

Doc. 2515 Evid.

Folder 29

(17)

INTERNATIONAL PROSECUTION SECTION

Doc. Nos. 2500-2515, inclusive

25 July 1946

ANALYSIS OF DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

DESCRIPTION OF ATTACHED DOCUMENT

Title and Nature: Records of Interrogations of General TOJO, Hideki

Date: Feb-Mar 46 Original Copy Language: English

Has it been translated? Yes No

Has it been photostated? Yes No

LOCATION OF ORIGINAL

Document Division

SOURCE OF ORIGINAL: Document Division

PERSONS IMPLICATED: TOJO, Hideki

CRIMES TO WHICH DOCUMENT APPLICABLE: Preparation for War, Military; Conspiracy for Aggressive Warfare; Relations with USA.

SUMMARY OF RELEVANT POINTS

Interrogations on dates shown below given document numbers as follows:

<u>Doc. No.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Doc. No.</u>	<u>Date</u>
2500	8 Feb 1946	2508	1 Mar 1946
2501	11 Feb 1946	2509	11 Mar 1946
2502	13 Feb 1946	2510	12 Mar 1946
2503	18 Feb 1946	2511	14 Mar 1946
2504	19 Feb 1946	2512	15 Mar 1946
2505	20 Feb 1946	2513	18 Mar 1946
2506	21 Feb 1946	2514	25 Mar 1946
2507	23 Feb 1946	2515	26 Mar 1946

Analyst: W.H.Wagner

Doc. Nos. 2500-2515, incl

Extract from
Interrogation of Hideki Tojo
26 March 1946

p. 1 - 3

A Yesterday there was some interrogation about prisoners and there is something I would like to say about that.

Q I was about to bring that question up and ask if you didn't have something you wanted to say.

A Since the end of the war, I have read about the inhumane acts committed by Japanese army and navy personnel. These were certainly not the intention of those in authority, that is, of the General Staffs, or the War or Navy Departments, or myself. We did not even suspect that such things had happened. The Emperor especially, because of his benevolence, would have had a contrary feeling. Such acts are not ~~permissible~~ permissible in Japan. The character of the Japanese people is such that they believe that neither Heaven nor Earth would permit such things. It will be too bad if people in the world believe that these inhumane acts are the result of Japanese character. ~~The~~ preceding portion of the answer was read back to the witness who agreed as to its correctness.

The second point with regard to prisoners: The treatment of prisoners is the responsibility of various army commanders, hence I relied upon them to have regard for humane considerations and to follow the terms of international treaties and rules. Of course, since I was the supervisor of military administration, I am completely responsible.

The third point is that Japanese manners and customs are different from those of Europe and America and the standard of living is also different. These things affected the treatment of prisoners. There are some things I want to explain about this.

a) In regard to inhumane acts, these are not permitted under Japanese manners or customs either.

p. 1 - 3 cont'd

b) In regard to the difference in the standard of living, the treaties provide that prisoners are to be given the same rations as the troops of the detaining nation. That was also directed in orders that were issued. Because of the difference in the standard of living, the American and European prisoners thought when they were given the same rations as Japanese troops that the rations were very very unappetizing. Particularly, on the battlefields this feeling was very strong, I believe. In regard to life in the barracks/shōsha, the barracks, for example, at Omori, which are field barracks /yaeichi/, they would not be thought bad by the Japanese troops, but the European and American prisoners thought they were very poor.

c) The Japanese idea about being taken prisoner is different from that in Europe and America. In Japan, it is regarded as a disgrace. Under Japanese criminal law, anyone who becomes a prisoner while still able to resist has committed a criminal offense, the maximum punishment for which is the death penalty. In Europe and America, it is different. A person who is taken prisoner is honored because he has discharged his duties, but in Japan, it is very different.

d) I want to say something now about the feeling with regard to slapping on the side of the face. In Japanese families where the educational standard is low, slapping is used as a means of training. In the Japanese army and navy, although this is forbidden, it continues in fact because of the influence of the customs of the people. This, of course, is a custom that ought to be corrected; it ought to be stopped; but I don't think it is a crime. It is something that comes from custom. That is all I want to say on this.

There is a correction I would like to make regarding yesterday's interrogation. Yesterday, I was asked if I had met Lieutenant General HOMMA. I said that I had not met him, but this year when I was in Omori Prison, I met him. One other point. When an army commander came back to Japan during the war, he would make a situation report to the Emperor. On such occasions, he would be accompanied by the Chief of Staff and the War Minister. I do not well remember, but it may be that I met HOMMA on such an occasion since he was an army commander. That is all I wanted to say.

