

# **The Treatment of Prisoners of War by the Imperial Japanese Army and Navy Focusing on the Pacific War**

TACHIKAWA Kyoichi

## Abstract

Why does the inhumane treatment of prisoners of war occur? What are the fundamental causes of this problem? In this article, the author looks at the principal examples of abuse inflicted on European and American prisoners by military and civilian personnel of the Imperial Japanese Army and Navy during the Pacific War to analyze the causes of abusive treatment of prisoners of war. In doing so, the author does not stop at simply attributing the causes to the perpetrators or to the prevailing conditions at the time, such as Japan's deteriorating position in the war, but delves deeper into the issue of the abuse of prisoners of war as what he sees as a pathology that can occur at any time in military organizations. With this understanding, he attempts to examine the phenomenon from organizational and systemic viewpoints as well as from psychological and leadership perspectives.

## Introduction

With the establishment of the Law Concerning the Treatment of Prisoners in the Event of Military Attacks or Imminent Ones (Law No. 117, 2004) on June 14, 2004, somewhat stringent procedures were finally established in Japan for the humane treatment of prisoners of war in the context of a system infrastructure. Yet a look at the world today shows that abusive treatment of prisoners of war persists. Indeed, the heinous abuse which took place at the former Abu Ghraib prison during the Iraq War is still fresh in our memories. Under normal circumstances in the military of any country, the mistreatment of prisoners is not tolerated from an institutional perspective. International covenants providing for the humane treatment of prisoners also exist. The questions that require answering, then, are why abusive treatment of prisoners of war continues today and what the fundamental causes are.

In this article, the author looks at the principal examples of inhumane treatment of European and American prisoners by the Imperial Japanese Army and Navy during the Pacific War to analyze the fundamental causes of abuse. In doing so, the author's objective is not simply to attribute the causes to acts of individual perpetrators as individuals or to the prevailing conditions at the time (in this case, the deteriorating war conditions), but also to look at the abuse of prisoners of war as a pathology that can occur at any time in a military organization. With this objective in mind, the author will attempt to investigate this phenomenon from the perspective of the Imperial Japanese military organization and systems, from a psychological perspective, and from the perspective of leadership.

## I. Examples and background of inhumane treatment of prisoners of war

There is still no commonly accepted definition of the term “abuse” either internationally or in Japan. “Abuse,” according to the *Kojien* dictionary, is “to treat with cruelty; cruel treatment;<sup>1</sup> and according to the *Shakai Fukushi Jiten (Dictionary of Social Welfare)*, abuse is “a physical or psychological attack inflicted on a defenseless or extremely weak person by a person with power. Inhumane treatment includes direct physical abuse, psychological abuse, and sexual abuse as well as neglect (deprivation of food, failure to provide medical treatment by not taking a person to the hospital when ill, etc.).”<sup>2</sup>

The Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare classifies abuse according to type: Physical abuse, where a person may be the victim of physical violence, for example; Psychological abuse, where the perpetrator of abuse causes the victim to experience anxiety or fear, or neglects or refuses to acknowledge the victim by refusing to attend to them; Or abuse in the form of long-term confinement or imprisonment, where the perpetrator of abuse holds the victim against his will for no apparent reason.<sup>3</sup> There is also a view which, in addition to the above, includes abuse in a material sense, such as deprivation of what rightfully belongs to a person by stealing, hiding or misappropriating assets of the victim including money.<sup>4</sup> In all of these cases, abuse “occurs between humans as a result of a relationship of ‘strong versus weak’ based on superiority of authority or physical strength,”<sup>5</sup> and constitutes “an act of violation of the human rights or dignity of a person in a vulnerable position by a person in a position of strength.”<sup>6</sup>

Existing international treaties concerning the treatment of prisoners of war at the time of the Pacific War demanded the humane treatment of prisoners with a spirit of humanitarianism, and stipulated that the country which captured the prisoners must provide the same level of nutrients to the prisoners as it provides to its own military. Furthermore, the failure to treat prisoners in a humane manner or the violation of their basic human rights, irrespective of whether it was intentional or unintentional, was considered abuse. Nevertheless, there have been instances where even when prisoners were treated in the same way as the captor country’s own military, they felt that they were being inhumanely treated due to differences in culture, customs and standards of living. Such cases were not infrequent in the handling of European and American prisoners by the Japanese military during the Pacific War.

Not all specific examples of acts of abuse committed against the European and American prisoners by the military and civilian personnel of the Imperial Japanese Army and Navy have yet been reported, but the number that has been disclosed is considerable. Although in the space of this brief article it is extremely difficult to refer to every case of abuse, the author will take up as many examples as possible, group them according to the circumstances in which they occurred and describe the backgrounds of their occurrence.

---

<sup>1</sup> Izuru Niimura, ed., *Kojien*, 4th Edition (Iwanami Shoten, 1991), p. 647.

<sup>2</sup> Chuohoki Shuppan Henshubu, ed., *Shakai Fukushi Jiten (Dictionary of Social Welfare)*, New Edition (Chuohoki Shuppan, 2001), p. 85.

<sup>3</sup> Kazuhiko Ichikawa, *Shisetsunai gyakutai: Naze enjoshu ga gyakutai ni hashiru no ka (Mistreatment within the facilities: Why do caregivers become the perpetrators of abuse)* (Seishin Shobo, 2000), pp. 5-12.

<sup>4</sup> Osamu Fujimoto, Fumiko Araga, Makiko Azuma, Noriaki Sumi, et al., *Boryoku, gyakutai, harasumento: Hito ha naze boryoku wo furuu no ka (Violence, Maltreatment, and Harassment: Why do people resort to violence)* (Nakanishiya Shuppan, 2005), p. 163.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 2.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 163.

## A. Examples of abuse of prisoners outside prison camps

### (1) Inhumane treatment during the transportation of prisoners

Perhaps the most well-known case of abuse occurring during the transport of prisoners is the Bataan Death March which cost the lives of about 30,000<sup>7</sup> soldiers. The deaths occurred during the transport of about 70,000 American and Filipino troops captured by the Japanese in the Bataan Peninsula and Corrigidor Island in Luzon in the Philippines to Camp O'Donnell more than 100 kilometers away from April 10, 1942 onwards. Because of the limited number of trucks available, except for a stretch of 40 kilometers<sup>8</sup> where railway transport was used, the majority of prisoners had to march on foot under the searing sun over a distance of more than 100 kilometers. The Japanese troops were also suffering from a shortage of water and food and provided the prisoners with little water, food or rest during the march. Although many of the prisoners were not only exhausted from battle but were also suffering from diseases such as dysentery and malaria due to malnutrition, medicine was in short supply and those who were sick did not receive appropriate medical treatment. Prisoners who fell behind or dropped out of the march were kicked and beaten, and some were shot or bayoneted to death by Japanese soldiers on guard duty. Prisoners who left the line to drink water at nearby wells were also either shot or bayoneted to death.

Numerous reasons have been given to explain why such a tragedy occurred. First, the surrender of the US and Philippine forces occurred far earlier than expected. The number of prisoners taken also significantly exceeded expectations so preparations for food, hygiene, transport and prison facilities were inadequate. Because there was very little food available in the Bataan Peninsula and it was purported to be an area where malaria was rampant, it was essential to transport prisoners out of the area quickly. The US and Philippine forces were also accustomed to using vehicles for transportation and were not used to long marches on foot. However, only 200 trucks were available for use. The prisoners were already in poor health at the time of surrender after a protracted period of fighting. There was a shortage of medicine, food and water, and the field hospitals were overflowing with Japanese soldiers and were unable to accommodate the prisoners. In addition to these dire conditions, there was a general feeling of contempt among the Japanese military towards the prisoners, as well as a tendency to disregard international law.<sup>9</sup>

In Timor in February 1942, Dutch prisoners were forced to march for five days with their hands bound behind them from the port to the prison camp in Kupang. Although the prisoners were injured, starving and at the same time suffering from dysentery and malaria, they were forced to march on foot and were often beaten by the Japanese and Korean guards.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Of these, fatalities during the march were slightly over 10,000. The majority of the fatalities were among the Filipino soldiers, while American fatalities were said to be about 600 during the march, and more than 16,000 after arriving at Camp O'Donnell. Ikuhiko Hata, Masamori Sase, and Keiichi Tsuneishi, eds., *Sekai senso hanzai jiten (Dictionary of the World's War Crimes)* (Bungei Shunju, 2002), p. 135.

<sup>8</sup> During this trip, prisoners were made to stand during the entire trip in freight cars with poor ventilation. Some prisoners died in the train during the trip.

<sup>9</sup> Hata, Sase, and Tsuneishi, eds., *Sekai senso hanzai jiten (Dictionary of the World's War Crimes)*, pp. 136-137.

<sup>10</sup> Gaimusho Renraku-kyoku (Liaison Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs), "Kyokuto kokusai gunji saiban hanketsu sokkikoku" (Stenographic record of judgment of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East) from November 4, 1948 to November 12, 1948, in the possession of the Library of the National Institute of Defense Studies, p. 191.

The Sandakan Death Marches that occurred in North Borneo between February and June 1945 is another incident that caused a large number of casualties during the ground transport of the prisoners. There were about 2,200 prisoners of the Allied Forces being used as laborers for the construction of an airfield in Sandakan as of August 1944. Out of these men, about 1,200 supposedly died later from starvation and malaria. Of the remaining approximately 1,000, those who were healthy enough to walk were divided into three groups to travel on foot from Sandakan to Ranau, a distance of about 260km, through the rugged mountain paths.<sup>11</sup> (Those prisoners unable to travel due to illness or other reasons were left behind in Sandakan, and either died from illness or were killed before the end of the war). All of the transferred prisoners were in extremely poor health due to malnutrition or malaria. The food they carried with them was minimal.

Prisoners who dropped out of line were slapped and beaten by guards to force them to keep walking, and they were executed when they were finally unable to walk. After a grueling march that lasted two weeks, the prisoners who succeeded in reaching the destination of Ranau numbered less than 200. The final outcome of this incident was that these few remaining prisoners either died later from illness or were executed by shooting, and the only survivors were six prisoners who managed to escape.<sup>12</sup>

There were also cases of abuse during transfer to the labor sites. The prisoners who were mobilized into service for the construction of the Burma-Thailand Railroad, which began in June 1942, were transported from Singapore to Ban Pong in Thailand by railway or truck. After disembarking from the trains or trucks, the majority of the prisoners were forced to walk to the construction site through dense jungle in mountainous terrain. The segment of the journey by railway alone was a long distance of 2,200km and prisoners had to endure almost the entire journey standing up in packed, stifling conditions in jolting box cars.<sup>13</sup> Food and water provisions were also extremely limited and the physical stamina of many of the prisoners at this stage was already spent.

Around February 1945, Dutch prisoners were mobilized to work as laborers in the construction of a military road in North Sumatra. The prisoners traveled on foot from the prison camp to the construction site on mountain tracks. Only 12 Korean civilian employees were assigned as guards for approximately 1,500 to 1,600 prisoners. Fortunately, there were no deaths during this trek but the guards did beat prisoners who fell out of line to make them keep walking. These Korean guards who beat the prisoners were convicted as war criminals after the war.<sup>14</sup>

The most life-threatening time for the prisoners during their transport was when they traveled by sea. The known number of prisoners who lost their lives at sea is 10,844.<sup>15</sup> The majority of these prisoners were Caucasian, and they were loaded onto transport ships from South Asia or the Chinese continent bound for mainland Japan, Korea and Taiwan to be used as the laborers. In transit, these

---

<sup>11</sup> This transportation was planned from the fear of prisoners being liberated by the Allied forces (ibid., p. 191).

<sup>12</sup> Hata, Sase and Tsuneishi, eds., *Sekai senso hanzai jiten (Dictionary of the World's War Crimes)*, pp. 211-212; Toshiyuki Tanaka, *Shirarezaru senso hanzai: Nippon-gun wa Australia jinni naniwo shitaka (Hidden war crimes: What did the Japanese forces do to the Australian)* (Otsuki Shoten, 1993), pp. 87-155. There were no deaths among guards on the Japanese side.

<sup>13</sup> Hata, Sase, and Tsuneishi, eds., *Sekai senso hanzai jiten (Dictionary of the World's War Crimes)*, p. 155.

<sup>14</sup> Aiko Utsumi, *Chosenjin BC kyu senpan no kiroku (The record of Korean BC class war criminals)* (Keiso Shobo, 1982), pp. 54-55.

<sup>15</sup> Sumio Adachi, "Rengokoku horyo toriatsukai seido shoshi" (A brief history of the management system of the prisoners of war of the Allied forces), *Urawa Ronso*, No. 3 (September 1989), p. 204.

vessels often came under attack from the allied forces.<sup>16</sup> Consequently, many of them either went down with the ships or are believed to have been fatally injured during the attacks. However, there are reported cases of Japanese crew members failing to attempt to rescue prisoners who were drifting in the sea and drowning. There were even reports of deliberate slayings.<sup>17</sup> The reason why these Japanese transport vessels that were carrying prisoners came under attack by the allied forces was that the vessels failed to raise signs indicating that they were transporting prisoners. This failure to give an indication of this nature was also because the Japanese were also carrying their own military personnel and materials along with the prisoners.

Even prisoners who reached their destination safely could not avoid suffering from exhaustion and emaciation, and there were quite a few prisoners who died from these conditions.<sup>18</sup> The taxing conditions under which they were transported were life-threatening. The prisoners were generally packed into the hold of the transport vessel in overcrowded conditions where not all of them were able to lie down all at once. Only a very small amount of water and food was provided, and although there were some sanitation facilities, they were by no means adequate. When there were no facilities, buckets and boxes were used instead. It was extremely hot inside the hold, and because ventilation was poor, the entire area was filled with a pervasive stench. In most cases the prisoners were not allowed out into the sunlight. Prisoners who were sick received no medical attention and gradually became unable to walk, and this in turn accelerated the worsening of sanitation conditions.<sup>19</sup>

The poor treatment of the prisoners during transport resulted in many prisoners falling ill as well as a number of deaths, and many prisoners became unusable as laborers. In view of the situation, the Ministry of War and General Staff Headquarters through their respective Vice Minister and Assistant Vice Minister issued notifications to the relevant troops requesting strict control over “the selection of prisoners to be transported to mainland Japan, the allocation of personnel for the medical inspection and sanitation of the prisoners, the preparation of medicine and food needed during transportation, management of the prisoners during transportation, and provision of facilities at ports of call, and the provision of clothing, etc.”<sup>20</sup> However, this directive did not make any difference.

In addition to physical abuse, prisoners of war were also subjected to psychological abuse. When

---

<sup>16</sup> The number of the prisoner transport ships under attack during voyage by the Allied forces reached 25 (*ibid.*, p. 204).

<sup>17</sup> Gaimusho Renraku-kyoku (Liaison Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs), “Kyokuto kokusai gunji saiban hanketsu sokkiroku” (Stenographic record of judgment of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East), pp. 195-196, 206.

<sup>18</sup> One of the reasons for the high number of deaths of 1,393 people at Fukuoka POW Camp was the severe condition of transportation. Fukuoka POW Camp took in the prisoners whose health conditions were too poor for further transferring after they arrived to the Moji port. Yoshio Chaen, ed., *Dainihon teikoku naichi furyo shuyojō (POW interment camps in the mainland of the Great Imperial Japan)*, BC kyu senpan kankei shiryō shusei (A collection of source materials concerning BC class war criminals), Vol. 6 (Fuji Shuppan, 1986), pp. 31-32. Fuyuko Kamisaka, *Sugamo prison 13-go teppi: Sabakareta senso hanzai (No. 13 Iron Door of Sugamo Prison: War crimes under judgment)* (PHP Kenkyūjo, 2004, originally published by Shinchosha in 1981), pp. 199-200.

<sup>19</sup> Lord Russell of Liverpool, *The Knights of Bushido: A Short History of Japanese War Crimes* (London: Greenhill Books, 2005, originally published in 1958), pp. 117-133, 188. The conditions of the transport ships when the Japanese soldiers headed for the south were environmentally very much the same to these conditions.

<sup>20</sup> “Furyo no yuso ni kansuruken” (Regarding the transport of POW) (December 10, 1942), Furyo johokyoku, (the POW Information Bureau), “Furyo ni kansuru sho hoki ruishu” (A collection of various regulations concerning POW) (November 1943, revised in December 1946), in the possession of the Library of the National Institute for Defense Studies, pp. 217-218. Vice Minister of War, in “Furyokanri kaizen nikansuruken” (Regarding the improvement of the management of POWs) (March 3, 1944), requested again to the troops concerned to drive home the improvement of the treatment of POWs during their transportation at sea (*ibid.*, pp. 182-183).

the prisoners were paraded in columns through built-up areas of cities or towns, it was only natural that they drew attention and were witnessed by the local population. There were reports of cases in places like Pusan and Seoul in Korea, Moulemein in Burma, and Manila in the Philippines where prisoners were subjected to the curiosity of the public. The prisoners felt humiliated by these acts.<sup>21</sup> At times they were also blindfolded as they marched, and this caused fear and anxiety among them.<sup>22</sup>

## (2) Inhumane working conditions

Work during the construction of the Burma-Thailand Railroad is perhaps a typical example of abusive treatment of the prisoners relating to working conditions. The Burma-Thailand Railroad crossed dense jungles to link Thailand and Burma and had a total span of 415km. The Imperial Headquarters in Japan decided on the construction framework on June 20, 1942, and on June 24, the first group of prisoners mobilized for construction work arrived from Singapore at Ban Pong station, the starting point on the Thailand side. The initial plan was for the railway to commence operation at the end of 1943. However, in February of the same year, the plan was brought forward and the opening was revised to August, stepping up completion by four months (“Speedo” period<sup>23</sup>). As it turned out, the opening was delayed until October. Nevertheless, this shortening of the construction schedule forced the prisoners to work under even harsher conditions. These oppressive conditions contributed to the deaths among Caucasian prisoners, which eventually rose to about 12,400. This was equivalent to about 20% of the total 61,806 white prisoners who were mobilized for construction work.<sup>24</sup>

The climate of the area where the construction of the Burma-Thailand Railroad took place was hot, rainy and humid. It was also an area conducive to diseases such as malaria, dysentery, tropical ulcers, and cholera. The living quarters of the prisoners were extremely poor and unsanitary, which fostered the spread of diseases. The tools used for the construction work were also rudimentary, consisting of chisels, hammers, shovels, saws, axes, pickaxes, and hoes. As time went on, the working hours increased and time allocated for rest was reduced. Particularly during the so-called “Speedo” period from February 1943 onwards, work continued around the clock.<sup>25</sup> Plagued by constant fatigue from harsh labor conditions compounded with lack of food resulting in malnutrition and beriberi, the prisoners fell ill one after another. However, there was a shortage of medicine and there were no hospitals. Japanese military doctors made visits only sporadically, and sick prisoners were treated either by Japanese medical orderlies or military doctors and medics among prisoners.<sup>26</sup> Seriously ill prisoners, if

---

<sup>21</sup> Gaimusho Renraku-kyoku (Liaison Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs), “Kyokuto kokusai gunji saiban hanketsu sokkiroku” (Stenographic record of judgment of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East), p. 200; Lord Russell of Liverpool, *The Knights of Bushido*, p. 186.

