Introduction

Battle of Manila from February 3 to March 3, 1945, which was once given considerable publicity in the Japanese War Crimes Trials (1946-1948), has long been the subject of amnesia in Japan, the United States, and even in the Philippines. The 50th year's anniversary (1995) marked the quiet beginning of protest against forgetting with the erection of a small memorial by the civic group Memorare Manila 1945. Since then, both the media and scholars have begun to give more attention to the battle and its historical significance with an increasing number of publications reviving memories of the city's "death", i.e. Japanese atrocities, U.S. shelling, and all the sufferings of the
civilians under siege. With this big question in my mind, in April 2007, I started to organize the group of scholars for the research project titled The Truths and Memories of the Battle for Manila 1945: Area Studies for Peace, which endeavors to restore and reconstruct the memories of the Battle for Manila 1945 among Japanese public as well as to start further dialogue between the three peoples (Filipinos, Americans and Japanese) on the truths and the memories of the battle. The project have been and will be financially supported by Japanese government through the Japan Society for Promotion of Science grants-in-aid program up until March 2011. In this presentation, I would like to sketch the outline of the issue, focusing on the politics of reconciliation and forgetting.

Battle of Manila 1945

If the Nanking Incident of 1937 marked the beginning of series of major war crimes committed by Japanese forces during the (Second) Sino-Japanese War and World War II, one of the last and worst ones took place during the Battle of Manila (February 3 – March 3, 1945), which has been known as the single most deadly urban battle fought in Asia between the United States and Japan during the last days of World War II.

The Battle began on February 3 with the U.S. raid and liberation of the civilian internees at Santo Tomas University Internment Camp in the northern part of Manila.

---

1 See Appendix II: Battle of Manila 1945 Bibliography.
2 See Appendix I: About the JSPS Project.
3 The author of this paper is writing another paper on this issue, titled “The Lost City: Carmen Guerrero Nakpil and the Battle of Manila 1945,” which will be distributed to those who are interested in the topic as PDF attached file. Contact the author via email.
the city. In total, approximately 3,000 Filipinos, 2,870 Americans, 745 British, 100 Australians, 61 Canadians, 50 Dutch and several other foreign nationals were freed. The almost bloodless liberation was made possible through a careful negotiation between the local unit commanders of both sides. This was in stark contrast to the near-total neglect of the civilian lives by the both U.S. and Japanese military forces in the subsequent month-long urban warfare, which took place in south of Pasig river area of the city. Intramuros, the Old Walled City of the Spanish times, the surrounding government buildings district, and Ermita/Malate district became the deadly battlefield as well as the theater of horrendous war crimes soon after the liberation of Santo Tomas Camp.

Manila Naval Defense Forces and the remaining Army and Naval units, facing the imminent battle, indiscriminately killed the people by sword, machine-guns, burning, and other ways, claiming they’re executing guerrillas, in order to secure the positions and eliminate the hostile population which would certainly be helping the Americans in the coming battle. Mere tactical difficulties to distinguish guerrillas from the civilian population, however, could hardly justify the magnitude of atrocities committed by the Japanese during the battle. Within the Intramuros under the siege, most of the adult male was arrested and later executed while Spanish nationals, priests and civilians alike, were indiscriminately massacred in spite of their being citizens of a neutral country. People taking refuge at the German Club, Casino Espanol, De La Salle University, and other buildings and major residence in the Ermita/Malate district were also mercilessly massacred. Rape was rampant and they were well organized especially in the case of Bay View Hotel in Ermita district, in which Caucasian girls were disproportionately targeted, as the war crime trials would later reveal.

Though the primary responsibility for the city’s devastation and the loss of civilian lives should go to the Japanese Forces, the U.S. Army could not escape from its own responsibility. After having the nightmarish close street fighting in the jungle of buildings; and taking threats of Japanese snipers and fortification of the buildings very seriously, the 37th Battalion’s commanding officers urged Douglas MacArthur to loosen the restriction of using heavy shellfire, which was authorized on February 12
after the 37th Battalion’s casualties reached all time high in their Luzon campaigns. Recent military history of the battle estimates almost four-tenth of the civilian death was caused by the U.S. shelling and notes that the people of Manila endured the sufferings of the U.S. shelling with almost “philosophical resignation.”