* * * * *

Exh. 1981

Er 2515
Mandate 26

Interrogation of Hideki Tojo
26 March 1946, Case File #20, Serial #141, pp. 3 - 4

- "Q You mentioned yesterday, in reference to the Hague Convention, that that Convention states that war can be initiated (1) by a declaration of war, or (2) by an ultimatum. Here is the official text of Article 1 of Hague III, dated 18 October 1907, and signed by Japan, the United States, and Great Britain: 'The contracting parties recognize that hostilities between themselves must not commence without previous and explicit warning in the form either of a reasoned declaration of war or of an ultimatum with conditional declaration of war'. Did the final note, delivered to Secretary of State HULL on 7 December 1941, contain either a declaration of war or an ultimatum with conditional declaration of war?
- "A About this my recollection is a little different. I remember that there were two methods - a declaration of war, and a final note. This matter was the grave responsibility of the Foreign Minister and, since he had a treaty bureau, I thought that the provisions of the treaty had been fully complied with. In Japan, as I have said before, the basis for the action taken was that the right of self-defense was being invoked in the face of challenge. /The preceding sentence was read back to the witness who agreed as to its correctness./ On this basis, the final note was dispatched. I thought that the Foreign Minister had fully complied with the provisions of the treaty.
- "Q Did the final note, given to HULL on 7 December 1941, contain either a reasoned declaration of war or an ultimatum with a conditional declaration of war? Please answer 'yes' or 'no'.
- "A It contained the implication of a break in diplomatic relations.
- "Q But we are not talking about that. We are talking about an ultimatum with a conditional declaration of war. Did it contain that?
- "A It contained the implication of a break in diplomatic relations. Whether that implication of a break in diplomatic relations constituted a conditional declaration of war or not is a controversial matter. I thought that, since this was the heavy responsibility of the Foreign Minister who had under him a treaty bureau, the treaties would be fully complied with. But I think that when the right of self-defense is invoked, treaties can be taken with reservations."

Extract from
Interrogation of Hideki Tojo
26 March 1946

p. 4 - 5

Q Do you not recall that the Japanese Government informed the United States, through the Swiss Government on or about 30 January 1941, that Japan would follow, in the war then pending: (1) The various international conventions, including those signed at The Hague and Geneva; (2) International law; (3) The rules and customs of law as to prisoners and civilians?

A I don't recall it, but I think it is very likely.

Q You state that you are now aware of the fact that that promise was not kept or carried out. Why was it not complied with or kept? Do you understand the question?

A I understand it as regards the inhumane acts towards prisoners that we have talked about. It was the Government's intention to follow these conventions, and it was mine. The fact that these things happened is very much to be regretted. The responsibility for them is mine.

Q You mentioned today that you did not even suspect the occurrence of these atrocities and the inhumane treatment of prisoners. How can you say this when the United States and Great Britain, through the Swiss and other governments, made numerous written and detailed complaints to your Foreign Office about these very matters?

A The matter of responsibility for humane considerations and the following of treaty provisions was the responsibility of the various army commanders. I believed that they were ~~not~~ following them. That is my answer.

Q So that, although these numerous complaints were made on these matters, you still trusted the commanders in the field and did not believe the complaints. Is that true?

A As I said before, when a protest would come in, I would forward it to the responsible army commander involved for action which I thought was taken. I could not tell whether the protest was appropriate or not, and I presumed that investigations were made, followed by courts martial or other suitable action.

p. 4 - 5 cont'd

- Q Did you hear of any courts martial or suitable action taken in connection with the atrocities and inhumane acts against American prisoners in the "Bataan March" that we spoke about yesterday and today?
- A I think that the commanding officer took legal measures.
- Q On what do you base that statement?
- A The facts of that case would have gone to the commanding officer who had the responsibility for taking appropriate action.
- Q Then, it is only your speculation that such action was taken?
- A Yes, but I think it was taken because it was his responsibility.

* * * *

Extract from
Interrogation of Hideki Tojo
26 March 1946
p. 6

Q You state today that the probabilities are that when General HOMMA returned to Japan that, as an army commander, he visited the Emperor and that you, in all probability, went with him. Does that refresh your recollection as to whether you spoke to General HOMMA regarding the "Bataan March" atrocities during his visit here?

A The matter did not come up, because ~~the~~ the report was a report on the military situation in the Philippines from the beginning of the war until that time. This "March" was not touched on.

* * * *

Extract from
Interrogation of Hideki Tojo
26 March 1946

p. 6 - 7

Q You state that when complaints were made by the United States and Great Britain about the inhumane treatment of their prisoners of war, the complaints would come to the Foreign Ministry and then to the War Department. Were copies of these complaints sent to the Emperor, or was the Emperor informed in any way of them?

