

philippine studies: historical and ethnographic viewpoints

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

Japanese Solidarity Discourse on the Philippines during the Second World War

Takamichi Serizawa

Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints
vol. 63 nos. 1 (2015): 71–100

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies.soss@ateneo.edu.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>

Japanese Solidarity Discourse on the Philippines during the Second World War

This article examines the formation of Japanese knowledge on the Philippines during the Second World War, which spawned numerous Japanese writings on the Philippines that ranged from governmental-military reports to fictional literature. Previous works criticized or simply dismissed these writings as products of a “wrong” history of Japan during its imperial era. Private Japanese wartime accounts were seen as “ethnocentric,” “self-deceiving,” and “violent.” This article sheds light on these so-called “bad” Japanese accounts by tracing their roots in American colonial writings. It demonstrates how Japanese Asiatic and solidarity discourse with the Philippines was informed by the US discourse on benevolent assimilation.

**KEYWORDS: SECOND WORLD WAR · JAPANESE SOLIDARITY DISCOURSE ·
USES OF HISTORY · US COLONIALISM · KI KIMURA**

The choice between “getting out of Asia” (*datsua*) or “being prosperous with Asia” (*kōa*) was a dilemma of modernizing Japan. In 1868 when the Meiji government was established, most parts of Asia were already colonized or semi-colonized by Western powers. Japan was faced with the Western threat and the option of either emulating the Western system of acquiring colonies or aligning with other Asian countries to present a unified front against Western colonialism.

The *datsua*–*kōa* dilemma has shaped the conventional history of modern Japan. During the Meiji era (1868–1912) Japan opened its doors to the West and started to create a strong military and develop a strong economy. In particular victory in the Russo–Japanese War in 1905 had made Japan into a regional power, gaining for it recognition as a member of the so-called great powers (*rekkyō*). Thus in the Meiji era Japan seriously went for *datsua*. The succeeding Taishō era (1912–1926), a Westernized period with a two-party political system then known as Taishō democracy, was also characterized by *datsua* in general.

However, the First World War, which occurred during the Taishō period, escalated the “pan movements,” which promoted the solidarity of peoples who were united by common or kindred languages, group identification, traditions, or other characteristics such as geographical proximity (Snyder 1984, 6). The practices and thoughts prevalent in the pan movements strongly influenced Japan’s later pan-Asianism, such as those found in the Japanese Monroe Doctrine for Asia or the self-determination of Asia. The Manchurian Incident in 1931 and Japan’s withdrawal from the League of Nations in 1933 were associated with Japan’s shift from *datsua* to *kōa*. During the period from the late 1930s until the end of the Second World War—the wartime Shōwa period—Japan took a powerful orientation toward *kōa*. At this time Japan’s war against China intensified and the government of Fumimaro Konoe¹ declared a “New Order” in East Asia in 1938 to strengthen solidarity between China, Manchuria, and Japan. During the Second World War Japan declared the “Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere,” which included several areas of Southeast Asia, in order to “liberate” Asian countries from Western colonization (Saaler 2007, 6–12).

Thus the processes of *datsua* and *kōa* have been studied as two different principles or contrasting approaches underlying Japan’s national and imperial policies. However, Masafumi Yonetani (2006), a historian of Japanese thought, has pointed out that the two principles share the same feature of

colonial discourse: to modernize Asia with the help of Japan. For example, Yukichi Fukuzawa advocated the creation of a modern Japan during the Meiji era and published the *Datsua ron* (thesis for “Getting out of Asia”) in 1885, which since then has been considered iconic of *datsua*. However, Yonetani (ibid., 50–53) has pointed out that Fukuzawa’s earlier writings had a sharp element of *kōa* and that Fukuzawa believed the westernization of Korea was important in order to establish Asia’s independence. He also tutored Korean students at the school he established, Keio Gijuku. In 1884 his students staged the failed Gapsin Coup to undermine the Joseon dynasty; its failure disappointed Fukuzawa and strengthened his belief in *datsua* or saying goodbye to Asia.

The ambiguity of *datsua* and *kōa* also existed in the Japanese discourse on the Philippine Revolution of 1896. When the revolution occurred various major Japanese newspapers reported the event in real time. Based on an examination of these newspaper accounts, Setsuho Ikehata (2003, 39) concluded that their continuous coverage of the revolution over a number of years stimulated Japan’s interest in the Philippines and enhanced the Japanese people’s understanding of the situation and their sympathy for the revolution. This interest coincided with Japan’s experience of its first victory against a foreign country, China, and acquisition of its first colony, Taiwan. This territorial expansion inevitably made the Philippines the country that was closest to the Japanese sphere of influence. This period is usually interpreted as the time when Japan shifted its orientation to *datsua*, when Japan became “Western” through its acquisition of Taiwan as a colony. But the real-time news on the Philippine Revolution also included Japan’s *kōa* principle, which encouraged the Filipino revolutionaries to fight against Western colonial powers.

Scholarly Approaches to Japanese Writings on the Philippines

In terms of Japanese writings on the Philippines, booms or surges in publication emerged twice under similar circumstances: the wars against Western supremacy. The first surge occurred in the late Meiji period during the Philippine Revolution (1896–1898) and the subsequent resistance against the United States from 1899 to 1902. The second boom took place during the Second World War from 1939 to 1945, when Japan occupied the Philippines and fought against the US and its allies. Produced more than ever during the latter period were Japanese writings

about the Philippines, which ranged from government reports to private memoirs.²

Previous studies—intentionally or otherwise—have treated Meiji-era solidarity with the Philippines differently from that of wartime Shōwa or the Second World War period. For example, various scholars have studied Meiji solidarity, focusing on several Japanese efforts to help Filipino revolutionaries; these narratives are found in historical accounts, including novels, written during the era (Yanagida 1961; Hatano 1988; Ikehata 1989, 2003; Jose 1999; Yamashita 1999; Shimizu 2007; Hau and Shiraishi 2009). In contrast, Japanese solidarity discourse on the Philippines during the Second World War has attracted less scholarship; even if studied, this solidarity discourse has been examined usually as a transplantation of Japanese wartime ideology onto the Philippines or treated simply as propaganda (Goodman 1991; Terami-Wada 1990, 1991; Jose 1999; Terami 2001; Jose 2003; Nakano 2012).

Tōru Yano, the pioneering scholar of Japan's southward advance policy (*nanshinron*), produced a series of works that criticized Japanese wartime writings in the 1930s and 1940s. According to Yano (1975, 1979, 1980), the writings were “ethnocentric,” “self-deceiving,” and “violent.” The distortion of history also characterized some of the works of Japanese intellectuals during this period. Shinzō Hayase (1989) uncovered the absence of historical proof to support the heroic narrative of Japanese construction workers in building the Benguet roads, revealing its mythical character. Lydia Yu Jose (1999) analyzed several Japanese writings on the Philippines that appeared in the first half of the twentieth century and showed how these accounts assessed Filipinos as backward people while showing compassion toward American colonialism. She also argued that this earlier Japanese view in peacetime was carried forward during the Japanese occupation with its violence in order to bolster notions of Japanese supremacy in the Philippines.

As mentioned, Ikehata (1989, 2003) studied Japanese perceptions of the Philippine revolution and the war against America by referring to Japanese accounts that appeared contemporaneously with that event. However, she did not discuss the “revisiting” and “reprinting” of these accounts that were greatly encouraged during the Second World War. Furthermore the book edited by Ikehata (1996), *Nihon senryōka no Firipin* (The Philippines under Japanese Occupation), was the first comprehensive collection of Japanese scholarly writings on the Japanese occupation of the Philippines. Although it included findings based on fresh Japanese sources and interviews with concerned persons, most articles in this collection used military or

governmental reports to understand Japan's economic policy. They excluded sources such as nonfiction novels, travel memoirs, essays, and Japanese translations of existing literature—which I seek to discuss in this article. Motoe Terami (1996), who also contributed a chapter in Ikehata's edited collection, might be the sole Japanese scholar who used both Tagalog and Japanese sources and showed an interest in cultural encounters between Japan and the Philippines during the Second World War. However, her concerns were limited to Japan's propaganda activities and the successes and failures of those activities (Terami-Wada 1990, 1991, 1996; Terami 1996, 2001).

The question arises: Why have scholars approached differently the historical writings with regard to the Meiji era's period of solidarity with Filipinos and that of the Shōwa period? It seems to me that the former solidarity has captured scholars' interests because the Meiji *kōa* discourse suggested a “weak” Japan and concern for the Philippines. In contrast, the Shōwa-era solidarity with Filipinos was deemed “ideologically wrong” or even “ill-minded” because Japan was a fanatical empire that victimized and brought a huge disaster to the Philippines. All publications in the Second World War were also under military censorship, and Japan's eventual defeat in the war further “stigmatized” the pious image of the wartime Shōwa's solidarity with Filipinos.