The battle was the single most devastating urban warfare fought in Asia during the World War II and the Manila’s downtown district was reduced to ruins, which was later called by Dwight Eisenhower to be “the second most destroyed Allied capitol after Warsaw.” The number of bodies of the Japanese dead soldiers was recorded as 16,665 while the U.S. lost 1,010 lives and 5,565 were wounded. There was no official statistics for the loss of the civilian population, while the postwar Philippine government as well as majority of scholars cited 100,000 as the estimated number of the civilian victims. Of course the battle was but a portion of the Philippines war damage. Japanese atrocities took place in every part of the country and U.S. shelling and bombing destroyed most of the major cities. The postwar Philippine government estimated 1,110,000 lives were lost and physical as well as economic damage reached almost 8 billion U.S. dollars in 1953 price.

The battle was followed by the battles of Iwojima (February 19 – March 26, 1945) and Okinawa (April 1 – June 22, 1945). It may well be noted that the approximately same number of non-combatant civilians were killed during a month-long battle of Manila and the subsequent U.S. bombings of Tokyo on March 10, Hiroshima and Nagasaki on August 6 and 9, 1945.

**Early Postwar Hatred and Present Day Forgiveness**

Given the depth of pain the republic and the people of the Philippines suffered during the Japanese occupation and the war, it was only natural for them to show ill feeling
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5 Cannaughton, et.al, 121, 174.

toward Japan and Japanese people for years after the war. What is important is that Japanese people in the early postwar years had plenty of opportunities to know about this. The first major war crime trial Japanese faced was the Yamashita Tomoyuki Trial in October 1945, which was given much publicity in Japan because of Yamashita’s popularity as the war hero; and the trial was all about the Japanese atrocities during the Battle of Manila. In 1946 the Philippine government sent Pedro Lopez as a prosecutor and Delfin Jallanila as a judge to the International Military Tribunal for the Far East, in which the Battle of Manila and other Japanese atrocities in the Philippines were given as much attention as the Nanking Incident. Lopez and Jallanila became the most fierce prosecutor and unforgiving judge.⁷ Even after the Korean War (1950-1953) transformed the International politics in Asia and made it necessary for the United States to re-incorporate Japan to the anti-communist bloc as an important ally, the Philippine government remained an almost lonely challenger in the western democracy to the Japan’s return to the international community, expressing skepticism about the truthfulness of Japanese determination to eliminate its militarism,⁸ while Filipinos as a people were regarded as harboring the worst “feelings against Japan”.

Since as late as the 1980s, however, the very opposite of the above became an established pattern, in which Japanese apology and Filipino forgiveness characterized the mood and created the “virtuous circle” between the two countries. This made a stark contrast with the Northeastern Asian “history issue” disputes, which have been characterized by “vicious circle” of harsh exchange of words and provocations.

For example, when Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone visited the Philippines in May 1983, he was so moved by the welcoming crowds (apparently mobilized by the then dictator Ferdinand E. Marcos) that he personally redrafted a banquet speech, in which he went as far as to say, “our country deeply regrets and repents having caused your country and people such trouble in the past war. The more you treat us with warm

---


friendliness and generosity, the deeper should we repent and castigate ourselves.” This was the first time in any occasions that Japanese PM had ever expressed “repentance for the past” in such clear terms.9

Also noteworthy was President Corazon Aquino's state visit to Japan in November 1986, when Emperor Hirohito allegedly “kept apologizing for what the Japanese caused the Philippines” while Ms. Aquino told the Emperor “to forget about this.”10 The handlings of “comfort women” issues in the Philippines-Japan relations might also be included as the one fitted to this pattern.

These cases show that a pattern has been established between the two governments, in which the Japanese side would make an apology and the Philippine side would accept it in good faith. This has not been the case with China or Korea since the 1980s. What happened between then and now?