A No, he was not. I handled them on my own responsibility.

Q Why was not the Emperor, as Commander-in-Chief of the Japanese army and navy, advised of these complaints?

A I thought it was all right to handle them on my own responsibility.

Q Since the Emperor had ordered that prisoners of war should not be mistreated, did he not have the right to know of these protests.

A I understood the Emperor's feelings very well. On my own responsibility, I sent these protests to the responsible field commanders for investigation as to the facts. The Emperor was busy and had a great deal of work so I did this on my own. Consequently, the Emperor is not responsible in connection with this matter. I am responsible.

* * * * *

EXHIBIT 1985 A

Doc. No. 2515 B

Page 1

Extract from
Interrogation of Hideki Tojo
26 March 1946

p. 1 - 3

A Yesterday there was some interrogation about prisoners and there is something I would like to say about that.

Q I was about to bring that question up and ask if you didn't have something you wanted to say.

A Since the end of the war, I have read about the inhumane acts committed by Japanese army and navy personnel. These were certainly not the intention of those in authority, that is, of the General Staffs, or the War or Navy Departments, or myself. We did not even suspect that such things had happened. The Emperor especially, because of his benevolence, would have had a contrary feeling. Such acts are not permissible in Japan. The character of the Japanese people is such that they believe that neither Heaven nor Earth would permit such things. It will be too bad if people in the world believe that these inhumane acts are the result of Japanese character. [The preceding portion of the answer was read back to the witness who agreed as to its correctness.]

The second point with regard to prisoners: The treatment of prisoners is the responsibility of various army commanders, hence I relied upon them to have regard for humane considerations and to follow the terms of international treaties and rules. Of course, since I was the supervisor of military administration, I am completely responsible.

The third point is that Japanese manners and customs are different from those of Europe and America and the standard of living is also different. These things affected the treatment of prisoners. There are some things I want to explain about this.

a) In regard to inhumane acts, these are not permitted under Japanese manners or customs either.

FILE COPY
RETURN TO ROOM 361

p. 1 - 3 cont'd

b) In regard to the difference in the standard of living, the treaties provide that prisoners are to be given the same rations as the troops of the detaining nation. That was also directed in orders that were issued. Because of the difference in the standard of living, the American and European prisoners thought when they were given the same rations as Japanese troops that the rations were very very unappetizing. Particularly, on the battlefields, this feeling was very strong, I believe. In regard to life in the barracks [shosha], the barracks, for example, at Omori, which are field barracks [yasichi], they would not be thought bad by the Japanese troops, but the European and American prisoners thought they were very poor.

c) The Japanese idea about being taken prisoner is different from that in Europe and America. In Japan, it is regarded as a disgrace. Under Japanese criminal law, anyone who becomes a prisoner while still able to resist has committed a criminal offense, the maximum punishment for which is the death penalty. In Europe and America, it is different. A person who is taken prisoner is honored because he has discharged his duties, but in Japan, it is very different.

d) I want to say something now about the feeling with regard to slapping on the side of the face. In Japanese families where the educational standard is low, slapping is used as a means of training. In the Japanese army and navy, although this is forbidden, it continues in fact because of the influence of the customs of the people. This, of course, is a custom that ought to be corrected; it ought to be stopped; but I don't think it is a crime. It is something that comes from custom. That is all I want to say on this.

There is a correction I would like to make regarding yesterday's interrogation. Yesterday, I was asked if I had met Lieutenant General HOMMA. I said that I had not met him, but this year when I was in Omori Prison, I met him. One other point. When an army commander came back to Japan during the war, he would make a situation report to the Emperor. On such occasions, he would be accompanied by the Chief of Staff and the War Minister. I do not well remember, it it may be that I met HOMMA on such an occasion since he was an army commander. That is all I wanted to say.

* * * * *

リ、生活水準之又異ワテキルトイフコトデアリマス。コレラノ事柄が俘虜ノ取扱ヒニ影響ヲシタノデアリマス。コノ点ニ付キ一寸説明致シテ置キタイト思ヒマス。

P.4

(1) 非人道的行爲ニ就テハ、コレラノ行爲ハ日本ノ風俗習慣ノ何レカラモ許サレナイモノデアリマス。

(2) 生活水準ノ相違ニ関シテハ、條約ハ、俘虜カハ彼等ヲ抑留セル國ノ軍隊ト同一ノ糧食ヲ給セルルベキコトヲ規定シテアリマス。ソノコトハ、命令ニ於テモ指示サレテキタノデアリマス。生活水準が異ナルタメニ、歐米人ノ俘虜達ハ日本兵ト同一ノ糧食ヲ受ケタ時ソノ糧食ハ非常ニ不味イト考ヘタノデアリマス。殊ニ戦地ニ於テハ、コノ氣持ハ非常ニ強カワタニチガヒナイト思ヒマス。廠舎ニ於ケル生活ニ就テハ、例ヘバ野營地廠舎デアル處ノ大森ノ廠舎ハ、日本兵ニハヒドイ所ダトハ思ハレナカワタノデアセウガ、歐米人ノ俘虜達ハトテモ貧弱ダト思ワタノデス。

