intervening Powers had suffered, at the hands of the delinquent states, repeated and serious injuries through violence and the denial of civilized justice. In both cases, it has been alleged that the ostensible reasons for intervening were not the real ones. However that may be, for the motives of states as of individuals are not accurately comprehended, it can be safely asserted that, as a general rule, creditor states have shown a considerate disposition toward debtor states, and this from the purely selfish reasons to which attention has already been called.

Where the finances of states have become utterly deranged from various causes—such as the ravages of civil and foreign war, a corrupt, extravagant and

overmanned financial service, conducted without proper means of accounting—it has frequently happened that the creditor states have been able, through diplomatic negotiation and pressure, to take over temporarily the administration of the finances of the country. This is what happened in Egypt in 1879, in Greece in 1898, and in San Domingo in 1904.

In some instances claims, arising from non-payment of bonds, without having been the subject of prior diplomatic negotiation, have been presented by the counsel of a creditor state to an International Arbitration Tribunal established by treaty to hear and decide “all claims” against either state. With one exception, the Tribunals have declined to take jurisdiction on the ground that the claims has not been diplomatically presented and could not, therefore, have been intended by the High Contracting Parties to be embraced within the description “all claims.” And, though it seemed to be admitted that this objection would not be applicable to other than bond claims, yet it was applicable to them merely because of the special policy of non-interposition which states ordinarily pursued in these cases.

upon to decide whether the three blockading Powers had exhausted all pacific methods in their dispute with Venezuela, in order to prevent the employment of force”; in fact, it considered itself “absolutely incompetent to give a decision as to the character or nature of the military operations.”

Some have been misled as to the significance of The Hague Convention in international law by the language of Article XIX of that Convention, in which reservation was made that, “independently of existing general or special treaties, imposing the obligation” to arbitrate, the Signatory Powers should have “the right to conclude” at any time “new agreements, general or special, with a view of extending the obligation” to arbitrate. The phrase “extending the obligation” relates to any “obligation” which might be subsisting under arbitration treaties that were at the time in force between the parties, not to any “obligation” to arbitrate imposed by The Hague Convention—because, unfortunately, there was none. All proposals to make arbitration in any way obligatory were turned down by the Conference.

The Hague Convention, therefore, omitted entirely

Effect of Arbitration Treaties.—It has been thought by some that the establishment of The Hague Arbitration Tribunal affected to some extent the rules of international law, by making it incumbent upon states to arbitrate their differences and not to resort to the use of force. This is a mistake. The obligation, or rather the lack of obligation, to arbitrate remains the same, except possibly that there is an indefinite moral obligation imposed by the civilized public opinion of the world. And even international law is made up of more determinate stuff than this!

On the belief that The Hague Arbitration Convention of 1899 had “altered international law,” it was urged by the counsel for Venezuela, Mr. Wayne Mac Veagh, in the Preferential Treatment case at The Hague, that “the question as to whether or not Great Britain, Germany and Italy are entitled to preferential or separate treatment in the payment of their claims against Venezuela” required the Tribunal to decide “whether the war (waged) was justified or not,” and that this was “the whole marrow of the question” submitted for decision.

The Tribunal, however, held that it “was not called

the giving of any jurisdiction to the Tribunal it set up; it merely provided an arrangement for the arbitration of international disputes, and left each state free to decide whether in a given case it would invite, or if invited, would refuse the remedy of arbitration.

The “epidemic” of arbitration treaties which has followed The Hague Conference shows the same hesitancy on the part of nations to give to arbitration in any wise a certain and definite jurisdiction. Of the fifty-odd treaties which have been signed “with a view of extending the obligation” to arbitrate, only a few give a jurisdiction—only a few make arbitration obligatory. Under none of the others is it possible for one state to summon another to the Arbitral Court. Under none of the others is any definite question of international dispute unconditionally segregated for arbitration. Under each of the other treaties, the state has reserved for its own decision, whenever a question of difference shall arise, whether the particular question shall be arbitrated. If at such time, which would ordinarily be a time of more or less national excitement and feeling, the state should decide that it was compatible with its “vital interests,” “na-

tional honor," "independence" or "constitution" to arbitrate, then it might extend an invitation, or accept an invitation, to arbitrate.

To sum up, the present situation in law as regards the necessity to arbitrate international disputes instead of resorting to force is in no wise different, with the minor exceptions mentioned, from what it was before The Hague Conference.

Question at the Next Hague Conference.—The question at the next Hague Conference should be, it would seem: Are the civilized states so much in favor of peace that they are willing to agree, in order to make a positive but slight start in this direction, to set apart for settlement by arbitration a portion, however small, of the matters which give rise to international disputes?

The giving of a definite and unconditional jurisdiction to arbitration would act as an entering wedge. Gradually, this jurisdiction might be extended, as the early writs in England extended the jurisdiction of the courts. Gradually, the states might be expected to discover that their "national honor" and "vital interests" are not jeopardized by referring their differences to the arbitrament of law. Gradually, states,

an ordinarily calm state of the public mind, be considered a mere lawsuit.

If, then, the civilized public opinion of the world is so much in favor of peace that it is willing to venture a slight but positive step in the direction of the reign of law in the settlement of international differences, the question arises: What are the matters which are giving rise to international disputes that can, with safety to the "vital interests," "national honor," etc., of states be unconditionally segregated for this purpose?

A strong argument might be presented for the setting apart for peaceful settlement, at all times, of all disputes incident to the collection of public debts arising from money loaned by subjects to foreign states, or, at least, for deferring the right to use force till after the alleged debts have been judicially examined and the sum due ascertained. "The propositions" in the note of Dr. Drago of December, 1902, described by Mr. Hay as "ably set forth," incidentally mention some of the reasons why international arbitration tribunals might be given jurisdiction over disputes relative to the public debts due foreigners.

and the society of which they are composed, might be expected to acquire the habit of submitting international disputes to the decision of international tribunals in which they have confidence. Gradually, the crude arbitration arrangements of the present would be perfected, and that confidence in the fairness and judicial attitude of the arbitrators which is fundamental to the reign of law would come to exist. Gradually, the attachment of the property of an alleged debtor, in advance of a judicial investigation into the merits of the debt—a procedure unknown to the English common law—would cease as between the states. Gradually, states would consider that it is unbecoming the high dignity and standards of justice which they should maintain, to lend their great powers to the collection of the often falsely exaggerated claims of unprincipled speculators, supported by merely *ex parte* evidence.

To give to the Arbitration Tribunal a definite and unconditional jurisdiction, however small to begin with, would put it beyond the legal capacity of states to confound their "national honor," etc., in a time of necessarily keen public feeling, with what would, in

Several cogent arguments, it would seem, can be advanced for a jurisdiction of this subject, which are not applicable to other classes of international pecuniary claims. Thus: "The capitalist who lends his money to a foreign state always takes into account the resources of the country and the probability, greater or less, that the obligations contracted will be fulfilled without delay." He generally takes advantage of the necessities of the borrowing state, and exacts discounts and interest accordingly. He knows that he is loaning his money to a sovereignty which is accorded by law the right to give or withhold the usual remedies of civil suit. He is aware that all debts of a state exist subject to the state's being in position to pay them without embarrassment to its existence; and that, in law, the state is the sole judge of its ability to pay at any particular time. He knows that modern conditions require states to expend vast sums of money for the development and maintenance of their various public works; that, in the long run, all states must uphold their credit; and that, to accomplish this, the debtor states must observe a decent husbandry and keep good faith in their obligations. He knows that the

legal relation of the delinquent debtor to his creditors has some points of difference from the legal relation of a state to foreign subjects whose person and property, while within the jurisdiction of the state, are injured, and who are denied civilized justice; that in the transaction of buying the bonds of a foreign state he is accepting the promise of the state in return for his property; and that the loss of one's property through a breach of promise is not so direct an injury as a loss occasioned without a promise.

If the various foregoing considerations are sound, the Conference at Rio de Janeiro did well not to adopt the resolution originally formulated for its consideration which had for its object the requesting of the next Hague Conference to consider a rule of international law which it would seem impossible to question. What the Conference did do was formally "to recommend to the Governments represented therein that they consider the point of inviting the Second Peace Conference at The Hague to consider the question of the compulsory collection of public debts; and, in general, means tending to diminish between nations conflicts having an exclusively pecuniary origin."

The resolution adopted by the Conference is very indefinite, but it is probably an improvement on the one formulated for its consideration.

It is generally expected that some American state, perhaps the United States, will "consider the point" and present "the question" to the next Hague Conference. It is to be hoped that the question will be formulated for the consideration and action of the Conference with due regard to international law, foreign politics and the practical object to be attained, and that, by a treaty to which all states are party, International Arbitration will be given an unreserved jurisdiction of a small portion of the matters which are giving rise to disputes between states.

GEORGE WINFIELD SCOTT.

八七 明治三十九年十二月十日

韓国駐劄長谷川統監代理ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

第二回萬國平和會議ニ韓国招請ノ事實ナキ旨回答ノ件

機密統發第一九号

十二月十八日接受

第二号

第二回平和會議ハ大凡何月頃召集セラルヘキ模様ナルヤ帝國政府ハ土地遠隔ナル為委員派遣等ノ都合上可成速カニ大凡ノ日取リヲ承知シタキニ付其向キニ就キ内密問合電報アリタシ

八九 明治三十九年一月六日

露国駐劄本野公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬國平和會議期日打合ノ為メ露国政府ニ於テ「マルテンス」ヲ欧州諸国ニ派遣ノ旨報告ノ件

一月十六日 後八、三二 聖都發
一月十七日 前八、一〇 本省着

林外務大臣

本野公使

第四号

貴電第二号ニ関シ本日外務大臣ニ問合セタル処其答ニ平和會議ニ関シ内相談ノ為メ近日マルテンスヲ凡ソ三週間ノ豫定ニテ西欧諸国ニ派遣スル筈ニ付會議期日モ同人帰国後ニアラサレハ定ムル事能ハス又定マリタル上ハ直チニ本官ニ知ラシムヘシト

八八 明治三十九年一月十五日

林外務大臣ヨリ
露国駐劄本野公使宛(電報)

第二回萬國平和會議開催期ニ関スル露国政府ノ見込問合方ノ件

一月十五日 午後六時發

在露 本野公使

林

九〇 明治四十年二月二十三日 独国外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議開催打合ノ為メ露国「マルテンス」博士来着ノ件

一月廿三日 後五、一五 伯林着
一月廿四日 前七、三〇 東京着

林 大 臣 井上大使

第七号

海牙ニ於ケル次回ノ萬国平和會議ニ関シ豫メ独乙政府ト内協議ヲ遂グル為メ露国政府ノ委員トシテ「マルテンス」博士露都ヨリ当地来着目下当国政府ト交渉中ナリ同氏ハ猶ホ是レヨリ巴里倫敦維納羅馬ヘモ巡回ノ管ト聞ク

九一 明治四十年二月二十四日 獨国駐劄西臨時代理公使

林外務大臣宛

第二回萬国平和會議ニ関スル「ステッド」氏意見發表ノ件

公第八号

四月二日接受

軍備縮少主義ヲ以テ有名ナル Mr. Stead 頃日来当地ニ来

九二 明治四十年二月六日 独国外務大臣ヨリ

独国外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議開催ニ関シ「マルテンス」ト独国政府トノ協議振内偵方ノ件

二月六日後二時四五分発

在独 井上大使 林 大 臣

第六号

「マルテンス」ハ目下次回平和會議開催期日ノ件ニ付独国政府ト打合中ノ趣ノ処右ハ大凡何時頃ニ決定スヘキ模様ナルヤ又同氏ハ同會議ノ議題及右ニ対スル露国政府ノ意見等ニ付独国政府ト内打合ヲナシ會議ニ於テ兩國政府ガ同一歩調ヲ執ルノ地歩ヲ作リツ、アル模様ナキヤ御探知ノ上電報アリタシ

九三 明治四十年二月七日 独国外務大臣宛(電報)

林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議開催期日及議題ニ関スル独国政府ノ意向報告ノ件

二月七日 後七、五〇 伯林着
二月八日 前一一、四五 東京着

リ軍備縮少及縮盟国間ニ於ケル爭議ニ於テ仲裁ヲ判之方法ニ依ルヲ義務トスルノ主義ヲ主張シ尙ホ此ヲ第二平和會議ノ議案ニ追加セントシ在当国英独露仏大使ニ面会シ其希望ヲ陳述シタル後当国外務大臣ニモ右之主義ヲ面述シ此ニ関スル意見書ヲ皇帝ニ拝呈セリ右ニ付当国外務大臣ハ第二平和會議ニ関シテハ目下露国政府ヨリ「マルテン」氏ヲ列強政府ニ派遣シ議案及開会時期等ニ付協議中ニ付本件ニ関スル獨国政府ノ意見トシテハ今尙發表スル事不能旨ヲ答ヘ且軍備縮少問題ニ付テハ實際ニ実行シ難キ主意ヲ述タル由又露獨兩大使之意向モ亦外務大臣ト略同様ノ意見ニ有之趣聞及候又第二平和會議開会時期ニ関シ露国大使ハ目下日露間ノ通商條約締結後ニ於テ開会スルヲ好機トスル旨ヲ談話セシ趣聞接ニ聞及候間併テ為御參考及報告候 敬具

明治四十年一月廿四日

在獨臨時代理公使 西源四郎(印)

外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

林外務大臣 井上大使

第一七号

貴電第六号平和會議ノ件ニ関シ探知シタル結果左ノ通同會議開会ノ期日ハ来ル五月末カ六月上旬頃ニナサムトノ露国提示ニ対シ独乙政府及米露国ヨリ列國ヘ回送シタル由、次回會議ニ於ケル議題ハ昨年露国ヨリ列國ヘ回送シタル「プログラム」ノ範圍内ニ留メムトノ露国ノ主義ニ対シ独乙政府ハ同意ヲ表シ若シ列國ニ於テ討論案提出ノ意向アラバ可成速カニ露国政府ニ通牒シ之ヲ一括ノ上次回ノ會議ニ露国ヨリ招待ヲ發スル際其「プログラム」ノ内ニ掲載スル由、独乙政府ハ武裝縮少(デイスアーマメント)問題ニ対シ敢テ賛同ノ意向ヲ有セス若シ本問題ニシテ會議ニ提出セラレタル場合ニハ或ハ其討議ニ与ラザルニ至ルベク独乙政府ハ會議ニ於テ露国政府ト同一歩調ヲ執ルト云フガ如キ態度ニハ出デザルベシト思考セラル

九四 明治四年二月八日

独国駐劄井上大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議開催ニ関スル打合ノ為メ
「マルテンス」欧州各国歴訪ノ件

二月八日 後一〇、一〇〇 伯林發
九日 前四、五〇〇 本省着

林外務大臣

井上大使

第一八号

往電第七号

既ニ往電第七号ヲ以テ報告ノ如ク「マルテンス」ハ独乙政府ノミナラス仏・英・墺・伊及ビ和蘭政府ヘモ次回ノ平和會議ニ関シ豫メ協議ヲナス目的ニテ同氏ハ既ニ一週間前巴里ヘ向テ出發セリ尙ホ在独米國大使ハ本国政府ノ委任ヲ受ケ「マルテンス」ト当地ニ於テ打合ヲナシタルヨシ

九五 明治四年二月六日

蘭国駐劄佐藤公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議開催日取ニ関シ「マルテンス」
談話ノ件

La Haye, 6.35 p.m., 18.2.07.
Tokio, 12.56 p.m., 19.2.07.

重要議案ニ関スル任国政府ノ意見等ニ付テハ今後可成詳細ニ報告相成且ツ其概要ヲ電報セラレタシ
右本大臣ノ訓令トシテ在英大使ニ転電シ同大使ヨリ在欧各大使公使ニ転電スル様取計ハルヘシ

九七 明治四年二月九日

独国駐劄井上大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議ノ件ニ関スル独乙皇帝ノ議
会演説報告ノ件

Berlin, 2.10 p.m., 19/2/7.
Tokio, 9.10 a.m., 20/2/7.

Hayashi,

Tokio.

No. 19. New German Reichstag was opened Feb. 19th. by German Emperor in person. In the course of his speech, in alluding to foreign affairs, he declared that the general political situation justified conviction that peace will continue to be further maintained. To the Allied Powers the Government entertain old cordial, and, to the other foreign Powers good and correct

Hayashi,
Tokio.

No. 6. In the interview February 18th. de Martins confidentially told me that, as the result of his visits to various Capitals of Europe, which have been satisfactory, his private opinion is that Peace Conference will be opened during first few days of June. He expects to be back in St. Petersburg in two weeks after visiting Rome and Vienna.

Sato.

九六 明治四年二月九日

林外務大臣ヨリ
米國駐劄青木大使宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議及同會議ノ重要議案ニ関スル各国政府ノ態度並ニ意見報告方及右在欧各大使ヘ転電方訓令ノ件

二月十九日後二時四五分發

在米 青木大使

林 大臣

第二五号

平和會議ニ対スル任国政府ノ態度及同會議ニ付セララルヘキ

relations. In virtue of the initiative of the United States of America and of the proposal of Russian Government Emperor had accepted invitation to Second La Haye Peace Conference which is to be called to further develop international law in the sense of peace and humanity, in conjunction with results of the First La Haye Conference.