Politics of Reconciliation and Forgetting

The transformation of the bilateral relations from one of hatred to (at least) tolerance was brought about by combination of a number of factors, including international politics of Cold War, reparation and ODA, trade and investment, and so forth. In my previous article titled “Politics of Mourning,”11 however, I stressed the significance of accumulation of positive images generated from increased contact between the two peoples in memorializing the war dead as a socio-cultural basis of the transformation. Let me summarize my argument in the article.

Because of the vast number of Japanese who died in the Philippines during the Asia-Pacific War, which reached 518,000,12 memorialization practices, including collecting the war dead remains (bone gathering), pilgrimage tours by bereaved
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12 The figure is a second only to the 711,000 who were killed in China (including 245,400 in Manchuria). Koseisho Shakai Engo Kyoku [MHW Bureau of Social Welfare and War Victim’s Relief Bureau], ed., Engo 50 nenshi [Fifty Years of War Victim Relief], pp.578-579.
families and veterans as well as erecting statues and markers, were more widely held in the Philippines than any other countries outside Japan. Japanese government missions for gathering remains have been sent to the Philippines since 1958, while pilgrimage tours organized by the Japanese War Bereaved Association (Nippoin Izokukai), prefecture governments, and various tour agencies have been sent to the Philippines since the mid 1960s. The peak was the year 1977, declared by Marcos as the “Year of Peace,” to attract the war bereaved and veterans from all the countries concerned: Japan, the United States, Australia, etc., to visit the Philippines in hope of promoting tourism. The number of pilgrimage tours declined after the 1980s because of political chaos in the Philippines as well as of progressive aging of Japanese bereaved families and veterans. There, however, have still been many Japanese in their 80s or even 90s who continue to visit the Philippines to memorialize their war dead to this date.

What I emphasized in my article is not the number but the pattern of behaviors and experiences as narrated by the Japanese government missions and pilgrim visitors, which we can gather from their government reports, numerous private publications, local newspapers, as well as the journal of JWBA and other organizations which sent tours to the Philippines since the mid 1960s. To sum up, (1) knowing or being taught that the country they would visit to memorialize their war dead had been devastated by Japan, they tend to have more sensibility to Filipino sense of victimization than the average Japanese; quite often they felt they had to apologize for Japanese misdeeds in the war; their apologies, however, were usually made only in general terms and rarely did they admit their own, their lost loved-one’s, or their lost comrade’s wrongdoings; in many cases they tend to think the memorialization should be held jointly or in a spirit of “joint memorialization” commemorating the war dead of both nations (in some cases all the nations concerned including Americans, Australians, etc.); (2) Filipinos who received Japanese missions and pilgrim tourists, assuming that they (Japanese) knew their (Filipino) sufferings, tend to display their hospitality by not speaking grudges and avoiding “collision of memories” while showing tolerance and generosity to the mourning visitors; (3) the average reaction of Japanese pilgrim visitors towards the Filipino generosity, which not only allowed but even welcomed
the former enemy people to come and memorialize their war dead, was one of deep gratitude; many visitors thus became “repeaters” and many of them came to assume the Philippines to be a more appropriate place to preserve their memories of loved-ones or comrades than Japan, even to be “the second home.” (4) there seems to have existed a kind of reciprocity (in anthropological term) between the kindness shown by Filipinos and the donation by the Japanese to the local communities (or ODA in the national level); such cases as “trade” in human bones or arrogant attitudes of some of the veteran tourists and bone gathering missions show the relation between the host society and the pilgrim visitors did not always deserve reciprocity; on the other hand, positive efforts to maintain reciprocity in many cases developed into important grassroots sources of locally based non governmental civic exchange between the two peoples.

I also pointed out that the largest bereaved family association, JWBA, shared much of the above-mentioned experiences in their very satisfactory relations with the Philippines, which was precisely summarized in Tadashi Itagaki’s address in the 1977 memorial ceremony held in Carilaya Memorial Park.