(3) 俘虜ニサレルトイフコトニ對スル日本人ノ考ヘハ、歐米ニ於ケルト異ワテキマス。日本ニ於テハ、ソレハ恥辱ダト考ヘラレテキマス。日本ノ刑法デハ、未ダ抵抗シ得ル内ニ俘虜ニナツタ者ハ誰デモ刑事上ノ罪ヲ犯シタコトニナルムデアリマシテ、ソニ對スル最高刑ハ死刑デアリマス。歐米ニ於テハサウデアリマセン。俘虜ニサレタ者ハソノ任務ヲ遂行セル故ヲ以テ名譽ニナルノデスが、日本デハ大妻ヲ違ヒデス。

(4) 今度ハ、横ッ面ヲ改ル事ヲドウ感シルカー一寸甲上ゲタイト思ヒマス。教育水準が低イ日本ノ家庭ニ於テハ、平手打

トイフコトハ、一ツノ躰ノ任カトシテ行ハレテヤルノデアリマス。日本ノ陸海軍ニ於テコレハ禁止カレテイマスガ、國民ノ習慣ニ影響サレテ、事實上ハ依然行ハレテヤルデアリマス。コレハ勿論矯正サレネバナラナイ習慣デアリマス。ソレハ止メナケレバナリマセン。シカシ私ハソレガ犯罪デアルトハ考ヘマセン。ソレハ習慣上カラ起ル処ノモノデアリマス。コノコトニ関シテ私が申上ゲタイコトハコレダケデアリマス。

昨日ノ訊問ニ関シテ訂正致シタイコトガアリマス。昨日私ハ本間中將ニ會ワタリコトガアルカドウカヨネラレマシタ。私ハ彼ニ會ツタコトハナイト申上ゲマシタガ、今年私が大森收容所ニ在リ時彼ニ會ヒマシタ。モウ一ツノ点ハ戦時ニ於テ軍司令官が日本へ歸還スルト天皇ニ戦況ヲ奏上スルコトニナツテヤマシタ。サウイフ場合ニハ、ソノ司令官ハ參謀總長及陸軍大臣ニ伴ハレテ參内スルガ常デシタ。ハツキリハ覺エテアリマセンガ本間^{八軍}司令官デシタカラ、サウイフ場合ニ私ハ彼ニ會ツタカモ知レマセン。私が申上ゲタイコトハコレダケデアス。

Doc 2515C

一九四六年三月二十六日 東條英機 訊問 抜萃

第四頁
問 日本政府が一九四一年一月三日頃スイス政府ヲ通告シテ日本が發生スルカモ知レヌ

戦争場合ニハヘグ及ビテネルニ於テ調印サレタ條約ヲ合ニ程ハルニ際
條約ニ國際法ニ悖虜及非戦闘員ニ關スル法律上ノ規定復例ヲ遵守
スル旨アメリカノ通告ニ答テ貴方ハ思ヒ去シセシカ。

答 思ヒ去シセシマシガサテアツタラウト思ヒス

問 貴方ハソノ約束ガ守ラレズ遂行サレタカウタイフコトヲ 現在承知ニテキルト述べ
テキマスガ何故ソレヲ守ラナカワタルデスカ 質問ノ意味ガ解リマスカ。

答 ソノ質問ハ前ニ話シテ存虜ニ對スル非人道的ノ取扱ニ關スルモノト了解ス
コレ等條約ニ從フコトハ政府ノ意圖デアリ又私ノ意圖デモナシキコト
等ノ事件ガ起キタイフコトハ頗ル遺憾ナコトデアリヌソレ等ニ對スル責任ハ私
ニアリヌ

問 貴方ハ今日コレ等殘虐行為 兇暴存虜 非人道的ノ取扱ノ想像
ガニシテコトガナイト述ベマシガ米英兩國ガ外ナラヌコレ等事柄ニ就キスイス
他ノ政府ヲ通ジテ何通トナフ言面ニル細目ニ互ツタ抗議ヲ貴國外務省
ニ提出ニテキルニドラテラニテ事ガ言ヘルデスカ。