Inoue.

九八 明治四年二月二十日

蘭国駐劄佐藤公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議開催期日及議題ニ関スル任
国政府ノ意向報告ノ件

二月二十一日 海牙發
前八、一〇 東京着

林外務大臣

佐藤公使

第七号

蘭国外務大臣曰ク当国ハ平和會議ヲ歓迎スルモノニテ露国ノ「プログラム」ニ対シ別ニ意見ナシト又曰ク頃日「マル

テンス」ニ向ヒ來ル六月ノ初メニ海牙ニ該會議ヲ開クコト
差支ナキ旨ヲ答ヘ置キタリ

九 明治四年三月二日

奥国駐劄西臨時代理公使
ヨリ
林外務大臣宛（電報）

第二回萬國平和會議議題ニ關スル任国政府ノ意
向報告ノ件

二月廿一日 後〇、三〇 維也納着
二月廿二日 前六、三〇 東京着

林外務大臣

西代理公使

第六号

奥国政府ハ平和ニ関シテハ専ラ露国ノ議案ニ依ル尤モ確タ
ルコトハ追テ「マルテンス」ト意見ヲ交換セシ上取極ムル
旨「ステイド」ノ軍備制限案ヲ會議ニ付スルノ意見ハ之ヲ
採用セズ

一〇〇 明治四年三月二日

独国駐劄井上大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛（電報）

第二回萬國平和會議議題ニ關シ露独兩國意見交
換ノ件

二月廿八日前八〇、五 倫敦着
本省着

林外務大臣

小村大使

第一五号

青木大使經由貴電第二五号萬國平和會議ノ件ニ關シ今廿七
日英国外務大臣ニ面会セルニ同大臣ハ左ノ通り本官ニ語ラ
レタリ

同會議ノ議案ハ目下取調委員ニ於テ調査中右落次第閣議
ニ附シ其上ニテ同会出席委員ニ訓令ヲ加フルコトナルハ
シ右出席委員ハ未定ナリ該訓令確定次第之ヲ本官ニ内示ス
ヘシ又軍備制限ノ件ニ關シテハ英國ハ依然本問題ノ同會議
ニ上ルヲ希望シ居ルモ英國自ラ進テ之ヲ提議スルト否トハ
未タ確定セス又同會議ハ多分六月初旬開カルヘキ筈ナリ

一〇二 明治四年三月二日

仏国駐劄栗野大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛（電報）

第二回萬國平和會議「マルテンス」協議振ニ付
報告ノ件

二月廿七日 後一〇、五〇 巴里着
二月廿八日 後七、二〇 本省着

二月二十八日 後二、四五 伯林着
三月一日 前八、二五 本省着

林外務大臣

井上大使

第二四号

往電第一七号平和會議ノ件ニ關シ尙其後探知シタル処ニ依
レハ独乙政府ハ先般露国政府へ外交文書ヲ以テ平和會議へ
武装減縮ノ問題ヲ提出スルヤ否ヤヲ問合セタルニ右問題ハ
提出スルノ意志ナキ旨ヲ回答スルト同時ニ該會議ノ議題ハ
昨年露国ヨリ各國へ送リタル回文ノ「プログラム」ニ止ム
ル旨ヲ当国へ通報シタル趣ナリ又独乙政府ハ武装減縮問題
ニ對シ絶對的反対ノ主義ヲ固守スルニハアラサルモ其方法
ニ於テ到底各國一様ニ協定シ得ヘカラサルヲ認メ右問題ヲ
會議ニ提出スルノ無益ナルヲ信シ居ルモノナリトノコトナ
リ

一〇一 明治四年三月二日

英國駐劄小村大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛（電報）

第二回萬國平和會議議題並同會議開催期日ニ關
スル英國政府ノ意向報告ノ件

林外務大臣

栗野大使

第二一号

平和會議ニ關シ「マルテンス」氏ハ露国政府ノ命ヲ奉シ既
ニ独仏英白蘭ノ五ヶ国ヲ歴訪シ各國政府ノ意向ヲ質シ數日
前羅馬ニ到リ伊国政府トモ打合ヲ為シ尙同所ニ於テ西班牙
大使ト会見シ西班牙政府ノ意向ヲモ聞取リタル趣ナリシニ
会見ノ為メ特ニ「ブルクセル」ニ行キ去ル二十二日歸來シ
タル当地駐劄露国大使ガ本日本官ヲ訪問シタルニ付同伴ニ
關シ各國政府ノ態度ニ付談話ヲ試ミタル所同大使ノ語ル処
ニ依レハ各國政府ヨリハ露国ノ提議ニ對シ何等修正ヲ提出
シタルコトナキモ只英國政府ヨリ軍備縮少ノ問題ヲ提出
シ米国政府ハ之ヲ賛成スルカ或ハ別ニ同様ノ提議ヲスヘシ
尤提出ノ方法ニ至リテハ未タ確定セスト雖英國ノ提議ハ不
日露国政府ニ送附ノ筈ナル由又會議開会ハ多分六月一日頃
ナルベク右ハ蘭国政府ヨリ其内公然ノ案内ヲ各國ニ送附ス
ベシト「マルテンス」氏ハ本日羅馬着維也納ヲ經テ歸国ス
ル由

一〇三 明治卅年二月二十六日 伊国駐劄日下部臨時代理
公使ヨリ 林外務大臣宛（電報）
前同伴

Rome, 28/2/7. 3.15 p.m.
Received 1/3/7. 9 a.m.

Hayashi,
Tokio.

No. 5. I saw Martens who is here on his tour of consulation. After expressing hope for parival of Japanese delegate in Holland in June 上旬 he said that all Powers accepted Russian programme without any objection. The questions as to limitation of armament and doctrine of Drago will be placed before Congress as an extra programme but in what form to present them is not yet decided. I asked whether he consulted on the matter of his mission with any of our representatives during his tour he answered 'no' and said he consulted with U. S. Ambassador in Germany and Spanish Ambassador in Rome? who have been instructed by their Government to meet him. He added that if Japanese Government desire to take with him anywhere out of Petersburg he should be pleased

to see our representative in Vienna, (though he deems it quite superfluous.)

Kusakabe.

一〇四 明治卅年二月二十六日 蘭国駐劄佐藤公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

第一回萬国平和會議ニ対スル「マルテンス」談
話要旨並ニ蘭国政府ノ意嚮報告ノ件

機密第四号

四月四日接受

第二回平和會議ニ関スル件 (一)

本件ニ付各国ノ態度ヲ問諦メムトシテ露国ヨリ派遣セラレタル露国外務省参議官デ、マルテンス氏ハ伯林巴里倫敦ヲ歴訪ノ末本月十七日当地ニ来着翌十八日ニハ当国駐劄露国公使チエリコフ氏ハマルテンス氏紹介ノ為メ茶話会ヲ催シ同僚外交官ヲ招待セル際拙者モ其席ニ列リマルテンス氏ニ面会シ一応ノ挨拶及社交談ニ少シク時ヲ移セシトキ同氏ハ拙者ヲ客房ノ一隅ニ誘ヒ声ヲ潜メ告ケテ曰ク御承知ノ如ク拙者先日ヨリ平和會議ニ対スル各国政府ノ態度ヲ審ニセムカ為メ諸大國ノ首都ヲ訪ヒ当路者ノ意見ヲ叩キ試クルカ

今日迄ノ結果頗ル満足ニシテ素ヨリ確然若クハ公然トハ申上難キモ余一個ノ私見トシテハ平和會議ハ来ル六月ノ初二三日間ニ開会ノ運ニ至ルベシト思考ス而シテ今殊更ラニ之ヲ閣下ニ内示スル所以ノモノハ貴國ハ会場ノ地ヲ距ルコト路遠ク各般ノ準備及参会者ノ旅行ニモ多分ノ日数ヲ要スルヲ以テ貴國政府ニテハ略々開会期日ノ見当定マラバ速ニ内示アランコトヲ望マル、旨兼テヨリ本野公使ヨリ拙者（マルテンス氏自称）ニ内談アリシカ為メナリト依テ拙者其好意ヲ謝シ尙ホ此外日本国政府ノ参考ト相成ベキ事アラバ差支ナキ限り内示セラレンコトヲ請フ旨ヲ述べタレトモ差同キ別ニ申上クヘキコトナシト告ケ相別レタリ右面会ノ要点ハ本月十八日付ヲ以テ閣下ヘ電報ニ及ヒ置キタレバ疾ク御承知ノ答ト存候

又本月二十日貴大臣ヨリ青木大使宛二十五号訓電ヲ小村大使ヨリ転電ニ接シ平和會議ニ対スル当国政府ノ態度及同會議ニ附セラルベキ重要ノ議案ニ関スル意見等ニ就テハ今後成ルベク詳細ニ御報告可致且其概要ヲ電報可致旨貴訓ノ趣敬承即チ同日ハ幸ヒ当国外務大臣ノ面会日ニ当レルヲ以テ直ニ同大臣ヲ訪ヒタルニ先ツ同大臣ヨリ口ヲ開キ今日ハ好個ノ報告ヲ閣下ニ与フルヲ得ルハ欣嬉ノ至リナリトノ緒

言ヲ附シ且曰ク蘭国政府ハ頃日露国ノデ、マルテンス氏ノ問合ニ対シ来ル六月初日ニ当海牙ニ第二回平和會議ヲ開カル、コトニ対シ聊カ異存アルコトナク欣デ之ヲ迎フルノ準備ヲ為スベシト答ヘタリト拙者之ヲ謝シタル後貴訓ヲ体シ平和會議ニ対スル当国政府ノ態度及同會議ニ附セラルベキ重要議案ニ関スル意見等ヲ尋問セシモ御承知ノ如ク和蘭國ハ彈丸黒子ノ小国仮縦ヤ異見アルニモセヨ之ヲ主張シ之ヲ貫徹スルニ必要ナル兵力ノ後援ナキヲ以テ其言聲ノ國際商議ノ上ニ重視セラレサルコトハ蘭国自ラモ亦夙ニ之ヲ認メ居ラザルベカラス唯巧ニ列強ノ間ニ介立シ能フ限り不偏不党ノ態度ヲ守リ何レノ國ノ感情ヲモ害ハサラムコトヲ是レ努ムルハ当國ニ取テ策ノ上乘ナルモノナレバ決シテ各國ニ先テ異様ノ態度ヲ示シ若クハ特殊ノ意見ヲ發表スベキ管ナク外務大臣ハ拙者ニ答フルニ蘭國ハ平和會議ヲ歡迎スルノミナラズ一度ナラズ二度マテモ当海牙ヲ以テ會議ノ地ト定メラレタルハ蘭国政府ノ光榮トスル所ナリ又會議ニ附セラルベキ重要議案ニ付テハ最初ヨリ露国提案ニ同意ヲ表シ置キタル外別ニ意見ノ述べベキナシトノコトヲ以テセリ因テ拙者ハ同大臣ニ向ヒ何レノ國カノ提議ニ由テ露国原案ニ變更ヲ来スカ如キコトアルベキヤヲ聞込マレタルコト無之ヤト問ヒシニ無之ト答ヘ但若シ萬一之アル節ニハソハ

露国政府ヨリ夫々通知セラルベシ尤モ各国政府ニ向テ案内状ヲ發スルハ蘭国政府ノ担任ニ屬シ貴国ハ遠隔ノ地ニ在ルヲ以テ在東京蘭国公使ニ電報シテ以テ貴国ニ案内ヲ通スヘシト附言セリ

又近頃蘭国ハ次回ノ平和會議ニ向テ蘭国永世中立ノ担保ヲ与ヘラレンコトヲ請求スベシトノ風聞ヲ耳ニセシコトアルヲ以テ更ラニ外務大臣ニ向ヒ左レバ貴国ハ次回ノ平和會議ニ向テ貴国ヨリ進テ何等特種ノ議案ヲ提出スベキ御見込ナキヤト尋問セシニナシト答ヘラレタリ依テ拙者ハ又今ヨリ開会ニ至ルマデニ萬一貴国政府ノ態度若クハ意見ニ變更ヲ來スコトアラバ御差支無之限り帝國政府ノ参考迄ニ御内示アランコトヲ請ヒタルニ外務大臣ハ之ヲ諸セルヲ以テ則チ辭シ去リ即日第七号ヲ以テ其大要電報ニ及ビ置候間疾ク御承知ノ義ト存候右為報告此段得貴意候 敵具

明治四十年二月二十八日

在蘭 特命全權公使 佐藤 愛麿(印)

外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

追テ本文デ、マルテンス氏ハ前記ノ如ク本月十七日当地着ノ処翌十八日午前直チニ皇帝陛下及皇太后陛下ニ謁見被仰付其翌十九日ニハ皇帝陛下及和蘭親王殿下ヨリ晚餐

一〇六 明治四十年三月三日

伊国駐劄日下部臨時代理公使
林外務大臣宛

第二回萬国平和會議ニ関シ「マルテンス」博士
ト会见ノ件

機密第四号

四月十二日接受

博士マルテンス第二回平和會議ノ要務ヲ帶ヒ欧州諸強國訪ノ途次當ローマ府ニ來着三日程滞在ノ上維納ニ向ケ出發致シ候同博士ハ小官露国在勤中ノ旧知己ニ有之候ヲ以テ氏ヲ其旅館ニ訪問シ互ニ其久闊ヲ叙シ懇談相試タル上將ニ開カレントスル第二回平和會議ニ談及候処氏ハ開会ノ期日ハ六月上旬ト内定セリ日本ハ遠隔ナレハ右ノ趣キヲ本国政府ニ電報アリ度旨小村男爵及在蘭日本代表者ニ依頼シタルガ重ネテ小官ヨリ政府ニ電報セラル、ニ於テハ尤モ仕合セナリ

杯相話有之候

小官曰ク新聞紙ノ報道ニ由レバ露国政府ハ西国政府ニ對シ貴官同国迄旅行スル時日無之ヲ以テ蘭伊墺ノ三首府ノ一ニ於ル適當ナル代表者ヲシテ貴官ト会见セシメラレ度旨申入レラレ西国政府ハ當府駐劄大使ニ訓令シテ貴官ト会见スルニ至レリト果シテ然ルカ

マルテンス氏曰ク敢テ露国ガ申入レタルニ非ズ其事ハ西班牙

御陪食仰付ケラル、等優遇至ラザル所ナク右ハ殆ド異例ノ待遇ナリト低語スルモノアリタルヤニ聞及ヒタル位ニ候

一〇五 明治四十年三月三日

林外務大臣ヨリ
英國駐劄小村大使宛(電報)
在歐公使

第二回萬国平和會議ニ関シ任国政府ト「マルテンス」トノ協議内容探報方並ニ右在仏墺伊各大公使ニ電報方訓令ノ件

三月二日前一、〇〇

林 大臣

在英 小村大使

第一〇号

マルテンスハ歐洲各国ヲ歴訪シ平和會議ニ関スル各国政府ノ意向ヲ質シツ、アル趣ノ処同人ハ會議期日及議案ニ関スル事項ノ外任国政府トノ間ニ尙他ノ事項ヲモ協議シタルコトナキヤ分リ得ル丈御探知ノ上電報アリタシ右在仏墺伊各大使公使ニ電報アリタシ

牙政府ニ於テ「イニシアチブ」ヲ取りタルナリ又米國政府モ駐劄大使ヲシテ小官ト会见スルヲ訓令シタルバ伯林ニテ同大使ト面談シタリ云々 小官ハ重ネテ同氏ニ我代表者ト殊ニ氏ノ使命ノ事項ニ関シ會談セラレタル事アリヤト尋ネタルニマルテンス氏ハ否ト返答アリ独逸ニテハ井上大使ヲ見タリ仏国ニテハ栗野氏病氣トカニテ遂ニ面會セズ若シ日本政府ガ露都以外ノ地ニ於テ其代表者ヲシテ小官ニ会见セシメントノ希望アラバ只今ノ処維納ニ於テスルノ外ナシローマハ明日出發スル筈且朝九時ヨリ午後四時半迄寸暇ナシ云々 然シ露都ニハ本野公使駐在セラル、次第ナレバ殊ニ他処ニ於テ会见スルノ必要モナカルベシ左リ乍ラ政府ノ訓令サヘアラハ自分ハ喜ンデ維納ニ於ル我代表者ト交渉スベシ云々

依テ小官ハ更ニ第二回平和會議準備ノ模様ニ付相尋ネタル処露国政府カ曩ニ列国ニ提出シタル議案ハ何等ノ故障ナク迎ヘラレタレバ右ヲ根拠トシテ討議スルコト、ナルベク而シテデサルムマンニハ非ズリミティションノ問題トドラゴドクトリンニ関スル問題ハ番外トシテ提出セラルベシ其形式ニ就テハ未ダ決定セズ云々