“sincerity and truthfulness of the war bereaved families has opened a way to heart-to-heart exchange between the two peoples going beyond love and hate, which has lead to the establishment of amicable relationships due to the efforts of people in the both countries. This is ample proof of the fact that heroic spirits (eirei) will live forever as the foundations of peace.” 13

This satisfaction spoken by one of the top JWBA official had a very important political implication because many of the self-acclaimed nationalist politicians in the Japanese parliament have more or less relied on the support of the organization in their election bids. It is my assumption that JWBA’s friendship with the Philippines is not completely unrelated to the total absence of negative reaction or “gaffe” among Japanese rightwing nationalist politicians against the Japanese government’s repeated apologies towards the Philippines, while the same politicians show strong resentments against Japanese “diplomacy of apologies” towards China and Korea. The absence of

“gaffe” is significant because it has made the Philippines-Japan diplomacy, as well as mutual public sentiment in the two countries, much less strained than the situation in China and Korea.

In terms of Japanese diplomatic history, it may be praised as a remarkable success that the very unfavorable initial situation of a half-million Japanese war dead, on one hand, and over one million Filipino war dead, on the other, was surprisingly “exploited” by the both governments and peoples, thus successfully having brought about today’s friendship using a most effective means to touch the human heart, i.e., mourning, and achieve forward-looking bilateral relationships which Japanese government has so wanted to have with all the Asian neighbors.

There is, however, a flip side of the conciliation through memorialization. First of all it should be reminded that memorializing the war dead is different from recalling or preserving war memories. Just imagine you attend the funeral or any other memorial gatherings like one of the September 11th attack anniversaries in lower Manhattan. When mourners gather, they assume everyone knows what happened to the victims, who quite often died in unspeakable misery and horror especially in time of wars. People therefore tend to deem it not only unnecessary but even undesirable to recall the graphic circumstances of the tragedy surrounding the death. In this sense, amnesia could desirable not only for Japanese but Filipino mourners, who really could not recover from their loss of loved-ones and traumatic experiences of the war. Just think about it. How long did it take for Carmen Guerrero Nakpil, an important Filipina intellectual, or Vicky Quirino, the President Elpidio Quirino’s daughter, to speak about their near-total loss of family and all the traumatic experiences they had in the Battle for Manila? And the war was equally traumatic experiences for Japanese as well, something we ask our fathers and mothers and get no reply for such a long time.

In this way, Japanese war dead memorialization in the Philippines, accompanied by host-Filipinos desire to avoid bringing up past traumatic memories, could work not so much to preserve the war memories but rather to quicken the erasure of them. This is exactly what has happened in the postwar Philippines-Japan relations. History has rarely seen such a large number of people went overseas to the former
battleground specifically in order to memorialize the war dead, in such continuity for more than four decades, BUT Japanese public memories of war in the Philippines are miserably wearing thin with time to near-total amnesia at present especially among younger population. I believe all the Japanese university professors here will agree with me about total ignorance about the war in the Philippines among the undergraduate students we teach, even if they are relatively familiar with Japanese colonialism in Korea or the wartime atrocities in China all the because of noisy “history issue” disputes.

In the short term, suppressing ugly memories and encouraging both parties to forget them might well have promoted relaxation of tensions and creation of mutual amity. In the long run, however, erasure of war memories may result in unsettling the bases of mutual understandings about the past.

This rather dangerous aspect of amnesia first became evident (in my opinion) between 1994 and 1995, when a series of the 50th anniversary events celebrating the liberation of the Philippines roused memories of the war and Japanese atrocities among the Filipino population, while Japanese media completely failed to cover the 50th anniversary of the Battle for Manila or any other Japanese war crimes in the Philippines on the occasions. I thought then, however, it could be more or less excusable because it was the time Great Kobe Earthquake and Aum Shinrikyo Cult Subway Terror Attack in Tokyo shook the whole nation of Japan.

After 10 years passed, however, I have to admit that Japanese amnesia about the Battle of the Philippines has reached to the complete erasure of war memories. Recent developments, to which Embassy of Japan responded very successfully, show how it could have potentially dangerous consequences to the Philippines-Japan relations if Japanese amnesia is left uncared for.