I cannot provide a comprehensive answer to the question posed above, but I hope to help illumine this issue. At the outset, I wish to state that I want to avoid labeling any ideology or propaganda in analyzing Japanese wartime accounts on the Philippines, an endeavor that includes shedding light on several “accidents” that were by-products of Japanese knowledge production on the islands during the Second World War. I focus on the Meiji and Taishō solidarity discourses in order to understand the relation between these discourses, and that of the Shōwa solidarity discourse. My concern here is not a developmental history of how the discourses evolved in later periods. Rather, I hope to uncover how Meiji and Taishō solidarities were revisited and appropriated by the writers in the wartime Shōwa era.³ Fomented by the “genealogists,” Friedrich Nietzsche and Michel Foucault, this study neither searches for the origin of Japanese solidarity discourse on the Philippines in the Meiji period nor draws its expansion in Taishō and its explosion in the wartime Shōwa as what previous studies have done.⁴ Rather, I argue that the discourse emerged, or more accurately, was formed, at every moment, in relation to the American colonial knowledge and its grip on power in the Philippines.

Reynaldo Ileto (1998, 5) has pointed out that American colonial scholars and officials, in reconfiguring Philippine history, launched a new “emplotment” to suit the policy and practice of American colonialism; these Americans located the events and leading figures of the Philippine Revolution within a framework of progress, or the repetition of Western developmental history in an oriental setting. When Japan invaded the islands, another version of Philippine history was produced and promoted, this time by Japanese scholars and writers, to suit their occupation policy and practice. As discussed in the following sections, their writings were much influenced by the works produced decades earlier by American colonial officers and scholars.

The argument in this article revolves around Japanese journalist Ki Kimura,⁵ who in 1942 went to the Philippines out of his own will after having written a nonfiction novel on Philippine history.⁶ I examine the writings of Kimura and other “infamous” writers, even including one who had never been to the Philippines but had “left some accounts” on the Philippines. By focusing on these “forgotten” writers, we may find another aspect of Japanese knowledge production on Philippine history that cannot be criticized simply in terms of Japan’s pan-Asiatic ideology and propaganda. As demonstrated in this article, their solidarity discourse was formed by selecting certain elements found in the discourse of the earlier US occupation of the islands: the so-called benevolent assimilation.

Ki Kimura (1894–1979): Collecting Archives during the War

Ki Kimura stayed for two months in the Philippines between March and May 1942, when the battles of Bataan and Corregidor were still raging. Based on this short trip, he wrote three books on the Philippines. It is noteworthy, however, that his interest in the Philippines had begun much earlier than the war. The first boom in publications on the Philippines, especially novels written during the Meiji period, stimulated young Kimura’s compassion toward the Filipino revolutionaries fighting against the Western powers.

Among the various studies of Meiji novels on the Philippines, that of Caroline Hau and Takashi Shiraishi (2009) discusses an unexpected “encounter” between José Rizal and Japanese political novelist Tetchō Suehiro on a ship going to Europe via the United States. Hau and Shiraishi discuss the impact of Suehiro’s meeting with Rizal and Suehiro’s motivation

in writing a series of political novels about the Philippines. Suehiro left behind four political novels related to the Philippines, which talked about the oppressed islands that were in revolt against the West.⁷

Izumi Yanagida (1961), Michiko Yamashita (1999), and Hiromu Shimizu (2007) focused on novelists aside from Suehiro, such as Bimyō Yamada and Shunrō Oshikawa. Yamada published *Aguinaldo* in 1902, the first Japanese novel on the Philippine Revolution, and in the following year translated some parts of Rizal’s (1903) *Noli me tangere* and published them under the title *Chino no Namida* (Bloody Tears). Oshikawa (1902, 1906/1944) wrote two adventure novels, *Bukyō no Nihon* (Japanese Chivalry) and *Shin Nihontō* (New Japanese Islands), in which Emilio Aguinaldo was treated as one of the main antagonists. Written for young boys, the novels told the story of how an imaginary brave Japanese samurai named Kentōji Danbara fought together with Aguinaldo against Spain and the United States.

Kimura in particular was a great fan of Oshikawa’s novels when he was a boy. Kimura kept a diary during his stay in Manila and reminisced about his youthful days when he enthusiastically read Oshikawa. Kimura published this diary as a travel memoir in October 1942 with the title *Minami no shinju* (Pearl of the South). This travel writing is not only about Kimura’s eyewitness experiences but also his reading experience in the Philippine National Library while conducting his research there.

In the national library Kimura happened to look at the fifty-five volumes of Blair and Robertson’s *The Philippine Islands, 1493–1898*, an English translation of Spanish colonial accounts compiled in 1903 to 1907 when the US occupied the islands. He came to know that Shizuma Nara, who worked for the publishing company Kōdansha, had written his PhD thesis some twenty years earlier about relations between Japan and the Philippines based on Blair and Robertson. Nara worked under the supervision of Payson Treat, a pioneering American scholar of East Asian history at Stanford University. Eventually Nara (1942, 5–6) decided to publish his dissertation in Japanese in 1942, several years after it remained as a draft, as his contribution to Japan’s rule in the Philippines.

Glòria Cano (2008a, 2008b) has pointed out that in *The Philippine Islands 1493–1898* Blair and Robertson (1903–1907) used terms such as “oppression” and “tyranny,” although these were not in the original Spanish sources. Cano insists that Blair and Robertson needed to believe that the Spaniards destroyed native institutions and customs because such

destruction helped justify American invasion and rule as liberation from the “Dark Age” of Spanish colonialism. Cano argues that US “imperialist propaganda” was launched when American scholars began to cite *The Philippine Islands, 1493–1898* as the most valuable primary source. She is also critical of Filipino elites who have grown up under an Americanized school system and have used Blair and Robertson to learn a partial and distorted Filipino history (Cano 2008a, 13, 28; 2008b).

In the same manner, Nara relied totally on Blair and Robertson in describing Spanish colonialism. As can be seen in his introduction, Nara (1942, 3–4) also inherited the American terminology of Blair and Robertson:

When Catholic Spanish people occupied the islands, they imposed severe tyranny against the islanders. The islanders’ indigenous classical literature was destroyed as the works of the devil and later on, their ancient letters were prohibited from being used. In this sense, there are no accounts in the Philippines regarding Japanese people before Spain occupied the islands.

Nara pointed out the absence of accounts that explored pre-Spanish relations between Japan and the Philippines. This gap is attributed to Spanish tyranny. Thus, although his dissertation was about Japan–Philippines relations during the Spanish colonial period, he dwelt on the misrule by Spanish generals and bishops.

Nara’s dissertation was originally written during the 1920s when the Washington Naval Treaty was signed and Japan started experiencing “discrimination” by the great powers. It was also the time when the US Immigration Act of 1924 was enacted. This legislation totally prohibited new migrants from Asia except those coming from the Philippines (Nakano 2007, 135–36; Fujiwara 2008, 100–101). Nara might have desired to let the American people know about the long history of Japanese migration by focusing on their relations with the Filipinos, whose nation was then under US control and the only Asian country with migration access to the US.

In his 1942 book Nara added a new chapter on the Filipino–American War. Although Nara (1942) insisted on the exploitive character of American possession, he considered the war merely as a marginal incident that occurred during the Spanish–American War period. This view was similar to the dominant understanding of the Filipino–American War, which traditional

American historians wrapped in the discourse of US “exceptionalism” (Kramer 2006, 15–16). Nara’s (1942, 297–98) note read:

It is not correct to identify Jefferson’s purchase of Louisiana with McKinley’s annexation of the Philippines. Jefferson bought Louisiana because he planned to add this land as an equal state along side the first thirteen states on the occasion of the independence. In fact, Louisiana was later divided into several states. The political rights and freedom given to the people there were what the people in the first thirteen states enjoyed. However, it is not the same in the Philippines. In the past and at present there has been no will at all to add it as one of the states in the United States.

Nara’s critique here was quite similar to those of American writers who belonged to the Anti-Imperialist League who opposed the occupation of the Philippine islands. To these writers the occupation contradicted the fundamental principle of the United States: political liberty. Nara insisted that the US violently robbed the Philippines from Spain and used many excuses based on the idea of humanity to cover up this aggression. He then continued that US human rights policies became ambiguous as time went by because these policies neither admitted that the Philippines was a state of the US nor that the Philippines was granted independence. Nara concluded that it was natural for the Philippines to be a part of the “Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere,” in order to be liberated from the US.

Let us then return to Kimura’s archival research for his nonfiction historical novels, which led him to read Nara. Kimura (1944, 68) wanted to have historical proof of the Filipinos’ fundamental desire for independence, which Japan would assist in bringing about. Kimura took a special interest on Rizal and read several of his biographies. He was particularly interested in Rizal’s Japanese lover, Osei-san. Before he went to the Philippines, he had read Saburō Akanuma’s *Suganuma Tadakaze* (1941)⁸ and Yamada’s translation of *Noli me tangere* (Rizal 1903). While staying in the Philippines he read around ten biographies, which included several Filipino works such as Carlos Quirino’s *The Great Malayan* (1940) and Victoria Lopez de Araneta’s *On Wings of Destiny* (1940).