右談話中外務大臣ノ來訪有之候ヲ以テ須臾ニシテ相辭シ

去リ候同夕露国大使館ニ於テ晚餐夜会有之小生モ之ニ列シ候伊国ノ態度ニ関シテハ未タ確報申上グル迄ニ至ラズ候ヘ共伊国外務大臣ハ前後三回程マルテンスト会见シ毎度ノ会谈二三時間ニ亘リタル如ク有之候風説ニ由レバ外務大臣自身海牙ニ赴クトノ事ニ候ヘ共外務大臣自身ハ委員ハ未ダ決定シ居ラズト申居リ候嘗テ外務大臣タリシ侯爵ブリネッテ及ヴィスニンチヴェノスタ侯等ハ平和會議ヲ痛ク冷遇視居ルモノ、如ク何等實際ノ効果ヲ来ス者ニ非ズト断言致シ候右不取敢及具報置候 敬具

明治四十年三月二日

在伊 臨時代理公使 日下部三九郎(印)
外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

一〇七 明治四十年三月三日

英国駐劄栗野大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議ニ関シ英国政府ト「マルテンス」トノ協議内容探報方訓令ニ対スル回答ノ件

三月三日 前五、二〇 倫敦發
本省着

ト、ナスト雖モ又此儀ニ与カルコトニハ同意スベシ乍然世人ガ兵力制限ハ到底各國多数ノ同意ヲ得ルコト能ハザルヲ確認スル今日ニ於テ之ヲ論議スルモ果シテ如何ナル結果アルベキ乎ト論ジ其他英国主唱ノ議論ハ一々自家撞着ノ説ナルコトヲ列挙駁撃シ終ニ結論シテ曰ク海牙會議ハ學者ガ会合シテ或程度迄世ノ利益ヲ合議スルコトニ止メシメ兵力制限等ニ関スル大問題ヲモ議決スル如キ空想ヲ世人ニ懷カシムベカラズ戰時ニ関スル規則類ノ制定ヲ以テ満足スベシ是既ニ人道ニ貢獻スルコト頗ル大ナルモノナリ世界平和ノ基礎ヲ確立スル如キハ到底希待スベカラズ而モ若シ斯ノ如キ空想ヲ世人ニ懷カシムルコト益々深カラシムルトキハ將來ニ於ケル失望ハ益々大ナルモノタルベシ故ニ此ノ如キ誤謬ナカラシムムニハ思フコトヲ有ノ儘ニ明言スルニ在リ斯ハ吾人ガ海牙會議ニ於テ為サムト欲スル所ナリト

一〇九 明治四十年三月四日

仏国駐劄栗野大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議議題ニ対スル任国政府ノ意向回答ノ件

第三章 平和會議ノ議題及時期、各國ノ準備 一〇九

林外務大臣

第一八号

貴電第一〇号ニ関シ平和會議ノ期日ト軍備制限問題ノ外「マルテンス」ト英国外務大臣トノ間ニ協議セル処ナキ由而シテ其要領ハ往電第一五号ニテ上申ノ通り

一〇八 明治四十年三月四日

仏国駐劄栗野大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議ニ英国政府ヨリ提出ノ軍備制限案ニ対スル仏国新聞論調報告ノ件

三月四日 後五、三五 巴里發
三月五日 後二、一五 東京着

林外務大臣

栗野大使

第二三号

海牙會議ニ関連シテ發表シタル英国主唱ノ兵力制限説ニ対シ三月三日「タン」新聞ハ社説ニ於テ之ヲ駁撃シ之ニ対シテ不賛成ノ説ヲ述ベタリ「タン」記者ハ兵力制限ハ天下ノ形勢ガ之ヲ許シ能ハザルハ一八九九年モ今日モ敢テ變ルコトナシト説キ尤モ兵力制限ハ英国ノ望ム如ク海牙會議ノ議ニ登ルベシ独仏墺伊露五国ノ如キ右ノ議論ヲ以テ不要ノコ

三月四日 後八、五〇 巴里發
三月五日 後四、五〇 本省着

林外務大臣

栗野大使

第二七号

海牙會議ニ関スル仏国ノ意向ハ昨年拙電第九七号ニ依リ略ホ御承知ノコト、存ス其後小村大使宛貴電第一〇号御訓令ノ次第モ有之タルニヨリ本日更ニ政務局次長ニ就キ間接ニ問試マシメタルニ前記拙電第九七号ノ趣旨ヲ繰返スノミニテ仏国ハ何処迄モ露国ノ提案ヲ基トシテ論議セントスル決心ナルカ如シ尤他国ヨリノ提議ニ付テモ無論研究スルニ躊躇セサルヘシ英国ガ提議スヘキ兵力制限ノ問題ニ関シテハ今日ヨリ之ニ対スル仏国ノ意見ヲ確言スル能ハス其場合ニ臨ミ各國ト之ヲ研究スヘシト

一一〇 明治四十年三月五日

西国駐劄市來臨時代理公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議ニ対スル任国政府ノ意向回答ノ件

三月五日 後八、四〇 マドリッド發
三月六日 後四、五〇 本省 着

林外務大臣

市来代理公使

第三号

青木大使宛貴電第二五号ニ関シ

一、西班牙政府ハ平和會議ニ対スル露国政府ノ建議案四ヶ條ニ參同スルコト

二、軍備制限ヲ議案ニ附セラルヘキヲ賛成スルコト

三、他国ニ対スル債權行使ニ関シ武力ヲ使用スル上ニ於テ或ル主義ヲ設クルノ方法アリヤ否ヤヲ議題トスルコト即チ「ドラゴ主義」ナリ

四、平和會議ニ南米諸国ノ參会ヲ可成容易ナラシムルコト

一一一 明治四年三月五日

西国駐劄市来臨時代理公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

第二回萬国平和會議開催ニ対スル西国政府ノ態度並會議議題ニ関シ同国政府「マルテンス」ニ手交セル覺書要旨報告ノ件

機密第三号

四月十五日接受

昨日外務次官ヘ面会致シ平和會議ニ関スル西班牙政府ノ態度及同會議ニ附セラルベキ議案ニ関スル同国政府ノ意見ヲ

一、軍備制限ヲ議案ニ附セラレン事ヲ賛成スル事

二、他国ニ対スル債權行使ニ関シ武力ヲ使用スル上ニ於テ或ル主義ヲ設クルノ方法アリヤ否ヤヲ議題トスルコト

因ニ云フ本案ハ會テ重爾然丁国ノ外務大臣タリシ「ドン、ルイス、フェルナンデス、ドラゴ」氏ニ依リテ主張セラレタル主義ナリ

三、平和會議ニ南米諸国ノ參会ヲ可成丈容易ナラシムル事

石ハ在倫敦小村大使經由ノ在華盛頓青木大使宛貴電第二十五号ノ御訓令ニ從ヒ本日概要不取敢電報致置候次第ニ有之候
右申進候 敬具

明治四十年三月五日

在西 臨時代理公使 市来政方(印)
外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

聞クコトヲ得バ幸ナル旨及談話候処同次官曰ク該問題ニ付テハ過般来「マルタン」氏露国政府ノ命令ヲ受ケテ次回ノ海牙平和會議ニ提出スル議案ヲ構成セン為メ各国ノ意見ヲ聞カントテ各国ニ巡回シ居ルモ馬德里ハ斯ク遠隔ニ居ルニ依リ來訪セザルトノ事故我政府ハ平和會議ニ関シ伊国宮廷ニ於ケル羅馬駐劄我大使ニ訓令ヲ發シ該地ニ滞在中ノ同氏ニ大略左ノ條件ヲ伝達セリトテ右ニ関スル覺書ヲ小官ヘ与ヘラレタリ即チ左ノ如シ

西班牙政府ハ露国政府ヨリ建議シタル左ノ四ヶ條ノ議題ニ賛同スルコト

一、仲裁々判及ビ國際審査委員ニ関スル千八百九十九年條約ヲ修正スル事

二、陸戰ノ法規慣例ニ関スル千八百九十九年條約ヲ一層完備セシムル事

三、ジェネヴァ條約ノ原則ヲ海戰ニ応用スル條約ヲ一層完備セシムル事

四、中立国ノ權利義務ニ関スル海戰ノ法規慣例ヲ編纂スル事

又西班牙政府ハ別ニ同国政府ノ意見トシテ左ノ三ヶ條ヲ議題ニ附セラレンコトヲ發議セリト

一一二 明治四年三月五日

壤国駐劄西代理公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議ニ関スル「マルテンス」協議内容探報ノ件

三月 五日 後一、〇〇 維納發
六日 前六、二〇〇 東京着

林外務大臣

西代理公使

第二二号

經英貴電第一〇号ニ関シ

「マルテンス」三月二日当地ニ著シ外務大臣ト会見シ猶皇帝ニ内謁見ス依テ同人及露国大使並ニ当国外務当局者ニ就キ内密ニ探知セシ所ニ依レバ同人ハ平和會議日付及議案ニ関スル重要事項ノ外当国政府トノ間ニ尙ホ他ノ事項ヲモ協議シタルコトナキモノト認ム

一一三 明治四年三月五日

伊国駐劄日下部臨時代理公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

第二回萬国平和會議マルテンス博士欧州巡回駐伊各国使臣トノ会谈要領報告ノ件

機密

四月十五日接受

マルテンス博士ノ来伊ニ関シテハ小官ハ終始其ノ探索ヲ怠ラサリシ次第ニ有之候処同博士ハ議案ニ関スル事項ノ外特別ノ使命ヲ有シタルモノニ無之ト被察候同博士ハ露国皇帝ノ伊国回訪ノ遅延ニ對スル謝意ヲ伊国皇帝ニ伝奏スルノ勅命ヲ帶ビタリトノ説有之又左ニ記載スル如ク爾ザツチ博士ノ談話中伊国外務大臣ハ伊露通商條約ノ談判ニ関シマルテンス博士ニ協議ニ及ビタリトノ内話モ有之候

又当国駐劄アルジェンチン公使カ欧州ノ数強國ヲ團結シテ或ル事項ニ関シテ平和會議ニ於ケル他國ノ意見ヲ支配セントノ内意ニ出テタルナラントノ説ハ頗ル茫然トシテ偶々昨年ノ赤十字會議ニ於テ自己カ有シタル經驗ヨリ生シタル杞憂ニ出テタルニ無之哉ト被察候兎ニ角唯今迄ノ処特別ノ事項ニ就テ談話シタルモノ、如ク無之ヲ信シ候今左ニ小官カ当國ニ於ケル大使公使等ト会谈シタル次第ヲ略記供御參考度候

三月二日英大使来訪有之雜談ノ末平和會議ニ話及候処軍備制限問題ハ多分英國ニ依リ提出セラルベシ伊国外相ハ已ニ二回程主義ニ於テ之ヲ賛成スル旨ヲ議會ニ於テ公言シ居ル事故本件ニ就テハ態度ヲ英國ト共ニスルナランカドラゴ説ニ関シテハ米國之ヲ提出説明スルナランカ(アルジェンチ

接到ノ上ハ写一部ヲ貴官ニ送ルベシ云々小官ハ氏ノ厚意ヲ謝シ之ヲ依頼シ置ケリ猶同國政府ハ多分ドラゴ博士ヲ委員ノ一人トシテ參列セシムルナラントノ話ニ有之候余ハ同公使ニ西國大使同様第二會議ノ議案日付等ニ就テ交渉ノ命ヲ受ケラレタル議ニヤト相尋ネ候処單ニドラゴ説ニ関シテノミ訓令セラレタリト返事セラレ候

同公使ハ軍備制限ヲ一般ニ適用スルハ頗ル困難ナレハ直接ニ尤關係アル二三國間ニ一ノ條約ヲ締結スルコソ簡便ナルベシ南米諸國ノ例之ナリ而シテ今回ノ平和會議ニ依リテ益々發達スベキハ仲裁條約ナルベシ自分ハ始シメテ伊國ト此ノ條約ヲ締結シタル以來今日ニ於テアルジェンチンカ諸外國ト有スル仲裁條約ハ実ニ十八個ニ達セリト云ヘリ

小官ハ露國ハ四十七ヶ國ニ對シテ案内ヲ發シ置キナカラ僅ニ欧州ノ數ヶ國ニ向ツテマルテンス氏ヲ巡回セシメタルニヤト相尋ネタルニ同公使ハ多分軍費制限問題ニ関シテ諸強國ノ意嚮ヲ探ル次第ナラン尤何レノ會議ニ於テモ團結ヲ作シテ會議ヲ支配セントノ計画有之昨年ノ赤十字會議ニ於テモ欧州ノ五強國ハ團結シテ効カニ他國委員ヲ凌カントノ舉動アリタルヲ探知シタルハ自分ハ南米諸邦十八名ノ委員ヲ集合シ「ブロック」ヲ作り之ニ對シタルハ欧州委員ハ驚愕

ン公使ノ同國提出ノ事真ナルベシ)マルテンス博士ハ此等ノ打合ヲ為シタルニ止マリ他ニ特ニ伊國外相ト協議シタルコトナシト信ズ同日希國公使来訪曰ク次回會議ノ議案中ニ宣戰公布ノ時日ト交戰開始ノ期日トノ間ニ一定ノ期間ヲ置クノ條項アリテ二國カ砲火相見シトスルノ際此ノ期間他三國ヲシテ調停容喙ノ余裕アラシメントノ嚮アリ而シテ露國ノ委員ハ間接ニ此点ニ於テ日露戰爭ニ於ケル旅順夜襲ノ日本ノ行動ヲ批評スルコトアルベシ云々

同四日小官ハ西班牙大使ヲ往訪シタリ同大使ハ本國政府ノ命ニ依リマルテンス氏ト会见シタル次第ナルカ略英大使ト同様ノ談話ヲ致候小官カ日本ヲ代表シテマルテンス氏ト会见シタル議ニヤト相尋ネ候ニ依リ單ニ旧知己トシテ訪問シ会谈シタルノミ欧州ニ於ケル我代表者ハ誰レモ同大使ノ如ク本國政府ヲ代表シテ同博士ト協議ニ及ヒタルモノナカルベシト相答候処同大使ハ少シク怪訝ノ思ヲナシタルモノノ如ク有之候

当國駐劄公使筆頭アルジェンチン公使曰ク自分ハ本國政府ノ命ニ依リドラゴ説ニ関シテマルテンス氏ト会见シタリ氏ハアルジェンチン政府力議案ヲ起草シ提出ス可キヲ依頼シタルハ余ハ之ヲ本國政府ニ電報シタリ本國政府ヨリ右議案

百方弁明スル処アリタリ自分ノ行動ハ大ニ本國政府ニ於テ迎認セラレタリ今回マルテンス氏ノ巡回又其目的ヲ有スルナキヲ保セズ云々懇話アリタリ

次ニ小官ハ前回平和會議ノ委員タリシ瑞典公使ヲ訪問シ氏ノ意見ヲ尋ネタルニマルテンス氏ハ頗ル世才ニ長ケ名譽心ニ富ミ自己ヲ紹介スルニ務ムルノ學者ナレハ多分露國皇帝ニ説キ欧州列強巡回ト云フコトニ出テ勲章ヲモ貰ハントノ希望ニ過キサルナラン勿論種々ノ打合ヲ為シタルナランモ格段ノ結果アリタリトモ思ハレス云々 又自分ハ今回ハ委員タルコトヲ辭シタリ多分丁抹駐在公使ハンマーシヨルド氏委員タルベシ同人ハ嘗テ司法大臣タリシ事モアリ自分ハ平和會議ヲ目シテ政治的事業ニ關係ナキ法學者ノ会合トナスモノナレバ法理ニ精通セル同人コソ適任ナラン已ニ本國政府ニモ上申シタリ云々

當國著名ノ學者ニシテ目下無職ノ國務大臣ナル議員ルザツチ氏トハ小官親交ノ間柄ニ有之候テ常ニ往來致シ居リ候一日同氏ヲ往訪シ懇談ニ及ヒ候氏曰ク

余ハ健康上公宴ニ臨ムコトハ好マサリシモマルテンス氏ヨリ知己トナリ度シトノ希望ナル由ニテ外務大臣之懇篤ナル依頼ニ応シ其ノ公宴ニ列シタリ往年グラッドスト

ン之死スルヤ仏国アカデミーハ其空席ヲ余ニ与ヘタリ余ハ之カ挨拶トシテ一場ノ演説ヲナシタルカマルテンス氏席ニアリテ余ヲ記憶シ居リタリト云フモ余ハ初メテ今回面談シタルノミ、マルテンス氏トチットーニ大臣トノ間ニハ平和會議々案ノ他ニ何等重要ノ相談ナカリシヲ断言ス外務大臣ハ自分ニハ凡テヲ打明ケテ談スノ常ナリマルテンス氏ノ使命ニ何等特種ノ意味ナキハ其確信スル処ナリ然ナカラ伊国外相ハ氏ノ来伊ヲ利用シテ同氏ニ懇談ニ及ビタル一事アリシハ通商條約ノ事之ナリマルテンス氏ハ露国皇帝ノ信用セラル、トノ事故其内露都ニ於テ開カルヘキ通商條約ノ談判ニ関シ伊国ノ利害、希望ヲ説明シ可然皇帝陛下ニ於テ其ノ委員ニ勅命セラレ善良妥協ノ精神ヲ以テ此條約締結ノ功ヲ全フセンコトヲ依頼ニ及ビタリ云々内話有之候
右不取敢及具報候 敬具

明治四十年三月五日

在伊 臨時代理公使 日下部三九郎

外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

ment in regard to the question, and I accordingly have the honour to request Your Excellency's assistance in obtaining the opinion of the Imperial Japanese Government on the point.
I avail myself of this opportunity, Monsieur le Ministre, to renew to Your Excellency the assurance of my highest consideration.