<sup>22</sup> Nobuko Kosuge and Hitoshi Nagai, commentary and translation, *BC kyu senso hanzai saiban (BC class war crimes tribunal)*, GHQ Nippon senryo shi (GHQ History of the occupation of Japan), Vol. 5 (Nihon Tosho Center, 1996), p. 29.

<sup>23</sup> Because the guards on the construction of the railway hurried work by prisoners by using the word “Speedo!” a name of “Speedo” period or “Speedo” era was born. See Toshiharu Yoshikawa, *Taimen tetsudo: Kimitsu bunsho ga akasu Asia-Taiheiyo senso (The Burma-Thailand Railway: Asia-Pacific War revealed in the secret documents)* (Dobunkan, 1994), p. 140.

<sup>24</sup> Hata, Sase, and Tsuneishi, eds., *Sekai senso hanzai jiten (Dictionary of the World's War Crimes)*, pp. 153-156.

<sup>25</sup> Aiming for the completion in August, prisoners were forced to work more than 10 hours a day.

<sup>26</sup> Aiko Utsumi, *Nihongun no horyo seisaku (Policy for the treatment of POW by the Japanese military)* (Aoki Shoten, 2005), p. 451; Nobuko Kosuge, *Sengo wakai: Nihon wa kako kara toki hanatareta no ka (Post-war reconciliation: Was Japan freed from the past?)* (Chuo Koron Shinsha, 2005), p. 118.

they were lucky, were sent back to the rear, but many were left without any proper treatment.

The construction work had to depend on the mass mobilization of workers, and to meet the stringent deadline set for completion of the railway, the project needed all the manpower it could muster. Even the sick prisoners, if they were able to walk, were goaded into working. Prisoners who stopped to rest were given a hiding by the guards who consisted mainly of Korean civilian employees.<sup>27</sup> Even the officers were not allowed to be idle and were forced to join in the work. At the end of June and the beginning of July 1942, group training was held for the first appointed camp commanders of the prison camps established abroad and in occupied areas. At the opening of the session, Mikio Uemura, head of the POW Information Bureau and POW Management Office read instructions out to the camp commanders on behalf of Hideki Tojo, Prime Minister and Minister of War. One passage of his instructions demonstrates its impact:

To begin with, our country, in its view on prisoners of war as well as the handling of those prisoners, naturally differs in some respects from views and practices of Western countries. When you are managing prisoners of war, and of course obeying regulations and adopting appropriateness in your treatment of the prisoners as expected, you must truly demonstrate both in Japan and abroad the fair attitude of Imperial Japan and, as long as you refrain from violations of humanity, be firm in your dealings with the prisoners and do not let them idle for even a day. It is your mission to strive to contribute to the execution of the Great East Asian War by fully utilizing prisoners' labor and skills to increase productivity.<sup>28</sup>

Work on the railway was protracted and as time went on, the prisoners' clothing and shoes were worn and tattered but they were not supplied with replacements. In the end some prisoners were working in nothing but a loincloth. Often communication between prisoners and the Japanese and Korean guards had to rely on gestures and hand signals, and therefore it was often lacking in accuracy and speed, causing impatience and anxiousness.

In May 1943, Tojo dispatched Taira Hamada, the second head of the POW Information Bureau and POW Management Office to inspect the work sites. Hamada proposed the introduction of integrated management by having the railway construction project and the prisoners engaged in its construction work under the assignment of the occupation forces of Thailand to minimize the toll of the prisoners. However, it is said that he was forced to back down on his idea after a staff officer jumped to the conclusion that this would be an encroachment on the Supreme Command of the Emperor.<sup>29</sup> Although administration of the POWs and prison camps was under the control of the Minister of War, the construction of the railway was a plan promoted by order of the Imperial Headquarters. It must be noted that there existed a "wall" between the military administration and the military command.

<sup>27</sup> More than 800 Korean paramilitary personnel were deployed in the construction of the Burma-Thailand Railway. Although their main duty was to prevent escape and sabotage by the POWs, they were put in charge of looking after everything concerning the POW including clothing, food and living facilities. Utsumi, *Chosenjin BC kyu senpan no kiroku (The record of Korean BC class war criminals)*, pp. 9-10.

<sup>28</sup> "Shinnin furyo shuyojocho ni atauru rukugun daijin no kunji" (The instruction of the Minister of War to the newly appointed commanders of the POW camps) (July 7, 1942), *Furyo johokyoku (The POW Information Bureau)*, "Furyo geppo," (Monthly journal on the POW), July issue (August 5, 1942), (Aiko Utsumi and Hitoshi Nagai, eds., *Tokyo saiban shiryō: Furyo johokyoku kankei bunsho (Materials of Tokyo Tribunal: Documents related to the POW Information Bureau)* (Gendai Shiryō Shuppan, 1999), p. 140.

<sup>29</sup> Utsumi, *Nihongun no horyo seisaku (Policy for the treatment of POW by the Japanese military)*, p. 420.

Tojo, after receiving the report from Hamada, court-martialed a commander of the railway transport unit for his mistreatment of prisoners and he dismissed a commanding officer of railway construction. However, he was unable to drastically change arrangements for the railway construction itself and thus his efforts did not lead to an improvement in conditions.<sup>30</sup> Confronted by the wall that stood firmly between the military administration and the military command, even Tojo himself could make little headway between the authorities.

To keep the Burma-Thailand Railroad construction project moving ahead, the prisoners were forced to spend long hours in unhygienic locations without sufficient food and rest, and without appropriate medical treatment for the injured and sick. They were forced to do extremely taxing work and be at the receiving end of arbitrary punishment which included beating and kicking which resulted in the deaths of many prisoners. Although opinions were divided as to whether the construction of the Burma-Thailand Railroad, which was also used for civilian transportation, was directly related to military operations, in the war crime trials in the postwar period it was decided that it came under “military tactical operations,”<sup>31</sup> and 120 personnel involved in the Burma-Thailand Railroad were charged, with 111 people receiving guilty verdicts and 36 receiving death sentences. Of the 36 given the death sentence, 33 of these were personnel of the prison camps.<sup>32</sup> Ill-advised plans, lack of preparations for prison camps and facilities, ill-preparedness of transportation and supply systems, the unequivocalness of the orders, haste in the railway’s execution, lack of communication measures, the Japanese military’s disdainful view of prisoners of war, the tendency to disregard international laws, and the customary practice of beatings all contributed to the creation of a major tragedy.<sup>33</sup>

As examples of the use of prisoner labor for operations that were clearly and directly related to the military, the following cases were reported: Construction of airfields in Ambon and Palembang; Construction of military roads in Sumatra; And the polishing of shell casings in Zentsuji. Prisoner labor was also used in other projects for military purposes including the construction of air-raid shelters and transporting of ammunitions. The prisoners were also used in labor where the distinction between military demand and civil demand was not clear, such as cargo handling at ports and train stations, coal mining and iron refining. Many of these work assignments were not only in oppressive conditions in terms of the work environment but also in conditions where they were exposed to risk from attack. Many prisoners were exposed to the danger of air-raids. In fact, over 50 prisoners were either killed or severely injured in air raids during labor assignments.<sup>34</sup>

In addition, it was not rare for officers to be forced into doing work “voluntarily.” It was also the

---

<sup>30</sup> Gaimusho Renraku-kyoku (Liaison Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs), “Kyokuto kokusai gunji saiban hanketsu sokkiroku” (Stenographic record of judgment of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East), p. 192.

<sup>31</sup> Hata, Sase, and Tsuneishi, eds., *Sekai senso hanzai jiten (Dictionary of the World’s War Crimes)*, pp. 154-156.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., p. 157; Utsumi, *Nihongun no horyo seisaku (Policy for the treatment of POW by the Japanese military)*, p. 631.

<sup>33</sup> For example, see Shigeharu Tarumoto, *Aru senpan no shuki: Taimen tetsudo kensetsu to senpan saiban (A memorandum of some war criminal: The construction of the Burma-Thailand Railway and the war crimes tribunal)* (Gendai Shiryo Shuppan, 1999).

<sup>34</sup> Furyokankei chosa chuo iinkai (Investigation Committee on POWs), “Naichi furyo shuyojo niokeru furyo toriat-sukai nikansuru daiichiji chosho” (The first report concerning the treatment of the POWs at the POW internment camps in the mainland Japan) (November 15, 1945), Gummu-ka, Gaisei-han (Foreign Policy Group, Military Affairs Section), “Furyo ni kansuru shorui tsuzuri” (A file of documents concerning the POW) (October 1945), in the possession of the Library of the National Institute of Defense Studies.

policy of the Central Command of the Army.<sup>35</sup> Although officers did not receive extra pay for their work, they received extra food. When prisoners engaged in labor outside of the prison camps, they naturally attracted the attention of the local population on their way to and from their workplaces. On mainland Japan, because the authorities tried as much as possible to avoid having prisoners of war come into contact with the general population, such encounters were rather rare. However, outside Japan in occupied areas, it was the military's policy to intentionally subject prisoners to the curious gaze of the public.<sup>36</sup> It was also reported that prisoners engaged in street cleaning in cities such as Yokohama in Japan and Rangoon and Moulmein in Burma.<sup>37</sup>

In view of the high death rate among prisoners, on March 3, 1944, the Army issued the notification "Regarding the management and improvement of prisoners" from the Vice Minister of War to relevant troops. The notification was aimed at improving the efficiency of prisoner labor by paying attention to the management of their sanitary conditions and time for rest for the prisoners. The subject matter of this notification mentioned: Prompt improvement of sanitary conditions and improvement in guidance for sanitary control; Thoroughness in the proper handling of prisoners during the transportation of prisoners; Provision of fixed quantities for food and clothing; The establishment of sick bays in prison camps and provision of essential medical treatment to diseased prisoners; To provide sufficient rest for sick prisoners and avoidance of forcing harsh labor conditions on prisoners; To give due consideration to the individual physical conditions of prisoners taking into consideration the climate and weather; And to transfer them if necessary.<sup>38</sup>

### (3) Inhumane treatment of escapees

The first case of the blatant killing of an escaped prisoner was at the Sakurajima Branch Camp of Osaka (established on January 20, 1943). It was a case where a military doctor killed a captured escapee prisoner by administering potassium cyanide by injection. It seems that the act was carried out under order of a commanding officer of the Chubu (Central Japan) Army "to take appropriate action" without going through military court-martial procedures."<sup>39</sup> Later charged with the killing of the escapee, Inoshige Sugasawa, who was the first camp commander of the Fukuoka Main Camp, was sentenced to death by hanging by the war crimes tribunal after the war. Sugasawa testified that

<sup>35</sup> "Furyo taru shoko oyobi junshikan no romu ni kansuru ken" (Regarding the labor service by the POW officers and warrant officers) (June 3, 1942), *Furyo johokyoku* (The POW Information Bureau), "Furyo ni kansuru sho hoki ruishu" (A collection of various regulations concerning POW), p. 225.

<sup>36</sup> "Furyo shori yoryo" (The main point in the disposition of POW) (May 5, 1942), *Furyo johokyoku* (The POW Information Bureau), "Furyo ni kansuru sho hoki ruishu" (A collection of various regulations concerning POW), p. 168.

<sup>37</sup> *Furyo johokyoku* (The POW Information Bureau), "Furyo ni kansuru kogi nikanshi furyo johokyoku oyobi furyo kanribu ga shochi shitaru kotogara wo kiroku shitaru shorui no utsushi" (A copy of the documents recording of the matters the POW Information Bureau and the POW Management Office treated concerning the protests in relation to POW) (not dated), p. 10 in Aiko Utsumi, commentary and ed., *Furyo toriatsukai ni kansuru shogaikoku kara no kogishu* (A collection of the protests made by the various foreign countries concerning the treatment of POW), *Jugonen senso gokuhi shiryō shū* (A collection of top-secret documents of the 15-year war), Vol. 16 (Fuji Shuppan, 1989); Utsumi, *Nihongun no horyo seisaku* (Policy for the treatment of POW by the Japanese military), p. 60; Lord Russell of Liverpool, *The Knights of Bushido*, p. 64.

<sup>38</sup> "Furyokanri kaizen ni kansuruken" (Regarding the improvement of the management of POWs) (March 3, 1944), *Furyo johokyoku* (The POW Information Bureau), "Furyo nikansuru sho hoki ruishu" (A collection of various regulations concerning POW), pp. 182-183.

<sup>39</sup> Utsumi, *Nihongun no horyo seisaku* (Policy for the treatment of POW by the Japanese military), p. 339.

he had killed the prisoner because he felt not to do so would be inexcusable to the town people if the prisoner were simply brought back to the camp following the mobilization of hundreds of people to capture the prisoner.<sup>40</sup> Sugasawa was well-versed in English and an internationally-minded person. Therefore, he would have been well aware of the existence of international treaties concerning the treatment of prisoners of war. However, this was the prevailing atmosphere at that time.<sup>41</sup> Furthermore, at Fukuoka Branch Camp No. 1, a prisoner who repeatedly stole and attempted to escape despite being tossed in the brig many times and who was even alienated from fellow prisoners was stabbed to death under order from the branch camp commander.<sup>42</sup>

At Cabanatuan Branch Camp No. 1 in the Philippines, there was a case of several American prisoners of war who, after making a failed attempt to escape, were left in the boiling sun without water or food in a state where they were unable to move their bodies. In the end the offenders were executed by shooting.<sup>43</sup> In Singapore, prisoners who escaped from Bukit Timah Camp were punished by execution after they were captured.<sup>44</sup>

It was also a procedure among the Japanese forces to require any captured prisoner of war to sign an oath promising that he would not attempt to escape (Article 5: Detailed rules concerning the treatment of prisoners of war). This act of forcing a person to sign an oath not to escape is already in itself mistreatment. However, it was definitely abuse at the time that the prisoners were forced to sign the document; Prisoners who refused to sign were threatened with weapons, and physical punishment was inflicted on them. Alternatively, they may have been tossed in the brig and given little food or water.

## B. Examples of inhumane treatment of prisoners of war in prison camps

### (1) Accommodation facilities

Many of the prison camps did not have adequate facilities in the living quarters due to the limited time available for preparations prior to interning the prisoners. The number of prisoners also significantly exceeded expectations. The facilities were even more inferior at the branch camps, outstation camps and detachment camps that were established for the convenience of having a prisoner labor force close by. The camp environment was particularly miserable on mainland Japan in cold climate areas with heavy snowfall and in southern areas with high temperatures, heavy rains and high humidity.

---

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., p. 570.

<sup>41</sup> At the meeting of the heads of bureaus of the Ministry of War in May 2, 1942, Tojo, the Prime Minister and Minister of War, when informed about the reports of the incidents of escape of POWs in Hong Kong and Shanghai, is said to have ordered them to capture the POWs immediately and execute them in front of the public, and stated that the measures taken were too lenient. Hitoshi Nagai, "Ajia-Taiheiyo senso ki no horyo seisaku: Rikugun chuo to kokusai joki" (The policy concerning POW during the period of the Asia-Pacific war: The central command of the Army and the international regulations), *Kikan senso sekinin kenkyu (Quarterly publication: The report on Japan's war responsibility)* (Autumn 1995), p. 36.

<sup>42</sup> The commander of the branch POW camp at that time was Kei Yuri who became the first person to be executed by hanging by the war crimes tribunal after the war. See, Ikuo Yamashita, *Zaisai: Kyokuto Yokohama gunji saiban koshukei dai ichi go: Omuta furyo shuyojochu Yuri Kei chui (Account of Crimes: First Lieutenant Kei Yuri, the commander of Ohmuta POE Internment Camp, the first person to be executed by hanging by the International Military Tribunal for the Far East in Yokohama)* (Soshisha Shuppan, 1983).

<sup>43</sup> Kosuge and Nagai, commentary and translation, *BC kyu senso hanzai saiban (BC class war crimes tribunal)*, pp. 103-104.

<sup>44</sup> Hata, Sase, and Tsuneishi, eds., *Sekai senso hanzai jiten (Dictionary of the World's War Crimes)*, p. 22.

Prison camps in these areas lacked the facilities to withstand extreme weather conditions. In addition, adequate consideration had not been given to sanitary conditions. In short, the poor housing facilities were one of the main reasons for the rampant spread of disease in the camps.

## (2) Medical treatment

The medical facilities and medicine supplies were inadequate and there were not anywhere near enough military doctors. The prison camps were supposed to be outfitted with sick bays and medical equipment. Conditions were slightly better in the main camps but there were many branch camps and outstation camps that were not serviced at all.<sup>45</sup>

In addition to the problem of supply shortages, the impact of cultural differences also had to be taken into consideration with respect to medicine and medical treatment, and even diseases. For example, the types of diseases that affect Japanese and Westerners even in the same age group differed. While diphtheria is a disease Japanese adults rarely contract, Western adults do. Medical knowledge of that nature was not available in Japanese medical circles at the time, and there was a basic assumption that diphtheria was a children's disease. In the prison camps, no effective serum to treat diphtheria was available.<sup>46</sup> Furthermore, at that time, the prevailing attitude in the camps was that even if a prisoner's legs were unusable, he could still use his hands.<sup>47</sup>

The status of military doctors was not very high in the prison camps. When doctors wanted to place an order for drugs and medicines that they required, they had to obtain the approval of the camp commander. At times, however, some of the camp commanders rejected the requests of military doctors. Consequently, those doctors were not able to provide appropriate medical treatment to the prisoners. Prisoners who were not aware of the situation in the camps probably felt that they were being denied medical treatment, and therefore may have felt they had been mistreated.<sup>48</sup> On the other hand, there actually were reports of military doctors who did give orders not to provide any medical treatment to prisoner patients.<sup>49</sup> Or, worse still, as will be described later, there were military doctors who conducted vivisection experiments using prisoners.

In terms of cultural differences regarding medical treatment, the use of moxa cautery can be cited as one such example. One prisoner on whom moxa treatment for diarrhea had been administered believed that he was being tortured.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> One of the improvement points observed in the notification by the Vice Minister of War, "Furyokanri kaizen ni kansuruken" (Regarding the improvement of the management of POWs) (March 3, 1944), *Furyo johokyoku* (The POW Information Bureau), "Furyo ni kansuru sho hoki ruishu" (A collection of various regulations concerning POW), pp. 182-183.