Kimura came to know that as a novelist Rizal was not as great as people made him out to be; at least, when compared with writers from the same period such as Balzac, Dostoevsky, and Melville. Kimura also realized that

the Americans had used Rizal's image very effectively, thus the emphasis on Rizal's resistance against Spain and the absence of anti-American sentiments in his works. Kimura's (1942, 74–75) diary stated:

[The Americans] felt at ease spreading the worship of Rizal with the building of statues of him in all villages in the islands. Japan came to the Philippines after getting rid of the Americans. In this sense, all islanders are interested in how Rizal is related to Japan. Rizal's works have significance, akin to today's Hitler's *Mein Kampf* and if there are anti-Japanese statements, Japan needs to exclude them. If there are pro-Japanese statements in contrast, we do need to use them effectively for directing the future governance of the Philippines and thus it will become the strongest bond to cement Japanese and Philippine friendship.

Kimura's logic here is based on an appropriation of Rizal's image as developed by the Americans, but in an opposite way: Rizal is to be an anti-Western and pro-Asian icon. Kimura (1961, 31–34) found a picture of Osei-san in Quirino's book in the national library and posted it in the articles he wrote for the *Osaka Mainichi Shimbun* and *Tokyo Nichinichi Shimbun* on 14 April 1942 in order to find the relatives of and sources regarding Osei-san (Kimura 1942b, 1942c). We should note that during the war Rizal's Japanese lover remained unknown even among Filipino scholars, and the romance between the two was researched for the strong bond it would provide between Japan and the Philippines.⁹

Japanese Wartime Use of Rizal, Aguinaldo, and Bonifacio

Rizal was very popular among Japanese writers during the Second World War. Besides Kimura, many others wrote on this Filipino national hero based on Spanish and English materials. These writers included Chūsuke Imamura (1941), Tomizō Hanano (1942), Kiyoshi Miki (1943), Yasotarō Mōri (1942), and Zentoku Nakahara (1944). Mōri also translated *Noli me tangere* into Japanese as *Reimei wo matsu* (Awaiting the Dawn), based on Charles Derbyshire's English translation (Rizal 1943). The works of Hanano and Nakahara were especially interesting because they were aware of America's appropriation of Rizal's image as noted by Kimura.¹⁰

For example, in *Firipin dokuritsu seishi* (A True History of Philippine Independence), Nakahara (1944, 41–42) gave his impression of his visit to the Philippines and explained the background of his book as follows:

What surprised me when I first visited the Philippines was that the person whose name is Rizal is mentioned everywhere, his bronze statue is everywhere, the town named Rizal is everywhere and his image is printed on everything from bills, coins, envelopes, notebooks, and matches etc. I could not help but think that the Filipino people might not know how to draw anything except for Rizal's portrait. However, later on, I came to realize that this was one of the tools of the Americans to rule the Philippines. . . . It is the wisest way to use Rizal as a device to remove the Spanish spiritual and material residues. Throughout his lifetime, Rizal attacked the ruling policy of Spain and insisted upon improvements and was sentenced to death by the Spanish Government. Therefore, Rizal seen only as a patriot would drive into the minds of the Filipino people the image of an evil Spanish regime, from the beginning to the end. At the same time, this will help Filipinos to appreciate the American rule and make the hearts of Filipino people disaffected with Aguinaldo, Ricarte, and others who see America as an enemy.

Here Nakahara pointed to the problem of the American use of Rizal, which justified American colonialism while negatively assessing Spanish legacies and alienating Filipino veterans of the revolution. In his book, Nakahara (1942) referred to Aguinaldo's (1899) personal account of the revolution in 1899, *Reseña verídica de la revolución filipina* (True Version of the Philippine Revolution), translated into Japanese by Hirayama Shū as *Firipin kakumei no shinsō* (Aguinaldo 1944).¹¹ Nakahara stated that, although Aguinaldo did have his own shortcomings in terms of his behavior, his negative image was a creation of the Americans. Nakahara (1942, 43) insisted that the Japanese had their own perspective on Aguinaldo.¹²

Tomizō Hanano (1942, 268), the author of *Jose Rizal den* (Biography of Jose Rizal), also revealed the need for a more accurate study of Rizal that would incorporate the role of Andres Bonifacio in the revolution:¹³

Bonifacio organized a new group called “Hijos de la Patria” (Children of the Homeland) and this group is usually regarded as the famous secret society, Katipunan. As mentioned above, this group followed Rizal’s claims and ideologies; however, it then began to call for armed struggle for the self-determination of the people. From the Homeland (Spain), this was seen as the elimination of all White people. But this interpretation is clearly based on the misunderstanding of the White writers. It is compelling to understand the movement as the self-determination of the people through the use of direct force. This is also applicable to Aguinaldo’s revolution that took place afterwards.

Hanano viewed the struggle of Bonifacio in relation to Rizal’s thought. During the American colonial period, history textbooks for public schools devoted fewer pages to Bonifacio, whose revolt was viewed merely as a local event, than to the progressive icon Rizal, whose death was regarded as a national martyrdom. Among the “White writers,” Hanano specifically referred to Wenceslao Retana, who described Bonifacio as an immature leader of the masses who insanely used violence, but who praised Rizal for denying violence and seeking peaceful solutions with the suzerain power.¹⁴ By appropriating the people’s self-determination, Hanano combined the thought (Rizal) and practice (Bonifacio) of the Philippine Revolution.¹⁵ Of course, Hanano’s intention was to justify Japan’s invasion of the Philippines under the pretext of protecting Asian peoples from Western powers.

However, we need to pay close attention to Hanano’s reevaluation of revolutionary heroes as derived from American colonial literature, which supported the idea of US benevolent assimilation. According to Ito (1998, 10), the history textbooks used in public schools during the American colonial era promoted Rizal as the most accomplished hero and depicted Bonifacio as less rational, or even a fanatic, in order to fit the American colonial project of bringing stability to the colony by denying the Filipinos’ use of armed forces. The same elements of Philippine history were now recomposed differently to go with the developmental discourse of Japan’s empire. This time, however, Filipino armed struggle was encouraged by Japan, at least at the discursive level, in fighting together against Western powers.

In a similar way Aguinaldo’s career was also revisited. Soon after the Japanese occupation of Manila in January 1942, the *Tokyo Nichinichi Shimbun* (1942a, 1942b) featured Aguinaldo twice on 9 and 12 January. The articles received numerous responses from Japanese readers who

were surprised that Aguinaldo was still alive. Kimura, who worked at this newspaper company, wanted to meet Aguinaldo because Kimura was a great fan of Shunrō Oshikawa’s (1906/1944) *Shin Nihontō* where Aguinaldo was the main antagonist. When Kimura met Aguinaldo with the help of Jose P. Bantug, a doctor, historian, and also a relative of Rizal, Aguinaldo somehow already knew that his story had been written as a novel by a Japanese writer and wanted to have copies of the novel. Kimura (1942, 39–56) was happy to give Aguinaldo copies, telling him that through Oshikawa’s novels one could get to know how the revolutionary leader fought stubbornly for around three years against the US Army.¹⁶

Aguinaldo gave his unfinished autobiography, compiled by his wife Carmen Aguinaldo, to Lt. Gen. Masaharu Homma, commander-in-chief of the Fourteenth Army, at the airport when Homma left the Philippines in August 1942. Kimura borrowed this account from Homma and wrote a biography of Aguinaldo that sought to correct the revolutionary general’s distorted image formed by American writers. Kimura published a book in English, with the title, *Aguinaldo’s Independence Army*, in 1943.

According to Kimura, the Japanese who went to the Philippines after the outbreak of the war did not know much of Aguinaldo or, if they knew anything, whatever they knew were all based on American propaganda, which portrayed Aguinaldo in a negative light. Kimura pointed out that the Japanese never realized that the negative image of Aguinaldo was in fact a trap set up by the enemy. In order to allow Japanese readers access to the truth, he cited Aguinaldo’s self-narrative on his unavoidable and frustrated surrender to the American forces. Kimura used a five-page citation list and Aguinaldo explained the details of the conspiracy directed by Brig. Gen. Frederick Funston, who hired eighty Macabebes, members of an ethnic group in Pampanga province, to pose as sham reinforcements (Kimura 1944, 300–305).