Henry Crofton Lowther
H.B.M's Chargé d'Affaires.

His Excellency,
Viscount Tadasu Hayashi,
Minister for Foreign Affairs,
&c, &c, &c,

一一五 明治四十年三月七日

奥国駐劄西臨時代理公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議議題ニ関シ任国政府ノ意向通知ノ件並ニ「マルテンス」意見報告ノ件(一)

(11)

(1)

三月七日 後六、四〇 維也納
前一日、一五 本省着

第三章 平和會議ノ議題及時期、各国ノ準備 一一五

一一四 明治四十年三月七日 英国代理公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛
第二回萬国平和會議副議長ニ関スル「アルゼンチン」共和国政府ノ希望ニツキ我邦ノ意嚮照会ノ件

British Embassy.

Tokio,

March 7, 1907.

Monsieur le Ministre,

The Argentine Minister in London recently informed Sir Edward Grey that his Government thought that one Vice-President of the Hague Conference would be chosen from the South American Powers who were to be represented there, and considered that the Argentine Representative should be Vice-President for South America in view of the importance of the Argentine and the extent of its trade, which latter was equal to that of Chili and Brazil put together. A similar communication appears to have been made to the United States Government.

As such a matter must clearly be settled by general agreement, His Majesty's Government are anxious to ascertain the views of the Imperial Japanese Govern-

林外務大臣

西臨時代理公使

第一四号

第二回平和會議ニ対スル奥国政府ノ態度ハ同會議ニ重ヲ措キ議案ハ可成実行シ得ベキ結果ヲ有スルモノニ限ル依テ露国提議外ノ議案ハ豫メ列国ノ同意ヲ得テ提出スルヲ必要トス不意ニ種々ノ提議ヲナスハ議事ノ進行ヲ妨グル憂アリト当国全権委員メレイシン本官ニ内話セリ又一般會議ニ関スル方針並ニ兵備問題ハ独乙ト歩調ヲ共ニスル筈又同問題ニ関シテハ伊国ハ英国側ノ意見ナリト外務当局者ヨリ間接ニ聞込シタリ

(11)

三月七日 後一、二〇 維也納
前七日、二〇 本省着

林外務大臣

西臨時代理公使

第一三号

「マルテンス」氏ガ当地ニ於テ第二回平和會議ニ関シ發表セシ意見ノ概要左ノ如シ
列強ハ第二回平和會議開催ノ提議ニ対シ余ニ最モ好感情ヲ与ヘリ依テ第二回會議ハ第一ヨリモ好結果ヲ奏スルコト疑ナシ又議案ハ主トシテ実行シ得ベキ問題ヲ目的トス

I. Commission International d'enquête ノ如キモ既ニ

「ハル」事件ニ関シ好結果ヲ与ヘ若シ之ガ応用ヲ猶ホ一層敏活ナラシメナバ将来開戦ノ場合ヲモ多少制限シ得ベシ

二、現在ノ仲裁々判ノ方法ヲ輕便且ツ敏活ニ行動スル様改正ヲ要スル件ニ就テハ列国多ク之レニ同意ス

三、軍備制限説ニ関シテハ多数ノ国ハ実行ノ見込ヲ有セズ但シ之ヲ會議ニ附スルコトヲ拒絶セズ又タ之ガ為メ列国間ノ感情ヲ損シ延テ本會議ニ影響ヲ及ボスガ如キ憂ナシ尤モ露國ハ現ニ戦後特別ノ場合ニアルガ故本件ニ関シ未ダ確タル意見ヲ發表セズ又之ヲ會議ニ附セントスルニハ豫メ英國政府ヨリ露國ハ公然通知シ露國ハ之レニ関シ列國ノ同意ヲ得ルヲ必要トス思フニ早晚英國ハ右ニ関シ適當ノ方法ヲ案出シ該問題ヲ會議ニ附セントス

四、Doctrine Drago モ亦米國政府ヨリ露國ニ對シ公然ノ手續ヲ為スニ非ラザレバ討論ニ附シ難ク殊ニ其結果ノ如何ヲ豫言シ難シ

五、Tribunal d'arbitrage obligatoire ノ問題ニ関シテハ参列國ノ多数ハ之レニ同意ヲ表スルノ傾キナシ

述委員會ハ已ニ Hull 事件ニ関シ好キ成績ヲ表ハシタリ如此場合ニ當テハ當事國ノ新聞ハ多ク論調ヲ高メ當時英露兩國ノ輿論モ亦タ頗ル激動シ遂ニ兩國政府ハ本件ヲ萬國調査委員ニ付シ審議セシムルコトトナシ數週間ノ後漸ク巴里ニ於テ會議ヲ開ク運ニ至レリ予ノ希望ハ如此場合ハ可成現場ニ付実地調査ヲ為スヲ必要トス彼ノ Hull 事件ノ如キニシテ若シ現場即海上ニ於テ即時ニ審査ヲナスコトヲ得バ該委員ノ議決モ亦タ數時間ニシテ確定スルコトヲ得若シ同委員ヲシテ如此敏活ノ行動ヲ為シ得ルコトトセバ或ハ西米戦争及最近日露開戦等モ避クルコトヲ得タルカト思考ス尤モ前述ノ注意ハ此ヲ以テ常ニ開戦ヲ豫防シ得ルト云フニ非ス寧ロ此方法ニ由リ或ハ戦争ヲ開ク場合ヲ多少制限シ得ル者ト云フニ過キス

第二問題ハ仲裁々判ノ改正ニ在リ右ニ関シ予ハ曩ニ第一平和會議ニ於テ意見ヲ提議セントセシモ已ニ Ponceforte (英國全權委員) 案アリシタメ此ヲ撤回セリ現在ノ仲裁々判ハ事務ノ処弁甚タ渋滞シ且敏活ヲ欠キ又出費多ク此三点ニ付キ最モ改正ヲ要ス列國多ク此カ改良ニ賛成ス又予ハ未タ最近ニ於ケル英首相ノ軍備制限説ニ関スル新聞ノ記事ヲ見ス(同記事ニ對スル質問ノ答) 乍去予ノ意見トシテハ該

一一六 明治四年三月七日 塙國駐劄西臨時代理公使ヨリ 林外務大臣宛

前同伴詳報ノ件

公第一八号

四月十九日接受

第二平和會議ニ関スル「マルテンス」氏ノ意見

第二平和會議ニ関シ欧州列國政府間ニ下協議ヲ纏ムル準備ノ為メ露國政府ヨリ派遣セラレシ「マルテンス」博士ハ本月二日当地ニ着シ四日間滞在中同會議ニ付同博士カ發表セシ意見ノ概要ハ既ニ電報ヲ以テ報告ニ及置候得トモ尙為御參考右ノ新聞記事要領訳出左ニ相掲候
予ハ第二平和會議開催ニ對スル各國感情ノ良好ナルコトヲ認ム依テ第二平和會議ハ第一ヨリモ良結果ヲ奏スルコト疑ナシ予ノ任務ハ第二平和會議ニ関シ露國政府ト列強トノ間ニ於ケル下協議ヲ纏ムル準備ヲ目的トス已ニ一ヶ年前ニ於テ露國政府ハ第二平和會議ヲ主張シ其議案ヲ大別セバ第一平和ニ関スル問題第二戦時ニ関スル規定ノ改訂トス且予ハ第一會議ニ際シ萬國調査委員會設立ノ必要ヲ提議セリ如何トナレハ兩國間ニ紛争起リシ際ハ自他双方相互ニ激昂スト雖モ中立者タル者ハ可成虚心平意此ニ對セサル可カラス前

問題ヲ會議ニ付スルコトニ反對セス但シ如此討議ハ或ル條件ヲ付セザル可ラス曩キニ露國ハ第一平和會議ニ於テ此問題ヲ提議セシモ成效セサリシヨリ再ヒ此ヲ提議スルヲ欲セス其要旨ハ軍備縮少ニアラス將來此カ擴張ヲ制限スルノ主義ニアリ今回會議ニ参列スル國ハ第一會議ニ列セシ國ノ外尙二十ヶ國ヲ追加シ且會議ハ全会一致スルニ非サレハ議決スルニ至ラス故ニ如此問題ニ對シ四十七ヶ國代表者カ悉ク此ニ賛成スルハ豫期ス可カラサル処ナリ因テ實際ハ何等ノ結果ヲ奏セサル者ト認ム第一平和會議ニ於テモ実行シ難キ種々ノ問題ヲ提議セシ实例アリ予ノ任務ハ維納ヲ以テ最終ノ地トス因テ當國政府ハ露國政府ノ提議ニ就キ友誼的ニ交渉ヲ為サンコトヲ希望スルニ在リ

右及報告候 敬具

明治四十年三月七日

在塙臨時代理公使 西源四郎(印)

外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

一一七 明治三十二年三月九日 林外務大臣ヨリ

米國駐劄青木大使宛(電報)
第一回萬國平和會議ノ副議長ニ関スル「プルゼンチ
ン」共和国政府ノ希望及議題ニシキ任國政府ノ意同
問合並右在英大使ハ転電方訓令ノ件

Sent March 9 1907 5-40 p.m.

Aoki,

Washington.

No. 35 I have received note from British Chargé d'Affaires saying that Argentine Minister in London had informed Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs that Argentine Government thought one Vice President of the Hague Conference would be chosen from South America and that Argentine Government considered that Argentine Representative should be Vice President in view of importance of Argentine. British Chargé d'Affaires also stated that a similar communication had also been addressed to United States Government. British Chargé d'Affaires added that as such a matter must be settled by general agreement British Government wished to know views of the Japanese Government on the subject. Before replying to above enquiry I should be glad to know (1) if question of

Hayashi,
Tokio.

No. 30. In the Budget Committee of the Reichstag March 7th, in reply to questions concerning forthcoming Peace Conference in The Hague, Minister for Foreign Affairs stated that the German Government had accepted invitation to take part in the Conference in virtue of an exhaustive programme which had been worked out by the Russian Government. This programme had been examined in detail and the Government were well aware as to what proposals they were prepared to support. Germany would seriously consider every proposal of the Conference and cooperate with good will in its task.

Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs remarked that whether the question of development of international maritime law would be discussed at the Conference or not was still a matter of consideration. The question of disarmament had not as yet been included in the programme and it was not yet certain in what manner, and if the question at all, would be treated.

Inouye.

一一八

Presidency of the Conference has been made the subject of international discussion and (2) if any discussion has taken place regarding the number of Vice Presidents to be chosen. You will accordingly make enquiries of the Government to which you are accredited in the above sense, and apart from the foregoing I wish you would sound Government with a view to ascertain whether the programme of the Conference has been made the subject of discussion or any amendments to the original Project have been made. I should also like to ascertain if anything definite is known about the date of meeting of the Conference. Transmit the above to Baron Komura as my instructions.

一一八 明治三十二年三月九日 独国駐劄井上大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬國平和會議ニ関スル独国外相及次官ノ
説明報告ノ件

Berlin, March 9, 1907. 7:10 p.m.
Recd. " 10, " 3:15 p.m.

一一九 明治三十二年三月十日 独国駐劄井上大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬國平和會議参列独乙国代表者決定ノ件

三月十日 後一、三五 伯林発
三月十一日 前四、三〇 本省着

林外務大臣 井上大使

第三一號

在土耳古国独乙全權大使「イルシナル・フォン・ビーヘル
スタイン」男爵ハ海牙平和會議ニ於クル独乙ノ筆頭代表者
ニ選定セラレタル旨發表アリ同氏ハ先年青木公使当国駐劄
ノ当時外務大臣タリシ人ナリ

一二〇 明治三十二年三月十一日 米國駐劄青木大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第一回萬國平和會議ノ議題ニ対スル任國政府ノ
意向回答ノ件

Washington, —
R'd Tokio, March 11th 1907. 6.00 a.m.

Hayashi,
Tokio.

No. 26. In reference to Your telegram 25. Secretary

of State told me that France most emphatically signified opposition to reduction of armament, more especially naval forces. On the other hand, Great Britain and United States of America, in deference to their respective public opinion, have been more in favour of the scheme, and are disposed to put the question to deliberation of Special Commission of the Second Hague Conference. Germany has thus far refrained from publicly announcing her position regarding the question.

The conference is expected to meet in June.

U. S. A. intend to appoint as Plenipotentiaries three ex-ambassadors, assisted by experts and secretaries. The delegation will comprise six or seven in all.

German Ambassador to U. S. A. told me that since launching of Dreadnaught, the President of U. S. A. seems to have given up his hope of arriving at an international agreement on limitation of armament.

In reference to your telegram 35, I shall see Mr. Root in a few days.

Aoki.

ル処ナシ、ドラゴ説ハ到底討議スルノ価値ナカルベシ云々

又同大臣ニ何故ニマルテンス博士ハ豫定ヲ交シテ再ヒ伯林ニ行キタルヤト尋ネタルニ多分塙外相ト会見ノ結果再ヒ独逸政府ト交渉スルノ必要アリタル為メナラント申サレ候猶小官ハマルテンス氏ノ使命ハ右ノ議案ニ関スル打合せノ為メノミナルヤト相尋ネ候ニ大臣ハ重ニ制限問題ニ関スル打合せノ為ナリト返答致候去ル五日塙国大使館ノ晚餐ニ招カレ宴後大使ノ談話ニ依ルニマルテンス氏ノ使命ニハ何等特別ノ性質モ必要モナキモノノ如ク彼ハ一個ノフューミストニシテ勲章位カ目的ナラント冷靜致シ居リ候

猶露独大使及諸公使其他トモ会談ヲ遂ケタレトモ何レモ同様ノ意見ニテ別ニ新シキ事モ聞キ得ス候

右ノ次第二ニ小官ハマルテンス博士ト伊国外務大臣トノ間ニハ議案ニ就キ打合セタルノ他ニ重要事件ノ交渉ヲ重ネタルモノナント推察致候

右及具報候 敬具

明治四十年三月十一日

在伊 臨時代理大使 日下部三九郎(印)

外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

一一一 明治四十年三月十一日

伊国駐劄日下部臨時代理大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

第二回萬国平和會議ニ関スル「マルテンス」博士協議内容報告ノ件

機密第八号

四月廿二日接受

マルテンス博士ノ来伊ニ関シテハ前信具報及置候処其後外務省書記官長及外務次官ト会談シタルニ右二人ハ僅ニ饗宴ノ席ニテマルテンス博士ト会見シタルニ止マリ次官ハ何等決定スル処ナシト申シ居リマルテンス氏ハ僅ニ遊歴シタルノミト申シ書記官長ハ自分ハ一向知ラザルコト故大臣ニ尋ネヨトノ事ニ有之候外務大臣ハ種々ノ差支アリタル為メ昨日迄会见ヲ与ヘサリシガ同日午後官衙ニ訪問シ司法大臣ノ死去ニ対スル弔詞ヲ述ベ将ニ死ニ頻セントスル大蔵大臣ノ容体等ニ就テ尋ネタル後平和會議ニ話及致シ候処同大臣ニハ第二平和會議ハ露国ノ提出ニ関スル議案ニ基ツキ討議スルコトニ有之伊国ハ右議案ニ対シ何等ノ反対モナク又附加フルモノモナシ、各案ニ対スル伊国政府ノ意見ハ何等決定スル所ナシ、軍費制限ノ問題ハ提出セラルヘキモ如何ナル方法ヲ以テ制限スルヤ如何ナル規定ヲ設クルヤ明細ニ之ヲ議案ニ記載スルヲ要スヘシ是等ノ形式実体トモ未ダ何等確定ス

一二二 明治四十年三月十一日

伊国駐劄日下部臨時代理公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議ニ関スル任国政府ノ意向及「マルテンス」トノ協議ニ関スル報告ノ件

三月十一日 後二、三〇 羅馬第

三月十二日 前六、 東京着

林外務大臣

日下部代理公使

第七号

平和會議ニ対スル伊国政府ノ意向未ダ決定セズ「マルテンス」ト当外務大臣トノ間ニハ右議案ニ関スルモノ、外別ニ相談シタル形跡ナキモノ、如シ

一二三 明治四十年三月十五日

英国駐劄小村大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議副議長ニ関スル亜爾然丁国希望並ニ同會議議長及副議長等ニ関スル任国政府ノ意向回答ノ件

三月十五日 前九、一〇 倫敦着

林外務大臣

小村大使

第二三三号

貴電第三五号ニ関シ今十四日「グレー」氏ニ面会セルニ同大臣ハ「アルゼンチン」ヨリ提議ノ件ハ同国ヨリ米國ヘモ通告ノ旨承知セルニ付之ニ対スル米國政府ノ意向ヲ問合セタルモ同政府ノ回答ニハ賛否ヲ明言セサル故其儘ニ成リ居レリ又「グレー」氏ハ本件ヲ我政府ニ問合スヘキ考ニハナカリシ旨語ラレタリ又会長問題副会長数等ハ未タ協議セラレタル所ナク其他貴電中ノ御下問ニ対シテハ往電第一五号及第一八号ニテ報告セル外別ニ変リナシ

一二四 明治四十年三月五日

白国駐劄大島代理公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬國平和會議ニ於ケル軍備制限ニ関スル
任国政府ノ態度報告ノ件

三月十五日 後五、五〇 プラッセル発
三月十六日 前八、五〇 東京着

林外務大臣

大島代理公使

第弐号

白国政府ハ軍備制限案ヲ平和會議ニ付スルコトニハ賛否ノ説ヲ述ベズ緘黙ノ態度ヲ取ルナラン

一二五 明治四十年三月五日

露国駐劄本野公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬國平和會議開催期日並ニ軍備制限案ニ
関シ英露兩國交渉ノ旨報告ノ件

三月十五日 後一〇、二〇 露都発
三月十六日 前一一、四五 本省着

林外務大臣

本野公使

第六九号

平和會議開催ノ期日ニ付三月十五日「マルテンス」ヲ訪ヒ開合セタル所未タ確定ハセザレトモ多分六月十五日頃迄ノ内ナルベシト云ヘリ目下之ヲ確定スルニ至ラサル原因ハ全ク軍備制限ノ問題ニ関シ英露ノ協議未タ整ハザルニアリ本件ニ関シ尙英大使ヲ訪問質問ニ及ヒタルニ同大使ノ説ニテハ英國政府ニ於テハ既ニ公然宣言シタル次第モアルコトナレハ今更本問題ヲ平和會議ニ提出セサル訳ニモ參ルマジ就テハ之ヲ提出スルノ順序等ニ付相当ノ協議繼マリ次第開催ノ期日モ確定スヘシト云ヘリ「マルテンス」ノ話ニ依レハ晚クトモ二週間内ニハ英國政府ヨリ右ニ付カ申出スヘキ答ノ由

一二六 明治四十年三月二十日

國際平和事務局局長ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

第二回萬國平和會議ニ対スル第十五回宇内平和
會議(ミラン)ノ希望票決通知ノ件

國際平和事務局長

フレデリック、バイエル(?)