<sup>46</sup> Tetsuya Akada, *Uketorinin Sugamo Prison ni shozai sezu* (*The addressee unknown in the Sugamo Prison*) (Showa Tosho Shuppan, 1982), pp. 167, 188, 195-196. There were many POWs who contracted diphtheria on the transport ships. However, because of the shortage of serums, proper treatments were not given. This was one of the reasons which caused debility of the POWs (*ibid.*, p. 188).

<sup>47</sup> Fuyuko Kamisaka, *Kaini natta otoko* (*A man who became a shellfish*) (Bungei Shunji, 1986), p. 114.

<sup>48</sup> Akada, *Uketorinin Sugamo Prison ni shozai sezu* (*The addressee unknown in the Sugamo Prison*), pp. 116, 120, 126, 225.

<sup>49</sup> Toshiyuki Tanaka, "Jintai jikken ni shiyo saretu rengogun horyo: Rengogun shiryō ni miru horyō gyakutai gyakusatsu no ichi sokumen" (The POWs of the Allied forces who were used in the human experiments: One aspect of inhumane treatment and slaughter of POWs recorded in the materials of the Allied forces), *Kikan senso sekinin kenkyū* (*Quarterly publication: The report on Japan's war responsibility*), No. 3 (March 1994), p. 34.

<sup>50</sup> Tetsutaro Kato, *Watashi wa kaini naritai: Aru BC kyu senpan no sakebi* (*I want to become a shellfish: A cry of a BC class war criminal*), New Edition (Shunjusha, 2005), p. 117.

### (3) Food

Where food was concerned, both quality and quantity were problems. At this time, not only soldiers at the front but the general population in Japan were unable to get enough food. Despite the widespread general shortage, there were more than a few prison camps where officials made considerable efforts to provide prisoners with meals that met standards for prisoners of war. However, food rations kept shrinking and there were many camps that did not have enough to go around. In some camps, starving conditions occurred.

Anti-prisoner sentiment harbored by the general population was strong and in some cases people refused to sell food to the camps not because they had no supplies but because they did not want to provide food for prisoners. Some camps were able to buy food only by concealing the fact that it was for prisoners, instead saying that it was for the military forces.<sup>51</sup> Because contact between the general Japanese population and prisoners was restricted whenever possible, prisoners would not have been aware of situations like this.

Even when food portions that complied with standards could be provided to prisoners, as bigger eaters than Japanese, they would not have found the portions satisfactory. There was also the additional problem of different dietary habits. Japanese generally are satisfied with a meal so long as there is plenty of rice to fill up on. However, some prisoners, who were used to eating mainly meat and bread, were not only unable to get used to the typical Japanese menu consisting of rice, fish and vegetables, but also felt that being served such a diet was mistreatment. In addition to these problems, there were also medical and nutritional problems. Western prisoners were physically unable to absorb nutrients from Japanese foodstuffs. At times, special consideration was given and beef bones were provided to Western prisoners only. However, because beef bones were scarce to begin with and there was a general shortage of all food supplies at the time, it was impossible to secure a steady supply.<sup>52</sup> There was also a serious vitamin deficiency among prisoners and this led to beriberi and the deterioration of eyesight.

The Ministry of War, concerned with the high death rate of the prisoners, ordered Goichi Nagao, a military doctor, to investigate the conditions of the prisoners interned in the Tokyo Main Camp over a two-month period. Nagao focused on differences in dietary habits as one of the causes of malnutrition in the prisoners and after his study submitted a report in which he stated that the dietary habits of prisoners should be respected when the camp is providing prisoners with food. It was because of this report that the camp began to provide the beef bones mentioned above.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> Kamisaka, *Kaini natta otoko (A man who became a shellfish)*, pp. 66, 72.

<sup>52</sup> See Tomoyo Nakajima, "Senso horyo mondai no hikaku bunka teki kosatsu" (Comparative cultural examination of the POW issues: focused on the problem of "food"), Vol. 1, *Kikan senso sekinin kenkyu (Quarterly publication: The report on Japan's war responsibility)*, No. 22 (December 1998), also by Nakajima, "Senso horyo mondaino hikaku bunkateki kosatsu" (Comparative cultural examination of the POW issues), Vol. 2, *Kikan senso sekinin kenkyu*, No. 23 (March 1999), also by Nakajima, "Senso horyo mondai no hikakubunkateki kosatsu" (Comparative cultural examination of the POW issues), Vol. 3, *Kikan senso sekinin kenkyu*, No. 26 (December 1999).

<sup>53</sup> Nakajima, "Senso horyo mondaino hikaku bunka teki kosatsu" (Comparative cultural examination of the POW issues), Vol. 3, pp. 80-81.

#### (4) Petition

To establish a system that would allow prisoners to present petitions to the prison camp authority, a decision was made to select an appropriate person among the prisoners in each camp to assist with presentations of “petition notifications.” Basically, at every prison camp, an appointed senior officer acted as a representative and, maintaining control over prisoners, acted as a negotiator with the prison authorities. How well this system functioned varied from camp to camp and depended on factors such as the camp commander and the type of complaints that were made, etc. However, as the air-raids by allied forces intensified in 1945, national sentiment toward prisoners further deteriorated, and as the stringency of supplies got worse, the Japanese military decided not to accept petitions from prisoners any longer.<sup>54</sup>

There was also a framework for the belligerent countries to make inquiries and register protests through their protecting powers or the International Committee of the Red Cross, as well as through the Japanese contact office for Japanese residents in enemy countries in the Foreign Ministry, and then to the POW Information Bureau which was an external bureau of the Ministry of War. Although the number of such inquiries and protests that are known today total 83 cases,<sup>55</sup> and the United States, through its protecting power Switzerland, made inquiries to Japan 746 times, about the two-thirds of these are known to have been ignored.<sup>56</sup>

#### (5) Relief supplies

Due to very fundamental problems such as the shortage of transport vessels, safety issues on the seas, and views regarding the relief of prisoners, the arrival and distribution of relief supplies from the Red Cross to the prisoners were often delayed or reached only a limited number of areas. Even when they reached their destination, they were sometimes not distributed. In matters relating to the distribution of relief materials, the prison camp commander was in charge. Although it is reported that there were some prison camps that took steps to insure that supplies were managed without dishonesty,<sup>57</sup> at times of extreme shortages, there were ongoing rumors that the illegal allocation of relief supplies

---

<sup>54</sup> “Furyo seigan ni taisuru toriatsukai no ken” (Regarding the treatment of the petitions by POWs) (June 15, 1945), *Furyo johokyoku* (The POW Information Bureau), “Furyo toriatsukai no kiroku” (The record of the treatment of POW) (December 1955), in the possession of the Library of the National Institute for Defense Studies, pp. 45-46.

<sup>55</sup> Included in *Furyo johokyoku* (The POW information Bureau), “Furyo ni kansuru kogi ni kanshi furyo johokyoku oyobi furyokanribu ga shochi shitara kotogara wo kiroku shitara shorui no utsushi” (A copy of the documents recording the matters the POW Information Bureau and the POW Management Office treated concerning the protests in relation to POW) (not dated) in Utsumi, commentary and ed., *Furyo toriatsukai ni kansuru shogaikoku kara no kogishu* (A collection of the protests made by the various foreign countries concerning the treatment of POW).

<sup>56</sup> Kosuge and Nagai, commentary and translation, *BC kyu senso hanzai saiban* (BC class war crimes tribunal), p. 38. There is a numerical record that the Swiss envoy to Japan made 134 representations in writing between February 1, 1942 and March 15, 1944 but only received 24 replies in writing from the Japanese Foreign Ministry. Gaimusho Renraku-kyoku (Liaison Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs), “Kyokuto kokusai gunji saiban hanketsu sokkiroku” (Stenographic record of judgment of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East), p. 207.

<sup>57</sup> Akada, *Uketorinin Sugamo Prison ni shozai sezu* (The addressee unknown in the Sugamo Prison), pp. 189, 215; Kamisaka, *Kaini natta otoko* (A man who became a shellfish), p. 93.

and the intentional delay of their distribution were frequent and ongoing.<sup>58</sup> Although at the request of the Red Cross a representative of the prisoners was to sign the receipt to acknowledge delivery of the supplies,<sup>59</sup> there is a possibility that this system was abused and prisoners may have been coerced into putting false signatures on the receipts.<sup>60</sup>

#### (6) Visits to POW internment camps and personal interviews with prisoners

Although Article 86 of the Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War<sup>61</sup> (hereinafter “Geneva Convention”) signed in Geneva, Switzerland on July 27, 1929 stated that the representatives of the protecting powers of the belligerent countries should be allowed to talk with prisoners without the presence of observers, Article 13 of Japan’s detailed rules concerning the treatment of prisoners of war required the presence of a guardian during interviews, as well as a predetermined location and time, and restrictions were placed on what could be discussed.

According to some records, the number of visits to POW internment camps by the representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross and by the attaché of the Swiss legation in Japan was 194 times up until the end of war.<sup>62</sup> Of these, visits by the representatives of the protecting powers of the belligerent countries were approved 49 times. However, requests were made 61 times and were rejected on 12 occasions. The rejections were mainly for requests for visits to camps on the Chinese continent and in occupied areas in the South. The reasons that the Japanese government gave for not complying with these requests was that they did not recognize the presence of interest protectorate representation in those areas, and war operations were currently underway there. However, even in these areas, there were cases when visits to POW internment camps in Hong Kong, Thailand, and the Philippines were allowed on an exceptional basis.<sup>63</sup>

Visits to prison camps on the mainland of Japan, the Korean peninsula, Taiwan and Manchuria, in comparison with other areas, were easier to carry out. At the time of the visits, however, there

---

<sup>58</sup> Gaimusho Renraku-kyoku (Liaison Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs), “Kyokuto kokusai gunji saiban hanketsu sokkikoku” (Stenographic record of judgment of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East), p. 198; Kosuge and Nagai, commentary and translation, *BC kyu hanzai senpan saiban (BC class war crimes tribunal)*, p. 111; Marcel Junod (Mikimasa Maruyama, translation), *Doctor Junod no tatakai: Ethiopia no dokugasu kara Hiroshima no genbaku made (The Battle of Dr. Junod: From the poison gas in Ethiopia to the atomic bomb in Hiroshima)*, Enlarged Edition (Keiso Shobo, 1991), p. 240.

<sup>59</sup> Shiro Okawa, ed. and translation, *Obeijin horyo to sekijuu katsudo: Paravicini hakushi no fukken (European and American POWs and the activities of the International Committee of the Red Cross: Reinstatement of Dr. Paravicini)* (Ronsosha, 2006), p. 56. Furthermore, “Kyujutsukinpin ni taisuru furyo matawa yokuryusha daihyo no ryoshusho ni kansuru ken” (Regarding the receipts by the POW or the representative of detainees for the relief money and goods) (November 7, 1944), was the notification issued by the head of the POW Information Bureau to the relevant troops requesting for prompt collections of these receipts. *Furyo johokyoku (The POW Information Bureau, “Furyo ni kansuru sho hoki ruishu” (A collection of various regulations concerning POW)*, pp. 234-235.

<sup>60</sup> “The list of accused” sent from Major General Gracie addressed to Field Marshal Terauchi, (November 23, 1945), Gummuka, Gaisei-han (Foreign Policy Group, Military Affairs Section), “Furyo ni kansuru shoruitsuduri” (A file of documents concerning the POW) (November 1945) in the possession of the Library of the National Institute of Defense Studies.

<sup>61</sup> Japan signed this agreement but did not ratify it.

<sup>62</sup> *Furyo johokyoku (The POW Information Bureau), “Furyo toriatsukai no kiroku” (The record of the treatment of POWs)*, p. 47; Takashi Masui, *Taiheiyō sensochu no kokusai jindo katsudo no kiroku (The record of international humanitarian activities during the Pacific War)*, Revised Edition (The Japanese Red Cross Society, 1994), p. 88.

<sup>63</sup> Adachi, “Rengokoku horyo toriatsukai shoshi” (A brief history of the management system of the prisoners of war of the Allied forces), pp. 183-184.

is no doubt that a range of restrictions were imposed including the time, travel to the camp, the inspection schedule, and the parties at the meeting. Although it may be an extreme example, there were times when visitors on a two-hour visit were forced to spend more than one hour listening to an explanation by the camp commander, as if the Japanese side was subversively sabotaging the visit.<sup>64</sup> Meetings with prisoners (normally senior prisoners) were further restricted with shorter meeting times. Furthermore, it was also a regulation that guardians from the prison camp be present during the meeting. There was no freedom in what the prisoners were allowed to say. Those who violated restrictions were said to have been tortured or placed in detention.<sup>65</sup> Some camp administrators also tried to window-dress camps in efforts to deceptively present a model prison camp during which time sick prisoners were kept out of sight by temporarily transferring them to other places before the arrival of visitors.<sup>66</sup>

The staff of the Japanese Red Cross Society visited prison camps many times. While foreigners needed a permit from the Minister of War to visit a prison camp (Article 11: Detailed rules concerning the treatment of prisoners of war), Japanese nationals required only a permit from the camp commander. However, for a prisoner to make a petition to the staff of the Japanese Red Cross Society required significant courage and the resolve to accept whatever punishment staff of the internment camp would mete out afterwards. In addition, there was no guarantee that the prisoners' petitions would be heeded.<sup>67</sup>

#### (7) Casualties due to air raids

Because prisoners were used as a valuable labor resource, the prison camps tended to be located adjacent to industrial zones that could become the target of attack. After 1944, the number of prison camps in various locations sustaining damages from air raids increased and a large number of casualties among prisoners occurred. In 1944, a total of seven attacks were sustained by camps in Thailand, Hong Kong, Borneo, and Mukden. In 1945, the POW internment camps, including those on mainland Japan, came under fire in a total of 35 air raids in which 318 prisoners were killed and 591 were injured.<sup>68</sup> On mainland Japan, the evacuation of prisoners started following the March 10, 1945 air raid on Tokyo.

---

<sup>64</sup> Junod, *Doctor Junod no tatakai (The battle of Dr. Junod)*, p. 237. Normally, the pattern of visits were to spend the first one-hour of the two-hour allocation on the meeting with the administrator of the POW camp, and the next 30 minutes for the inspection of facilities of the camp, and the last 30 minutes was for the meeting with POWs (Ohkawa, ed. and translation, *Obeijin horyo to sekijuu katsudo [European and American POWs and the activities of the International Committee of the Red Cross]*, p. 82).

<sup>65</sup> Gaimusho Renraku-kyoku (Liaison Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs), "Kyokuto kokusai gunji saiban hanketsu sokkiroku" (Stenographic record of judgment of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East), p. 198; Utsumi, *Nihongun no horyo seisaku (Policy for the treatment of POW by the Japanese military)*, pp. 250, 501.

<sup>66</sup> Gaimusho Renraku-kyoku (Liaison Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs), "Kyokuto kokusai gunji saiban hanketsu sokkiroku" (Stenographic record of judgment of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East), pp. 207-208; Kosuge and Nagai, commentary and translation, *BC kyu senpan saiban (BC class war crimes tribunal)*, p. 24.

<sup>67</sup> Lewis Bush (Yoji Akashi, translation), *Okawasoni: Tokyo horyo shuyoyo no eihei kiroku (How pitiful: The record of a British soldier in the Tokyo POW Camp)* (Bungei Shuju Shinsha, 1956), pp. 217-218, 231, 249. Bush was able to leave the Tokyo POW Main Camp and was transferred to a Western-style residence (Yokohama Internment Detached Camp) under the administration of the Japanese Navy, and thus freed from the persistent arbitrary punishment by the staff of the POW camp. Furthermore, the particular staff who repeated arbitrary punishment on Bush seemed to have been transferred immediately afterwards (*ibid.*, pp. 251-252, 277).

<sup>68</sup> Adachi, "Rengokoku horyo toriatsukai shoshi" (A brief history of the management system of the prisoners of war of the Allied forces), p. 166.

However, as demonstrated by the prisoners of war who fell victim to the atomic bomb attacks in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, such evacuations were not necessarily implemented across the board.

One incident that may be considered an indirect rather than a direct result of air raids occurred on Palawan Island in the Philippines on December 4, 1944. At the time, about 150 American prisoners of war were being used for maintenance work on an airfield that was exposed to air raids by American aircraft. At about 2 o'clock in the afternoon on that day the prisoners were ordered to enter the three dug-out air-raid shelters supposedly because two American fighter planes were approaching the airfield. When all the prisoners had entered the shelters, 50 to 60 guards armed with rifles and automatic weapons surrounded the entrances to the shelters and threw hand grenades and buckets filled with gasoline into the shelters and set them alight. Those who tried to escape were either shot or bayoneted to death. A total of 138 prisoners were killed in the incident and only 12 prisoners who were rescued by guerillas nearby survived.<sup>69</sup>

#### (8) Vivisection experiments

There are a number of reports of suspected cases of medical vivisection conducted using prisoners. In one reported incident, four American prisoners at the No. 4 Naval Hospital on the island of Dublon in the Truck Islands were vivisected after memo static clamps were attached to their limbs on January 30, 1944. Two of these supposedly died from shock and the two who survived were subsequently used for a bomb blast experiment on February 1. In that experiment, the bodies of the prisoners were torn apart by the blast from dynamite, which was detonated just one meter away from them. These prisoners actually did not die from the blast but were later put to death by injection of poison. The bodies of the four prisoners were supposedly submitted to dissection and parts of their organs were said to have been sent as specimens to military medical schools in mainland Japan.<sup>70</sup>

In Rabaul, New Britain Island, either in September or in the early October 1944, 13 prisoners were kept on a diet consisting mainly of cassava roots for a period of 30 days. Their weight was taken at the beginning and at the end of the period. In the second stage of the experiment, they were fed only unpeeled cassava for the next 30 days and they were weighed on the last day. During the experiment, four prisoners died from emaciation. Of the prisoners who survived, five prisoners who had never been infected with malaria before were given injections by a Japanese military doctor of blood taken from the Japanese soldiers who were infected with malaria. In this way, infection was artificially induced. The prisoners were then injected with serum supposedly produced by this military doctor.<sup>71</sup>

In Ambon in a dietary experiment similar with the one in Rabaul, prisoners were fed sago and continuously injected with an unknown agent for over a month.<sup>72</sup> At the Tokyo camp four prisoners were injected with a soy bean liquid solution without their consent.<sup>73</sup> Vivisection was also conducted on captured crew members of an aircraft of the allied forces, which will be mentioned later.

---

<sup>69</sup> Hata, Sase and Tsuneishi, eds., *Sekai senso hanzai jiten (Dictionary of the World's War Crimes)*, pp. 182-183.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 179.

<sup>71</sup> Tanaka, "Jintai jikken ni shiyō sareta rengogun horyō" (The POWs of the Allied forces who were used in the human experiments), pp. 32-34.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 34-35.

<sup>73</sup> Kosuge and Nagai, commentary and translation, *BC kyu senpan saiban (BC class war crimes tribunal)*, p. 180.