Kimura then quoted a Japanese poem, “Aguinaldo,” by Hakusei Hiraki (1876–1915), which depicted the emotional surrender of Aguinaldo in real time, to show an alternative perspective from Meiji Japan. The poem consisted of ten parts, of five lines each. Below is the eighth part, which seemed to most exemplify Hiraki’s (1903) compassion:

我この歌この涙	Ware Kono Uta Kono Namida
この愛いかで薄命の	Kono Ai Ikade Hakumei no

奇士を慰め得ざらんや	Kishi wo Nagusame Ezaranya
たまたま来れ極東の	Tamatama Kitare Kyokutō no
朝日しをりにアギナルド	Asahi Shiworini Aginarudo

How can I address this song
 This tear and this love
 To compensate the brilliant hero who died young
 Rise, Aguinaldo, as the morning sun from the Far East

Aguinaldo did not die as early as Hiraki anticipated; rather he survived the American colonial period, the Japanese occupation, and even the postwar period. Kimura knew that Aguinaldo was still alive and met him during the war. But Kimura still quoted this poem because it proved that in Meiji Japan there was an alternative view of Aguinaldo. Kimura did not simply revisit Meiji literature but carefully researched Japanese discourse on the Philippines that was missing from American discourse. In this sense his nationalistic endeavors were deeply framed by American colonial literature on the Philippines.

Jose Ramos and His Ties with Japan

Kimura's research in the national library in Manila gave him an opportunity to know the official past as shaped by American discourse. However, various meetings with old revolutionaries who were still alive during that time gave him another opportunity to know what had not been said about the Philippine past.¹⁷ This gap was clearly shown to him especially when he met Aguinaldo, Artemio Ricarte, and Jose Ramos's Japanese wife and daughters.

Kimura's (1942b) narrative appeared in the *Tribune* on 25 March 1942 as "Present war waged by Japan should have backing of Filipinos, says famed novelist" (Cabrera 1942, 1, 4). Kimura stated the two nations' compatibility of tradition, geographical proximity, and identity of the races to strengthen Filipino-Japanese solidarity. Upon reading Kimura's narrative, two daughters of Jose Ramos visited him. They brought with them Ramos's autobiography written in Spanish and its English translation. When he found out that Ramos's wife, Akiko Ishikawa, was still alive, Kimura immediately visited her at Misericordia Street in Manila. Akiko recounted to him how Ramos was unkindly treated as a Japanese spy by Americans and Filipinos alike and that she suffered much while raising their three daughters.

Reports found in the Bandholtz collection, located in the Bentley Library in the University of Michigan, show how American and Filipino constabularies were concerned about Jose Ramos and his ties with Japan. For example, Rafael Crame, a Spanish-mestizo Constabulary major and superintendent of the Division of Information, put Ramos under surveillance and investigated his political views and social network. In a report dated 15 January 1907, Crame (1907) described the life and career of Ramos as follows:

He was ordered to try to obtain the assistance of Japanese Government in aid of the Filipino[s] in their struggle for independence. After the Chino (Sino)-Japanese War he went to Japan with five children for the purpose of putting them in school, and also in the capacity of a commissioner of the Filipino Insurgents. . . . He returned to the Islands as manager of a circus, accompanied by a Japanese wife and the Japanese captain Narahara. During [sic] he (Ramos) stayed in the Philippines he met all prominent Filipinos who have been connected with the insurrection, and he and the Japanese captain obtained all the available information possible regarding condition in the Philippines, and then returned to Japan. About that time Pedro Paterno took a trip to Japan, and while there, stopped with Ramos and they became good friends . . . In 1905 he (Ramos) paid another visit to the Islands and went back to Japan in August, returning here in November of the same year. . . . It is now reported that he intends returning to Japan sometime in March of this year. He is engaged in raising fancy chickens in Tondo, and seems to have a great deal of money. He speaks English and Japanese fluently, besides Spanish and Tagalog. Sandiko, Paterno, the two Lucbans, Paez and Ilustre, Crispulo Feliciano, and others who were prominent men as members of the Filipino insurrection, are often seen at his house.

Crame's text suggested that Filipino revolutionary efforts persisted even after the pacification of the Philippine islands had been declared officially in 1902. Interestingly Pedro Paterno, usually regarded as a betrayer of the revolution and collaborator with America, was a good friend of Ramos, who had close ties with Japan. Kimura also read Paterno's *Ninay* (1885) during his research in the national library to gain knowledge of the ancient culture of the Philippines.

In order for him to get a better job, Aguinaldo and Mariano Ponce repeatedly tried to convince Ramos about taking an oath of allegiance to the Stars and Stripes, which they themselves had already done. Ramos, with his “bushido” mentality, refused to take the oath. Before he died in 1921 his final words were, “put up the Philippine national flag on my grave when the American power retreats from the nation” (Kimura 1942a, 111–17).

Kimura somehow idealized this image of Jose Ramos. Grant Goodman (1998, 380–81) revealed that Ramos was on Japan’s payroll at US\$40 per month and that he had strong connections with key Japanese agents who wanted to assist Filipino revolutionaries. In this sense Ramos might not need to get a better job by pledging allegiance to the United States nor did he have to possess a bushido mentality.

However, Ramos’s story indicated that before the Second World War many elements, though disparate and incoherently organized, had existed to form a story of Japan’s solidarity with the Philippines. This friendship was revisited and even invented during the “Greater East Asian War” in order to search for the “origin” of Japanese and Filipino friendship.

Kimura’s and other Japanese writers’ revival of these “forgotten” elements were intended to liberate Philippine history from American hands. But since Japan’s emplotment of narrating Philippine history anew depended heavily on the discourse of American colonial literature, on the basis of this same discourse another version of benevolent assimilation was created, one “which talks of the development of the Philippines as the burden of Japan” (Kimura 1942a, 326–28).

Changing the Country’s Name and Flag

Artemio Ricarte, like Jose Ramos, had refused to pledge allegiance to the United States. He was exiled to Japan and only went back to the Philippines when the Second World War began. Kimura visited Ricarte’s house in Yokohama before he traveled to the Philippines in order to ask about his proposal regarding the new nation’s name. Ricarte had wanted to name it Luzvimin or Luzviminda, but Kimura did not like it because he deemed that a name that simply joined the first characters of the three main islands of the Philippines did not register hope. Kimura wanted to change the name, Philippines, to one that would be more suitable under Japan’s empire: “Perlas nang Silangan” (Pearl of the Orient). In the Philippines, Kimura also argued about the country’s name with Eulogio B. Rodriguez,

then president of the national library and who had also written on the topic (ibid., 293).¹⁸

While doing archival research about the early relations between Japan and the Philippines, Kimura found that the word Luzon was used in Japanese accounts. But it was also found in the Chinese Ming dynasty accounts. The ruling race of the Ming dynasty, the Han people, had put up a strong resistance against Japanese incursions since 1937; in this context, it was problematic for Japan to use the term Luzon from the Ming dynasty’s historical accounts, which were obviously in Chinese. Kimura also referred to the Americans’ failed attempt to change the name of the country to Manila. Rodriguez told Kimura that there was no dream registered in the name “Manila” whereas “Philippines” was closely associated with the great king, Felipe II. Kimura’s final suggestion was “Perlas nang Silangan,” found in Rizal’s last poem in Spanish, *Mi ultimo adiós*. He wanted to put more emphasis on Rizal than on Felipe II for the sake of the country’s inhabitants. However, there were no positive responses to his idea about changing the country’s name, which he broached during his stay in Manila. Kimura (ibid., 293–300) wondered whether, since the most influential group in the islands consisted of mestizos, they might not want to cut their ties with their Spanish heritage by changing the country’s name.

Applying the same logic of “benevolently” assimilating the Philippines to Japan’s empire, Kimura tried to find the original flag of the Katipunan while researching the history of flags in the Philippines. But the original flag was missing. He referred to several books but could not find any records about it. However, he found clues in Yamada’s novel and Ricarte’s biography, which stated that the original flag had a white sun against a red background and also mentioned that it was similar to Japan’s flag. Kimura thus concluded that, because the Japanese flag inspired the Katipunan’s original flag, its history was erased by the Americans. Kimura added that Yamada’s work was based on materials provided by Mariano Ponce and it was probably Ponce who first said that the Katipunan’s flag was similar to Japan’s while seeking the latter’s assistance, which in turn was the basis of Ricarte’s narrative (ibid., 301–9).