日本帝国外務大臣閣下

以書翰致啓上候陳ハ第二回海牙萬國平和會議ノ事業ニ関シ千九百六年九月十五日ヨリ二十二日マテ伊国「ミラン」市ニ於テ開会セル第十五回宇内平和會議ノ表彰シタル別紙希望書御送付致候右希望ニ対シ閣下ノ御賛成ヲ仰カンコトハ該會議員ノ一致票決セル所ニ有之候而シテ閣下ニ於テモ亦該會議員ノ如ク右ノ希望ハ各国政府及人民ノ現今一般渴望ニ從ヒ世界各国ノ間ニ於ケル良好ニシテ永続スヘキ協商進行ノ目標トナルヘキモノト思惟セラルヘシト確信致候
敬具

千九百七年三月二十日「ベルン」ニ於テ

(註) 別紙見当ラズ

一二七 明治四十年三月二十日

露国駐劄本野公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬國平和會議開催期日及軍備制限案ニ関
シ露国外相談話ノ件

三月廿一日 後〇、四一 露都発
後五、二〇 東京着

林外務大臣

本野公使

第七六号

第二回平和會議ニ関シ三月二十日露国外務大臣ハ軍備制限ノ問題ヲ同會議ノ議事ニ付スルヤ否ヤニ付独塊兩國ハ絶体的ニ反対シ英國ハ是非共之ヲ議セムトノ意思ヲ表セルヲ以テ露國ハ其間ニ挾マリテ頗ル困難ノ位置ニアリ而シ此問題ガ如何ニ決定スルヲ問ハズ開會期日ハ新曆六月一日ト定メ近日ノ内公然ノ案内ヲ各国政府ニ出スベキ積リナリト話シタリ

一二八 明治四十年三月二十日

英國駐劄小村大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬國平和會議ニ於ケル軍備制限案ニ関シ
外務大臣ノ談話ノ件

三月廿三日 前五、三〇 倫敦發
本省着

林外務大臣

小村大使

第二五号

往電第五号ニ関シ昨二十一日英国外務大臣ハ左ノ通本官ニ談話セラレタリ露国ヨリ列国ニ向テ發スヘキ平和會議開會ノ通知書中ニ英國ハ軍事費制限問題ヲ同會議ニ提出スルノ權利ヲ保留スル旨ヲ記入スルコトニ関シ目下露国ト交渉中ナリ又若シ英國政府ニ於テ愈々右權利ヲ行使スル場合ニハ本問題ヲ諸強國全權委員ヨリ成レル調査會ノ審議ニ付スル事トナシタキ希望ナリ

一二九 明治四十年三月二四日

米國駐劄青木大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛 (電報)

第二回萬國平和會議ノ會長及副會長議長並議題ニ關スル任國政府ノ意向回答ノ件

Washington,——

Rd. Tokio, March 24th 1907. 0.40 p.m.

Hayashi,

Tokio.

is to favour reference of the subject to committee to consider and to report, as done by the first conference.

Aoki.

一三〇 明治四十年三月二五

米國駐劄青木大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

第二回萬國平和會議副議長ノ選定方ニ付在英「アルゼンチン」公使申出ノ儀ニ付米國政府ヘ問合せノ件

附屬書一 三月十三日付青木大使照會

二 三月廿二日付米國々務卿回答

機密公第九号

四月十六日接受

在英アルゼンチン國公使ノ英国外務卿ニ知照セル第二回萬國平和會議副議長選定ニ關スル「アルゼンチン」國ノ希望ニ付在日英國臨時代理大使ヨリ帝國政府ノ意見問合セノ次第有之タル趣ヲ以テ右ニ關シ示定ノ件々任國政府ニ就キ問合スヘキ旨本月九日第三十五号貴電來訓ノ趣承知致候
因テ去ル十三日國務長官ニ面會別紙甲号寫ノ通りナル覺書ヲ手交シ其回答ヲ求メ候処本月廿二日ニ至リ別紙乙号寫ノ

No. 29. In reference to your telegram 35: Mr. Root told me unofficially March 22nd that U. S. A. has taken no part in the question of president, vice President. They have rather assumed that those positions will be determined by the Govt. of Netherlands. Netherlands Govt. intimated that it would be ready to receive the conference by June 1st. There seems to be general understanding that formal invitations from Russia will contain that date or some other date early in June. Regarding programme, Secretary of State is not aware of any amendment has been (?) introduced to the original project except that assent of Great Britain to the proposal of Russia was with reservation of right to propose reduction or limitation of armament. Answer to Russia from U. S. A. on the subject of programme has been reported in my telegram No. 100 dated November 16th and my Kimitsu-shin No. 20 dated November 19th. Secretary of State says there has been discussions as to whether subject of armament should be brought before the conference. He thinks that it is evident that the subject will be presented (presented?) and says that tendency of the Powers

通り來書有之候其大要ハ不取敢翌廿三日往電第廿九号ヲ以テ及報告候得共尙御參照迄ニ右別紙甲、乙丙号封中差進候間委細右ニテ御承知相成度候

尙右國務長官ニ面會ノ折本使ハ第二回平和會議「プログラム」ノ問題ニ言及シ夫ノ兵備縮少又ハ制限ノ議ニ關シテハ世間種々風説有之候処右ハ果シテ該「プログラム」中ニ挿入セラルベキヤ否ヤヲ問ヒタルニ同長官ハ右兵備制限ノ問題ハ何分ニモ独逸ノ痛ク反對セル所ナルヲ以テ初メヨリ該「プログラム」中ニ之ヲ挿入セラルヘキヤ否ヤハ判知シ難キモ當米國ニ於テハ國民ノ輿論モアルコト故此議ハ是非共第二回平和會議ニ提出シ其委員會ノ討議ニ附スル筈ニシテ右ハ英國政府ニ於テモ同意ヲ表セル所ナリ云々相答ヘ候ニ付其後本使ハ独逸大使ヲ訪問シ參考迄ニ右兵備縮少ノ議ニ關スル其本國政府ノ意向ヲ問質シ候処同大使ハ

自分ハ此議ニ關シ本國政府ニ於テ果シテ如何ノ意向ヲ有セラルハ未タ訓示ニ接セサレバ斷言シ難キモ察スルニ若シ他ノ各國ニ於テ本件ヲ討議スルコトニ同意セバ独逸ニ於テ独リ之ニ故障ヲ唱フルカ如キコトハナカルヘシト思惟ス抑モ此兵備縮少ノ問題ニ關シ最モ反對ノ意見ヲ有

スルモノハ仏国政府ニシテ右ハ曩ニ第二回平和會議ノ提唱ト共ニ該問題提出ノ議起レルニ當リ仏国海軍大臣ハ之ニ反対ノ意見ヲ發表シタルコトアリ又右海軍大臣ノ反対意見發表ノ後ニ於テ仏国政府ノ機關紙ト目セラル、^{「ル、タン」}ハ政府ノ意ヲ承ケタルモノカ或ハ又独自一個ノ意見ニ依リタルモノカ其社説ニ於テ兵備縮少ノ實際云フベクシテ行フヘカラサル所以ヲ陳ベ之ヲ第二回平和會議ノ議題トナスノ議ニ反対ノ意見ヲ表シタルノ事實ニ徴シテモ推知セラル、ナリ云々

相答ヘ候ニ付本使ハ仏国政府ニ於テ既ニ右様ノ意向ヲ有スルニ於テハ独逸政府ハ其仏国トノ關係上自然ニ非兵備縮少ノ態度ニ出デザルベカラサル儀ト思惟スル次第ナルカ曩ニ独逸外務大臣ハ其國ノ議會ニ於テ第二回平和會議ノ「プログラム」中ニハ兵備縮少ノ問題ヲ含マサル旨ヲ公言シタル所以ノモノハ果シテ右ノ如キ仏国政府ノ意向ヲ看取シタルカ為メナリヤ將タ又タ独逸国民ノ輿論兵備縮少ノ議ニ反対セルモノアリテ為メニ政府ハ右ノ如キ言明ヲ必要又ハ便利ナリトシタル事情有之儀ニヤ否ヤ及反問候処独逸大使ハ外務大臣カ右ノ如キ言明ヲ為シタル理由ハ果シテ那邊ニ存ス

(附屬書一)

青木大使照会

Confidential.

PROMEMORIA HANDED BY VISCOUNT

AOKI TO SECRETARY ROOT ON

MARCH 13, 1907.

The British Government has communicated to the Japanese Government the fact that the Argentine Minister in London has informed the British Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs that the Argentine Government thinks one of the Vice Presidents of the forthcoming Hague Conference will be chosen from South America and that Argentine considers it proper that her Plenipotentiary should be the Vice-President to be chosen from among South American delegates. It is understood that a similar communication has been addressed to the Government of the United States by the Argentine Government.

The Japanese Government would be glad to know Firstly: Whether the question of the Presidency of the Second Peace Conference has been considered by the Powers.

ルヤ承知セス要スルニ此兵備縮少ノ問題ハ實際言フヘクシテ行フヘカラサルモノニシテ現ニ大統領ルーズヴェルト氏ノ如キモ先年英國ニ於テ巨大ノ戦艦「ドレッドノート」ヲ建造セルヲ見テ斯ル怖ルヘキ兇器ノ現出スルニ於テハ世界ノ平和ハ扨措キ兵備縮少問題ノ前途モ知ルヘキナリ云々嘆息セラレタルコトアル旨談話致申候

其後本使ハ重テ國務長官ニ面会シ話次復ビ兵備縮少ノ問題ニ及ヒタルニ同長官ハ矢張り前言ヲ繰返シ其問題ハ独逸ノ痛ク反対スル所ナルモ米國政府ハ是非共此議ヲ提出スヘク而シテ其提出セラレタル上ハ多分該會議分科委員ノ調査ニ付セラル、コトトナルヘシ云々懇話致申候

要之右兵備縮少ノ議ニ関シテハ米國政府ハ独逸ニ於テ最モ反対ト云ヒ独逸ハ仏國政府ニ於テ最モ反対スル所ナリト云ヒ兩者ノ間ニ於テ意向相違有之申候

右御參考迄不取敢及報告候 敬具

明治四十年三月廿五日

在米 特命全權大使子爵 青木周藏(印)
外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

Secondly: Whether the number of Vice Presidents to be chosen has likewise been discussed.

Thirdly: Whether the program of the Conference has been made the subject of discussion and whether any amendment has been introduced to the original project, and

Fourthly: Whether any particular day in June has been fixed as the date of the meeting of the Conference.

(附屬書二)

米國々務卿回答

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
WASHINGTON.

March 22, 1907.

(L)

Confidential.

My dear Viscount Aoki:

With regard to the questions of the memorandum which you left with me last week: as to the first and second questions, we have taken no part in the questions of the Presidency or Vice Presidency of The Hague Conference. We have rather assumed that those positions would be determined by the Govern-

ment which entertains the Conference. At the First Conference, there was but one Vice President, and I think that both the President and Vice President were Dutch.

As to the fourth question, no day has yet been fixed as to the date of the meeting of the Conference, but the Netherlands Government has intimated that it would be ready to receive the Conference by the first of June, and there seems to be a general understanding that the formal invitation from Russia will contain that date, or some other date early in June.

As to the third question, the program of the Conference has been made the subject of a great deal of discussion. I am not aware that any amendment has been introduced to the original project, except that Great Britain's assent to the program proposed by Russia was with reservation of the right to propose to the Conference the subject of reduction or limitation of armaments. The answer of the United States to Russia accepted all the subjects which Russia proposed to include in the program, but reserved the right to propose to the Conference two further subjects: one, the limitation of armaments, and the other, the use of force for the collection of ordinary contract

debts from a Government to the citizens of another Government.

Japan, you will remember, reserved, generally, the right to propose further subjects within a reasonable time before the meeting of the Conference.

There has been much discussion of the question whether the subject of armament should be brought before the Conference. Mr. de Martens, the Russian publicist, has visited all the European capitals and discussed the subject with the respective governments. I think it is quite evident that the subject will be presented, and the general tendency of the Powers is to favor the same course which was followed at the first Conference; that is, the reference of the subject to a Committee to consider and report. In that case, further action would, of course, be shaped largely by the report of the Committee.

With high regards, I am,
Always faithfully yours,
(Signed) Elihu Root.

His Excellency
Viscount Aoki,
Ambassador of Japan.

一四一 明治三十二年五月十日 林外務大臣ヨリ
蘭國駐劄佐藤公使宛(電報)

第二回萬國平和會議ノ確定期日及議題修正ノ如何
速報方任國政府ニ要請並右在露公使ニ郵電方
訓令ハ付

Sent March 30 1907 5-40 p.m.

Sato,
The Hague.

No. 4. You are instructed to inform the Netherlands Minister for Foreign Affairs that the Japanese Government have not received any official intimation of the date of the meeting of the forthcoming Peace Conference, although the public press confidently announces that June 1st has been fixed as the date. You will explain that on this occasion most of the Japanese Delegates will be sent from Japan instead of being appointed from among officials already in Europe, and you will say that having in view the necessary time of transit, the infrequent departure of convenient passenger steamers and the impossibility of obtaining steamer accommodation without booking a considerable time in advance, it will be extremely difficult, if not practically impossible, for the Japanese Delegates proceeding from Japan to reach The Hague

at the appointed time, unless the Japanese Government are given at least two months previous notice of the date when the Conference is to be convened. You will further state that the Japanese Government are unaware whether the Netherlands Government in giving notice of the date of meeting of the Conference are to communicate to the Powers the programme of the Conference as finally agreed upon, and you will add that Japanese Government understood that the programme proposed by Russia was tentative only and that they would be informed of the definitive programme before the meeting of the Conference. The Japanese Government are informed that the draft project has been made the subject of general discussion, but they are not informed whether any modifications have been introduced, and you will point out that the Japanese Government will wish to know before giving final instructions to their Delegates, what, if any, modifications have been made to the Russian project.

Transmit the above to the Japanese Minister at St. Petersburg for his own information.

Hayashi.

一三二 明治三十年三月十一日 蘭国駐劄佐藤公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛（電報）

第二回萬国平和會議ノ題及開催期日ニ関スル蘭
国政府意向報告ノ件（一）

The Hague, 9.15 p.m., 31/3/07.
Received, 11.20 a.m., 1/4/07.

Hayashi,
Tokio.

No. 10. Regarding your telegram No. 4 will telegraph
reply fully after seeing Dutch Minister for Foreign
Affairs Tuesday afternoon, but, meanwhile, I inform
you that Secretary General of the Foreign Affairs
told me to-day that no official intimation about date
etc. has yet been received from Russian Government.

Sato.

一三三 明治三十年四月二日 蘭国駐劄佐藤公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛（電報）

前同伴（一）

The Hague, April 2nd, 1907 5.25 p.m.
Tokio. " 3rd. " 10.45 a.m.