## (9) Arbitrary corporal punishment

What prisoners reviled more than anything else and what they believed to be the most humiliating affront as well as inhumane was the arbitrary punishment meted out by those in charge of the prisoners whenever and however they saw fit. Such punishment included beating, slapping, kicking, hitting, punching, and various other forms of torture and corporal punishment. When this punishment was meted out in the presence of other prisoners, the sense of humiliation felt by prisoners was even greater.<sup>74</sup> This punishment was not confined to the prison camps but also occurred during transport and at work sites. Although there may have been some exceptions in locations where prisoners were handled by Japanese forces, and there may have been varying degrees to which it was practiced in the camps, arbitrary punishment of prisoners was a practice that was so widespread it could be said that it had become institutionalized.

On the basis of existing cases, it appears that military personnel in the prison camps meted out arbitrary punishment on prisoners as a means of discipline and redress, or as a means for punishment. However, cases of indiscriminate corporal punishment for no particular reason or without explaining the reason to prisoners (and therefore prisoners not understanding the reason) were supposedly not uncommon. It can also be imagined that there were situations when such discipline and redress were merely excuses for meting out arbitrary punishment. At the same time, corporal punishment for disciplinary purposes at that time in Japan was not so uncommon, and, though it was a bad practice, corporal punishment was used in the military ranks frequently.<sup>75</sup>

Cultural values have a strong influence on our perception in terms of what constitutes disciplining and what constitutes abuse. For example, getting down on one's knee or bowing are quite ordinary practices for Japanese people but Westerners in the camps found it an affront when they were forced to perform them and viewed the practices as deeply humiliating. Of course, it can be said that the Japanese side was driving the point of discipline a bit too hard. For example, prisoners were forced to salute not only officers of the Japanese military but also all staff in the prison camps including the paramilitary guards. Failure to salute was met with some form of arbitrary punishment.

As a form of discipline, corporal punishment was seen as being preferable to taking formal procedures to have the offender court-martialed. In other words, corporal punishment was seen as an expedient method and, therefore, compassionate means by which someone could be forgiven after a couple of quick blows. This was without a doubt a Japanese custom. At the same time, it was based on both fear and practicality. For example, if a prisoner were to be court-martialed, there would also

---

<sup>74</sup> Yoshito Kita, "Nihongun no kokusaiho ninshiki to horyo no toriatsukai" (Understanding of the international law by the Japanese forces and the treatment of POW), Yoichi Hirama, Ian Gow, Sumio Hatano, eds., *Nichi-Ei koryu shi, 1600-2000, volume 3: Gunji (The history of exchanges between Japan and Britain; 1600-2000, Vol. 3: Military)* (University of Tokyo Press, 2001), p. 288; Akada, *Uketorinin Sugamo Prison ni shozai sezu (The addressee unknown in the Sugamo Prison)*, p. 221. The number of this is the highest among the items for the nature of crimes in the war crimes tribunal after the war (Daizaburo Yui and Nobuko Kosuge, *Rengokoku horyo gyakutai to sengo sekinin [Inhumane treatment of the POWs of the Allied forces and the post-war responsibility]*[Iwanami Shoten, 1993], p. 24).

<sup>75</sup> Furyokankei chosa chuo iinkai (Investigative Committee on POWs), "Naichi furyo shuyojō niokeru furyo toriatsukai nikansuru daiichiji chosho" (The first report concerning the treatment of POWs at the POW internment camps in the mainland Japan).

be sanctions for the person in charge.<sup>76</sup> At the same time, the prisoner could not be left unpunished. Furthermore, if there was no brig at a work site, there was no alternative but to give one or two blows as punishment.<sup>77</sup>

Research conducted immediately after the war indicates that there were cases where arbitrary punishment of prisoners was resorted to because of communication problems due to language and differences in customs or, in some cases, momentary emotional outbursts. According to this research report, “Japanese in general are extremely short-tempered and get upset over trifling matters...their emotions take over and in many cases they turn to arbitrary punishment.”<sup>78</sup>

Those who inflicted punishment directly on prisoners were, for the most part, believed to be the guards and security personnel who had frequent contact with the prisoners, and it is believed that punishment meted out by officers of the rank of camp commander was rare.<sup>79</sup> However, it is said that there were cases of some superior officers ordering the guards to beat prisoners, and that some gave silent approval for their subordinates to inflict arbitrary corporal punishment on prisoners. Furthermore, if subordinates defied the orders of superior officers, the subordinates themselves were beaten.<sup>80</sup>

In the POW internment camps abroad and in the occupied areas, Korean or Taiwanese civilian employees were deployed as guards, and they too inflicted corporal punishment on prisoners. It is believed that this practice was the result of training the Japanese military imposed on them.<sup>81</sup>

To improve the situation of rampant corporal punishment inflicted on prisoners, Taira Hamada, head of the POW Information Bureau and POW Management Office, at the meeting of the POW camp commanders on December 23, 1943, preached the harmful effect of corporal punishment and told the commanders to instruct their subordinates to demand fairness in the handling of prisoners.<sup>82</sup> Furthermore, the notification “Regarding the treatment of prisoners” issued in the name of the Vice-Minister of War to the relevant troops dated February 24, 1944 stated “personal punishment is strictly forbidden.” However, the effect of such notifications was minimal and the situation of rampant, arbitrary corporal punishment continued.

There were definitely some camp commanders who made efforts to thoroughly ban arbitrary corporal punishment. For example, Shigeo Emoto, the second camp commander of Hakodate Main Camp, gathered his prisoners and taught them about differences in customs and body language between Western countries and Japan and repeatedly showed them how to avoid being misunderstood by the guards. Every time he made inspection rounds of the branch camps he tried to assist the prisoners by

---

<sup>76</sup> Kosuge and Nagai, commentary and translation, *BC kyu senso hanzai saiban (BC class war crimes tribunal)*, p. 111; Yui and Kosuge, *Rengo koku horyo gyakutai to sengo sekinin (Inhumane treatment of the POWs of the Allied forces and the post-war responsibility)*, p. 24; Kamisaka, *Kaini natta otoko (A man who became a shellfish)*, p. 101.

<sup>77</sup> Utsumi, *Chosenjin BC kyu senpan no kiroku (The record of Korean BC class war criminals)*, p. 55.

<sup>78</sup> Furyokankei chosa chuo iinkai (Investigative Committee on POWs), “Naichi furyo shuyojo niokeru furyo toriatsukai nikansuru daiichiji chosho” (The first report concerning the treatment of POWs at the POW internment camps in the mainland Japan).

<sup>79</sup> Ibid.

<sup>80</sup> Kosuge and Nagai, commentary and translation, *BC kyu senso hanzai saiban (BC class war crimes tribunal)* pp. 110, 114; Kamisaka, *Kaini natta otoko (A man who became a shellfish)*, p. 100.

<sup>81</sup> Utsumi, *Chosenjin BC kyu senpan no kiroku (The record of Korean BC class war criminals)*, pp. 77, 131.

<sup>82</sup> Furyokankei chosa chuo iinkai (Investigative Committee on POWs), “Naichi furyo shuyojo niokeru furyo toriatsukai nikansuru daiichiji chosho” (The first report concerning the treatment of POWs at the POW internment camps in the mainland Japan); Furyo johokyoku (The POW Information Bureau), “Furyo toriatsukai no kiroku” (The record of the treatment of POWs), p. 52.

giving them advice and explanations. He also gathered his prison staff to give them explicit instructions never to strike prisoners under any circumstances.<sup>83</sup> Such efforts by Emoto seemed to have paid off but relatively successful cases like this were extremely rare.

Hiroshi Tamura, who became the third head of the POW Information Bureau and the POW Management Office in November 1944 as the successor of Hamada, saw such situations as an important issue that needed to be addressed. To stamp out illegal arbitrary punishments, he stressed the effectiveness of the brig as a means of punishment and called upon them to strictly enforce detention punishment in the guardhouse.<sup>84</sup> However, it is understood that there were some among the POW camp commanders who interpreted this as a message for controlling the prisoners more strictly and, instead of utilizing the guardhouse as a means of curtailing the arbitrary punishments, they continued to inflict corporal punishment along with detention in the guardhouse, thus making the prisoners suffer two-fold.<sup>85</sup>

Among those accused of inflicting arbitrary corporal punishment on prisoners, there were cases of punishment handed down to personnel of the prison camps as well as security personnel assigned to the camps and labor sites by companies that used prisoner labor. However, existing records regarding POW camps on mainland Japan show only the number of persons convicted and stated neither the length of time nor details of the punishment. According to this record, those who received punishments for inflicting arbitrary corporal punishment on prisoners were: 12 officers; 16 non-commissioned officers and personnel; 37 clerical assistants and employees; And 17 supervisors and security personnel.<sup>86</sup> It is assumed that the clerical assistants and employees, of which there were large numbers, in this case civilian employees, were the ones who directly inflicted the punishments and that the officers (probably the camp commanders) were held responsible for the management of prisoners as their superior officers.

In terms of the details of punishments handed down, as mentioned earlier, there was a case of a railway company commander who was court-martialed for the mistreatment of prisoners during the construction of the Burma-Thailand Railroad. However, such cases were extremely rare and there are no other reports of heavy penalties imposed on those responsible. However, because the security personnel, who were neither soldiers nor civilian employees of the military, were suspended, it can be assumed that the punishments for military personnel were either on the same level or more severe.<sup>87</sup> The very fact that these persons actually received punishment was in itself exceptional while in many cases it must have been the usual practice of taking the easy way out by transferring the relevant officers or personnel and dismissing the civilian employees of the military.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> Hokkaido Shimbun, ed., *Shokei: Aru BC kyu senpan no sei to shi (Execution: The life and death of a BC class war criminal)* (Hokkaido Shimbunsha, 1990), pp. 82-84, 148-149.

<sup>84</sup> Utsumi, Nagai, commentary and ed., *Tokyo saiban shiryō: Fūryō johōkyoku kankei bunsho (Materials of Tokyo Tribunal: Documents related to the POW Information Bureau)*, pp. 265, 291; Utsumi, *Nihongun no hōryō seisaku (Policy for the treatment of POW by the Japanese military)*, p. 298.

<sup>85</sup> Utsumi, *Nihongun no hōryō seisaku (Policy for the treatment of POW by the Japanese military)*, p. 298.

<sup>86</sup> “Shiteki seisai shobatsu jinin hyō” (The list personnel who received punishment for giving arbitrary punishment), *Fūryō kankei chōsa chūō iinkai* (Investigative Committee on POWs), “Naichi fūryō shuyōjo niokeru fūryō toriatsukai nikansuru daiichiji chōshō” (The first report concerning the treatment of POWs at the POW internment camps in the mainland Japan).

<sup>87</sup> Utsumi, *Nihongun no hōryō seisaku (Policy for the treatment of POW by the Japanese military)*, p. 298.

<sup>88</sup> Even according to the studies by Aiko Utsumi concerning the Fukuoka POW Camp, out of the total of 20 cases subjected to her studies, there were only 2 cases of heavy detention in guardhouse, 3 cases of heavy suspension, 2 cases of severe reprimand, and 1 case being reported to police station, and excluding the 2 cases still under investigations, the rest received either no punishment or some were simply dismissed from work (Utsumi, *Nihongun no hōryō seisaku [Policy for the treatment of POW by the Japanese military]*, pp. 565-568).

(10) Other

In addition to the above cases, the other examples of inhumane treatment of prisoners which occurred within the POW camps were: Delay in clothing, underwear, shoes, and bedding supplies; The plundering of personal belongings of the prisoners including wristwatches, rings, fountain pens, and photographs; Chronic delay in the receipt and delivery of the prison mail; Delay in the delivery of donated books and magazines in English due to long period required for censorship; Shortage of canteen supplies particularly in the latter half of the war; Insufficient religious freedom; And the lack of provision of details of international treaties concerning the treatment of POWs in languages that could be understood by the prisoners. The belligerent countries repeatedly protested to Japan during the war concerning these matters.<sup>89</sup> Although the Japanese side did make some effort, it failed to improve conditions overall, and therefore it can only be said that the Japanese side was lacking in motivation.

C. Examples of cases arising in other situations.

(1) Inhumane treatment towards captured crew members of the allied force aircraft

During the Pacific War, the captured crew of aircraft of the allied forces who were placed under the authorities of the Japanese military did not receive recognition as formal prisoners of war and suffered treatment that was even worse than that of the POWs. During their detention, they underwent strict interrogation and were severely tortured. They were confined in unsanitary conditions and were deprived of food. Those that were injured were deprived of medical treatment and many of them were executed. The majority of executions were not by firing but by decapitating, bayoneting, or poisoning. Some were even executed by experimental methods such as the use of martial arts techniques. Some prisoners were also used in medical experiments and after their death their bodies were used for training purposes including bayonet training.

The introduction of severe measures to deal with the crew of allied force aircraft occurred after what was known as the “Doolittle Raid of Japan” in April 1942. This incident sparked considerable outrage and the government responded by putting in place procedures that would provide for more severe punishments for captured airmen of the allied forces on the grounds that they were war criminals who launched indiscriminate attacks on a country in violation of international law (“Regards the captured crew of enemy aircraft during air raids,” July 28, 1942).<sup>90</sup> Later on September 8, 1944 when the air raids intensified, the notification “Regards the treatment of captured crews of enemy aircraft during air raids” was issued, calling attention to military officials the new procedures and the accompanying obligation to apply them fully.<sup>91</sup>

Of about 530 captured crew of the allied forces, about 100 were court-martialed under the new

---

<sup>89</sup> Fuyo johokyoku (The POW Information Bureau), “Fuyo ni kansuru kogi nikanshi fuyo johokyoku oyobi fuyo kanribu ga shochi shitaru kotogara wo kiroku shitaru shorui no utsushi” (A copy of the documents recording the matters the POW Information Bureau and the POW Management Office treated concerning the protests in relation to POW) (not dated), pp. 136-139 in Utsumi, commentary and ed., *Fuyo toriatsukai ni kansuru shogaikoku kara no kogishu* (A collection of the protests made by the various foreign countries concerning the treatment of POW).

<sup>90</sup> Fuyo johokyoku (The POW Information Bureau), “Fuyo nikansuru sho hoki ruishu” (A collection of various regulations concerning POW), pp. 169-170.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 184.

procedures.<sup>92</sup> However, there were more than a few cases where prisoners were punished without going through the process of a military court of Japanese civilians and non-Japanese except for POWs. This was particularly true toward the end of the war when this trend increased significantly.

In the Tokai Military District (Nagoya), on July 11, 1945, a military discipline council was held to deliberate on the case of 11 crew members from B-29s shot down during the “indiscriminate bombing” of the Tokai and Hanshin Districts. At the council, it was determined that indiscriminate bombing raids had in fact taken place and the crew was sentenced to death and executed by decapitation on the next day. However, for another 27 crew of aircraft captured afterwards, hearings before a military court of Japanese civilians and non-Japanese except for POWs were omitted, and on the basis of approval by the Judge Advocate General of the Area Army alone they were executed by decapitation at four separate occasions, with 11 executed on June 28, and the remaining 16 from July 12 to 15.<sup>93</sup>

In the Chubu Military District (Osaka), between July and August 1945, six airmen of the allied forces were executed by poisoning on three separate occasions, and between July 5 and August 15, 39 airmen were executed by firing squad on four separate occasions. All of these airmen were supposedly executed at the orders of superior officers without going through a military court of Japanese civilians and non-Japanese except for POWs. In addition to this, about 10 airmen died from unlawful treatment and the denial of medical treatment.<sup>94</sup>

In the Seibu Army District (Fukuoka) on June 20, August 10 and 15 in 1945, a total of 33 captured airmen of the allied forces were executed without any formal procedures and in many cases by decapitation. June 20, one of the execution days, was the day following a series of “indiscriminate bombings” in many areas in Kyushu. August 10 was the day after the dropping of the A-bomb in Nagasaki, and August 15 was the last day of the war. It is assumed that resentment and a desire for revenge were behind the staging of these executions.<sup>95</sup>

In the same Seibu Army District in May 1945, eight captured airmen were killed on four separate occasions by vivisection and other medical experiments conducted at Kyushu University.<sup>96</sup> The vivisections were mainly conducted according to the wishes of the doctors, but such procedures could not have taken place if the army did not offer the captured airmen for that purpose. Therefore, the locus of responsibility does not lie solely with the doctors.

On the island of Ishigaki on April 15, 1945, some American aircraft conducting air raids on the

---

<sup>92</sup> Sumio Adachi, “Kokusai jindoho saininshiki eno michi” (The road to a new recognition of the international humanitarian law), *Ho to chitsujo (Law and Order)*, No. 74 (September 1983), p. 26. There were 13 people who received punishment after court martial. Hiroaki Kita, ed. and commentary, *Tokyo saiban: Oyama Fumio kankei bunsho (Tokyo Tribunal: Documents related to Fumio Oyama)*, Jugonensenseo gokuhi shiryosho (A collection of top-secret documents of the 15-year war), Vol. 5 (Fuji Shuppan, 1987), p. 110.

There were 438 who were detained without going through the process of a military disciplinary council. Adachi, “Rengokoku horyo toristsukai seido shoushi” (A brief history of the management system of the prisoners of war of the Allied forces), p. 168.

<sup>93</sup> Hata, Sase and Tsuneishi, eds., *Sekai senso hanzai jiten (Dictionary of the World's War Crimes)*, pp. 201-202.

<sup>94</sup> Kosuge and Nagai, commentary and translation, *BC kyu senso hanzai saiban (BC class war crimes tribunal)*, pp. 136-140. There were some cases of executions by going through the process of a military disciplinary council. Gaimusho Renraku-kyoku (Liaison Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs), “Kyokuto kokusai gunji saiban hanketsu sokkikoku” (Stenographic record of judgment of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East), p. 187.

<sup>95</sup> Hirotsada Kobayashi, *Tobo: Aburayama jiken, senpan kokuhaku roku (Escape: Aburayama incident, a record of confessions by a war criminal)* (Mainichi Shimbun, 2006).