Yasotarō Mōri was another Japanese writer and newspaper journalist from *Osaka Mainichi Shimbunsha*, who insisted on retrieving the Philippine national flag from America’s hand. From the 1930s onward he anticipated the future independence of the Philippines as Japan’s “neighbor” and contributed several articles in the weekly periodical, *Kokusai Panfuretto*

Tsūshin (Times International News Pamphlet Services) published by the Times Tsūshinsha (Mōri 1930, 1932, 1936). During the war Mōri wrote a book in 1942 on Rizal that discussed the effects of American education on the Philippines. In his book Mōri commented on the problems of the national flag and anthem, shown below, based on the travel diary by a Filipino professor who led several dozen students to Japan in 1935. Mōri (1942, 231–33) retold two episodes from this Filipino professor about these “shameful” events:

We were welcomed by high school girl students in Hiroshima and at the end of the ceremony the host sang “*kimi ga yo*” (Japanese national anthem). In return, we tried to express our gratitude by singing the Philippine national anthem, but no one in our group remembered the lyrics correctly. I thought that even the English or Spanish version was ok; however, still, no one knew. We sang “*Pilipinas, Pilipinas Natin*” by necessity but what a contrast we and the Japanese were. At Kaoshiung in Taiwan, the first part of Japan’s empire where we set foot, each of us was given the paper-crafted Philippine national flag. It was the first time for us to see so many Philippine national flags.¹⁹

Based on his study of US–Philippines relations starting from the 1930s, Mōri pointed out the problem with America’s brand of education in the Philippines, which repressed Filipino self-consciousness. In 1907, when the Nacionalista Party dominated the elections, the victory parade displayed the Katipunan flag while the American flag was relegated to the background. The parade irritated many Americans. As a result, the Philippine Commission passed Act 1696, which prohibited the display of all flags, banners, and other symbols used by the resistance against the US as well as the flag, banners, and emblems of the Katipunan. It was not until 1919 that the Flag Law was repealed and the government allowed and legalized the display of Filipino flags (Agoncillo and Guerrero 1973, 293–94).

When the Japanese occupied the Philippines during the Second World War, they also banned the display of the Philippine national flag. It was only on 14 October 1943, the Independence Day for the Laurel government, that the Philippine national flag was displayed in public and the anthem played for the first time since the Japanese occupation (Agoncillo 1965, 394). Although I am not sure whether Mōri knew of the ban on the Philippine

national flag in the earlier days of the Japanese occupation, it is ironic that the Japanese writers who were criticizing the Americans for prohibiting the display of the Philippine national flag were the very ones who banned the flag’s display.

In American discourse, as exemplified by Dean Worcester (1914/1921, 921–22), Aguinaldo’s short-lived Malolos republic (1899–1900), was not seen as the government established with the consent of the Filipino people; rather, it was portrayed as a military oligarchy, which used terror and murder as a governmental agency, that was imposed on the people. Thus, along with the Katipunan flag, symbols of Aguinaldo’s republic were prohibited from display. American colonialism practiced under the pretext of tutelage—as caretaker of the Filipino people until they were ready for independence—was justified by this negative assessment of Aguinaldo, Ricarte, and other revolutionaries.

Evidently Kimura and other Japanese writers read American writers and cherry-picked in order to create an antithesis to American colonialism. For this reason these Japanese writers during the “Greater East Asian War” offered a positive view of Aguinaldo, Ricarte, and Ramos, all of whom were alienated under American colonial rule. In the same vein, Japanese writers alluded to the problems of America’s colonial rule by highlighting the issues of the Philippine national name, flag, and history and actively trying to show alternatives. The Japanese writers rearranged these plots to show that the Philippines became “civilized” with the help of Japan under the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere project. Moreover, as the next section shows, Japanese developmental discourse dovetailed with that of the earlier American discourse.

Kimura and the Genealogy of Japanese Solidarity Discourse

Shōzō Murata (1878–1957), who was the supreme adviser to the Japanese 14th Area Army of the Imperial Japanese Army, stayed in the Philippines during the Second World War. Before the war, Murata had worked since 1900 at Osaka Shōsen Kaisha, prewar Japan’s biggest marine company; in 1934 he became the company president. He also entered politics in 1939 and was appointed as the telecommunication minister in the second cabinet of Konoe (1940–1941). In February 1942, after the war broke out, he went to the Philippines.

Hideki Tōjō had ordered Murata's designation as the supreme adviser in order to avoid the same mistake as the Manchurian Incident, which ensued from the military officers' arbitrary decisions. Murata was expected to advise the Japanese Army based on his tested business acumen as well as political experience. Since battles were still ongoing when he first arrived in the Philippines and he had no active military duties, he spent his time reading books on the politics, culture, and history of the Philippines. Murata then organized the Hitō Chōsa Iinkai (Philippine Research Commission) in order to obtain more details about the islands. The commission members consisted of professors specializing on the Chinese economy and political affairs, such as Masamichi Rōyama and Seiichi Tōbata (Hanzawa 2007, 53; Nakano 2012, 14–15).²⁰

While reading books borrowed from the national library, Murata once asked Kimura what were the best books on the Philippines written by Japanese since the Meiji era. Kimura gave him a list of around twenty titles. Of the books Kimura recommended, he identified *Firipin basshō* (Roaming in the Philippines), authored by Motosaku Tsuchiya (1916), as the best Japanese monograph on the Philippines. Murata was amazed that, although Tsuchiya (1866–1932) had been a long-time friend who became his best friend since their Rotary Club days in Japan, he did not know much about Tsuchiya's work. Thanks to Kimura's (1942, 235–37) recommendation, Murata had his first encounter with his friend Tsuchiya's writing.

Firipin basshō, published in 1916, is a Japanese travel memoir based on Tsuchiya's three-month stay in the Philippines. Like Kimura Tsuchiya was a newspaper journalist. But, unlike Kimura, he traveled from north to south of the Philippines and wrote with great detail on a wide range of topics, such as indigenous customs, the natural landscape, public institutions, industry, the old and current Japan–Philippines relations, the history of the Spanish period, and the current “progress” under the American regime. This body of work came to more than 400 pages. It could not have been written without referring to the existing literature, and most parts in fact consisted of knowledge found in the most current works of American writers at that time. Referring to the works of Dean Worcester (1914/1921), Daniel Williams (1913), Prescott Jernegan (1907), and James Blount (1913), Tsuchiya admired what America did for the Philippines: rescuing the islands from the Dark Age of the Spanish era. In short Tsuchiya's work can be understood as a translation of the American developmental discourse into Japanese for Japanese consumption.

Perhaps unique to his work was his occasional focus on the similarities and differences between Japan and the Philippines in terms of Western influence. For example, Tsuchiya (1916, 82) admired the American educational system installed in the Philippines and compared it with Japan's.

America was successful in opening the doors of Japan and Admiral Perry is respected as a patron among Japanese people. It is better for the Filipino people to understand America well and learn Western civilization, by being a member of a civilized society. As I had recently heard, Japan had established an agreement with Russia (the fourth Japan-Russo Agreement in 1916) and this supports the Anglo-Japanese Alliance (1902) in keeping peace in the Orient. Currently, the most dangerous issue is China's instability, but this worry will be removed because the triangular alliance of Japan, Russia, and Britain, is established. It is important for the Philippines to stand by the side that guarantees the peace and safety of the Orient; while at the same time study Japan's recent history. It is also important for the Philippines to develop the nation as soon as possible, so that it can be on par with the level that Japan has accomplished. (ibid.)

The First World War was raging in 1916, when *Firipin basshō* was published. The triple alliance of Japan, Russia, and Britain was conceived with the aim of establishing a regional order in East Asia; however, the alliance was short-lived due to the outbreak of the Russian Revolution in 1917. Japan sent its military to the Marshall Islands and Palau, which Germany had occupied, and won battles there. Tsuchiya's travel story was written under such circumstances, when Japan gradually came to be acknowledged as an accomplished member of the great powers from the “Orient.” In this sense his compassion with regard to the American tutelage of the Philippines was based on Japan's experience of being transformed from a weak to a strong country, or the *datsumi* principle.

In the quote above Tsuchiya also showed the similarity between Japan and the Philippines under American hegemony, and he rather welcomed it. There was no resentment against Western supremacy in his work. At the same time he saw the Philippines as standing behind Japan. It is a curious fact that Kimura recommended *Firipin Basshō* as the best work during the “Greater East Asian War” in spite of Tsuchiya's admiration for US rule in the Philippines.

Interestingly Tsuchiya was a pupil of Fukuzawa. As mentioned at the start of this article, Fukuzawa had been seen as an icon for *atsua ron*: getting out of Asia and catching up with the West. In 1903 Tsuchiya wrote about his memories of Fukuzawa in *Yo ga mitaru Fukuzawa Sensei* (My View on Sir Fukuzawa), in which he narrated how he became Fukuzawa's disciple. At first Tsuchiya did not like Fukuzawa's materialistic ideas, which were put forth in articles that appeared in *Jiji Shinbō*, a newspaper founded by Fukuzawa. He even refused to study at the Keio Gijuku, which was founded by Fukuzawa as well. But later, after studying in the United States, Tsuchiya began to be impressed with Fukuzawa's proposition that money and independence were so intertwined. Tsuchiya then decided to be a journalist in Fukuzawa's newspaper company. Fukuzawa, although not often, did check Tsuchiya's articles with such strictness that it greatly influenced Tsuchiya's (1903, 61–73) writing style.