一三四 明治三十年四月三日 蘭国駐劄佐藤公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

前同伴（三）

機密第七号 五月十一日接受

去月三十日附第四号貴電ヲ以テ第二回平和會議開催ノ期日
ニ付キ右ハ六月一日ト決定セラレタル旨確実ラシク新聞紙
上ニ報道セラルト雖モ帝國政府ニ於テハ之ニ関シ未タ何
等公然ノ通知ニ接セザル旨ヲ蘭国外務大臣ニ告ケ且ツ今回
ノ平和會議ニ列坐スベキ帝國ノ委員ハ多クハ現ニ歐洲ニ在
ル所ノ官吏中ヨリ任命セラルコトナク特ニ本邦ヨリ派遣
セラルベキ管ナルヲ以テ其渡航ニ長日月ヲ要候処相当ナル
旅客船ノ出帆頻繁ナラサルカ故ニ久シキ以前ヨリ船室ヲ豫
約スルニ非ラザレバ便乗ノ便ヲ得ルコト不可能ニ屬シ旁以
テ平和會議開催ニ先チ帝國政府ニ於テ少クトモ二ヶ月ノ豫
告ヲ受クルニ非ラスンバ本邦ヨリ渡航赴任スル帝國ノ委員
ハ開会期日迄ニ海牙ニ到達スルコト實際不可能ニ屬セサル
マデモ極メテ困難ナルベキコトヲ同大臣ニ説明スヘキ旨又
蘭国政府ヨリ該會議開催ノ期日ヲ通知スルト共ニ該會議
ノ討議ニ附セラルベキ確定議案ヲモ同国政府ヨリ各国へ通
知セラルベキ積ナルヤ否帝國政府ニ於テ一向承知シ居ラス

Hayashi,
Tokio.

No. 11. Dutch Minister for Foreign Affairs told me
that, anticipating necessary allowance of time for the
delegates from distant countries, he inquired Russian
Government of the date, but as yet he has received
no answer from them. He thinks however that from
all indications it will be neither earlier than June 1st.
nor later than June 15th; yet to my question whe-
ther the conference will take place at all or not, he
could not answer positively yes or no, although he
thinks it will. He promised me to telegraph the
date to Dutch Minister in Japan as soon as known.
He says modification, if any, to original Russian
programme will be communicated in advance to the
Powers by Russia.

Sato.

且ツ帝國政府ノ承知セルトコロニテハ露国ヨリ提出セラレ
タル議案ハ単ニ試案タルニ過キスシテ何レ開会ニ先テ確定
議案ノ通知ヲ受クヘシト心得居リタルガ聞クトコロニ依レ
ハ該草案ハ広ク討議ニ附セラレタル由ナレドモ之ニ対シテ
如何ナル修正ノ加ヘラレタルヤ否ヤニ付テハ帝國政府ニ於
テ未ダ何等通知ニ接セズ因テ苟クモ修正ノ加ヘラレタラン
ニハ其修正ハ如何ナルモノナルカ帝國政府ニ於テ其委員ハ
最終ノ訓令ヲ与フルニ先チ之ヲ承知センコトヲ希望スル旨
ヲ当国外務大臣へ申入ルベキ旨ヲ訓示セラレタリ

依テ去三十日夜直ニ蘭国外務大臣ニ一書ヲ寄セ面会ヲ請求
セシニ惟ニ三十一日ハ日曜日一日ハエスター祭日ヲ以テナ
ルベク去ル二日午後二時半外務省ニテ拙者ヲ接見スヘキ旨
ノ回答ニ接シタリ

然ルニ恰好シ去ル三十一日当国外務省総務長官本官ヲ来訪
セシニ付キ其機ヲ利シ御來電ノ要旨ヲ告ゲ其意見ヲ叩キ試
タルニ平和會議開催期日ハ勿論其他ノ事柄ニ付テモ未タ露
国政府ヨリ何等公然ノ通知無之旨相答候ニ付其旨不取敢同
日第十号電信ヲ以テ閣下へ報告ニ及ビ置タリ

昨二日豫約ノ時間ニ外務省へ出頭外務大臣ニ面会貴電ノ旨
趣ヲ告ケ且ツ必要ノ説明ヲモ加ヘ候処同大臣ノ答ニハ実ハ

先達テヨリ御話モアリ愈ヨ六月一日ヨリ平和會議開催セラ
ル、コト、セバ地球ノ反対方面ニ位スル諸国即チ貴国清国
其他南米諸国委員ノ渡航ニハ幾多ノ時日ヲ要スルハ勿論ニ
付キ頃日露国政府ニ向ケテ其趣ヲ申入レ可成速ニ開会期日
ヲ決定シテ之ヲ通知アリタシト申遣ハシ置キタレトモ未ダ
何等ノ回答ニ接セズ尤モ回答ニ接セバ直ニ在貴国蘭国公使
ニ電報シ貴国政府ヘ御通知ニ可及ニ付夫レ丈ケハ御安神ア
リタシ又露国ノ原案ニ対シテ何等修正ノ加ヘラレタルヤニ
就テハ本大臣モ未タ何等公然聞キタルコトナシ蓋シ萬一修
正ノ加ヘラルベキ場合ニハソハ開会ニ先チ露国政府ヨリ各
国ニ向テ回章ヲ發送スベシ要スルニ蘭国政府ノ受持ハ開会
期日ヲ通知スルニ外ナラズ議題ノ件ノ如キハ露国政府ノ主
任ナリ併シ本大臣ノ考ニテハ平和會議ノ開会ハ六月一日以
後同十五日以前ナルベシト思ハル云々

然ルニ頃日新聞紙上ニ散見スルニ露国ノマルチン氏某新聞
記者ニ語リタリトイフ所ニヨレバ夫ノ英国ノ主唱セリトイ
フ兵備制限問題ニ関シ若シ之ヲ議題ニ上ボスレバ独逸兩國
同會議ニ参列スルヲ拒ムヘク之ヲ上ボセサレバ英米兩國同
シク参列ヲ拒ムベキ形勢ニテ頗ル困難ヲ感シ居ルヤニ被見
受候ニ付夫レトハナク試ニ当国外務大臣ニ向テ開会ノ期日
ハ或ハ伊国ヲシテ右ニ関シ居仲調訂ノ任ニ当ラシメントセ
ルモノ、如ク当地新聞ヘ報道セリ

一三六 明治四年四月六日 埃国駐劄西臨時代理公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議議題ニ関スル埃国新聞論調

報告ノ件(二)

四月六日 後一、三〇 維也納
四月七日 前一、三〇 本省着

林外務大臣 西臨時代理公使

第二一號

平和會議ニ関シ最近露国ノ通告ニ対スル当地新聞ノ意嚮ヲ
綜合セバ左ノ如シ

一、日英兩國ガ露国ノ議案ニ対シ充分結果ヲ奏スル見込ナ
キ條項ニ関シテ討議ニ与ラザルノ權利ヲ保留スト宣言セ
リ依テ日本ハ同盟国タル英国案ノ軍備制限説ニハ同意セ
ザルモノト認ム現ニ同案賛成者ノ内ニ列セザルヲ以テ明
瞭ナリトス

二、露国案ノ内日本ガ認メザリシ点ハ或ハ日露開戦ニ際シ
日本ノ所置ヲ批難セントスル傾キアルガ故ナルカ

第三章 平和會議ノ議題及時期、各國ノ準備 一三六

ハ兎モ角第二回平和會議ハ必ラズ開会セラル、コトニ決定
セラレタルモノト見做シ可然ヤト問試ミタルニ同大臣ハ自
分ハ開会セラルベシト思ヒ居ルモ其有無ヲ断言スルコト能
ハスト答ヘラレ候依テ右会见ノ要旨ヲ摘ミ昨日第十一号電
信ヲ以テ及御報告候次第ニ候 敬具

明治四十年四月三日

在蘭 特命全權公使 佐藤愛鷹(印)

外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

一三五 明治四年四月三日 埃国駐劄西臨時代理公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回平和會議軍備制限案ニ関スル埃国新聞論
調報告ノ件(二)

四月二日 後一、三〇 維也納
四月三日 前六、一〇 本省着

林外務大臣 西臨時代理公使

第一九號

軍備制限案ハ平和會議ニ関シ主タル先決問題トス英米ノ制
限説ニ対シ伊国賛成シ独逸ノ反対ニ露仏同意シ此ノ如ク列
国各々態度ヲ異ニスルガ故今回独逸宰相ガ伊外相ト会见セル

三、英国ガ軍備制限案ヲ主張スル主眼ハ独逸ノ海軍擴張ヲ
暗ニ牽制セントスルニアリ英国ノ陸軍ハ独乙ニ対立出来
ザルガ故自ラ之レヲ制限スルモ何等失フ所ナシトス
四、米國ハ有力ナル陸軍ヲ有セズ又西班牙ハ英國ト帝室ノ
關係アル等ノ理由ニヨリ英國案ニ賛成セシニ過ギズ
五、英國ハ極東ノ同盟タル日本及ビ大陸ノ友邦タル仏國等
ヨリ制限案ニ賛成ヲ得ザル上尙ホ独逸獨逸ノ反対ニ遇ヒタ
レバ止ヲ得ズ或ハ此際ハタゞ兵力制限ノ為メ尽力セント
ノ主義ヲ議事録ニ掲グルヲ以テ満足シ了ラントス

一三七 明治四年四月七日 埃国駐劄西臨時代理公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

第二回平和會議ニ関スル列国ノ態度ニ付埃国新聞
論調報告ノ件(三)

公第二三號 五月十一日接受

第二回平和會議ニ関スル列国ノ態度ニ付露国政府ハ本月四日
付ヲ以テ当国政府ヘ通牒セシ件ニ関シ当地新聞ノ意向ハ第
二一號電報ヲ以テ概要已ニ報告致置候処当国半官報「フレ

ムデン、ブラット」(本月六日) 論説ハ右ニ関スル当国政府ノ態度ヲ示セシモノト相認候間要領訳出為御参考左ニ相掲候

千八百九十九年ノ平和會議ニ於テ英國ハ海上法ニ関スル問題ニ對シテハ特殊ノ態度ヲ示セリ今回日英兩國政府ノ發表セシ主義ニ由レハ英國ハ今尙其所見ヲ變更スルヲ好マス又タ日本ハ海上ニ於ケル規定追加ニ反對スル英國ノ意見ニ贊成スル者ト推測スルコトヲ得若シ果シテ如此歐洲並ニ極東ニ於ケル各海上主權者ニシテ海上法規ノ激變ニ反對スルモノトセバ今回ノ平和會議ニ於ケル仕事ハ露國議案ノ内僅ニ細末ナル小問題ノ討議ニ了ルニ過キス昨去平和會議ニ於テ得タル結果ハ多少ニ不係博愛主義ニ著大ナル影響ヲ及スガユハ壤國ハ最初ヨリ実行ノ見込ナキ問題ヲ除クノ外ハ前述ノ主意ニ基ク総テノ動議ヲ援助セントス故ニ壤國ノ態度ハ利己目的ノ觀念ヲ去テ一二實際的有利ナル方針ニ向ハントスルニアルノミ且此ニ関スル露國ノ通牒ニ由レハ同國及獨逸ノ意見モ亦タ此ト均シ然ラハ則チ三帝國ノ親密ナル關係ハ更ニ新ニ海牙ニ於テ公然表示セラレントスルニアリ云々
右及具報候 敬具

明治四十年四月七日

在壤 臨時代理公使 西源四郎(印)
外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

一三八 明治四十年四月十四日 米國駐劄青木大使ヨリ
林外務大臣(電報)

第二回萬國平和會議ニ參列ノ米國委員任命通知
並同會議ニ韓國招請ノ新聞記事ニ對シ真否問合
セノ件

Washington,.....
R'd. Tokio, April 14th 1907, 11.30 a.m.

Hayashi,

Tokio.

No. 33. In reference to your telegram 25; personal of U. S. delegates to The Hague has been announced. The announcement coupled with private information from Solicitor State Department who is to accompany the delegation as expert in international law shows the following composition of delegation: seven members of the Commission jointly represent U. S. Government; are authorized to sign in its behalf; among

these, three are called "Commissioners Plenipotentiary with the rank Ambassador Extraordinary"; include Choate, former U. S. Ambassador to Great Britain, Porter, former U. S. Ambassador to France; the remaining four are called simply Commissioners Plenipotentiary including one brigadier-general one rear-admiral; there is a secretary attached to Commission; besides Solicitor above named, the reporter of Supreme Court of the U. S. accompany as an assistant legal expert.

Newspapers report Corea was invited to the Conference. Inform me regarding the matter.

Aoki.

一三九 明治四十年四月七日 米國駐劄青木大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

第二回萬國平和會議參列ノ米國全權及隨員任命
ノ件

公第二九号 五月十日接受

本年六月十五日和蘭國海牙ニ於テ開催セラルヘキ第二回萬國平和會議ニ參列ノ為メ米國代表委員及其隨員任命アリタ

ル旨別紙ノ通り本月十三日發刊諸新聞紙ニ掲載有之候ニ付即日宮岡參事官ヲ國務省ニ遣ハシ同省法律事務官 Scott ヲ就キ右代表委員ノ編制及資格等公然ト無ク問合ハサシメ候処今回ノ全權委員ハ七名ニシテ各自其委任狀ヲ帶有シ共同シテ米國ヲ代表スル權限アリ右全權委員ハ
一、前駐英大使 Joseph Hodges Choate
二、前駐仏大使 Gen. Horace Porter
三、U. M. Rose 弁護士ニシテ會テ米國弁護士會長ナリシカ現ニ Arkansas 弁護士會長タリ
四、David Jayne Hill
Rochester 大學総長ナリシカ後國務次官トナリ瑞西駐在公使ヲ經テ現ニ海牙ニ公使タリ著ス所 A. History of Diplomacy in the International Development of Europe (全部六卷第二卷既刊)アリ
五、陸軍少將 (Brigadier General) George Breckenridge Davis
West Point 陸軍士官學校ヲ卒業シタル後 Columbian University ニ遊ヒテ法律ヲ學ヒ會テ陸軍大學校國際法教授ナリシカ現ニ陸軍省法務局長タリ國際法米國陸軍法規ニ関シ數種ノ著書アリ

六、海軍大学校長海軍少将 Charles Stillman Sperry
七、William Insko Buchanan

會テ亜爾然丁及巴奈馬公使タリ先年 Buffalo ニ開設ノ全米博覽會總裁トナリ第二回全米會議ニハ米國政府ノ委員トナリテ參列シ客年伯刺西爾國首府ニ開カレタル第三回全米會議ニ於テハ米國政府委員長タリ

右七名ノ全權委員ハ之ヲ二段ノ階級ニ分チ初三名ノ帶有セル委任狀ニハ Commissioner Plenipotentiary with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary to serve as a member of the Commission to represent the Government of the United States at the Conference to be held at the Hague ナル文句アリ而シテ他四名ノ委任狀ニハ単ニ Commissioner Plenipotentiary to serve as a member of the Commission to represent the Government of the United States ヲトアリテ「大使ノ身分ヲ有スル云々」ノ文字無シ
又右委員中陸海軍ノ將官各一名ハ執レモ相當官ニハ非スシテ真ノ武官ナリ即チ軍事上ノ專門知識ヲ有スル委員トシテ此班列ニ加ハリタルモノト知ラル

一四〇 明治四十年四月十五日

林外務大臣ヨリ
米國駐劄青木大使宛（電報）

第二回萬國平和會議ニ韓國政府招請ノ新聞記事ニ關シ回答ノ件

四月十五日發

在米 青木大使

大 臣

第四六号

貴電三三号末段ニ關シ帝國政府ノ承知セル限り韓國ハ招待ヲ受ケタルコトナシ

一四一 明治四十年四月十六日

伊國代理公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

第二回萬國平和會議ニ軍備縮少案提出方法ニ關スル「チトニー」外相ノ電訓ヲ手交ノ件

（訳文）伊國外務大臣ヨリ伊國代理公使ニ宛タル電訓要領軍備制限若ハ縮少問題ニ關スル英國政府ノ提案ハ伊國政府ノ主義トシテ賛成スル所ナレトモ之ニ關シ豫メ諸大國ノ賛同ヲ得サレハ同提案ハ遂ニ一ノ高尙ナル希望ノ發表タルニ止マルニ至ルヘシ

曩ニ英國政府ハ本問題ヲ諸大國代表者ノ委員會ニ付セムト

第三章 平和會議ノ議題及時期、各國ノ準備 一四〇

隨員

一九八

一、書記トシテ Maine 洲選出上院議員ノ男ニシテ會テ在埃米國大使館書記官タリシ Chandler Hale

二、國際法專門委員 (Legal member of Commission, expert in International Law) トシテ前ノ Illinois 大学法科大学長現任國務省法律事務官 James Brown Scott (Cases of International Law 著者)

三、國際法專門委員補助トシテ米國大審院報告書記 Charles Henry Butler (The Treaty-Making Power of the United States, 1902 著者)

右大要既ニ本月十三日往電第三三三号ヲ以テ申進置候処尙御參考迄ニ詳細茲ニ及報告候 敬具

明治四十年四月十七日

在米

特命全權大使子爵 青木周藏（印）

外務大臣子爵 林 董殷

スル旨ヲ宣言シタルガ右英國政府發案ノ成効セサル場合ニ於テハ伊國政府ハ左記ノ順序ニ依リテ本問題ヲ處理セムト欲ス

一、軍備制限問題ハ露國提案中ニ記載セサルモノナリト雖モ或一國又ハ數國ニ於テ本問題ヲ平和會議ニ提出セムトスル旨ヲ豫メ自余諸國ニ通知スルニ於テハ之ヲ同會議ニ提出スルヲ得ヘキコト