<sup>96</sup> Fuyuko Kamisaka, *Seitai kaibo jiken: B 29 hikoushi, igaku jikken no shinso (Vivisection incident: B29 airmen, the truth of the medical experiments)*, New Edition (PHP Kenkyujo, 2005, originally published by Mainichi Shimbun, 1979).

airfield were shot down and three airmen were captured after they bailed out in parachutes. After interrogation, two of the airmen were executed by decapitation and one by bayoneting. Their remains were cremated and ashes disposed of at sea. This action may very well have been colored by the environment and events the Japanese military was experiencing at the time, such as the deaths of fellow soldiers in air raids day after day, a growing desire to take action, a dire shortage of food, the spread of malaria, and difficulty in securing facilities to house prisoners of war. On the other hand, there were times when similar action was taken with the conviction that it was probably more humane to ease the prisoners' pain by killing them rather than going through various forms of torture. Many of the soldiers would have seen prisoners suffer merciless torture during interrogations.<sup>97</sup>

In the Tobu Army District (Tokyo), in August 8, 1945, two airmen of the allied forces were captured in Tachikawa. The local residents who witnessed their capture and watched on as they were being taken away were reported to have shouted out to the soldiers to beat them and kill them. The next day on August 9, as if in response to the wishes of the local residents, one of the airmen was dragged out of the cell where he was being detained in bare feet, blindfolded, and in handcuffs. He was taken to the nearby school where more than 800 local residents were reported to have followed in file. The captured airman was tied to a basketball post and the local residents in turn assaulted him. Some of them supposedly hit him with bamboo and wooden swords. The assault by the local residents lasted about two hours until they were forced to stop because of the sounding of an air raid warning. The airman, who had reached the limit of enduring the pain, suffered a mental breakdown. He was finally taken to a cemetery where he was decapitated and buried where he fell. Many of the local residents witnessed this incident.<sup>98</sup>

Captured airmen of the allied forces were sent to the Tobu Army District from all over Japan, so there were a large number of detainees in the district. Some 62 of these airmen were being detained in the Tokyo Army Prison located at one end of the Yoyogi Military Drill Ground when it was damaged by air raids on May 25, 1945. At this time, although 464 Japanese prisoners all survived safely, all of these 62 airmen of the allied forces were killed. Furthermore, of the captured airmen who were detained in the lockup of the Military Police Headquarters, at least 17 were known to be killed as a result of torture, starvation or denial of medical treatment.<sup>99</sup>

The executions of captured airmen also took place in China, and in the occupied areas in the South. In Hangkow in December 1944, three captured airmen were paraded around the city and after being taunted, beaten and tortured, are said to have been doused in gasoline and burned to death.<sup>100</sup> In New Guinea on March 23, 1944, American airmen who were captured after bailing out of their aircraft in parachutes were decapitated after being tied and beaten.<sup>101</sup> In French Indochina, two American airmen who conducted air raids on the railways were captured in Saigon after being shot down. After being tortured by the military police, they were decapitated in the presence of a law officer. Another American airman who was deemed to be no longer necessary after interrogation was

---

<sup>97</sup> Hata, Sase and Tsuneishi, eds., *Sekai senso hanzai jiten (Dictionary of the World's War Crimes)*, pp. 196-197; Kamisaka, *Sugamo prison 13-go teppi (No. 13 Iron Door of Sugamo Prison)*, pp. 228-232, 238-239.

<sup>98</sup> Kosuge and Nagai, commentary and translation, *BC kyu senso hanzai saiban (BC class war crimes tribunal)*, pp. 131-132.

<sup>99</sup> Gaimusho Renraku-kyoku (Liaison Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs), "Kyokuto kokusai gunji saiban hanketsu sokkiroku" (Stenographic record of judgment of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East), p. 187.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid. p. 188; Lord Russell of Liverpool, *The Knights of Bushido*, p. 77.

<sup>101</sup> Kosuge and Nagai, commentary and translation, *BC kyu senso hanzai saiban (BC class war crimes tribunal)*, p. 41.

executed by injection of procaine hydrochloride in the carotid artery.<sup>102</sup> In Burma in early February 1945, six British airmen, after being interrogated and tortured, were paraded for about two miles and then decapitated after being forced to dig their own graves.<sup>103</sup> In Singapore in early August 1945, seven crew members of B-24 bombers were executed.<sup>104</sup>

These are the ways in which a large number of airmen of the allied forces were executed, some after court martial procedures and others with no formal procedures. In many cases, execution was by decapitation. The reasons for the particularly cruel treatment of captured airmen may be attributed to the culmination of various factors including the desire for retaliation and resentment at the time as well as the regular, general contempt of prisoners of war. There was also a shared awareness of those who knew that meeting their end was just a matter of time. Therefore, at times the Japanese captors felt that execution could be a compassionate way of easing the suffering of their captives, particularly if they were severely injured when their aircraft was shot down. Since they were going to die anyway, rather than let them meet a slow death, they would relieve them of their suffering. This was the concept behind administering the *coup de grace* (to someone who committed *hara-kiri*).<sup>105</sup> However, even though superior officers who made decisions about executions may have thought that way, in many cases it was the subordinates who actually had to dirty their hands, and although there were some among them who willingly took part in decapitation and bayoneting executions to vent their resentment,<sup>106</sup> most soldiers obeyed the orders of their superiors in executions simply because they had no choice.<sup>107</sup>

## (2) Inhumane treatment of prisoners immediately after their capture

There were some prisoners who were executed without being detained in POW camps even though they were not airmen. In February 1942, the Japanese forces that invaded Ambon Island in the Dutch East Indies, right after capturing the Laha Airfield, killed about 200 prisoners. The executions were conducted over three days: February 6, 15, and 20. The method of execution was by bayoneting the prisoners from behind. A desire for revenge seemed to be fueling their actions after the Japanese suffered heavy casualties in a fierce battle.<sup>108</sup>

In August 1942, US Marine forces made a surprise attack by landing on the Japanese occupied Makin Atoll in the Gilbert Islands. When the marines withdrew soon after, the Japanese forces captured nine US marines who failed to withdraw and were left behind. They were transferred to the Kwajalein Atoll for interrogation and later executed by decapitation on October 16. Interpreting the policy of the Naval General Staff to locally deal with POWs of this nature, the commander of the Japanese Naval Base Force, gave an order to his subordinate, the commander of the Naval Security Guards, to kill the prisoners.<sup>109</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup> Lord Russell of Liverpool, *The Knights of Bushido*, pp. 72, 77-78.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 78.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 73.

<sup>105</sup> Kosuge and Nagai, commentary and translation, *BC kyu senso hanzai saiban (BC class war crimes tribunal)*, pp. 61, 126-127; Kobayashi, *Tobo (Escape)*, p. 100.

<sup>106</sup> Kobayashi, *Tobo (Escape)*, p. 140.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 125-130. Kosuge and Nagai, commentary and translation, *BC kyu senso hanzai saiban (BC class war crimes tribunal)*, p. 134.

<sup>108</sup> Hata, Sase and Tsuneishi, eds., *Sekai senso hanzai jiten (Dictionary of the World's War Crimes)*, p. 132.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 145.

On March 12, 1945 there was an incident in which all of the 300 to 500 French POWs in Lanson, French Indochina were executed. The majority of the prisoners were captured in battles on March 9 and 10. The Japanese troops that captured the French prisoners were under orders to transfer immediately to their next operations. Because this troop had already suffered about 500 casualties in battle and was reduced to about 800 men, the leaders in charge wanted to minimize the number of soldiers they would have to leave behind for local guard duty. There was also serious concern that about 3,000 to 4,000 French troops were still on the loose evading capture. Therefore, the troop commander made a decision to execute all prisoners. The French commander of the local troop and the chief of local administration were beheaded and the others were killed either by bayoneting or by military swords.<sup>110</sup> This case was a typical example of mistreatment of prisoners for the sake of military expedience.

## 2. Causes of the Abuse of Prisoners

The author will begin the next stage of the discussion by presenting views expressed by authorities who conducted the war criminal trials, parties involved in the handling of war criminals, legal scholars and history academics from after the end of the Pacific War to the present day regarding the reasons for the abusive treatment of prisoners of war of the allied forces by the Imperial Japanese Army and Navy. Next, the author will re-examine the causes from organizational, systemic and psychological viewpoints, and finally will consider the various problems from the perspective of leadership. In cases where there is evidence of overlap in the results of the analyses, the author will consider the recurrence of those elements as an affirmation that their consideration as causes of abuse is highly appropriate.

### A. Analysis of general reasons

#### (1) Tokyo Tribunal, General Headquarters of the Allied Forces (GHQ), and the Red Cross International Committee

In its reasons of adjudication, the Tokyo Tribunal (International Military Tribunal for the Far East) stated that the abuse of prisoners of war was attributable to “the basic training of the Japanese military” and the generally accepted view of prisoners of war and the avoidance of capture based on the belief that “surrender to the enemy is shameful” and also cited “instilling in Japanese soldiers a spirit of disdain for soldiers of allied countries that surrendered.”<sup>111</sup>

“History of the Non-military Activities of the Occupation of Japan,” a historical document compiled by General Headquarters of the Allied Forces (GHQ), suggests that the reasons for the abuse of prisoners of war were: a desire for retaliation, the sentiments of the general public, disregard for international law, the leadership of Hideki Tojo, the barrier between military command and military administration within the Japanese army, the shortage of food and medical supplies, *bushido*, the

---

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., pp. 210-211.

<sup>111</sup> Gaimusho Renraku-kyoku (Liaison Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs), “Kyokuto kokusai gunji saiban hanketsu sokkikoku” (Stenographic record of judgment of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East), p. 203.

unequivocalness of orders in the Japanese army, and negligence.<sup>112</sup> The reason *bushido* is included as one of the reasons is due to the attention the Americans paid to the concept of *coup de grace*, or the kindness a warrior shows a comrade by helping him die since he is going to die anyway (as demonstrated in the Japanese ritual of *hara-kiri by kaishaku*, beheading his comrade after he has committed *hara-kiri*).<sup>113</sup>

A report presented by consultant Frederic Siordet at the 16th Permanent Committee Meeting of the International Committee of the Red Cross in 1947 cited the problem of prisoners of war in the Far East as one of the three major failures of the International Committee of the Red Cross during World War II and classified it as “a failure of civilization.” The same report attributes the reasons for failure as: The expansion of the Pacific War into sea areas where delivering aid was difficult; The Japanese army’s indifference to the Red Cross activities; The differences in views of prisoners of war of Japan and the West; And the different nature of their cultures. The report expresses the view that even if Japan had strictly applied the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, it is unlikely that its treatment of prisoners of war would have been comparable with that of the United States or Europe.<sup>114</sup>

## (2) Parties dealing with prisoners of war

In a lecture he gave not long after the end of the war,<sup>115</sup> Tadashi Odashima, who had been on the staff of the POW Information Bureau and the POW Management Office, gave the following as the main reasons for the “incidence of unreasonable acts” in the handling of prisoners of war:

- 1) The reality of the current war and the intensifying national sentiment;
- 2) The policies of superior officers regarding the treatment of prisoners of war;
- 3) Use of the prisoners of war for increasing national production;
- 4) The protracted period of imprisonment of prisoners of war;
- 5) The extreme stringency of food and medical supplies;
- 6) And a decline in the capability of the prison camp staff.<sup>116</sup>

On the issue of “the policies of superiors,” Odashima was speaking specifically of the contents of instructions from Prime Minister and Minister of War Tojo, which were read by Uemura, head of the POW Information Bureau and POW Management Office during the group training of the first intake of prison camp commanders. Furthermore, on the point of “a decline in the qualifications of prison camp staff,” he cites the low level of staff from the level of branch camp commander down in terms

---

<sup>112</sup> Kosuge and Nagai, commentary and translation, *BC kyu senso hanzai saiban (BC class war crimes tribunal)*, pp. 6, 21-22, 95, 104, 126-127, 134, 138, 168, 184.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 126-127.

<sup>114</sup> Okawa, ed. and translation, *Obeijin horyo to sekijuji katsudo (European and American POWs and the activities of the International Committee of the Red Cross)*, p. 38; Yui and Kosuge, *Rengokoku horyo gyakutai to sengo sekinin (Inhumane treatment of the POWs of the Allied forces and the post-war responsibility)*, p. 49; Kosuge, *Sengo wakai (Post-war reconciliation)*, pp. 104-105.

<sup>115</sup> Fuyo kankei chosa-bu (Investigative Division on POW), “Furyo wa ikani toriatsukawaretaka” (How the POWs were treated) (February 23, 1946) in Utsumi, Nagai, commentary and ed., *Tokyo saiban shiryō: Furyo johokyoku kankei bunsho (Tokyo Tribunal materials: Documents related to the POW Information Bureau)*, pp. 361-416.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 367.

of ability both physically and psychologically. In particular, he mentioned the physical weakness and “deep-seated inferiority complex” of the disabled soldiers who were used as guards in prison camps on mainland Japan.<sup>117</sup>

Odashima also discusses a range of factors that caused problems in the handling of prisoners of war such as differences in the perception of prisoners of war between Japanese and Westerners, inadequate education of the Japanese prison camp staff in international laws relating to the treatment of prisoners of war, contradictions between international treaties and domestic laws and ordinances, “emotional complications” between prisoners and prison camp staff due to the “absence of linguistic communication” and “differences in customs.” He also cited the “extremely cramped transport conditions,” and the establishment of prison camps in frigid regions.<sup>118</sup>

Commenting on arbitrary punishment, Odashima explains it as a “traditional bad habit” of the Japanese military and “shortcoming of the Japanese people” and that Japanese did not consider it as “abusive treatment” in the way that Westerners did. He says that Japanese believe it is “kinder to forgive by dealing a single blow” than to be punished and bring dishonor on one’s family. Explaining that Japanese in general were short-tempered and got irritated over small matters, he said that when problems arose due to lack of communication or differences in customs arose, rather than rationally considering the right or wrong of one’s actions, or following rational disciplinary proceedings, they tended to get carried away emotionally and resort to meting arbitrary punishment.<sup>119</sup>

In December 1955 the POW Information Bureau itself also mentioned arbitrary punishment in the “Record of the Treatment of Prisoners of War,” which summarizes details of the bureau’s activities since its establishment at the outbreak of the Pacific War and afterwards, noting, “As personnel in the prison camps... disabled soldiers were used in Japan, and Koreans and Taiwanese were used abroad. As a result, personnel were poorly qualified and lacking in skills to deal with prisoners of war. Arbitrary punishment was widely practiced.” Stating further that arbitrary punishment was used as a means of redress or justified defense, or in response to what might be mistakenly interpreted by prison camp officials as affronts or disobedience by prisoners of war due to the lack of verbal communication, the record again acknowledges that, “Arbitrary punishment is not only a bad habit of the Japanese military but is also a shortcoming of the Japanese people. Japanese in general are extremely short-tempered and get upset over trifling matters. When friction occurs due to lack of linguistic communication or differences in customs, for example, they fail to consider what is right or wrong or follow legitimate procedures, but instead let their emotions take over and in many cases turn to arbitrary punishment.”<sup>120</sup>

The POW Information Bureau cited the following reasons as obstructing the processing of essential POW information such as names, nationalities, and deaths, etc. to report to the International Committee of the Red Cross: 1) A shortage of personnel; 2) Delay in the reporting of or failure to report information due to prison camp officials’ lack of understanding of the relevant POW camp rules; 3) Difficulty in communication and research due to the widening or remoteness of the field

---

<sup>117</sup> Ibid., pp. 375, 389.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid., pp. 369-372, 381-384.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid., pp. 396-397.

<sup>120</sup> *Furyo johokyoku* (The POW Information Bureau), “*Furyo toriatsukai no kiroku*” (Record of the treatment of POW), pp. 51-52. At the meeting of the POW camp commanders in December 26, 1943, Hamada, the second head of the POW Information Bureau and POW Management Office, attributed arbitrary punishment to “lack of linguistic communication and lack of understanding of regulations by the camp” (ibid., p. 52).

of operation and the unfavorable war conditions; 4) The escalation of hostilities of the allied forces; 5) A sharp increase in the number of prisoners, their frequent movement and transfer, and a rash of fatalities due to epidemics and distress.<sup>121</sup>

Known for his words “I want to become a shellfish,” Tetsutaro Kato, based on his experience as a prisoner of war camp commander and staff member, cited as specific reasons for the abuse of prisoners of war the shortage of medical supplies, the failure of measures in prison camps to ward off the cold, differences in culture between Japan and the West, lack of food and oppressive work. In addition to these causes, he also cited as causes of abuse the criminal nature of war, education and training in the Japanese military, and fundamental difficulties in dealing with prisoners of war.<sup>122</sup> As Kato explained, in war, killing is considered the highest virtue, and people at war are forever in a situation where they either kill or are killed. This state of mind causes people to become deranged, but it is under these conditions that the army trains soldiers to be able to kill people. He also explained that because prisoners of war have a knowledge of international law and understand the rights they are entitled to, even if under difficult circumstances at the prison camp efforts are made to show prisoners of war as much courtesy as possible, Kato says that this is taken for granted by the prisoners of war, and that good intentions do not make an impression on them at all. These were the conclusions Kato reached through his own personal experience. When Kato was serving as a camp commander and there were no heaters to ward off the cold, with help from the prisoners, he made a decision to make heaters from oil drums. Even the Japanese soldiers in that region lived without heaters at that time. Therefore, Kato’s decision was in violation of the principle to treat prisoners of war in the same Japanese soldiers were treated. However, Kato’s attitude was “unless you ignore every rule and order of the Japanese army, you will never be able to act on the basis of common sense and reason.”<sup>123</sup>

Shigeharu Tarumoto, who belonged to the railroad unit which used prisoners of war as laborers in the building of the Burma-Thailand Railroad, seems to believe that the reasons for the abuse of prisoners of war were: A shortage of equipment; Difficulty in communication; The personalities of the individual soldiers; The character of Japanese society; The lack of military training and education in international law; The perception of the prisoners of war; The sense of urgency and anxiety in executing orders; The shortage of food supplies; Insufficient rest; The absence of clothing supplies; Inadequate living facilities; A shortage of military doctors; Poor hygiene and an indifference to hygiene; Improper control of communicable diseases; Unreasonable movement of prisoners of war; And the relationship between military command and military administration.<sup>124</sup>

### (3) Legal specialists and international law academics

Fumio Oyama, who was the Legal Affairs Bureau Chief of the Ministry of War from December 1933 to April 1945, describes his view of the “causes of the frequent occurrence of violations of war legislation” from the following perspectives:

---

<sup>121</sup> Ibid., p. 102.

<sup>122</sup> Kato, *Watashi wa kaini naritai (I Want to Become a Shellfish)*, pp. 30-31, 47, 111, 117, 130, 136.

<sup>123</sup> Ibid., pp. 136-137.

<sup>124</sup> Tarumoto, *Aru senpan no shuki (A Memorandum of a War Criminal)*, pp. 36-41, 50-51, 77, 102, 129-131, 140, 147, 168, 178-179, 193-197.

- 1) The lack of education in international law in the army;
- 2) Errors in the advertising of the government and the army;
- 3) The negative impact of the Sino-Japanese Incident;
- 4) The inappropriate lineup of staff for managing the prisoners of war;
- 5) Desire for retaliation for indiscriminate attacks on Japanese territory;
- 6) And incomplete “application of *mutatis mutandis*”<sup>125</sup> of the Geneva Convention.<sup>126</sup>

On the first point above, Oyama states that where international law was concerned, “education was in no way adequate” but that if a person “had humane common sense, that person should have been able to make rational judgments.” He believed that even if people had been familiar with international law, violations would probably still have occurred “due to feelings of hostility.” He also stated that it was only natural that differences in language and customs resulted in a lack of understanding of each other’s intentions and that this was at the root of problems.