Protest Against Forgetting and the Japanese Preventive Diplomacy 2005-2006

Though the Philippine government has long detached themselves from any of “history
issue” disputes whether it be Prime Ministers’ Yasukuni shrine visits or criticism on Japanese amnesia about its wartime atrocities and wrongdoings, the signs of discontent in the public opinion, which could possibly develop into seeds of conflict, appeared in the Philippines news media on the occasions of the 60th anniversaries, particularly the one of the Battle for Manila in February 2005, exactly one year ago.

There seems to have been at least three interrelated factors behind the discontent: (1) the Philippine government’s inattention or negligence on commemorating the Battle for Manila; (2) lack of publicity in the international communities for the wartime Japanese atrocities in the Philippines and (3) recent Japanese lack of attention and lack of sensibility to the Filipino sentiment about their traumatic war memories.

For example, Maria Isabel Ongpin in her February 2005 column lamented that the memorial gathering organized by the Memorare Manila 1945 had not been attended by the Philippine government officials nor congressmen but only by the diplomatic corps from the United States and EU. Ongpin then stressed the importance of remembrance and thoughtful reflections of the past as a part of “universal awakening that has risen all over the world affected by World War II.” Concerns about lack of publicity for Philippines wartime ordeal both in international communities and in younger generations of the Filipinos were widely shared by the major newspapers, which carried series of feature articles remembering the Japanese atrocities and U.S. fire, be it friendly or unfriendly, which destroyed Manila as well as other parts of the Philippines during the last months of the war.

Though it should be noted these columns and feature articles rarely aimed at rousing antagonism but showed remarkable objectivity and tolerance, they nevertheless should be taken as signs of gathering clouds which could develop into a storm if not properly addressed In February 2005, Manila Bulletin published a letter to the editor from the person who was orphaned by the Battle for Manila protesting against the

14 The Philippine Ambassador to Japan Domingo Siazon in an interview article stated that “perceptions of history” had never become an issue between the two counties at the government level.” Asahi Shimbun, 5 September 2001, p.2.
holding Philippines-Japan Friendship Month in February.\textsuperscript{16}

Along with other major newspaper columnists, Bambi L. Harper in her November 2005 opinion article threw harsh words for the Japanese government. She claimed that the Japanese government made no official apologies regarding the past invasion to the Filipinos and the Southeast Asian peoples, \textsuperscript{17} which was in fact not true but anyway represented displeasure shared by the Filipino intellectuals about lack of Japanese attention to the Philippines when they refer to the past aggression, while the Yasukuni shrine controversy continuously spotlighted China and Korea as two and only critics to Japanese amnesia.

Feeling a gathering storm on the horizon, I was about to publish an article in last December including the following passage, “if I am a Japanese diplomat, I would have sent warning messages to MOFA in Tokyo.” It was in late October that I could manage to withdraw the sentence from my final proof of the article, having found the text of Ambassador Yamazaki’s message on the occasion of the 61\textsuperscript{st} Leyte landing anniversary through Philippine Daily Inquirer coverage:

"As I stand on this shore, I am moved by a deep sense of remorse and reflections over the tragic fate of all those who have fought to defend this country against the atrocities of Japanese military aggression.” \textsuperscript{18}

I am not pretty sure but I wonder if such words as “atrocities of Japanese military aggression” have ever been uttered by any of the Japanese diplomats in the Philippines. Then I also found the columnist Bambi L. Harper might have been approached and informed (most possibly by the Embassy of Japan) about the Japanese government’s official position regarding the past aggression. In a later column depicting much blighter side of the Philippines-Japan postwar relations, she referred to both the Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi’s and Ambassador Ryuichiro Yamazaki’s remarks on different occasions of the 60\textsuperscript{th} anniversary events of the ending of the war, which

\textsuperscript{16} “Not in February! - IF memory serves, it was in February 1986, during the first...” \textit{Manila Bulletin,} 22 February 2005.
equally acknowledged “the misery brought about by Japan’s colonial rule and aggression on the people of Southeast Asia.”