二、右通知書ヲ發スルニ當リテハ本問題ノ大体ヲ陳述スルノミナラス本問題ノ解決ヲ容易ナラシムヘキ諸般ノ細目ヲモ併セテ具體的ニ記載スルコト

三、本問題ハ露國提案中ニ記載セサルモノナルニ因リ同提案中記載ノ諸問題ヲ議シタル後最先ニ之ヲ議スルコト
四、本問題ニ關スル議決ハ單ニ本問題ヲ以テ諸大國ノ考量ニ供スルノ価値アリトスルノ意味ヲ有スルニ過キサルモノトスルコト

五、右議決ヲ經タル事項ハ追テ之ヲ諸大國間ノ直接談判ニ付スルコト

本大臣先般獨逸帝國宰相ニ面會ノ折前記考案ニ付談話シタルニ同宰相ハ全然同意ノ旨ヲ宣明セラレタリ

一四一

一九九

貴官ハ内密ニ本書ヲ林子爵ニ読聞カセ其意見ヲ徴シタル上之ヲ本大臣ニ報告セラルヘシ

註 右ニ対スル回答ノ試案トシテ当初立案セラレタルモノ左ノ通

「林子爵ハ軍備制限問題ニ関シ「チットーニ」閣下ノ提出ニ係ル方案ハ最モ穩當ニシテ調和的ナル者ト思考スルニ付同閣下ニ同情ヲ表ス同案ハ諸國ノ終ニ一致スルヲ得ルニ至ルヘキ基礎ヲ形成スルモノニシテ若シ他日同案ヲ海牙第二平和會議ニ提出セムトスル「チットーニ」閣下ノ意思ヲ実行シ得ヘキ情勢ノ發生シタル場合ニ於テハ帝國政府ハ該案ニ対シ賛同ノ意ヲ表スヘシ」

一四二 明治四年四月七日

林外務大臣ヨリ
伊國代理公使宛

第二回萬國平和會議ニ軍備縮少案提出方法ニ関

スル伊國政府ノ考案ニ対スル回答ノ件

The Imperial Government congratulate the Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs upon his eminently conciliatory propositions respecting limitation of armament. Although the Imperial Government fear that there is no present prospect of a general accord among

ハ當國外務省ノ鼓吹ヲ受クルト称セラル、「ル、タン」ハ三月三日紙上ニ於テ英國首相ノ論說ニ対シ忌憚ナク評論ヲ試ミ冒頭先ヅ自由黨機關雜誌「ナショナル・レビュー」ガ其初号紙上ニ英國首相ノ論文ヲ掲載シタルハ其発端ニ於ケル成功ト云フベキモ首相ノ言說ニ対シテハ論議スベキモノアリト喝破シタル後大要左ノ如ク陳述セリ

吾人ハ平素「サー、ヘンリー、カムベル、バンナーマン」ノ性格ニ対シ最モ誠実ナル敬意ヲ有スルモノニシテ今其所論ニ対シ忌憚ナク是非ノ評論ヲ加フルモ氏ノ寛容ナル必スヤ之ニ対シテ一驚ヲ喫スルコトナカルベシ吾人ノ見ル所ニテハ英國首相ノ所論中一言一句タリトモ事實又ハ論者自身ノ言質ニ牴觸セサルモノナキヲ如何セン先ツ首相ハ何ニ拠リテ以テ軍備制限ニ関スル協定ハ既ニ一八九九年ニ於テ之ヲ結ブコトヲ得タルモノニシテ今日ニ於テモ亦之レヲ結ブコトヲ得ベキ旨斷言スルニ至リタルヤ借問ス「ビューロー」公ガ吾人ハ鉄砲タルカ將タ鉄鎗タルカヲ扱ハサルヘカラズトノ形容ヲ下セル此地球上ニ於テ何等カノ變動ヲ生シタルコトアリヤ近代ノ世界ハ皆經濟上ノ利害及ヒ政治上ノ情慾ニ依リ支配セラル、モノニシテ現ニ第一海牙會議以來諸國民ハ此ノ利害及ヒ情慾ノ為

the Powers on that important subject, they would have no objection to Monsieur Tilton's propositions in principle as an eventual mode of procedure.

一四三 明治四年四月三十日

仏國駐劄栗野大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

英國ノ軍備制限計画ニ対スル仏國新聞論調統報

ノ件

公第三六号

五月廿八日接受

英國ノ軍備縮少計画ニ対スル當國側ノ意見ニ関シテハ客年八月十二日付公第八七号信ヲ以テ委曲具申ノ次第モ有之候処去月始メ英國首相「サー、ヘンリー、カムベル、バンナーマン」ガ自由黨機關雜誌上ニ於テ公然軍備制限説ヲ發表スルニ及ビ英國政府カ来ル第二回平和會議ニ於テ本問題ヲ討議ニ附スルノ意思ヲ有スルコト最早蓋フベカラザルノ事實トナリタルヲ以テ當國新聞紙ハ社会黨臭味ノ分ヲ除クノ外概ネ萬口一齊ニ右軍備制限説ヲ駁撃シ之レニ対シテ不贊成ノ意見ヲ發表スル所アリ今左ニ重立テル二三新聞紙ニ就キ其所論ノ要領ヲ報告ニ及ブベク候外交上ノ問題ニ就テ

メ左右スル所トナレリ英杜戦争ト云ヒ日露戦争ト云ヒ將タモロコシ事件ト云ヒ皆其以後ニ發生セルモノニシテ今其ノ内何レカハ回避スルコトヲ得ヘカリシト言ヒ得ルモノアリヤ若シ現世界ニシテ「ワルデック、ルーソウ」カ其大演説中ニ於テ述ヘタルカ如キ幸福ナル島嶼(即チ其ノ富ノ程度住民ノ生計ヲ支フルニ足レルモ敵手ヲシテ略奪ノ慾望ヲ抱カシムルニハ不足ナルモノ)ヨリ成立スルモノトスレバ然リト答フルコトヲ得ベシ此ノ如ク理想ト現実トヲ比較シ見バ英國政府ノ責任アル首长カ如何ニ不謹慎ナル確信ヲ抱持セルカヲ知ルニ足ラン

又「サー、ヘンリー、カムベル、バンナーマン」ハ軍備制限ニ関シ討議スルモ何等ノ危険ナキ旨ヲ宣言スル所アリ然リ之レニ対シテハ疑ヲ容ル、ノ余地ナシ蓋シ何人モ海牙會議ヲ以テ其成行上和戰如何ヲ決スルニ至ルカ如キ重味ヲ有スルモノト考フルモノナケレハナリ

實ニ氏ノ希望スルカ如ク同會議ハ右ニ関スル討議ヲ為スニ至ルベク現ニ露、独、仏、伊、墺諸國ハ右ノ討議ヲ以テ固ヨリ不必要ナリト看做スモ此儀ニ与ルコトハ敢テ辭セザルベシ然シ世人カ軍備制限ノ一事ハ列國多數ノ反対

ニヨリ國際協約トナルノ見込ナキヲ看破シ居レル今日ニ於テ之レヲ討議スルモ果シテ如何ナル効果アルベキヤ次ニ英國首相ガ英國ハ先ヅ自國ノ海軍力ヲ制限シタリト言ヘルニ對シ冷評ヲ加ヘ又首相カ英國ノ海軍力ハ何レノ國家又ハ國家聯合體ニ對シテモ何等ノ威嚇タルモノニアラズトテ其理由ヲ詳説セルニ對シ一々自家撞着ノ説ナルコトヲ列挙駁撃シタル後チ左ノ如ク結論セリ

海牙會議ハ彼ノ「マルテンズ」氏カ巴里ニ於テ言ヒタルカ如ク其性質ヲ學者カ會合シテ或ル程度迄世ノ利益ヲ計ルモノタルニ止メシメ軍備制限ニ關スル大問題ヲ議決シ得ルカ如キ空想ヲ世人ニ抱カシムベカラズ要スルニ此會議ハ戰時法規ノ制定ヲ以テ満足スベキモノニシテ是レスラ既ニ人道ニ貢獻スルコト頗ル大ナルモノアリ世界平和ノ基礎ヲ確立スルカ如キハ到底之レヲ期待スベカラズ若シ萬一世人ヲシテ此ノ如キ空想ヲ抱カシムルコト益々深カラシムカ其失望モ亦之ニ比例シテ益々大ナルモノアルベシ故ニ此ノ如キ誤解ナカラシムルニ足ルベキ唯一ノ方法ハ凡テ有ノ儘ヲ明言スルニ在リテ是レ即チ吾人カ特ニ海牙會議ニ於テ為サント欲スル所ナリ

右「ル、タン」社説ハ其筋ヨリノ鼓吹ヲ受ケタルモノト被

制限問題ノ如キ現在解決スルヲ得サルモノト認メラル、問題スラ之レヲ討議スルニ對シ敢テ不同意ヲ表セサルモ本問題ノ討議ヲ希望スル諸國カ果シテ如何ナル地步ヲ占メ如何ナル意見ヲ有スルヤ詳ニ之レヲ知ランコトヲ欲ス是レ即チ海牙會議ニ於ケル事業ノ秩序及ヒ効果ヲ確實ニセント欲スルニ外ナラス」ト言ヘルニヨリテ明ナリ露國政府ノ見ル所亦之レニ異ナラズシテ是レ以上ニ望ムコト能ハザルベシ独逸ハ露國三國ト同ジク軍備制限問題ニ於テ列國協定ノ見込アリトハ信シ居ラズ從來吾人ハ独乙外交政略ノ公明ヲ缺クルヲ見テ恨事トシタルコト一再ニシテ止マラサリシモ今回ノ事件ニ付テハ何等非難ヲ加フベキ筋アルヲ見ズ伯林ニ於テハ巴里及聖比特堡ニ於ケルト同ジク歐洲現時ノ文化ハ之レヲ譬ヘハ今猶ホ銅鉄時代ニ屬シ黃金時代ノ如キ到底之レヲ期待シ得サルモノト認メ居レリ實ニ吾人ハ昨日實現シタルコトアル戰爭ハ明日モ亦發生スヘキモノト考フルカ故ニ独乙ノ如キ陸軍國カ豫メ自己ヲ拘束スルカ如キ協定ヲ喜ハサルヲ見テ敢テ驚ク所ナシ仏國政府ガ独乙ト同ジク拒絶ノ態度ヲ取りタル亦理アリト云フベシ

吾人ハ英獨兩國新聞紙ノ論戰ヲ見テ其ノ徒勞ナルヲ思ヒ

察時節柄御參考ニモ相成ランカト思考シ三月四日往電第二三号ヲ以テ其要領貴聞ニ達シ置タルニヨリ疾ニ御了承ノ義ト存候尙ホ「ル、タン」ハ三月十五日ノ紙上ニ於テ「愚ナル平和論者」ナル題目ノ下ニ更ニ仏國カ英國ノ軍備制限説ニ同意ヲ表スルコト能ハサル事由ヲ説明シテ大要左ノ如ク陳述スル所アリ

露國政府カ海牙會議原案中ヨリ軍備制限問題ヲ除外シタルノ智巧ハ日ト共ニ益々明白トナレリ本問題ノ提起セラレタル以來物議囂々トシテ続出シ該理想信仰者ノ一人タル「サー、ヘンリー、カムベル、バンナーマン」カ相互ニ相愛セヨト述ヘタル警告モ畢竟徒勞ニ屬シ刻下其声ノ發スル毎ニ國際間ノ不協益々大トナルノ觀アリ

露國政府ハ此点ニ付キ極メテ自由寛容ノ主義ヲ採レリ同政府ハ元來軍備制限問題ヲ以テ未ダ討議ノ時機ニ達セサルモノト認メタルモ英米兩國カ海牙會議ニ於テ本問題ヲ提起スルニ意アルコトヲ知ルニ及ヒ全然之レヲ拒絶スルノ拳ニ出デズ却テ其議題トナルノ曉ニハ如何ナル條件ノ下ニ討議セラルヘキモノナルヤヲ知ラント欲スルノ希望ヲ表白シ之カ為メ「マルテンズ」博士ヲ西欧諸國ニ派遣スルニ至レリ右ハ同博士カ本紙記者ニ向ヒ「吾人ハ軍備

取テ之レニ加ハラズ又海牙會議ニ對シテハ寛容ノ念ヲ以テ敢テ其為ス所ニ放任セシモ同會議ニシテ果シテ軍備制限問題ヲ論議シタル曉ニハ國際關係ハ之カ為メ却テ以前ヨリモ一層不良トナルヘキヤ斷ジテ疑フ所ナシ

平和論者ハ愚直者流ナルカ將タ誇負者流ナリ若シ彼等ニシテ最近十年間ノ歴史ヲ了解セス又將來二三者ノ專意ヨリ生シタル戰爭ハ今後ハ多數者ノ經濟的情慾及物質的利害ノ衝突ヨリ發生スベキモノナルコトヲ認識シ得サルモノトセバ即チ愚直者流ナリト謂ハサルヘカラズ又彼等ニシテ世間ノ事物ハ文字通りニ行ハル、モノト思考セバ即チ誇負者流ナリト謂ハザルベカラズ何ノ途平和論者ナルモノハ特ニ仏國ニ取リテ國難タル所以ハ仏國ニテハ兎角樂天主義ニ耳ヲ傾ケ易ク之レカ為メ油斷ヲ生スルノ虞アルヲ以テナリ終ニ臨ミ吾人ハ飽マテ再言スベシ海牙ニ於テハ國際法ニ關スル事業ヲ為スニ止マリ是レスラ有益ナルニハ相違ナキモ是レ以上ニハ囑望スルコトヲ得ズ而カモ之カ為メ空想ヲ誘導シテ仏國人ハ國民的氣力上更ニ幾分ノ損失ヲ加フヘキコトヲ

平素排獨親英主義ヲ以テ知ラル、「ル、シェクル」ハ三月三日ノ紙上ニ於テ「英國及ビ海牙會議」ト題シ先ツ「ル、

タン」ト同ジク自由黨機關雜誌「スビーカー」カ「ネーション」ト改題シタル初刊ニ於テ英國首相ノ論文ヲ掲載シタル成功ヲ賞讃スルト共ニ海牙會議ガ此論文ニヨリテ得ル所ノ結果鮮少ナルベシト椰揄シ首相ノ所謂軍備費削減ナルモノヲ数学的ニ説明シタル後チ大要左ノ如キ評論ヲ下セリ現今ノ状態ニテハ首相ノ議論モ遺憾ナガラ大陸ニ於テ多數ノ同感者ヲ得ルノ望ナシ蓋シ將來貴國カ久シク平和的運動ノ為メ熱心ニ尽力シタル誠意ハ何人モ之レヲ疑フ所ナク又此運動ハ既ニ多少ノ効果ヲ奏シ現ニ或ル重要ナル場合ニ干戈ニ訴ヘントシタルコトアル某國ノ決心ニ對シ影響ヲ及ボシタルコトアルハ人ノ知ル所ナリ然レトモ英國ハ歐洲大陸諸國トハ大ニ其事情ヲ異ニスルヲ以テ英國ノ先例ハ是等諸國ニ取リテ適切ナラサルモノアリ英國ハ海軍力ノ点ニ於テ大ニ優勢ナルガ故ニ一ニ軍艦建造ヲ一兩年見合スガ如キハ殆ント齒牙ニ掛クルニ足ラス又陸軍費削減ノ如キモ其實陸軍大臣ノ言ニヨレバ費用ヲ減ズルモ國防力ハ却テ増スモノトスレハ是レ亦左マテ重ヲ措クニ及ハズ要スルニ英國首相ノ議論ハ結局軍備制限問題ニ帰着スルモ其實際ヲ云ヘバ直チニ減少ト称スルヲ得ベ

ハス他日其鉄鎚ヲ受クルノ日アルベキヲ覺悟セサルベカラス故ニ其打撃ヲ受クルノ虞ナキ一友邦ノ忠告ニ從ヒ安心以テ軍備制限ノ提議ヲ甘受スルコト能ハサルヤ推シテ知ルベキノミ

平素論議ノ着實穩健ヲ以テ知ラル、中立新聞「ジュールナル、デ、デバー」モ亦三月三日ノ紙上「英國ト軍備制限」ナル題目ノ下ニ大要左ノ如キ比較的温和ナル論評ヲ加ヘ居レリ

「サー、ヘンリー、カムベル、バンナーマン」ノ軍備制限説ハ正ニ英國自由黨政府カ海牙會議ニ於テ取ラントスル態度ヲ宣言セルモノニシテ右ハ全ク總撰筆ノ際ニ表明シタル自由黨政綱ニ從ヒタルモノナリ此政略ニ對シテハ固ヨリ保守黨ノ激烈ナル反對ヲ招キタルモ世人ノ豫想シタルカ如ク英國公衆ヲ激昂セシムルニ至ラザリキ蓋シ英國民ハ何ノ途其海軍力ノ優勢ナルヲ確信シ軍備制限実行ノ曉ニハ自國ニ取リテハ軍事費減少ノ利アルト共ニ他國海軍力ヲシテ現状維持ノ状態ニ在ラシムルノ益アルコトヲ熟知シ居レリ