Tsuchiya realized the significance of Fukuzawa's ideas only after he returned to Japan from his studies in the United States. In this sense, Tsuchiya's narrative on the Philippines could be understood in accordance with Fukuzawa's *atsua ron*. But, as stated earlier, Fukuzawa's ideas included at the same time the element of *kōa ron*, of being prosperous within Asia. Tsuchiya's quote above also suggested some solidarity of Japan with the Philippines when he stated that "it is important for the Philippines to stand by the side that guarantees the peace and safety of the Orient; while at the same time study Japan's recent history" (Tsuchiya 1916, 82).

This kind of Japanese discourse on Philippine development was circulated widely under the pretext of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. Although Tsuchiya did not show any hatred toward or resentment against Western supremacy, his approach might be a powerful reason for Kimura to recommend it to Murata as the best Japanese monograph on the Philippines. In other words, it was a Japanese colonial discourse or a complex dilemma between *atsua* and *kōa*—a way of modernizing the Philippines aided by Japan. This solidarity discourse appropriated the vocabulary previously used by the US in its discourse of benevolent assimilation. Ironically, it turned against the very discourse from which it had been appropriated.

Conclusion

Japanese wartime solidarity with Filipinos has been understood as part of Japan's ideology of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. Japan's

atrocities in the Philippines and defeat in the war further strengthened the image of solidarity as a myth or even a lie. However, as discussed in this article, the solidarity discourse in Japanese wartime writings was greatly shaped and even justified by the works of American writers who talked about benevolent assimilation. In seeking to change the national flag and name; appropriating the images of Rizal, Aguinaldo, and Ramos; and excluding anti-Japan while emphasizing pro-Japan elements, Kimura and other Japanese writers' efforts constituted another emplotment of the Philippine past based on US developmental discourse.

Japanese wartime solidarity discourse was thus a usurpation of US power and knowledge, which succeeded in a mission of bringing prosperity to the Philippines *but* with the help of Japan. In this sense ideological differences between the pro-West and the pro-East, between democracy and fascism, or between *atsua* and *kōa* did not bring about any difference in terms of the formation of Japan's developmental discourse. For this reason it is important to conduct a genealogical study to examine Japanese wartime writings. Japanese developmental discourse on the Philippines was reflected in the different outlooks of solidarity throughout the years of the Meiji (helping the Katipunan), Taishō (welcoming American tutelage), and wartime Shōwa eras (Asia for Asians). In every form of solidarity we find peculiar "descents" left by the father—America. The elements found in the developmental discourse of the United States' benevolent assimilation of the Philippines were appropriated by every form of Japanese solidarity discourse, regardless of whether Japan's ideological orientation was *atsua* or *kōa*.

We may be able to apply this genealogy to postwar Japan's solidarity with the Philippines. After the Second World War, both countries became client states of the "American informal empire" (Fujiwara 2011, 17). Under American hegemony, postwar Japanese scholarship on Philippine history reflected on Japan's "wrongful" past with strong moral sentiments, such as apologetic feelings. However, this morality was informed by another narrative of linear history, which in turn led to the forgetting, dismissing, and stigmatizing of Japanese wartime accounts on the Philippines. It is hoped that this article will inspire further examination of both Philippine and Japanese pasts in an episteme where the discourse of development has been formed by US colonial knowledge and power productions.

Notes

- 1 Japanese names are indicated by the Western format, given names first followed by family names. Meiji Japan's novel writers are usually indicated by their given names but I do not follow this convention in order to avoid possible confusion among English-language readers.
- 2 According to the survey by Shinzō Hayase (2009, 9), the number of Japanese publications on the Philippines increased starting in the late 1930s. When the "Greater East Asian War" occurred, the number drastically rose, with around 200 items published within the year 1942. Furthermore, almost all Japanese novels on the Philippines written during the Philippine Revolution were reprinted, read by the public, and reexamined by critics during the Second World War. This boom was much larger than the preceding one, and it also produced several new books and translations on Philippine culture, economy, and history. The reason for the large quantity of Japanese knowledge production on the Philippines can be traced, of course, to Japanese imperial power.
- 3 Tadakaze Suganuma (1865–1889) was a typical example of Shōwa writers' appropriation of Meiji writers' texts. Suganuma was a rather unknown character in his time but came to be seen as a saint under the "Greater East Asian War." His works, *Shin-Nihon no tonan no yume* (New Japan's Dream of Aspiration in the South Sea, 1888/1940) and *Dainihon shōgyōshi* (History of Commerce in Great Japan, 1892/1940), which argued for Japan and China's cooperation in developing the South, were compiled in a book in 1940 and first publicly recognized at the eve of the war. He died in Manila at the age of 25. His death at an early age might also have helped in mystifying his character during the Second World War.
- 4 I am particularly indebted here to Foucault's (1977) famous essay, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History." Foucault (ibid., 146) defines genealogy as one that "does not resemble the evolution of a species and does not map the destiny of a people. On the contrary, to follow the complex course of descent is to maintain passing events in their proper dispersion; it is to identify the accidents, the minute deviations, . . . the errors, the false appraisals, and faulty calculations that gave birth to those things that continue to exist and have value for us; it is to discover that truth or being do not lie at the root of what we know and what we are, but the exteriority of accidents."
- 5 Kimura was born in Okayama. After graduating from Waseda University in 1917, he became editor for two publication companies and joined socialist parties. In the postwar era he taught at Waseda University and became advisor to Josefa Sanieel on her doctoral dissertation in the University of Michigan in 1963, which was eventually published as *Japan and the Philippines, 1868–1898*.
- 6 Previous works, particularly by Motoe Terami and Lydia Yu Jose, did not pay much attention to Kimura, as compared to more famous intellectuals such as Kiyoshi Miki (1943), Hidemi Kon (1943), Ashihei Hino (1945), or Shirō Ozaki (1943). These intellectuals had already gained a reputation among Japanese literary circles before the Second World War and were dispatched to the wartime Philippines by the order of Sanbō-honbu (General Staff Office) to propagate Asiatic solidarity between Filipinos and Japanese.
- 7 Tetchō Suehiro's four novels are *Oshi no ryokō* (Mute's Travel, 1889), *Nanyō no daiharan* (Storm over the South Seas, 1891b), *Arashi no nagori* (Remains of the Storm, 1891a), and *Ōunabara* (The Big Ocean, 1894).
- 8 Akanuma wrote of an encounter between Tadakaze Suganuma, Nichinan Fukumoto, and José Rizal. But Kimura found out that Rizal was in fact not in the Philippines while these Japanese

were there (in 1889), leading him to conclude that these writings were fiction. Izumi Yanagida, professor at Waseda University, told Kimura that Tetchō Suehiro met Rizal on a ship bound for the United States and subsequently wrote his novels.

- 9 Kimura kept this concern in the postwar period, and in 1961, to mark the centennial of Rizal's birth, he edited a book, *Jose Rizal to Nihon* (Jose Rizal and Japan). In the meantime, he translated works by Cesar Lanuza and Gregorio Zaide, both focusing on this love for Rizal and his relationship with Japan.
- 10 It is uncertain whether Kimura knew the works of Hanano and Nakahara during the time of war. In the postwar era, Kimura (1961, 76) had a copy of Hanano's *Jose Rizal den*, which he gave to Josefa Sanieel.
- 11 Shū Hirayama moved within a network of friends including Mariano Ponce, Sun-Yat Sen, and Tōten Miyazaki, who were well known for leading revolutions in Asia. In 1899 he went to the Philippines to support the independence movements.
- 12 Nakahara was born in Okinawa. He traveled to the Philippines, Borneo, and Celebes in 1917. In 1924 he established a news service agency for *nanyō* (south seas) and published several periodicals. Aside from *Firipin dokuritsu seishi*, he also wrote three books on the Philippines during the war days: *Firipin kikō* (Philippine Travel Diary, 1941), *Firipinguntō no minzokuto seikatsu* (Race and Life in the Philippine Archipelago, 1942), and *Bagobo-zoku Oboegaki* (A Memo on the Bagobo, 1943).
- 13 Hanano was born in Tokushima in 1900. During his junior high school days, he was taught by Wenceslau de Moraes, a retired Portuguese diplomat who stayed in Tokushima. Moraes came to be known for his "pro-Japan" attitude, courtesy of Hanano's translation of some of his works from Portuguese. Hanano was professor at the Tenri Gaikokugo Academy during the Second World War. He died in 1979.
- 14 These images of Bonifacio and Rizal left strong imprints on later American works, such as those by Austin Craig and Charles Derbyshire (Quibuyen 1999, 43).
- 15 Nazi Germany appropriated this principle to justify its invasion of neighboring countries, the stretches of Polish Prussia that Germany had lost due to its defeat in the Second World War, under the pretext of protecting German residents and bringing civilization to the region (Bambach 2003, 86, 153–55; Kopp 2011, 151).
- 16 In particular Kimura was impressed with Yamada's (1902) novel on Aguinaldo for its articulateness and fine detail. He then discovered the fact that Yamada based his novel on Aguinaldo's self-narratives that appeared in a journal, *American Old Timer*, and newspapers in the United States. They were given to Yamada by Mariano Ponce, who was in Japan at that time, for the purpose of creating a revolutionary network in Asia together with Sun Yat-Sen. Yamada also acquired a copy of *Noli me tangere* from Ponce and translated it into Japanese (Kimura 1942a, 307–9; Rizal 1903).
- 17 While staying in the Manila Hotel, Kimura entered General MacArthur's suite and was amazed at his book collection, which included works by Whitman, Shakespeare, Epictetus, Mommsen, Guibea, Ranke, Maupassant, Tolstoy, Wells, London, Hewlett, and Mitchel. Kimura's catching sight of those books created a sense of intimacy between him and MacArthur.
- 18 In 1943 Rodriguez wrote the *National Library Handbook* to highlight the Philippine archives from the pre-Spanish to the current era of the Japanese occupation. He paid particular attention