On the second point, he states that Tojo’s words concerning the treatment of prisoners of war “in some respects may have been misunderstood by subordinates who went too far.” In fact, he said “I believe that what Tojo meant when he said ‘Don’t be soft on prisoners of war,’ was to follow procedures and rules fairly and squarely and not to hesitate in disciplining those who fell out of line. However, I do not believe that it was ever his intention to order them to be cruel in their treatment.”

On the third point, he believes that military discipline and morale deteriorated with call-ups and assignment to the front line of a massive number of reserves, and this situation continued on into the Pacific War.

On the fourth point, he states that in prisoner of war camps instead of “soldiers in active service who gave the impression that they were leading their subordinates,” it was a situation where “second- and third-class persons in the second reserves, who could not be used for anything else were assigned and the interpreters, who played what can be assumed to be a vital role, were particularly bad.” He also indicates his awareness that this “constituted a major cause of war crimes.”

On the fifth point concerning the desire for retaliation in regard to the allied force airmen, he admits that “[retaliation] happened on many occasions” but “the fact was rather than the military not following orders, it was the local residents who refused to obey and the military forces had a hard time restraining them.”

---

<sup>125</sup> After the start of the Pacific War when Japan started taking POWs, Japan received inquiries from the warring nations including the United States and Britain as to whether Japan intended to apply the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War. In response to this, Japan replied that it was prepared to “apply *mutatis mutandis*” in January 29, 1942. According to the affidavit presented at the Tokyo Tribunal after the war by Tojo, the then Prime Minister and Minister of War, the meaning of the word “apply *mutatis mutandis*” was that the Imperial government intended “to apply accordingly” the treaty by adding the necessary amendments to what was already stipulated in the Geneva Convention to conform to the domestic laws of Japan and the conditions of current situation (Yuko Tojo, ed., *Daitoa senso no shinjitsu: Tojo Hideki no sensei kyojitsusho [The Truth of the Great East Asian War: Affidavit by Hideki Tojo]* [WAC, 2005 ], p. 185). On this point, the Foreign Ministry also had the same understanding at the time of its reply and thereafter (Masao Ichimata, “Senpan saiban kenkyu yoron (1): 1929 nen horyo joyaku junyo mondai” [An Obiter Dictum of the Study of War Crimes Tribunal (1): The Issue of Applying *mutatis mutandis* to the Geneva Convention in 1929], *Kokusaiho gaiko zasshi [International Law Foreign Diplomacy Journal]*, Vol. 66, No. 1 [June, 1967] , pp. 14, 21).

<sup>126</sup> “Moto Fukuinsho homu chosabucho, Rikugun homu chujo Oyama Fumio shi kara no choshusho” (A report of the investigation of the former director of judicial research division of the Demobilization Bureau, Army Judge Advocate and Lieutenant General, Fumio Oyama) (October 1, 1963), Kita, commentary and ed., *Tokyo saiban; Oyama Fumio kankei bunsho (Tokyo Tribunal: Documents related to Fumio Ohyama)*, pp. 207-211.

On the sixth point regarding *mutatis mutandis*, he stated, “Measures to ensure thoroughness in the adoption of applicable provisions of treaties were blatantly ambiguous.”

International law academic Masao Ichimata states outright, “There is no doubt but that the abuse of prisoners of war during World War II was due to the attitude of the military and the heads of government in their disregard for international law.” He adds “the expansion of the battle theater and the enormous surge in prisoner numbers [were] unavoidable causes.” At the same time, Ichimata sees ethnic and racial emotions as major contributing factors, what he describes as “the inveterate influence of dealing with Chinese soldiers since the Manchurian Incident and pride arising from the acquisition a massive number of Caucasian prisoners of war.”<sup>127</sup>

Similarly Yoshihito Kita, as a scholar of international law who studies prisoner of war issues, focuses on the neglect of the Army, which failed to pay careful attention to the humane treatment of prisoners of war, Japan’s national strength, ethnic and cultural differences, and the national character of the Japanese people as causes of the abuse of prisoners of war of the allied forces.<sup>128</sup> As specific causes, he cites: The view of prisoners of war (Japan’s unique philosophy on avoidance of surrender at all costs); The lack of knowledge of international law (particularly where the rights of prisoners of war were concerned); Failure of food and medical care systems (ill-preparedness of medical facilities), and their low level (deficiency in food and medical supplies as war conditions worsened); The natural environment of the prisoner of war camps; The personalities of the prison camp commanders; The content of the work duties; The Japanese view of life and death; The practice of arbitrary corporal punishment (pummeling, etc.); The unequivocalness of superior officers’ orders (orders that could not be challenged); Abnormal psychology in the battlefield; The retirement of military leaders of the Meiji Period; And difficulties in the disclosure of illegal acts.<sup>129</sup>

Specialist in international humanitarian law Sumio Adachi cites the lack of education in international law, a shortage of supplies, defective food and medical supply systems, and fundamental difficulties in the humane treatment of prisoners of war by the Japanese army as the main causes of prisoner of war abuse.<sup>130</sup> Hisakazu Fujita, also a specialist in international humanitarian law, cites disregard for international law and the Japanese view of prisoners of war as causes of abuse.<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>127</sup> Ichimata, “Senpan saiban kenkyu yoron (1)” (An Obiter Dictum Study of the War Crimes Tribunal (1)), p. 5.

<sup>128</sup> Yoshito Kita, “Nihon wa rengogun no horyo wo gyakutai shitaka” (Did Japan Mistreat the POWs of the Allied Forces?) in Fumihiko Hata, ed., *Showashi 20 no soten, Nihonjin no joshiki (Twenty Points in Dispute in the History of Showa, the Common Sense of the Japanese)* (Bungei Shunju, 2003), p. 152.

<sup>129</sup> Kita, “Nihongun no kokusaiho ninshiki to horyo no toriatsukai” (Understanding of the International law by the Japanese forces and the treatment of POWs), pp. 278, 282, 285, 288, 299; Kita, “Nihon wa rengogun no horyo wo gyakutai shitaka” (Did Japan Mistreat the POWs of the Allied Forces?), pp. 151-152; Kita, “Kyu rikugun shogakko ni okeru kokusaiho kyoiku” (The Teaching of International Laws at Schools under the Former Japanese Army) in Yoshio Chaen, ed., *BC kyu senpan beigun Shanghai tou saiban shiryō (Materials on BC Class War Crimes Tribunals from the US Forces in Shanghai, etc.)*, BC kyu senpan kankei shiryō shusei (A collection of materials related to BC-class war crimes), Vol. 11 (Fuji Shuppan, 1989), p. 150.

<sup>130</sup> Adachi, “Kokusai jindoho sainshiki eno michi” (The road to a new recognition of the international humanitarian law), *Ho to chitsujo (Law and Order)*, No.74 (September 1983), p. 24; Adachi, “Rengokoku horyo toriatsukai seido shoshi” (A brief history of the system for the treatment of the POWs of the Allied nations), pp. 175, 195.

<sup>131</sup> Hisakazu Fujita, “Kokusaiho kara mita horyo no chii” (The position of POW from the view point of the international law) in Yoichi Kibata, Nobuko Kosuge and Philip Towle, eds., *Senso no kioku to horyo mondai (The memory of war and the POW issues)* (Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 2003), pp. 2-28.

#### (4) Scholars of history

Fumihiko Hata indicates that the unique Japanese view of war prisoners were the notion of being captured in war was considered taboo was pervasive not only in the military forces but among the Japanese people in general and, as a consequence, an ethos of respecting the rights of prisoners of war which are recognized by international law was lacking in the Japanese army. He also claims that in more than a few cases, the desire for retaliation among those who had lost comrades in battle also had an impact. In addition, he argues that it is not correct to cite inadequacies in legislation as a cause for the abuse of POWs, but should instead view the failure of its appropriate operation as being at fault. In this respect, he argues that the heads of the armed forces represented by Tojo should be held responsible for this failure rather than the staff at the prison camp level.<sup>132</sup>

Fumitaka Kurosawa believes that in the processes leading up to the Pacific War, a number of significant changes took place internally in the Japanese military, and these changes had an effect on the way the prisoners of war of the Allied forces were treated. The changes which Kurosawa refers to are: Changes in the perception of prisoners of war; The dominance of military rationality; The change from pro-Western to anti-Western sentiments (disregard for international law); Emphasis on nationalism; The rise of spiritualism; And the beginning of a consciousness of the Imperial Army.<sup>133</sup>

Aiko Utsumi cites a wide range of problems as causes of the abuse of prisoners of war: Delay in the establishment of a prisoner management system and its failure to function properly; Insufficient personnel, ineffectiveness, and the low caliber of personnel in positions responsible for managing the prisoners as well as insufficient training and errors in the training content; The widening of the battle theater; the diversity and massive number of prisoners; The relationship between military administration and military command; National sentiment; Differences in culture, way of life, customs (including the notion of compassion underlying physical punishment), and the standard of living; The shortage of food and medical supplies; The psychological state during the time of war (fear, agitation, etc.); The leadership of the POW camp commanders; The unequivocalness of orders of superior officers; The defiance and escape attempts of prisoners of war; And the war conditions.<sup>134</sup> In addition, as the reasons for abuse leveled at prisoners by Koreans who were hired as guards at prison camps particularly in southern occupied territories, Utsumi cites the content of the training (to be elaborated on later) they received at Pusan prior to their dispatch to their postings, the view of prisoners of war that had been instilled in them during training, and the customary practice of meting out arbitrary punishment. Utsumi continues by saying that for these Korean guards, who were on the lowest rung of the Japanese army, the abuse of prisoners of war, who were even lower in status, offered a vent for the Korean guards' dissatisfaction and stress or a target onto which they could transfer their feelings of oppression and thereby derive a sense of overcoming the humiliating

<sup>132</sup> Fumihiko Hata, *Nihonjin horyo: Hokusukinoe kara Shiberia yokuryu made (Japanese prisoners of war: From Hokusukinoe to detention in Siberia)*, Vol. 1 (Hara Shobo, 1998), pp. 50, 101, 140.

<sup>133</sup> A report by Fumitaka Kurosawa at the study meeting of military history held at the National Institute for Defense Studies in October 6, 2006. "Nihongun no rengogun horyo no toriatsukai ni kansuru ichi kasetu" (An examination concerning the treatment of the POWs of the Allied forces by the Japanese military).

<sup>134</sup> Utsumi, *Nihongun no horyo seisaku (Policy for the treatment of POW by the Japanese military)*, pp. 183, 188-189, 190, 270, 342-343, 502, 554, 591; Aiko Utsumi, "Nihon no horyo seisaku, senjikano gaikokujin no jinken" (Japan's policy on POWs, the human rights of the foreigners during the war time), *Kikan senso sekinin kenku (Quarterly publication: The report on Japan's war responsibility)*, No. 3 (Spring, 1994), pp. 15-16. Utsumi, *Chosenjin BC kyu senpan no kiroku (The record of Korean BC class war criminals)*, pp. 49-50, 55, 77, 131.

discrimination they received from the Japanese.<sup>135</sup>

In her research of the causes of abuse of prisoners of war, Nobuko Kosuge points to the Japanese view of physical assault as an act of kindness, the disregard for human life and the unequivocalness of orders as special attributes of the Japanese military, the absence of an awareness of human rights, spiritualism, the Japanese view of prisoners of war, the desire for retaliation, education in international law, difficulties in maritime transport, the differences in dietary habits and customs, and the extreme circumstances and idiosyncrasies created by the war.<sup>136</sup>

Chiyo Nakajima, who has looked at the problem of the abuse of prisoners of war from the perspective of “food” in terms of differences in dietary culture and habits and the lack of knowledge in nutritional science, cites in addition to problems associated with food as causes of abuse: The notion of spiritual superiority; Differences in the sense of what constitutes “rest”; The manner of upbringing of soldiers; The small number and poor caliber of military doctors; The shortage of medical supplies; Supply difficulties; Conditions of the prisoner camp locations; The “Conquest of Modernity”; The view of prisoners of war; And the execution of the war based on an unreasonable food supply plan.<sup>137</sup>

Furthermore, it must not be forgotten that racial prejudice was also a cause of abuse of prisoners of war by the Japanese military. Great Britain’s Philip Towle writes:

The racist views of the Japanese had a powerful effect on the attitude Japanese had of the prisoners of war. To show that the era of European supremacy had ended, the Japanese made a point to humiliate Western prisoners of war in front of people of various Asian countries. On the other hand, the treatment of Asian people including Chinese was by far more inhumane than the treatment of Westerners.<sup>138</sup>

Historian Clifford Kinvig, also of Great Britain, points out that in addition to the military culture and strategic demands of the Japanese military, racial prejudice was also an underlying factor in the abuse of POWs by the Japanese.<sup>139</sup>

Among Japanese scholars too, there are those who argue that racial and ethnic prejudice was one of the causes of the abuse of prisoners. For example, Harumi Furuya, while stressing that hate of Caucasians should not be emphasized, notes the following:

---

<sup>135</sup> Utsumi, *Chosenjin BC kyū senpan no kiroku (The record of Korean BC class war criminals)*, pp. vii, 23, 94, 118-119, 201-203.

<sup>136</sup> Yui and Kosuge, *Rengokoku horyo gyakutai to sengo sekinin (Inhumane treatment of the POWs of the Allied nations and the post-war responsibility)*, pp. 24, 31, 40, 48, 57; Nobuko Kosuge, “Horyo mondai no kisoteki kento: Rengokoku horyo no shiboritsu to gyakutai no haikai” (Fundamental examination of POW issues: the death rate of the POWs of the Allied nations and the background of inhumane treatment), *Kikan senso sekinin kenku (Quarterly publication: The report on Japan’s war responsibility)*, No. 3 (March 1994), p. 22.

<sup>137</sup> Nakajima, “Horyo mondai no hikakubunkateki kosatsu” (Comparative cultural examination of the POW issues), Vol. 1, pp. 27-33; Nakajima, “Horyo mondai mo hikakubunkateki kosatsu” (Comparative cultural examination of the POW issues), Vol. 2, pp. 28-30; Nakajima, “Horyo mondai mo hikakubunkateki kosatsu” (Comparative cultural examination of the POW issues), Vol. 3, pp. 79, 81-83.

<sup>138</sup> Philip Towle (Yoichi Kibata, translation), “Senso horyo mondai wo meguru Seiyō to Nihon” (The West and Japan surrounding the POW issues) in Kibata, Kosuge, and Towle, eds., *Senso no kioku to horyo mondai (The memory of war and the POW issues)*, p. 7.

<sup>139</sup> Clifford Kinvig (Kazuto Ikeda, translation), “Rengokoku horyo to Taimen Tetsudo” (The POWs of the Allied nations and the Burma-Thailand Railway) in Kibata, Kosuge, and Towle, eds., *Senso no kioku to horyo mondai (The memory of war and the POW issues)*, p. 68.

On the one hand, we Japanese adopt a white supremacist attitude ourselves by showing cruel racial discrimination toward Asians, and the reason we Japanese treated Caucasian prisoners of war in an inhumane way was, to put it simply, an expression of anti-white sentiment and an expression of racial retaliation against Caucasians. In a word, the racial identity of Japanese is a contradictory combination of self-promotion to Caucasians based on our willing consent to white supremacy and a latent resentment to Caucasians... The racial identity of the Japanese reflected in the treatment of prisoners of war during World War II was one of racial inferiority. It took the form of adoration and revenge toward “superior” white people and a form of enslavement toward “inferior” Asians.<sup>140</sup>

The above was a brief explanation of the views expressed by authorities who handed down the war criminal judgments, parties involved in the treatment of prisoners of war, legal scholars, and history academics regarding acts of abuse by the former Japanese military committed against prisoners of war of the allied forces. Although many specific reasons were cited, it is possible to indicate to certain extent from these a common understanding of the general causes of abuse of prisoners of war of the allied forces and the main causes which can be summarized as follows:

- 1) View of prisoners of war;
- 2) Disregard for international law and lack of education;
- 3) The lineup of personnel involved in dealing with prisoners of war (low caliber of the prison camp staff, etc., and shortage of personnel);
- 4) The unequivocalness of the orders of superior officers;
- 5) Lack of food and medical supplies;
- 6) Differences in culture and customs (eating habits, arbitrary punishments);
- 7) A desire for retaliation;
- 8) And racial and ethnic prejudice.

## B. Organizational, systemic, and psychological causes and leadership

### (1) Organizational and systemic causes

Immediately after the start of the Pacific War, the Japanese armed forces established the POW Information Bureau as the department responsible for dealing with prisoners of war. This bureau was a provisional government agency established at the beginning of the war and was an affiliated agency of the Ministry of War. Its mission was to gather, exchange, prepare and amend the *mei-mei hyo* (information card for each POW) and it was not affiliated with the supervision of the prisoner of war camps. Furthermore, for a period after the beginning of the war, a POW Management Office was established in the Military Affairs Bureau of the Ministry of War. This office was in charge of general planning of the handling of prisoners of war in areas such as their accommodation, work duties, punishment and general treatment but because it remained an office within the Military Affairs Bureau

---

<sup>140</sup> Harumi Furuya, “Dai niji sekai taisenki ni okeru Nihonjin no jinshu identity” (The racial identity of the Japanese people during the period of the World War II) in Kibata, Kosuge, and Towle, eds., *Senso no kioku to horyo mondai* (The memory of war and the POW issues), p. 166.

of the Ministry of War, it had to be overseen by the head of the bureau and in decision-making had to receive the approval of the Military Affairs Bureau. Furthermore, it shared a horizontal relationship with other bureaus or held an inferior position to agencies such as the Finance Bureau, which was in charge of food, and the Medical Affairs Bureau, which was in charge of the medical care of the prisoners of war. In other words, the POW Information Bureau and the POW Management Office were weak as organizations and had limited authority and, as such, were not exclusively responsible for managing the affairs of the prisoners of war.

In addition, the staff of the POW Information Bureau and the staff of the POW Management Office were one and the same, and increases in staff in these offices failed to keep pace with the rapidly increasing number of prisoners of war, and work fell behind as a result of the shortage of staff. Although the position of head of the POW Information Bureau and POW Management Office was held by generals, none of the generals who filled this position was an influential person of the dominant faction who could exert influence within the army. General Tanaka, who was the third to take up this position, was also recuperating from illness when he held the position. Therefore, to get his point across, the head of the POW Information Bureau and POW Management Office had to resort to the desperate measure of obtaining decisions and approval directly from the Prime Minister and Minister of War Tojo at meetings of the bureau heads of the Ministry of War.