独乙ニテハ固ヨリ英國首相ノ論文ニ對シ賛成ヲ表スベクモアラズ苟モ海牙會議ニ関スル問題起ル毎ニ独乙新聞ハ

キヤ寧口疑ハシク英國政府ハ心ナラスモ言句ノ末節ニ拘泥スルモノト認メラル

「サー、ヘンリー」ハ海牙會議ハ何故軍備制限問題ヲ討議スルコトヲ得サルカト發問セルモ惜ムラクハ未タ本問題討議ヨリシテ如何ナル危險發生スルニ至ルヘキカヲ知ラス又氏ハ世人カ平和ヲ希望スルノ念慮大ニ鞏固ヲ加ヘ國際爭議ヲ仲裁其他ノ平和的手段ニヨリテ解決スルノ觀念ハ其後一八九八年ニ於テハ夢想タモ及ハサル程度ニ違シ今日ニ於テハ最早一大勢力トナルニ至レリト云ヘリ吾人モ亦大ニ其然ルヲ認ムルモ如何セン此一大勢力モ大陸某國ニテハ全ク無視セラル、ニヨリ是等ノ國々ニモ適用セラル、ニ至ル日蓋シ遠キニ在リト云ハサルベカラス從來安逸政府ハ機會アル毎ニ其聯隊及艦船ノ數ヲ制限スルカ如キハ斷シテ之ヲ許サ、ル旨ノ意ヲ明ニシ又独乙ハ「ビスマーク」及「ウイヘルム」第二世ノ為メ漸々普國風ニ化セラレテ侵略的國民トナリ常ニ其武備ヲ整ヘ機會ダニアラバ直ニ他國ニ對シ一撃ヲ加ヘントス殊ニ「ビュロー」公ノ口ヨリシテ此地球上ニ於テハ吾人ハ鉄砲タルカ將タ鉄鎚タラサルベカラストノ言ヲ聞キタル今日ニ當リ他ノ歐洲大陸諸國ハ独乙ト同盟關係ニ在ルト否トヲ問

異口同音ニ独逸ハ其海軍擴張ニ對シ何等ノ制限ヲ加フルコトヲ許サ、ル旨ノ表明ヲ為シ居レリ

仏國ニ関シテハ固ヨリ英國提議ニ參同ヲ辭セサルヘキヤ疑ヲ容レサルモ之ニ對シ余リ空想ヲ抱クカ如キハ不謹慎ノ甚シキモノナリ我カ共和政治ノ性質ニ照ラシ將又言論橫行ノ状態ニ鑑ムルトキハ平和主義ノ唱導ハ他ノ何レノ國ヨリモ仏國ニ取リ最モ危險ナリト謂ハサルベカラス蓋シ當國ニ於テハ其唱導ハ容易ク成功ヲ告ケテ主ニ他ノ目的ヲ達スルノ手段トセラル、ノ虞アリテ真平和主義者ノ外ニ偽平和論者ヲ生スルニ至ルベシ故ニ我輿論ハ平和論者ノ所説ニ帰服スルニ先チ独英兩國ノ地位ト英國首相及独乙新聞論調トヲ比較對照シテ以テ周到ナル考察ヲ遂クルヲ要ス果シテ然ラバ仏國ニ取リ緊要適實ナル結果ニ到着スベキヤ疑ヲ容レザルナリ

右英國ノ軍備制限提議ニ関スル當國新聞論調一班往電ノ說明旁及具報候 敬具

明治四十年四月廿日

在仏 特命全權大使 栗野慎一郎(印)

外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

一四四 明治四十年四月二十四日

英國駐劄小村大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛（電報）

第二回萬國平和會議參列英國委員氏名報告ノ件

London,

Rec'd 6.50 a.m., 24/4/07.

Hayashi,

Tokio.

No. 36.

British Plenipotentiaries to the Hague Conference will be Sir Edward Fry, formerly Lord Justice of Appeal; Sir Ernest Satow, Lord Reay, formerly Governor Bombay, President British Academy; Sir Henry Howard, British Minister to Holland.

Komura.

一四五 明治四十年四月二十六日

英國駐劄西臨時代理公
使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛（電報）

伊國政府軍備縮小案撤回ノ件

四月二十六日 後一二、二五 維納發
二十七日 前四、二〇 本省着

林外務大臣

在 境 西代理公使

of armament, they have not as yet made any definite proposal to the great Powers and that Italian proposition has been (?) withdrawn owing to the objection of Austria and Germany.

Komura.

一四七 明治四十年五月一日

英國駐劄井上大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛（電報）英國宰相ノ軍備制限問題ニ關スル議會演說内容
報告ノ件（一）（一）

(1)

Berlin, 3.30 p.m., 1/5/07.

Received 11.10 a.m., 2/5/07.

Hayashi,

Tokio.

No. 44.

In the course of debate at the Reichstag April 30 on the budget for Foreign Office Chancellor of the Empire made a speech on Germany's foreign relations of which the main points are as follows:—

第二三号

今回英伊兩帝会合前ニ於テ伊國政府ハ兵力制限案ニ關シ妥協ノ方法ヲ案出シ独塊露政府ニ内協議ヲ試ミシモ成功ノ見込ナキガ故後遂ニ之ヲ撤回セリ右ニ關スル当國政府ノ態度ハ其後變更スル所ナシ

一四六 明治四十年四月二十六日

英國駐劄小村大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛（電報）

英國政府提案軍備制限問題ニ對スル伊國政府ノ折衷提議ヲ英國政府ニ通報済ノ旨並ニ伊國政府ノ抗議撤回ノ旨報告ノ件

London,

R'd. Tokio, April 28th 1907. 1.25 a.m.

Hayashi,

Tokio.

No. 39. I have informed April 26th the Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the purport of your telegram No. 29. and he has informed me that although British Gov't have reserved right to propose to the Conference the question of limitation

After alluding to Russian programme for the Second Hague Peace Conference as one being likely to secure practical results, Chancellor referred to the fact that outside this programme Powers have been engaged in considering whether it was not expedient to discuss the question of limitation of armaments at the Conference. Such a programme has however not yet been formulated and England, Spain and the United States have reserved right to bring up this question at the Conference. At the First Conference the only decision arrived at was that Powers should carefully examine the question. German Government had done so but had found no means which in view of great difference in the geographical, economical, military and political situation of the different States would be justifiable and suitable to remove these differences and to serve as a basis for an agreement Chancellor had no knowledge whether other Governments were more successful in finding such means. So long as satisfactory solution of this question and possibility of its practical realization does not exist Chancellor had no hopes that anything would come out of discussion at a Conference; on the contrary there is danger that

by touching on such contrasting interests effect might ensue in an undesired direction.

To be continued.

Inouye.

(11)

Berlin, 9.15 p.m., 1/5/07.

Received 8.30 p.m., 2/5/07.

Hayashi,

Tokio.

No. 44. (Continuation)

German Government could have done as the British Government did 1874 at the Brussels Conference when they declared that their participation in the Conference would depend upon non-introduction of the question of right of seizure at sea at the Conference and Germany in taking part in The Hague Conference could also have made it condition that the question of limitation of armament should not be touched, but in consideration for the Russian programme she refrained from so doing and limited herself in letting those Powers, who had hopes of a success from the discussion, discuss the question among themselves. Chancellor then

as an international courtesy and friendly relations between Italy and England were not only compatible with triple alliance but was discontinuous Germany followed events in Morocco with attention and has confidence in loyal observance of obligations entered into by the act of Algeiras, Germany had no other aim in Morocco but the right of equal opportunity. Germany viewed with perfect calmness conclusion of Anglo-Russian negotiation in regard to Persia and her attitude was the same in regard to boundary question, concerning Tibet or Afghanistan which may be concluded between Russia and England. Chancellor was well aware of the difficulties and danger which surround Germany and in order to overcome them self-consciousness and confidence in the power of the nation are necessary and Germany keeping loyal to her friends and allies need not be anxious if understanding were to be concluded about things which did not immediately concern her.

Inouye.

questioned if it was to be feared that by the reserved attitude in this special question it would be alleged that Germany was the disturber of peace from some warlike or other selfish motives. He had reason to believe that other Powers take a similar attitude as that of Germany; she had never misused her military strength nor will she do so in future. Her armament has preserved itself as a good instrument of peace both technically and morally and nobody can blame her for maintaining this instrument Germany would be frank in saying that she could not take part in any discussion which according to her conviction would be but impracticable if not objectionable. Should however anything practical ensue from a discussion of the question of limitation of armament then she would carefully examine whether it would correspond to preservation of her peace, to her own national interests and to her special situation. Chancellor then made some remark in regard to recent meeting between the King of England and the King of Italy saying that news papers had lately reported that Italy was only to be considered now as an unsafe partner of the allied. Meeting was quite natural

一四八 明治四十年五月三日

独国駐劄井上大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

大宰相「ビエロー」公独逸帝國議會ニ於テ演説

ノ件

公第三八号

六月十二日接受

去ル四月三十日独逸帝國議會ニ於テ本年度外務省豫算討論ノ際帝國大宰相「ビエロー」公ガ外交上ノ關係ニ付為シタル演説ノ要旨ハ翌五月一日不取敢電報ヲ以テ達貴閣置候処右演説中同公ガ目下世上ノ一問題タル「ハーグ」第二回平和會議ニ於ケル軍備縮少問題ニ對スル独逸ノ不賛成ナル態度ノ理由ヲ説明シ且本件ニシテ他日該會議ニ提出セラレタルトキハ独逸ハ其議事ニ賛同セサル旨ノ意志等ヲ發表シ議場一般ノ喝采ヲ博シ当國諸新聞紙モ其所説ヲ是認シ歐洲他列國ニ對シテモ好感動ヲ与ヘタル状況ニ有之候ニ付テハ為御參考該演説筆記原文別紙ヲ以テ及御送付候此段申進候
敬具

明治四十年五月二日

在独特命全權大使 井上勝之助 (印)

外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

註 別紙省略

一四九 明治四十年五月三日

暹羅国駐劄田辺臨時代理公使
ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

海牙平和會議ニ参列ノ暹国委員任命出發ノ件

公信第三十号

五月廿一日接受

当国陸軍参謀部長陸軍少将「モム、チャティデヂ、ウドム」
(Mom Chatdej Udom) 及大尉「ルアング、プーワナッ
ト」(Luang Puwanat)ノ両氏ハ今度蘭国海牙府ニ於テ開
催セラルヘキ第二回平和會議ニ参列ノ暹国委員ヲ命セラレ
去月三十日同国ヘ向ケ当地ヲ出發致候
右及報告候 敬具

明治四十年五月三日

在暹

臨時代理公使 田辺熊三郎(印)

外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

一五〇 明治四十年五月五日

蘭国駐劄佐藤公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

第二回平和會議和蘭国委員任命ノ件

公信第二十六号

六月十二日接受

法学博士ヨシントヘアー、ファン、カルナベイク(H.
A. van Karnebeek)

三、専門委員

参謀本部出仕、陸軍大学教授

陸軍中佐ファン、オールト(H. I. van Oordt)

海軍省出仕

海軍大尉シュリー(H. G. Surie)

右及報告候 敬具

明治四十年五月五日

在蘭 特命全權公使 佐藤愛鷹(印)

外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

一五一 明治四十年五月五日

蘭国駐劄佐藤公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

第二回萬国平和會議丁抹国委員任命通知ノ件

第二回平和會議丁抹国委員任命ノ件

公信第二十七号

六月十二日接受

在丁都コーペンヘーゲン帝国名誉領事ヨリノ報告ニヨレバ
第二回平和會議丁抹国委員左ノ通り任命有之候

第三章 平和會議ノ議題及時期、各国ノ準備 一五一

一五二

一一一

本月二日付勅命ヲ以テ第二回平和會議ニ参列スベキ和蘭国
委員左ノ通り任命有之候
一、全權委員

前外務大臣第二議院議員

法学博士ド、ボーフォルト(W. H. de Beaufort)

国務大臣兼参事院議員

法学博士アッセル(T. M. C. Asser)

参事院議員前陸軍大臣休職陸軍中將

ヨシントヘアー、デン、バアー、ボルチュガル(J. C.
C. den Beer Postuagael)

前海軍大臣休職海軍中將

ヨシントヘアー、ロヘル(J. A. Röel)

前司法大臣第二議院議員

法学博士ルン(J. A. Loeff)

二、「デレグザヂョーン」(Délégués adjoints)

外務省政務局長

法学博士ヨシントヘアー、ファン、アイシング(W.
J. M. van Eysinga)

殖民省書記官

第一委員

亞米利加合衆国駐劄

特命全權公使ブラン(C. Brun)

第二委員

海軍少将シェラル(Scheller)

第三委員

外務書記官ヴィデル(A. Vedel)

右及報告候 敬具

明治四十年五月五日

在蘭 特命全權公使 佐藤愛鷹(印)

外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

一五二 明治四十年五月七日

蘭国駐劄佐藤公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

第二回萬国平和會議ニ丁抹委員ヨリ中立国ノ權
利義務ニ関シ提議ノ旨在同国名誉領事ノ報告ノ
件

The Hague, 11.30 a.m., 7/5/07.
Received 3.40 a.m., 8/5/07.

Hayashi,

Tokio.

No. 21. Honorary Consul in Copenhagen reports that Danish Delegate to Peace Conference has been instructed to propose question of rights and obligations of neutrals.

I leave for Copenhagen May 7.

Sato.

一五三 明治四十年五月八日

仏国駐劄栗野大使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛(電報)

軍備制限問題ニ関スル米國委員ノ意見ノ件

五月八日 後五、五五 巴里発
五月九日 前九、五五 本省着

林外務大臣

栗野 大使

第五九号

本日平和會議ニ列席スベキ米國全權委員「ポーター」氏ト
會話セシニ米國ハ國ノ地勢ヨリ海軍ハ二分サレ陸軍ハ之ヲ
重視スルニ足ルノ兵力ヲ有スルモノニ非ルヲ實際ニ於テ兵
力制限ノ地位ニ在リ從テ平和會議ニ兵力制限ノ議起レバ無

明治四十年六月六日

在西 特命全權公使 稻垣満治郎(印)

外務大臣子爵 林 董殿

一五五 明治四十年六月十六日

西國駐劄稻垣公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

第二回海牙平和會議ニ於ケル西班牙政府ノ態度
ニ付外務大臣ト談話ノ件

機第六号

八月五日接受

西班牙政府ノ意見トシテ三案ヲ議題ニ付セラレ度旨当國政
府ヨリ發議セリトノ事ハ去三月五日付電信第參号ヲ以テ其
當時市來代理公使ヨリ上申相成居候
去ル六月十四日外務大臣ト會見ノ際尙詳細ニ之ヲ聞ク事ヲ
得ハ至幸ナル旨申候処同大臣徐ニ語テ曰ク

第一

軍備制限問題ニ付テハ今回ノ平和會議ニ於テ其主義原則ヲ
討議決定シ得サル時ハ常設委員會ヲ設ケテ之カ研究ヲ附託
シタキ旨ヲ發議シ置ケリ而シテ此ノ問題タルヤ英國政府ヨ
リモ發議アルヘキ筈ナレバ先頃「カルタヘナ」ニ於テ英國

論之ニ賛成スベキモ新聞ガ囂々タル如ク決シテ兵力制限ノ
主張者ニハ非ズト言ヘリ

一五四 明治四十年六月六日

西國駐劄稻垣公使ヨリ
林外務大臣宛

海牙平和會議參列西班牙國委員任命ノ件

公第四〇号

七月十二日接受

平和會議參列當國委員ハ三月廿六日付ヲ以テ左ノ通り任命
有之候

一、英國駐劄全權大使 Don Wenceslao Ramires de Villa-
Urrutia y Vila-Urrutia

但シ第一回平和會議ニ參列セシ人

一、和蘭國駐劄特命全權公使 Don Jose de la Rica y
Calva

一、衆議議員 Don Gabriel Maura y Gamazo

現總理大臣長男

以上午遲延御參考迄申進候尙專務委員ノ儀ニ付テハ確知次
第可及御通報候 敬具

外務次官 Harding 氏ト會見ノ際若シ今回ノ平和會議ニ於
テ軍備制限問題ヲ議題ニ附スル事ヲ得サレバ之ガ研究ヲナ
スヘキ事ヲ打合置ケリ

第二

債權行使ニ関シ武力ヲ用フル件ニ付テハ或ル主義ヲ定メ之
ガ実行ノ方法アリヤ否ヤヲ研究シタキ旨我政府ハ曩ニ露國
政府ニ通告シ置キタレバ更メテ平和會議ニ於テ之カ提出者
カラサルベシ

第三

今回ノ平和會議ニ南米諸政府ヨリ委員參列ノ件ハ我政府ヨ
リ露國政府ニ發議シ其結果トシテ南米諸洲ニ參會ノ招待狀
ヲ發送スルニ至リタル次第ナリ云々

右申進候 敬具

明治四十年六月十六日

在西 特命全權公使 稻垣満治郎(印)

外務大臣子爵 林 董殿