Then February came and with the very first time attendance of Japanese Ambassador, the memorial gathering of Memorare Manila 1945 commemorating the 61st anniversary of the Battle seemed to be much more significant one than the last one. Ambassador Yamazaki took the occasion to make the following statement:

With this historical fact in mind, I would like to express my heartfelt apologies and deep sense of remorse over the tragic fate of Manila. Let me also reiterate the Japanese Government’s determination not to allow the lessons of that horrible World War II to erode, and to contribute to the peace and prosperity of the world without ever waging a war. Last year I participated in virtually all the ceremonies commemorating the 60th anniversary of the end of World War II. In practically all cases, I was invited to lay a wreath and state my remarks, quite similar to today’s ceremony. All of this has led me to be impressed by the noble spirit of reconciliation and the sense of fairness on the part of the Filipino people, firstly, in appreciating Japan as we are now, a nation sharing the values of democracy, freedom and respect for basic human rights, and, secondly, for taking a future-oriented attitude with a view to deepening the friendly relations between our two nations.

As one of the participants of the gathering, Bambi L. Harper offered the following observation of the event.

THE SILENCE WAS PALPABLE AT PLAZUELA DE Sta. Isabel last Saturday in Intramuros when Japanese Ambassador Ryuichiro Yamazaki… expressed his apologies and deep sense of remorse over the tragic fate of Manila…

There was hardly a dry eye in the audience when Ambassador Juan Rocha,

20 Remarks by H.E. Ambassador Ryuichiro Yamazaki on the occasion of the 61st Anniversary of the Battle for the Liberation of Manila Plazuela de Santa Isabel, Intramuros, Manila, 18 February 2006.
who lost his mother in that holocaust, remarked that it had been difficult to forgive when there was no contrition. Yamazaki’s sincere regrets may go a long way in healing those festering wounds.\textsuperscript{21}

Without going into further detail of Ambassador Yamazaki’s wording of his speeches and other factors shown in Japanese diplomatic responses to the signs of rising discontent in the Filipino public opinion on the issue, I would only like to point out that the recent efforts of Embassy of Japan in the Philippines can be said to be a good example of preventive diplomacy, which in this case has been successful in keeping the Philippines-Japan relations from following the path of vicious circle of “history issue,” which has disturbingly put Northeast Asian international relations in harm’s way for almost five years.

Conclusion: What more should be done?

However successful the preventive diplomacy was, it was after all no more than symptomatic treatments, which could not cure the root cause of the problem, i.e., Japanese amnesia. Here it should be noted that neither recent commendable efforts of Ambassador Yamazaki nor Japanese official apologies repeatedly spoken to the Filipino people including Prime Minister Nakasone’s and Emperor Hirohito’s alleged one has ever been given any considerable publicity in Japan. This lack of publicity has deprived Japanese public of any chances to learn what happened in the Philippines during the War. I regret MOFA is not in charge of educating the Japanese public.

If this absence of memories had resulted from years of Filipino forgiveness, it is to be regretted. It may be sometimes more desirable for the search for international mutual understanding not to avoid but to continue to recall memories of an ugly past. One may also ask what will happen when the era of war dead memorialization is over with a change in generations and the two peoples have to confront each other without sharing common grounds or any accumulation of dialogue about their collective past. And the day is coming.

What is necessary, then, to go beyond preventive diplomacy, which is commendable but not enough?

Let me suggest (1) Joint historical studies, which are always on the list of solving “history issue” disputes between Japan and China/Korea, can be and should be “revived” between the Philippines and Japan (I use the term “revive” because we have had the one before); and this time “we/we-inclusive/tayo” should tackle with such untouched issues as the Battle for Manila and other atrocities, which I believe “we” can, taking advantage of accumulation of past collaborations as well as absence of public antagonism on the issue between two peoples; (2) Public support and encouragement for memorial and reconciliation projects by such civic groups as Memorare Manila 1945 and Japanese NPO projects promoting dialogue between Japanese veterans and Filipino people; in this respect Japan-UK reconciliation projects may be regarded as one of the good precedents; it is also necessary to include at least United States in these projects because there are so many Filipino WWII veterans now in the United States and it was after all the war between Japan and the United States which “we” fought in the Philippines; (3) Focus should be put on educating Japanese public; we (Japanese) should be able to show Ambassador Yamazaki’s “heartfelt apologies and deep sense of remorse” is shared among the Japanese public, that I regret is far from the truth at present. My conclusion therefore is that it may be not so much silence respecting for the dead as a talkative recounting of the past that will be desirable when we thinks about the future.