The wall between military command and military administration was also an impediment. The POW Information Bureau and the POW Management Office came under the military administration system and each prisoner of war camp was also under the control of the Minister of War. However, the Chief of Management was either a military commander or garrison commander, which comes under the control of the military command, and the line of command was a very complex system where the commandant of the POW prison camps came under either the military commander or garrison commander. Therefore, even if the POW Information Bureau and the POW Management Office requested some improvement in the POW camps, it was impossible to give direct orders to the POW camp heads but instead they had to go through either the military commander or garrison commander. Problems arising from relations between the military command and military administration were mentioned earlier in the discussion of the construction of the Burma-Thailand Railroad. The construction work was executed under the order of the Imperial Headquarters so operations were divided with the labor of the POWs under the jurisdiction of the military command and the management of the prisoners of war in POW camps came under military administration. Furthermore, because the military command was in a superior position to execute tactics according to plan, the unequivocalness of orders requiring that construction work be done by the deadline stated in orders and military needs took precedence over human requests in the appropriate management of prisoners of war and, consequently, prisoners of war were hard-driven and mistreated. Even Tojo himself was unable to break down the barrier between military command and military administration.

In most cases, the camp commanders at the helm of the prison camps were reserves or second reserves and there were few who demonstrated leadership by taking the initiative to resolve problems in the camps. There was also a severe shortage of subordinates. In the main camps and branch camps, the situation was not so pressing, but in out stations and detachments petty officers, soldiers and interpreters, who acted as the arms and legs of the camp commanders, were sparse or completely absent. To look after prisoners of war in Japan, disabled soldiers were hired as civilian employees in the capacity of camp guards. Outside Japan, Koreans and Taiwanese, hired as civilian employees,

served as camp guards. In some camps, apart from the camp commander, prisoners were supervised solely by private-sector sentinels provided by companies that used prisoners of war as laborers. It was believed that 30 prisoners per guard was an appropriate number<sup>141</sup> but a look at the actual figures on an annual basis shows that this number varied. In 1942 there were about 60 POWs per guard, in 1943 about 25, in 1944 about 47, and in 1945 about 23.<sup>142</sup> As these numbers indicate, there was clearly a shortage in personnel in 1942 and 1944.

In terms of international law and Japanese laws and ordinances concerning the handling of prisoners of war, short-term intensive courses were conducted for personnel of camp commander level prior to taking up their posts but those of petty officer and lower rank did not receive any education of that nature. Koreans hired as army civilian guards underwent training similar to that of new recruits of the army. However, while they were not given any instruction on the treatment of prisoners of war, they received indoctrination in the importance of absolute obedience of the orders of superior officers and contempt for prisoners of war through the “Imperial Code of Military Conduct” and “Field Services Code.” On top of that, the bad habit of meting out punishment as they saw fit was drilled into them. As a result, the military guards who lacked knowledge of international law and Japanese legislation, who could not disobey orders of senior officers, who learned the practice of resorting to lynching as a means of discipline and redress, looked after the prisoners of war in the prison camps and at work sites. The sentinels, who were private citizens provided by companies were also of the same mold.

It is necessary here to also mention the inconsistency between international law and Japan’s laws as one systemic factor. During the Pacific War, Japan publicly indicated that it would “apply *mutatis mutandis*” with respect to the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War. However, international law was rarely consciously applied at places where POWs were being handled, and domestic law took precedence. Although there were some exceptional instances where Japanese regulations were in conflict with the principles of international law, such as its traditionally severe punishment for escapees and restrictions on meetings with prisoners of war, for the most part, domestic laws and ordinances were established in line with international law. However, when Japan kept winning battles in the early stages of the Pacific War, overconfidence set in. Seizing upon the opportunity of the Doolittle Raid of April 1942 in particular, the Army, which had until then agreed to “applying *mutatis mutandis*” of the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War as its fundamental policy, rapidly put in place procedures to make punishment for the prisoners more severe by classifying captured airmen of the allied forces in a special category different from general prisoners of war. Establishing new regulations which enabled the Japanese military to treat captured airmen as serious criminals who violated international law in time of war, they revised the Regulations for the Punishment of Prisoners of War (March 9, 1943) and made applicable punishment more severe. These measures served to widen the gap between international law and Japan’s domestic laws and ordinances significantly. After the revisions, if prisoners were tried under Japan’s domestic laws, in some cases, the possibility that laws would be in violation of the international law increased.

---

<sup>141</sup> “Furyo nikansuru gigi kaito jiko no ken” (Regarding the items for replying the questions in relation to the management of POW) (June 26, 1943), *Furyo johokyoku* (The POW Information Bureau), “Furyo ni kansuru sho hoki ruishu” (A collection of various regulations concerning POW), p. 177.

<sup>142</sup> Yoshio Chaen, commentary and ed., *Dainihon teikoku gaichi furyo shuyojo* (*Overseas POW internment camps of the Great Empire of Japan*), BC kyu senpan kankei shiryō shusei (A collection of materials related to BC class war crimes), Vol. 7 (Fuji Shuppan, 1986), p. 24.

Therefore, the following can probably be cited as organizational and systemic causes of abuse of the allied forces prisoners of war by the Japanese army:

- 1) The authority of the POW Management Office of the Army was weak and there was a shortage of personnel;
- 2) The POW camps were not able to obtain appropriate, adequate personnel (including interpreters) on site, and education that was both necessary and appropriate regarding the treatment of prisoners of war for personnel of petty officer and below with respect to the treatment of POWs;
- 3) Dualism existed in the line of order with the military command being superior to the military administration;
- 4) The orders of senior officers were unequivocal;
- 5) The abusive practice of meting out punishment arbitrarily;
- 6) The inconsistencies between international law and domestic law;

Other organizational and systemic causes such as the following can also be cited but consideration of these must also take into account the prevailing conditions at the time including the war conditions, the level of technology, the living standards in Japan, and the standard of medicine and nutrition science:

- 7) Problems in the system for the replenishment of supplies such as food, medicine, and clothing;
- 8) Problems in securing equipment for the prison camps (including medical and sanitary equipment);
- 9) The shortage of doctors and their relatively low status and quality;
- 10) And problems in the system for transporting prisoners of war.

## (2) Psychological causes<sup>143</sup>

There are scholars who analyze the psychological processes abusive parents go through in the lead up to abusing their children, considering aspects such as: 1) Isolation; 2) Inadequate communication skills; 3) Low self-esteem; 4) Unrealistic expectations of wanting their children, for example, to obey their orders at the drop of a hat; 5) Stress in their daily lives; 6) And a deficiency in asserting themselves, and venting stress caused by these on their children who are vulnerable through “displacement.”<sup>144</sup>

There are also scholars who analyze abuse by classifying it into different types. For example, abuse inflicted on users of the services of aid providers at facilities for the intellectually disabled or social welfare facilities is divided into intentional (treatment of the user, improvement in behavior, improvement in a situation, social adaptation, or social rehabilitation) or unintentional abuse (instinctive, egotistical) irrespective of whether it is motivated by a specific purpose or theoretical basis. They further divide it into “autonomous” abuse influenced by the values or ideals of a third party which differ from those of the group the party inflicting the abuse belongs, and heteronymous abuse committed as a result of the influence of another within the group the inflicting party belongs

---

<sup>143</sup> The method of psychological approach is effective in examining the cause of inhumane treatment resulted from the behavior of individual offender, or the negligence of the offender.

<sup>144</sup> Analysis by E.C. Jorgensen introduced in p. 132 in Ichikawa's *Shisetsunai gyakutai (Maltreatment within the facilities)*.

or pressure from the group. In summary, such scholars classify abuse as 1) intentional autonomous abuse, 2) intentional heteronomous abuse, 3) unintentional autonomous abuse and 4) unintentional heteronomous abuse.<sup>145</sup>

These methods of analyses may also be applied when analyzing the psychology of parties involved in the abuse of prisoners of war in prison camps. It is the role of parents to protect and care for children, facility employees to protect and care for facility users, and, conversely, children and facility users are in a position where they are meant to be protected and cared for. In this respect, the imbalance in power based on abuse arising between the parent and child in a family and the staff and the facility user in a social welfare facility is the same as the relationship between persons in charge of prisoner camps and prisoners of war. Another aspect, which they also have in common, is they interact with each other in their daily lives within a certain social and spatial framework.

In line with the example of the psychological analysis of parents who abuse their children, the article will now look at the psychology of prisoner of war abuse.

#### a. Isolation

At the time of the Pacific War, it was considered dishonorable and shameful for a soldier to be captured and taken as a prisoner of war not only by the Japanese army but also by Japanese people in general. Therefore, the duty of looking after prisoners of war was an assignment that was in conflict with their basic view on prisoners of war as well as the view of the people around them, and its objectives and rules of conduct were at odds with those of other military personnel and the general population. Consequently, military personnel assigned to posts at prisoner of war camps could not help but feel a sense of self-contradiction, which caused psychological conflict within them. At the same time, outside the army among the general population, they also became the target of criticism and protest. It is not hard to imagine that this feeling of isolation had an effect on the psychological well being of the military and civilian personnel of the prison camps, and was the cause of feelings of dissatisfaction, anxiety and stress. It is also not hard to imagine that as a means of venting their feelings they might have resorted to physical and psychological abuse of prisoners of war. Furthermore, as a rear assignment of the military, tending to prisoners of war was a duty that was not highly regarded and little was expected of personnel assigned to this duty in terms of performance. Therefore, it can be assumed that persons assigned to duties in prisoner camps must have felt abandoned by the military and harbored feelings of isolation. Because of this perception, it is likely that they felt apathetic toward their work and even a sense of despair which might have led to abusive acts against prisoners that could be classified as neglect as well as physical and psychological persecution and deprivation.

---

<sup>145</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 26. A common trait can be detected from the result of analysis of both. According to this, mistreatment can be described as being caused by the following reasons: 1) Implementation under the name of discipline and training (orientation); 2) By aggressiveness; 3) Understandable from the defense mechanism such as projective identification or identification to aggressor; 4) Due to frustration; And 5) altruism (*ibid.*, p. 132). "Projective identification" is an act to praise or criticize others by identifying the aspect for self-praising or self-hating in others as a mirror. "Identification" is an act to imitate or fulfill one's desire by adopting the characteristics of favorable or ideal persons. "Defense mechanism" is a method for getting rid of uneasiness and stress including suppression, evasion, rationalization, and identification.

b. Inadequate communication skills

With the exception of a number of officers, there were very few military personnel with an operational proficiency in English or Dutch, the mother tongues of the prisoners of war of the Allied Forces at the time of the Pacific War. Even if among the military guards and sentinels most frequently in contact with prisoners of war there were personnel with the minimum operating level of language required to successfully engage in daily communication, they would have been extremely small in number. Therefore, persons who needed to communicate with prisoners of war had to depend on interpreters, but the small number of interpreters available could in no way begin to meet the needs of all the prison camps. Therefore, it is not difficult to imagine the serious difficulties in communication that existed between the military personnel and prisoners of war in the camps. Under these circumstances, explanations by camp personnel to prisoners were generally inadequate and it was not unusual for explanations to prisoners to be omitted entirely due to the enormous language gap. Because of the limited possibilities for communication, it was difficult for both parties to arrive at a mutual understanding and was, at times, impossible. As expected, this unsatisfactory situation gave rise to misunderstandings, distrust, conflict and feelings of irritation, which in turn fostered feelings of apprehension, anxiety and stress. In an environment charged with such negative feelings, the likelihood that acts of abuse would occur was high. People with weak language skills lack the confidence to try to persuade others or to effectively get across their point of view. Consequently, resorting to the use of force to resolve social conflicts was not unusual.<sup>146</sup>

c. Self-evaluation

As explained earlier, looking after prisoners of war was an assignment at the rear of military operations for persons who were evaluated as having limited ability. Therefore, it was considered a posting suitable for second- and third-class or older military personnel. Although the evaluation of one's performance is a procedure carried out by another party, the evaluated person must first be resigned to accept the results of that evaluation. As expected, many of those assigned to postings at prisoner of war camps felt dejected, depressed, or deeply disappointed. On the other hand, some expressed dissatisfaction with their evaluation and became highly indignant. No doubt, there would have been protests and indignation at not being allowed to engage in the work they had originally planned to do. Being placed in such a situation made some military personnel feel powerless, empty, or resigned, and others feel irritated and aggressive (desperate). In the former, these feelings may very well have resulted in the abuse of prisoners of war and in the latter, in the form of neglect and physical or psychological abuse. If one were to explain this phenomenon in psychological terms, it could perhaps be said that they were suffering from "symptoms of disassociation" caused by mood disorders such as depression or, in a metaphorical sense, "a sense of underachievement."<sup>147</sup>

In cases of abuse of prisoners by Korean and Taiwanese military guards too, low self-esteem may have been one of the causes. These military guards were the victims of ethnic discrimination

---

<sup>146</sup> Kenichi Obuchi, *Kogeki to boryoku: Naze hitowa kizutsukeru no ka (Aggression and Violence: Why do people hurt other people?)* (Maruzen, 2000), p. 58.

<sup>147</sup> Fijimoto, Araga, Azuma, Sumi, et al., *Boryoku, gyakutai, harasumento (Violence, Maltreatment, and Harassment)*, pp. 64, 171.

and they were well aware of the fact that Japanese held them in low regard. Therefore, as a means of enhancing their status or breaking away from the mold in which they were cast, these guards may have attempted to identify with Japanese through acts of abuse aimed at prisoners of war. Or, they may have committed them as a means of being viewed as Japanese. Or, they may have felt that simply committing acts of abuse against prisoners of war would place them on a par with Japanese. This logic of identification or of gaining recognition through acts of abuse may also have applied to disabled soldiers who had low status among Japanese. In all of these cases, the adoption of a heavy-handed attitudes toward prisoners of war by guards in the prison camps can perhaps be considered the reverse side of poor self-esteem.

There were also cases where prisoners of war regarded camp officials as having limited ability, or cases where they mistakenly believed this to be the case. It can be assumed that to some extent this perception was due to language problems or differences in customs. However, when people's reputation or dignity is hurt, or they risk losing face, they have a tendency to respond with aggressive behavior. This reaction is also referred to as "defensive self-presentation" or "face-saving."<sup>148</sup>

d. The unrealistic expectation that one's instructions will be willingly followed

In the Japanese army, the unequivocalness of orders from superior officers is drilled into soldiers when they are first recruited. Therefore, it was taken for granted that lowly prisoners of war would abide by the instructions and rules given by prison camp military officials who were superior in status. The custom of achieving targets that were assigned, or at least making an all-out effort to do so was also something that every soldier in the Japanese army had learned as a matter of course, so it was taken for granted that prisoners of war would naturally do the same. The notion that a prisoner of war would express dissent or show doubt regarding an order was absolutely unthinkable. Nevertheless, among the prisoners of war there were those who did not follow instructions, those who did not obey rules, and those who did not exert themselves when they went about their work duties. There were even some prisoners of war who demanded their rights and who, when they were not granted, rebelled by taking retaliatory action. To correct attitudes of this nature, it was not unusual for prison officials to resort to physical abuse by immediately meting out punishment as they saw fit. Such punishment might have been physical abuse or unreasonable confinement, or abusive acts including psychological torture over time or neglect.

Under orders from their superiors, military personnel in charge of prisoners in the prison camps were responsible for controlling them and ensuring that they carried out their work duties. When prisoners did not perform according to expectations, the onus was on the officer in charge of them. The prisoners' poor performance was equivalent to the officer's failure to obey orders. Because of the war, there was already a shortage of supplies and both the Japanese military and the general population were resentful of prisoners of war. People also harbored negative feelings toward military personnel connected with the prison camps, at times referring to them as "hi-kokumin" or "unpatriotic persons." Under the prevailing circumstances, it was difficult to secure supplies or make improvements to prison facilities. On the other hand, the prisoners in the camp viewed the frantic efforts of military personnel around them simply as what was expected of anyone in their position. It can be assumed

---

<sup>148</sup> Obuchi, *Kogeki to boryoku (Aggression and Violence)*, p. 68.

that the various demands on military personnel in the camps caused them to feel enormous pressure. In particular, the responsibility to ensure that prisoners executed their work duties must have been the source of considerable stress.

e. Displacement of stress by directing it at vulnerable prisoners of war

The terms “transfer of coercion” and “transfer of oppression” were concepts used by Masao Maruyama<sup>149</sup> to explain the fundamental principles of maintaining discipline in the Japanese military. In psychology, the same phenomenon is referred to as “displacement.” It can probably be argued that “displacement” in the psychological sense was also evident in situations involving the handling of prisoners of war. Those assigned to oversee prisoners of war were army civilian employees. On the Japanese mainland, these employees for the most part were disabled soldiers, while on foreign soil and occupied territories Koreans and Taiwanese were mainly responsible. In the hierarchy of the Japanese army, these employees were on the lowest rung. In a position even lower than these were the prisoners of war. For civilian employees, these prisoners were also just about the only ones on whom they could vent their stress, and they were the ones in closest proximity.<sup>150</sup>

Let us next take a look at the psychology of the abuse of prisoners of war in the same light as abuse experienced by some users of facilities for the mentally disabled or social welfare facilities. Irrespective of whether the abuse is for a positive end or has a theoretical basis, the first point of consideration is whether the abusive act is voluntary or whether it is due to pressure or influence from another party.

f. Autonomous intentional abuse

The meaning of intentional is that there is a positive objective or theoretical basis for an action such as the treatment, the improvement in behavior, improvement in conditions, social adaptation, or the social rehabilitation of the user. Autonomous in this case means that the perpetrator of the abuse carries out the act on the basis of his own self-centered values and ideals, or the action is carried out under the influence of the values and ideals, etc. of a third party that is different from the group the perpetrator belongs to. At any rate, there is a positive objective and logical basis for autonomous intentional abuse, and the doer firmly believes that his action will bring about results. At such times, the perpetrator’s sense of inflicting abuse is only slight or even nonexistent.

For example, among forms of arbitrary punishment considered being abusive acts against prisoners of war, those of a minor nature had in fact been commonly practiced in general society in Japan and the Japanese military as means of correction, redress, discipline or maintaining order. The same persons who inflicted abuse on prisoners of war were themselves those who had been previous recipients of arbitrary punishments from others as a means of disciplining or redress. Although the perpetrators themselves may not recognize the value of arbitrary punishment at the time, they begin to recognize the results achieved by it as time goes on, and begin to affirm its value as a means of

---

<sup>149</sup> Masao Maruyama, *Gendai seiji no shiso to kodo (Thought and Behavior in Modern Japanese Politics)*, (Mirai-sha, 1964), pp. 25-26.