to the accounts related to the Orient. In particular he introduced two important books published in the early Spanish colonial period related to Japan and China. One book was *El vocabulario de Japón* that was written originally by Portuguese Jesuit priests and translated by Tomas Pinpin to Spanish and printed in Manila in 1630. Pinpin, known as the first native printer in the early Spanish period, wrote a book in Romanized phonetic script to teach the Tagalog people the Spanish language (Rafael 1988, 55). The other book was *Dell'istoria della China* (History of China) written by Juan Gonzáles de Mendoza (1586). His book was prepared from materials and data that were mostly furnished by Fr. Martin de Rada, religious missionary to the Philippines, and possibly by the foremost Filipino poet, Fernando Malang Balagtas (Rodriguez 1943, 38–41).

19 The professor, although not mentioned by Mōri, could have been Emiliano Remo of the University of Manila, according to Grant Goodman (1967) who was researching on the Philippine–Japanese students' exchanges from 1935 to 1940. Mōri could have been writing based on a diary, *Our Thirty Days in Japan*, edited by Hideo Yamanouchi (1935). However, I could not find the specific episodes that Mōri had quoted from this diary.

20 Their report, *Hitō Chōsa Hōkoku* (Report of the Philippine Research Commission), was fully reprinted in 1993, due to the efforts of Japanese scholars of Philippine history. Because of the gargantuan nature of the report, its examination warrants more work and is beyond the scope of this article.

References

- Agoncillo, Teodoro. 1965. *The fateful years (I)*. Quezon City: R. P. Garcia Publishing.
- Agoncillo, Teodoro and Milagros Guerrero. 1973. *History of the Filipino people*. Quezon City: R. P. Garcia Publishing.
- Aguinaldo, Emilio. 1899. *Reseña verídica de la revolución Filipina*. Tarlac: Imprenta Nacional.
- . 1944. Fipirin kakumei no shinsō/Reseña verídica de la revolución Filipina, trans. Hirayama Shū. In *Firipin dokuritsu seishi*[A true history of Philippine independence], ed. Zentoku Nakahara, 51–96. Tokyo: Chūbunkan Shoten.
- Akanuma Saburō. 1941. *Suganuma Tadakaze*. Tokyo: Hakubunkan.
- Bambach, Charles. 2003. *Heidegger's roots*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Blair, Emma H. and James Alexander Robertson. 1903–1907. *The Philippine Islands, 1493–1898*. 55 vols. Cleveland, OH: Arthur H. Clark Co.
- Blount, James. 1913. *The American occupation of the Philippines 1898–1912*. New York: Putnam.
- Cano, Glòria. 2008a. Evidence for the deliberate distortion of the Spanish Philippine colonial historical record in the Philippine islands 1493–1898. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 39(1): 1–30.
- . 2008b. Blair and Robertson's *The Philippine Islands, 1493–1898*: Scholarship or imperialist propaganda? *Philippine Studies* 56(1): 3–46.
- Cabrera, Celso. 1942. Present war waged by Japan should have backing of Filipinos, says famed novelist. *Tribune*, 25 Mar.: 1, 4.
- Crame, Rafael. 1907. *Memoir of remours of Japanese intervention in the Philippines*. Manila: Division of Information, Bureau of Constabulary.
- De Araneta, Victoria. 1940. *On wings of destiny: A novel on the life and times of Jose Rizal*. Manila: White Cross.

Foucault, Michel. 1977. Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In *Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews by Michel Foucault*, ed. Donald Bouchard, 139–64. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Fujiwara Kiichi. 2011. Futatsu no teikoku no monogatari [The tale of two empires]. In *Amerika no kage no moto de: Nihon to Firipin* [Japan and the Philippines in America's shadow], ed. Kiichi Fujiwara and Yoshiko Nagano, 3–19. Tokyo: Hōsei Daigaku Shuppanyoku.

Fujiwara, Lynn. 2008. *Mothers without citizenship*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Fukuzawa Yukichi. 1885. *Datsua ran* [Getting out of Asia]. *Jiji shinpo* [Current events], 16 Mar.: 1.

Gonzáles de Mendoza, Juan. 1586. *Dell'istoria della China*. Rome: Grassi.

Goodman, Grant. 1967. *Four aspects of Philippine–Japanese relations, 1930–1940*. New Haven: Southeast Asia Studies, Yale University.

———. 1991. Introduction. In *Japanese cultural policies in Southeast Asia during World War 2*, ed. Grant Goodman, 1–6. New York: St. Martin's Press.

———. 1998. Filipino secret agents, 1896–1910. *Philippine Studies* 46(3): 376–87.

Hanano Tomizō. 1942. *Jose Rizal den* [Biography of Jose Rizal]. Tokyo: Nishimura Shoten.

Hanzawa Kenichi. 2007. *Zaikajin no sensō ninshiki* [A businessman's historical awareness on the war]. Yokohama: Kanagawa Daigaku 21seiki COE program.

Hatano Masaru. 1988. Fipirin dokuritsu undō to nihon no taiō [Philippine independence movement and Japanese response]. *Aiza Kenkyū* [Asian Studies] 34(4): 69–95.

Hau, Caroline and Takashi Shiraishi. 2009. Daydreaming about Rizal and Tetchō: On Asianism as network and fantasy. *Philippine Studies* 57(3): 329–88.

Hayase Shinzō. 1989. *Benguet imin no kyojō to jitsuzō* [Images and realities of Japanese migrant workers in Benguet]. Tokyo: Dōbunkan.

———. 2009. *Firipin kankei bunkenmokuoku* [Bibliography of Japan–Philippines relations]. Tokyo: Ryūkei Shosha.

Hiraki Hakusei. 1903. Aguinaldo. In *Nihon kokka* [Japanese national songs], Hakusei Hiraki, 68–74. Tokyo: Naigai Shuppan Kyōkai.

Hitō Chōsa Inkai, ed. 1993. *Hitō chōsa hōkoku* [Report of Philippine Research Commission]. Tokyo: Ryūkei Shosha.

Hino Ashihei. 1945. *Hitō mintan shū* [Folklores in the Philippines]. Tokyo: Taisei Shuppan.

Ikehata Setsuho. 1989. Fipirin kakumei to nihon no kanyo [Philippine revolution and Japanese commitment]. In *Seiki tenkanki ni okeru Nihon Firipin kankei* [Japan–Philippine relation at the turn of the twentieth century], ed. Setsuho Ikehata, 1–36. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa (ILCAA), Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

———. 2003. Japan and the Philippines, 1885–1905. In *Philippines–Japan relations*, ed. Setsuho Ikehata and Lydia Yu Jose, 19–46. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

———, ed. 1996. *Nihon senryōka no firipin* [The Philippines under Japanese occupation]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Ileto, Reynaldo. 1998. The revolution of 1896 and the mythology of the nation state. In *The Philippine revolution and beyond*, vol. 1, ed. Elmer Ordóñez, 61–71. Manila: Philippine Centennial Commission, National Commission for Culture and Sports.

Imamura Chūsuke. 1941. *Firipin no seikaku* [The character of the Philippines]. Tokyo: Okakura Shobō.

Jernegan, Prescott. 1907. *The Philippine citizen*. Manila: Philippine Education Company.

Jose, Lydia Yu. 1999. *Japan views the Philippines 1900–1944*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Jose, Ricardo. 2003. Accord and discord: Japanese cultural policy and Philippine national identity during the Japanese occupation (1942–1945). In *Imperial Japan and national identities in Asia, 1895–1945*, ed. Li Narangoa and Robert Cribb, 249–69. Monograph series, 31. Copenhagen: Nordic Institute of Asian Studies.

Kimura Ki. 1942a. *Minami no shinju* [Pearl of the South]. Osaka: Zenkoku Shobō.

———. 1942b. Hitō no ijin no kokoro ni yakitsuku Osei san [Osei san, burned into the great Filipino man's mind]. *Tokyo Nichinichi Shimbun*, 14 Apr.: 4.