Appendix I
About the JSPS Project

In Japan we have the Japanese Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS), which is government-owned science promotion agency operating various grant-in-aid programs. Basic Research Projects are categorized into (A), (B), and (C) according to the size of the budget. I applied in late 2006 for the middle sized (B) project under the title of
"The Truths and Memories for the Battle for Manila 1945: Area Studies for Peace."

For unknown reasons, my application was instantly accepted (usually we have to repeat application for years to be accepted) and I could start the project in April 2007 as the four-year project that will be concluded in March 2011.

The project’s main focuses are on the truths (what happened and why?) of the Battle for Manila as well as the issues of war memories (how it’s remembered and forgotten; comparative politics of memory). The two pillars of the project will thus be (1) comprehensive studies on the causes of total destruction of the city as well as mass killings and atrocities during the battle; and (2) studies on various aspects of the postwar memories of the battle including (a) issues of war crimes and war responsibilities, (b) socio-cultural-psychiatric analysis of the battle’s memories as represented in postwar memoirs, novels, films, and other artistic works, and (c) comparative studies of memory politics. With respect to the last point, our project pays special attention to the comparative analysis with the issues of Nanking Massacre 1937, asking why the Manila 1945 has not been constructed as a "history problem" between the Philippines and Japan in recent years, while asking if it can be a "history problem" in the near future. I personally believe comparative studies of Nanking 1937 and Manila 1945 will give us many clues to find the more meaningful and desirable ways of reconciliation between the peoples on the past wars and atrocities; not forgive and forget (which apparently is the case of postwar Philippines-Japan relations) but remember and reconcile. In this sense we hope the project will be an exemplar of "Area Studies for Peace."

In hope of achieving this goal, I have organized a multi-disciplinary team of scholars from Japan, the Philippines, and the United States. The project is also working very hard to gather multi-language as well as multi-media documents regarding the battle as comprehensive as possible. We hope the research results and selections of important documents will be translated and published both in English and Japanese in hope of establishing the basis for "more meaningful and sustainable reconciliation and dialogue" between the peoples of the Philippines, Japan, and the United States.

During the first two years, we have put emphasis on data gatherings while
holding three workshops at Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo (December 2007; October 2008; March 2009), Ateneo de Manila (March 2008), George Washington University (November 2009), and here at University of Hawai‘i at Manoa (March 2010). So far we’ve been joined by the following professors.

Coordinator: Satoshi Nakano. Professor (History). Hitotsubashi University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Yutaka Yoshida. Professor (Political Science). do.

Naoko Miyaji. Professor (Social Psychiatry). do.

Hirofumi Hayashi. Professor (History). Kanto Gakuin University Faculty of Economics.

Hitoshi Nagai. Assistant Professor (History). Hiroshima City University Hiroshima Peace Institute.

Tokushi Kasahara. Professor (History) Tsuru University College of Humanities.

Herbert P. Bix. Professor (Hisotry) Binghamton University State University of New York.

Ricardo T. Jose. Professor (History) University of the Philippines.

Lydia N. Yu-Jose. Professor (Political Science) Ateneo de Manila University.

Motoe Terami. Visiting Scholar (History). Sophia University.

Florentino Rodao. Professor (History & Asian Studies). University of Madrid-Compultense

Appendix II

Battle of Manila Bibliography

1945 McCall, James Emmanuel. Santo Tomás Internment Camp; Stic in Verse and Reverse; Stic-Toons and Stic-Tistics. Lincoln, Neb.: The Woodruff printing company, 1945.


2003 Holland, Robert B. *Rescue of Santo Tomas: Manila, WWII: The Flying Column: 100