<sup>150</sup> It is rare to start an attack against a person who outranks one, because restraint comes into play for fear of retaliation (Obuchi, *Kogeki to boryoku [Aggression and Violence]*, p. 58).

discipline and redress. Or, the perpetrators of arbitrary punishment may even see it as the only means of discipline and redress. When people who reach that stage see arbitrary punishment as an effective method of discipline and redress for prisoners of war, it can be called autonomous intentional abuse. This can also be said of punishment at a level where prisoners are placed in detention confinement or their food rations are decreased. More importantly, if as proof of its effects, such as correction in the behavior of a prisoner of war or, at least a display of dutiful respect is deemed to have been achieved, autonomous intentional abuse is suspended.

g. Heteronymous intentional abuse

A heteronymous act means an act that is performed as a result of pressure or influence of another party in the group the perpetrator belongs to or the pressure or influence of the group itself, irrespective of the values or principles of the perpetrator. Therefore, even when abuse is intentional, at the stage when the perpetrator is not yet firmly convinced of the value of its effects (for example, if the doer has executed physical punishment aimed at correction or redress), this can perhaps be considered heteronymous intentional abuse. Abuse of this type, rather than being voluntary, is generally carried out under coercion in the form of an order, for example, from a superior officer. Furthermore, when the perpetrator has no desire to use abusive behavior as a means, or originally has a negative view of abuse but is influenced by the particular circumstances at the time and ends up abusing prisoners of war, if there is a positive purpose, this can also perhaps be considered heteronymous intentional abuse.

It can also be said that the reason a person commits abuse even against his own beliefs is because he is able to rationalize abusive acts as the result of orders of a superior officer or the military discipline of Japan's army, or even the prevailing atmosphere at the time. Furthermore, when abuse is carried out as an order, the responsibility can be transferred, and when it is an act committed by a group, responsibility can be diffused.<sup>151</sup>

h. Autonomous unintentional abuse

Unintentional abuse means instinctive, egotistical abuse that is carried out without any positive objective or theoretical basis. The most typical form of this type of abuse is sudden, explosive abuse leveled at an unassuming prisoner of war due to a temporary abrupt change. For example, the perpetrator metes out physical or psychological abuse on a prisoner or restrains a prisoner due to the perpetrator's own frustration or stress. Likewise, neglect to provide necessary care for a prisoner due to the perpetrator's indifference or revulsion also comes under the category of abuse.

In addition, certain social learning models indicate that those who have witnessed violence frequently and who themselves have also been the victims of violence are likely to have an affinity with violence and to abuse others.<sup>152</sup> In the Japanese army, the exercise of arbitrary punishment was a vicious practice occurring on a daily basis and also took place in the prevailing climate of war where killing and maiming had the highest value. Such an environment may have spawned a pathology that could be described as an indifference to abuse.

---

<sup>151</sup> Ibid., p. 169.

<sup>152</sup> Fijimoto, Araga, Azuma, Sumi, et al., *Boryoku, gyakutai, harasumento (Violence, Maltreatment, and Harassment)*, pp. 78-79, 127.

i. Heteronomous unintentional abuse

Typical forms of this kind of abuse in the past included the maiming or injuring of prisoners of war, not providing appropriate medical care for sick or injured prisoners, or not providing food or rest due to orders of a superior, the military discipline of the Japanese army, or the situation at the time. In each case, the abusive act was not the original intention of the perpetrator but was carried out under pressure or under the influence of another party of the group the perpetrator belonged to or due to pressure or the influence of the group itself. The abusive act was also performed with an understanding on the part of the perpetrator that abuse would not bring about any positive outcome with respect to the prisoner of war who was the target of the abuse. There may also be feelings of fear or anxiety underlying such acts of abuse. For example, the perpetrator may feel that failure to carry out such abusive acts could lead to alienation or isolation.<sup>153</sup> Furthermore, if the abuse were carried out as an order, the perpetrator could transfer or rationalize responsibility for the act.<sup>154</sup>

If we again take a look at the psychology underlying the abuse of prisoners of war by looking at the abuse of users of facilities for intellectually disabled or social welfare, we see that in cases when acts deemed to be abuse of prisoners of war are committed, there is a positive objective in those acts, and the causes of such acts can be pursued by separating cases whereby the desired outcome was achieved and those cases where it was not. Furthermore, it is also evident that they can also be analyzed from the perspective of those acts that were carried out voluntarily at the will of the doer and those that were carried out under the influence of another party of the group the doer belongs to or under the influence of the group itself. However, irrespective of whether or not there was an objective, abuse is abuse.

j. Desire for Retaliation

One area which has not yet been discussed in the analysis of psychological causes relating to the abuse of prisoners of war is the desire for retaliation. When we consider the abuse of prisoners of war, this is one psychological cause that can never be overlooked. Dave Grossman explains how difficult it is psychologically for one person to kill another even on the battlefield. Despite this, however, he says that there are cases when soldiers on the battlefield can become positive about the act of killing. This happens when there is a reason to kill, such as seeking revenge for a fellow comrade that has fallen in battle.<sup>155</sup> Even when the person is not a soldier, or the person killed a comrade in arms, the desire for revenge serves as the motivation for killing. In other words, when the life of a family member or friend is taken by another person, it is in the nature of people in general to want to seek out the person who has done this. This desire was the cause of hostility toward prisoners of war and the psychological cause of abuse of prisoners of war. The best example of this would perhaps be the abuse leveled against captured air crew of enemy aircraft. The desire for revenge has also served as the basis for psychologically rationalizing acts of murder by people who have no choice but to execute prisoners at the order of superiors.

---

<sup>153</sup> Ibid., p. 170.

<sup>154</sup> In relation to obedience, there is a famous study by Stanley Milgram using electric shock (Stanley Milgram, "Behavioral Study of Obedience" *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 67, No. 4 [1963], pp. 371-378).

<sup>155</sup> David A. Grossman (Kazumi Yasuhara, translation), *Senso ni okeru "Hitogoroshi" no shinrigaku (Psychology of "Murder" in the War)* (Chikuma Shobo, 2004), p. 261 (Originally published in 1995 with the title: *On Killing*).

k. Racial and ethnic feelings

Another psychological cause of prisoner of war abuse, which has not yet been previously covered in the psychological analysis of the causes of abuse of prisoners of war, is the existence of racial and ethnic sentiments. The psychological process leading up to the abuse of Caucasian prisoners of war is complex and difficult to explain. Prior to the Pacific War, Japanese had an inferiority complex toward Westerners, who are Caucasian. After Japan began to win battles in the early stages of the Pacific War and to capture large number of Caucasian prisoners, a psychological reversal took place among the Japanese soldiers and the racial resentment and hatred that had lain concealed beneath their feelings of inferiority seemed to have emerged in the form of abuse against prisoners of war once they had the opportunity for retribution.

The author would now like to consider the external causes of abuse while summarizing the psychological causes of the abuse of prisoners of war.

Various forms of stress, dissatisfaction, anxiety, fear, impatience, irritation, self-despair, dejection, apathy, a desire for retaliation, and racial and ethnic feelings were at work when military personnel in the prison camps committed acts of abuse against prisoners of war. These psychological states were not mutually exclusive of each other, and it can reasonably be assumed that underlying an individual abusive act was the simultaneous existence of various feelings. When prison camp personnel, who were already beset by feelings of depression in wartime when they could not help but feel that their lives were always at risk and who lived in an ongoing state of tension and obstruction, became unable to maintain a psychological balance in their lives, it is likely that they resorted to acts of abuse when prisoners of war were present as a target for venting their frustration. It can also be assumed that the perpetrators of violence also went through various psychological phases before engaging in violence, such as social learning, defensive self-presentation/face-saving, rationalization, and transfer of responsibility, identification, and displacement.

Apart from when abuse was committed under orders from a superior officer, unless the perpetrator by nature had sadistic tendencies, it can be assumed that those who committed acts of abuse against prisoners of war experienced a breakdown in their psychological equilibrium as a result of some external factor. As described earlier, it can be assumed that factors such as the pressure of executing work duties and carrying out orders, the lack of understanding and criticism of the general public and other military officials, a sense of isolation, and low self-esteem became psychological burdens on military guards and other camp personnel involved in dealing with prisoners of war. If, in addition to the burden of these emotions, there were a direct catalyst that triggered the venting of pent-up stress, desires and conflict, and if these emotions were directed at prisoners of war, the result would have been abuse of those prisoners. There are a number of situations that could be assumed to act as possible direct catalysts, such as the demonstration of behavior or an attitude, or a verbal response by a prisoner of war that was contrary to expectations. Possible scenarios include failure to follow instructions, breaking rules, rebellion, sabotage, attempts to escape, demanding one's rights and the expression of dissatisfaction. A superior officer telling off camp military personnel, or the presence of a captured prisoner of war who is responsible for the wounding or killing of a friend or comrade in a battle or air raid, or even the presence of a prisoner of the same country as that person can also be assumed to be potential catalysts.

### (3) Leadership problems

This article will now examine the causes of abuse to prisoners of war from the perspective of leadership by considering four cases in which leaders failed to demonstrate effective leadership.

a. Cases where leaders were unable to show their leadership, or their leadership was ineffective due to systemic problems.

As discussed earlier, the head of the POW Information Bureau and head of the POW Management Office was unable to demonstrate his leadership due to systemic problems. As the head of the POW Information Bureau, this officer had no relationship of command with the POW camps and as head of the POW Management Office, this same officer held a position where he was effectively under the control of the head of the Military Affairs Bureau. Powerless to act despite holding the combined position of head of two agencies, Uemura, the first head of the POW Information Bureau and head of the POW Management Office, is said to have resorted to obtaining decisions directly from Prime Minister and Minister of War Tojo at meetings of the bureau heads of the Ministry of War. Without doing this, Uemura would have had significant difficulty in having his proposals adopted. Due to such systemic problems, the leadership of the head of the POW Information Bureau and head of the POW Management Office, a dedicated administrator of the central headquarters of the military for dealing with POW affairs, found it difficult to demonstrate leadership in matters relating to the POW camps even within the Ministry of War. Although no mainstream prominent person with the ability to exert influence within the army ever held the position of head of the POW Information Bureau and head of the POW Management Office, even if such a person had been assigned to that position, that person most likely would have had difficulty demonstrating leadership effectively within the existing system. As the example of the failure of the efforts of even Tojo to improve the treatment of prisoners of war during the building of the Burma-Thailand railroad demonstrated, overcoming the barrier that existed between military administration and military command was no easy matter.

b. Cases where leaders failed to demonstrate leadership

In terms of the system, it could at least be said that the prison camp commanders had far-reaching authority in the operations of the prison camps and in the management of the prisoners of war. The camp commander controlled all punishments, interviews, relief supplies and the prisoners' food rations. Procurement requests for medical supplies and medical equipment by military doctors also required the final decision of the camp commander, and it was possible for the camp commander to refuse such requests. However, there were exceptions. For example, if the camp commander received an order for the labor services of the prisoners, the commander was obliged to supply the number of prisoners indicated in the order. It was the same regarding the transport of prisoners of war.<sup>156</sup> However, a camp commander did have the authority to select prisoners at his own discretion. Therefore, camp commanders were effectively the heads of the prison camps they were in charge of in each country

---

<sup>156</sup> There were restrictions imposed on the heads of branch camp, outstation camp, and detached camp that they must obey the orders and decisions made by the head of the main camp.

and each region and, accordingly, they were in a position to exercise leadership to the extent that they desired. Nevertheless, there were cases in which the camp commander failed to exercise leadership or where their leadership was at fault.

The position of prison camp commander was a rear position of the military that was held in low regard and there were low expectations of the performance of persons assigned to that position. Considered a post to be filled by elderly officers or second- or third-rate officers, during the war camp commander positions were filled by call-ups from the reserves to a large extent. Therefore, when persons were assigned to these posts, it would have been no surprise if they themselves were aware that little was expected of them and, so long as nothing out of the ordinary occurred, there was no need for them to make active attempts to improve the treatment of prisoners of war in their camps. All they had to do was fulfill the minimum responsibilities required of them. In some cases, however, there were camp commanders who failed to do even this. In camps headed by such commanders, subordinates who meted out corporal punishment arbitrarily against prisoners of war were merely rebuked verbally and no effort was made to thoroughly ban such practices. In effect, camp commanders who failed to exercise their leadership due to indifference or a passive attitude committed abuse against prisoners that would be classified as neglect.

c. Cases where the leadership of leaders was at fault

Cases where the leadership was at fault are those cases where the camp commanders themselves resorted to the abuse of prisoners of war or where they ordered their subordinates to abuse prisoners. The camp commander of the Batavia POW camp, who was the first to be sentenced to death after the war at a war criminal trial (drumhead court-martial) in Batavia (Jakarta) was probably a typical example of the former case.<sup>157</sup> On the other hand, the camp commander of the Fukuoka POW camp, who ordered the execution of a POW who attempted to escape, is probably a typical example of the latter. His order to execute the escapee POW later had an impact on the stabbing death of an escapee in the Fukuoka Prisoner of War Camp No. 17 (Omuta).<sup>158</sup>

d. Cases where the leadership of leaders was not understood or was misunderstood

As mentioned a number of times in this article already, the most blatant example where leadership was correct but was not correctly understood occurred when instructions from Prime Minister and Minister of War Tojo were delivered on his behalf by Uemura, the head of the POW Information Bureau and head of the POW Management Office, during group training conducted in June and July 1942 for the first appointed camp commanders of prison camps that had been established in colonies and occupied territories. In Tojo's instructions to camp commanders delivered by Uemura, he advised staff, "As long as you refrain from violations of humanity, be firm in your dealings with the prisoners and do not let them idle for even a day. It is your mission to strive to contribute to the execution of

---

<sup>157</sup> Yoshio Chaen, commentary and ed., *BC kyu senpan oranda saiban shiryō: zenkan tsuran (Materials of the Netherlands' tribunal for BC class war crimes, a complete reading of all volumes)*, BC kyu senpan kanren shiryō shusei (A collection of the materials related to BC class war crimes), Vol. 15 (Fuji Shuppan, 1992), p. 84; Utsumi, *Nihongun no horyō seisaku (Policy for the treatment of POW by the Japanese military)*, p. 403.

<sup>158</sup> Yamashita, *Zaisai (Account of Crimes)*, pp. 124, 134-135.

the Great East Asian War by fully utilizing prisoners' labor and skills to increase productivity." These words, evidently, were misconstrued as instructions emphasizing the need to drive the prisoners of war hard and were in fact later used as an argument for forcing prisoners of war to perform hard labor and as an argument for officers in prison camps to force prisoners to do inhumane labor. Tojo himself had taken the position of "applying correspondingly" (*mutatis mutandis*) the conditions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War. Therefore, it can be assumed that Tojo's fundamental view was to comply with the convention to the point of where it diverged with the laws of Japan and did not intend for military officials to mistreat prisoners of war. However, that part of the lesson where Tojo called for the international convention to be "applied correspondingly" was lost and only the misinterpretation mentioned above took on a life of its own, so to speak.<sup>159</sup>

Another point regarding misunderstood leadership, which was also mentioned earlier, was the severity of the detention promoted by the third head of the POW Information Bureau and head of the POW Management Office Tamura. With the intention of putting an end to the arbitrary punishment of prisoners of war, Tamura urged a review of the effects of detention as a method of punishment. Among the camp commanders, however, were those who misconstrued his request as a request to increase the disciplinary action taken against prisoners, and in addition to continuing arbitrary corporal punishment widely practiced until then, they introduced confinement as a form of punishment. Consequently, a number of prisoners were made to endure dual hardships for their punishable acts.<sup>160</sup>

Therefore, when we look at the causes of abuse leveled against prisoners of war of the allied forces by the Japanese army during the Pacific War from the perspective of leadership, we can point to the effects emanating from two types of problems. To begin with, there were the systemic problems of the central military which included the weak status of the head of the POW Information Bureau and head of the POW Management Office and the dualism of the military command and military administration. The second problem was the widespread problem in the quality of personnel resulting from the inability to secure either superior military or civilian personnel to be in charge of prisoners of war in prison camps, and the overall poor caliber of personnel including the heads of the POW Information Bureau and POW Management Office and the camp commanders in every region. Both of these problems can be seen as being related to the following three main factors:

- 1) The view of the Japanese military toward prisoners of war;
- 2) The shortage of appropriate human resources, particularly officers in active service, due to the widening of the battle theater and deteriorating war conditions;
- 3) And the massive number of prisoners of war the Japanese army was saddled with, which was far in excess of expectations.

---

<sup>159</sup> Also of "the Field Services Code" (Senjin kun), a passage "You shall not render yourself to the shameful status of being a captive..." generated its own momentum.

<sup>160</sup> Tamura, at the time of his visit to the No. 1 Branch Camp of Hakodate POW Camp (Muroran), said to have stated an opinion to Emoto, the head of Hakodate POW Camp who was present with Lieutenant Kaichi Hirate, the head of the branch camp that the punishment would become more effective if the provision of food is stopped while the prisoner is imprisoned. This is a case of wrong leadership. Hokkaido Shimbunsha, ed., *Shokei (Execution)*, pp. 76-77.

## Conclusion

This article analyzed the causes of abuse of prisoners of war inflicted on the allied forces by the Imperial Japanese Army and Navy during the Pacific War. Because the discussion focused on examples of failures of the Japanese military in its treatment of prisoners of war, little mention was made of positive aspects in the treatment of prisoners of war by the Japanese military. Therefore, because of its one-sided investigation of the treatment of prisoners by the Japanese armed forces, it may be dismissed as being biased. Furthermore, rather than simply develop a discussion aimed at explaining the general causes of abuse in prison camps, the author attempted to analyze the causes of abuse from organizational, systemic and psychological perspectives. By adopting a novel approach to the subject, the author hoped to be able to develop a new discussion on the causes of prisoner of war abuse.

Furthermore, in investigating the causes of abuse of prisoners of war, the article took a close look at the Japanese side as the main subject. This view may also be criticized as one-sided. While the article did make reference, albeit slight, to the behavior of the prisoners of war, the failure of the article to examine this aspect as an underlying factor in the causes of abuse in any way may also be seen as a weakness of the article. If the article did take up this issue, it would have been necessary to take a look at an element that might be termed “delinquent prisoners,” or those prisoners of questionable character. Although small in number, there was an element among the prisoners in the camps that caused trouble by repeatedly engaging in theft and attempts to escape. Among these were some prisoners who, no matter how many times they were placed in detention, inevitably recommenced the same behavior pattern the minute they were released. Upsetting the order of the camp, these delinquent prisoners not only caused unnecessary problems for those in charge of controlling the prisoners but also inconvenienced other prisoners. There are also examples of executions of “delinquent prisoners” when repeated attempts at redress had no effect on their recalcitrant behavior.<sup>161</sup> After the war, those in charge who committed such acts were tried and punished as war criminals. To prevent such tragedies from recurring, however, what kind of measures should be taken in those situations?

---

<sup>161</sup> Kamisaka, *Sugamo prison 13-go teppi (No. 13 Iron Door of Sugamo Prison)*, pp. 53-58.