答 人道ヲ重シシ條約ノ條項ヲ遵守スル責任ノ問題ハ各軍司令官ノ責任デ
アリマシタ彼等ハコレ等事ヲ遵守ニテキルモノト私ハ信ジテキマシタ私ガ私ノ答
テアリマス。

問 ソレニバンノ問題ニ就キテコレ等數ヲクノ抗議ガ提メサレタモノニス 貴方ハ依
然トシテ戦地ノ司令官ヲ信用シ抗議ヲ信ジナカクテスルデスカ。

答 前ニ申シテ様ニ抗議ガ来ルト私ハ責任アル關係軍司令官ニシテ抗議ヲ
転送シ適當ノ處置ガトララセムト思フニキマシタソノ抗議ガ適切ナラデア

NO. 1

Doc. 25/50

ルカトカ私ニ解リマセンデシタ分取調ベガ行ハレ次ニ軍法會議ニ他ノ通
シナル處置ガトラタモト推測ニテヤマシタ

問. 昨日及今日話シテバタン行造¹⁹³¹ニ於テ下カ人存虜ニ付テ行ハレタ殘虐
行爲ト非人道的行爲ニ關シ何等カ軍法會議或ハ適キナル處置
ガ取ラレタイコトヲ聞キマシタカ。

答. 其ノ司令官ガ合法處置ヲ取ラタトト思ヒマス。

問. 何ヲ根據ニシテサウ云フノデスカ。

答. ノ事件ノ顛末ハ適キナル處置ヲ取ルベキ責任アル司令^官ニ通達セラレタコト
ト思ヒマス

問. ソレニバサウイフ處置ガ取ラレタイフハ貴方ノ推測ニ過ギイノデスカ。

答. サウデス。ニカシソレハ司令官ノ責任デスカラソウイフ處置ハ取ラレタコトト思ヒマス。
x x x

Doc-2515E

文書第ニ五二五E号

(Page 1)

一九四六年三月二十六日

東條英機、訊問披露

問

米英兩國が自國人、俘虏ニ対スル非人道的ヲ取扱ヒテ抗議ヲ提

出シタル場合、抗議ハ何時モ外務省ニ未テソレカラ陸軍省へ未ト貴下ハ

述ベヌカコシラ、抗議、爲シテ天皇ニ提ルレシカ又、天皇ハソレ等ノ抗議

ニ就イテ一休報告ヲ受ケテサタリデスカ。

答

イヤ、天皇ハ報告ヲ受ケテサマシテシテ、私ハソレヲ獨断デ處理シテス。

問

何故日本陸海軍、大元帥ニル天皇ガコシ等ノ抗議ヲ知ラカシテスカ。

答

ソレ等ノ抗議ハ私ノ獨断デ處理シテカス、又ト考ヘヨシヌ。

問

天皇ガ俘虏ヲ虐待シテハナラヌトイフコトヲ命令シタリダカラ、天皇ハソレ等ノ

抗議ヲ知ル権利ガアツタ、デハナイデスカ。

答

私ハ天皇、御氣持ガヨク解フテサマシタ。私ハ獨断デソレ等ノ抗議ヲ實狀調

査、爲シ責任者ヲ現地司令官ニ送ワタリデス。天皇御忙シク、非常ニ況

山、仕事ヲ持フテ居ラマシタリデ、私ハ獨断デソレ等ヲサタリデス、從フテ天皇ハソ

レ事ニ關シテハ責任ハナイデス。私ニ責任ガアルデス。

Ex 1981C

FILE COPY
RETURN TO ROOM 361

1981C

Doc. No. 2515 E

Page 1

Extract from
Interrogation of Hidoki Tojo
26 March 1946

p. 6 - 7

Q You state that when complaints were made by the United States and Great Britain about the inhumane treatment of their prisoners of war, the complaints would come to the Foreign Ministry and then to the War Department. Were copies of these complaints sent to the Emperor, or was the Emperor informed in any way of them?

A No, he was not. I handled them on my own responsibility.

Q Why was not the Emperor, as Commander-in-Chief of the Japanese army and navy, advised of these complaints?

A I thought it was all right to handle them on my own responsibility.

Q Since the Emperor had ordered that prisoners of war should not be mistreated, did he not have the right to know of these protests.

A I understood the Emperor's feelings very well. On my own responsibility, I sent these protests to the responsible field commanders for investigation as to the facts. The Emperor was busy and had a great deal of work so I did this on my own. Consequently, the Emperor is not responsible in connection with this matter. I am responsible.

* * * * *