———. 1942c. Yasashiku junketsu na kijo [The gentle and pure-hearted lady]. *Osaka Mainichi Shimbun*, 14 Apr.: 3.

———. 1943. *Aguinaldo's independence army*. Tokyo: Daitōa Shuppan Kabushiki Gaisha.

———. 1944. *Nunobiki-maru*. Tokyo: Shunyōdō.

———. 1961. Jose Rizal to Nihon. In *Jose Rizal to Nihon* [Jose Rizal and Japan], ed. Ki Kimura, 10–46. Tokyo: Aporonsha.

Kon Hidemi. 1943. Shūkyō to konketsuji [Religion and mestizo]. In *Hitō fūdoki* [Culture and natural features in the Philippines], ed. Kiyoshi Miki, 97–119. Tokyo: Koyama Shoten.

Kopp, Kristin. 2011. Arguing the case for a colonial Poland. In *German colonialism*, ed. Volker Langbehn and Mohammed Salama, 146–63. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kramer, Paul. 2006. *The blood of government*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Miki Kiyoshi. 1943. Hitōjin no toyōteki seikaku [The oriental character of the Filipino people]. In *Hitō fūdoki* [Culture and natural features in the Philippines], ed. Kiyoshi Miki, 1–54. Tokyo: Koyama Shoten.

Mōri Yasotarō. 1930. Firipin dokuritsu undō no genjō[A report on the Philippine independence movement]. In *Kokusai Panfuretto Tsūshin* [Times international news pamphlet services]. Tokyo: Times Shuppansha.

———. 1932. Firipin no shōrai wa dōnaruka[How will the future of the Philippines be]. In *Kokusai Panfuretto Tsūshin* [Times international news pamphlet services]. Tokyo: Times Shuppansha.

———. 1936. Hitō tsūshin [Correspondences with the Philippines]. In *Kokusai Panfuretto Tsūshin* [Times international news pamphlet services] 911. Tokyo: Times Shuppansha.

———. 1942. Firipin no ijin Jose Rizal [Jose Rizal as a great man for Filipino people]. Tokyo: Seinen Shobō.

Nakahara Zentoku. 1941. *Firipin kikō* [Philippine travel diary]. Tokyo: Kawade Shobō.

———. 1942. *Firipinguntō no Minzoku to seikatsu* [Race and life in the Philippine archipelago]. Tokyo: Nanpō Shuppansha.

———. 1943. *Bagobo-zoku oboegaki*[A memoir on the Bagobo tribe]. Tokyo: Kaizōsha.

———, ed. 1944. *Firipin dokuritsu seishi* [A true history of Philippine independence]. Tokyo: Chūbunkan Shoten.

Nakano Satoshi. 2007. *Rekishi keiken toshite no Amerika teikoku* [American empire as historical experience]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

———. 2012. *Tōnan ajia senryō to nihonjin* [The occupation of Southeast Asia and the Japanese people]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Nara Shizuma. 1942. *Nihon to Firipin* [Japan and the Philippines]. Tokyo: Dainippon Yūbenkai Kōdansha.

Oshikawa Shunrō. 1902. *Bukyō no nihon* [Japanese chivalry]. Tokyo: Hakubunkan.

———. 1906/1944. *Shin nihontō* [New Japanese islands]. Tokyo: Ishi Shobō.

Ozaki Shirō. 1943. Senjōzakkan [Impression on the battle field]. In *Hitō fūdoki* [Culture and natural features in the Philippines], ed. Kiyoshi Miki, 279–93. Tokyo: Koyama Shoten.

Paterno, Pedro Alejandro. 1885. *Ninay (costumbres Filipinas)*. Madrid: Imprenta de Fortanet.

Quibuyen, Floro. 1999. *A nation aborted: Rizal, American hegemony, and Philippine nationalism*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Quirino, Carlos. 1940. *The great Malayan*. Manila: Philippine Education Company.

Rafael, Vicente. 1988. *Contracting colonialism: Translation and Christian conversion in Tagalog society under early Spanish rule*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Rizal, Jose. 1903. *Chi no namida* [Bloody tears], trans. Bimyo Yamada. Tokyo: Naigai Shuppan Kyōkai.

———. 1943. *Reimei wo matsu* [Awaiting the dawn], trans. Yasotarō Mōri. Tokyo: Dainippon Shuppan Kabushiki Gaisha.

Rodriguez, Eulogio. 1943. *National Library handbook*. Manila: Bureau of Printing.

Saaler, Sven. 2007. Pan-Asianism in modern Japan history. In *Pan-Asianism in modern Japan history*, ed. Sven Saaler and Victor Koschmann, 1–18. London: Routledge.

Saniel, Josefa. 1963. *Japan and the Philippines, 1868–1898*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines.

Shimizu Hiromu. 2007. Imagining the Filipino revolution 100 years ago. In *Junctions between Filipinos and Japanese*, ed. Arnold Azurin and Sylvano Mahiwo, 49–67. Quezon City: Kultura't Wika.

Snyder, Louis. 1984. *Macro-nationalisms: A history of the pan-movements*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Suehiro Tetchō. 1889. *Oshi no ryokō* [Mute's travel]. Tokyo: Aokiōzandō.

———. 1891a. *Arashi no nagori* [Remains of the storm]. Tokyo: Shunyōdō.

———. 1891b. *Nanyō no daiharan* [Storm over the South Seas]. Tokyo: Shunyōdō.

———. 1894. *Ōunabara* [The big ocean]. Tokyo: Shunyōdō.

SuganumaTadakaze. 1888/1940. *Shin-nihon no tonan no yume* [New Japan's dream of aspiration to the South Seas]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

———. 1892/1940. *Dainihon shōgyōshi* [History of commerce in great Japan]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

- Terami Motoe. 1996. Nihongun ni yume wo kaketa hitobito [The Filipino volunteer armies]. In *Nihon senryōka no firipin* [The Philippines under Japanese occupation], ed. Setsuho Ikehata, 59–102. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- . 2001. Nichijōji no tatakai [Battles in everyday life]. In *Tōnan Ajiaishi no naka no nihon senryō* [The Japanese occupation in Southeast Asian history], ed. Aiko Kurasawa, 259–92. Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu.
- Terami-Wada, Motoe. 1990. The Japanese propaganda corps in the Philippines. *Philippine Studies* 38(3): 279–300.
- . 1991. The Japanese propaganda corps in the Philippines. In *Japanese cultural policies in Southeast Asia during World War 2*, ed. Grant Goodman, 173–211. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- . 1996. Lt. Shigenobu Mochizuki and the new Philippine Cultural Institute. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 27(1): 104–23.
- Tokyo Nichinichi Shimbun*. 1942a. Aguinaldo shōgun to saikai [Reunion with Aguinaldo], 9 Jan.: 3.
- . 1942b. Rōtai kakagetatan [Rise up with the old body], 12 Jan.: 2.
- Tsuchiya Motosaku. 1903. *Yo ga mitaru Fukuzawa sensei* [My view on Sir Fukuzawa]. Osaka: Sanwa Insatsuten.
- . 1916. *Firipin basshō* [Roaming in the Philippines]. Tokyo: Dōbunkan.
- Williams, Daniel. 1913. *The odyssey of the Philippine Commission*. Chicago: A. C. McClurg.
- Worcester, Dean. 1914/1921. *The Philippines past and present*. New York: MacMillan.
- Yamada Bimyō. 1902. *Aguinaldo*. Tokyo: Naigai Shuppan Kyōkai.
- Yamanouchi, Hideo, ed. 1935. *Our thirty days in Japan*. [Manila]: n.p.
- Yamashita Michiko. 1999. Nanshin no manazashi [Views on southward advance]. *Sōgō Bunka Kenkyū* [Transcultural Studies] (Institute of Cultural Studies, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies) 3:77–99.
- Yanagida Izumi. 1961. Nihon bungaku ni okeru Jose Rizal [Jose Rizal in Japanese literature]. In *Jose Rizal to nihon*, ed. Ki Kimura, 49–76. Tokyo: Aporon.
- Yano Tōru. 1975. *Nanshin no keifu* [A lineage of southward advance]. Tokyo: Chūko Shinsho.
- . 1979. *Nihon no nanyō shikan* [Japanese historical perspectives for South Seas]. Tokyo: Chūko Shinsho.
- . 1980. *Tōnan ajia sekai no ronri* [The logics in the Southeast Asian world]. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha.
- Yonetani Masafumi. 2006. *Ajia/Nihon* [Asia/Japan]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Takamichi Serizawa is assistant professorial lecturer, International Studies Department, De La Salle University, 2401 Taft Avenue, Manila 1004, Philippines. He received his PhD degree in 2013 from the Department of Southeast Asian Studies, National University of Singapore. He teaches courses on Japanese history, modern history of East Asia, history of civilization, and globalization studies.
<serizawa.takamichi@gmail.com>