The Purification of Victims: The Himeyuri Student Corps Through the Lens of Okinawa, Japan, and the U.S. 1945–1953

Daigo Shima
Department of East Asian Studies
McGill University, Montreal
April 2015

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in East Asian Studies

Abstract

This thesis examines the stories based upon the Himeyuri Student Corps (hereinafter referred to as HSC), who were female Okinawan students working as assistant nurses on the battlefields of Okinawa during the Asia-Pacific War. This work focuses on the different narratives which depicted the HSC, and the shifts in how the story of the HSC was narrated between 1945 and 1953. These shifts are analyzed through the various storytelling forms used to talk about the HSC, which include memoir, novelization, non-fiction work, film, and finally musical revue. Although there were other narratives about the HSC created after 1953, the discussion is limited to the period between 1945 and 1953, since it is the stated aim of this thesis to focus on the shift between the Occupation era (1945-1952) and Japan's official comeback as an independent nation. The thesis thereby aims to shed light on how the images of the war dead of the Battle of Okinawa, and that of the female students in particular, were constructed and exploited within the complicated socio-political triangle between Okinawa, the Japanese mainland, and the United States.

In this thesis, the words "purify" and "purification" are key terms. These terms are used to refer to the ways in which the complicated and contradictory nature of the HSC was glossed over or simplified for ideological purposes. After Japan's defeat in 1945, throughout the late 1940s and up until 1953, a variety of narratives about the HSC were born, and these vacillated between two primary types: one which described the female students as patriotic martyrs who had willingly and voluntarily sacrificed their lives for the nation; and one which described them as pure-minded victims who had been forced to support and die for the Japanese Imperial Army. This thesis explores the process by which each of these contradicting narratives purified images of the HSC in order to enhance the persuasiveness of their arguments. In order to consider these narratives from the socio-political perspective, I explore the following four issues: American censorship of Japanese literature and cinema; governmental aid to former soldiers and bereaved families; Okinawa's reversion movement to Japanese sovereignty; and the ways in which the creators of the HSC narratives viewed their own wartime responsibility.

Therefore, the narratives of the HSC are examined not as free-standing cultural works, but rather as products of the intersections of culture, society and politics. To achieve this goal, this thesis will focus not only on the narratives but also on their creators, seeking to understand the cultural, social, and political backgrounds of the stories and the storytellers.

Résumé de la thèse

Cette thèse est une étude des histoires basées sur le corps étudiant Himeyuri (indiqués HSC dans le texte), qui étaient des étudiantes d'Okinawa travaillant comme assistantes infirmières sur les champs de batailles à Okinawa durant la guerre du Pacifique. Je me concentre sur comment chacun des récits dresse un portrait different du HSC entre 1945 et 1953, que ce soit sous forme de mémoires, de romans, d'oeuvres de non-fiction, de films ou de revues musicales. Malgré qu'il y ait eu d'autres récits sur le HSC créés après 1953, j'ai fais le choix de limiter ma discussion à la période entre 1945 et 1953 afin de me centrer sur la transition entre la période d'occupation américaine (1945-1952) et le retour officiel du Japon en tant que nation indépendante. Ainsi, mon but est d'éclaircir comment les images des défunts de la Bataille d'Okinawa, notamment celles des étudiantes, ont été construites et exploitées dans un triangle socio-politique complexe entre Okinawa, le territoire continental japonais et les États-Unis.

Dans cette thèse, j'utilise les mots clés "purifier" et "purification". J'utilise ces termes pour faire référence aux moyens par lesquels la nature compliquée et contradictoire du HSC a été dissimulée ou simplifiée pour des raisons idéologiques. Après la défaite du Japon en 1945, durant les dernières années 1940 et jusqu'en 1953, une grande variété de récits sur le HSC ont été créés, vacillant entre deux types: l'un décrivant les étudiantes comme des martyrs patriotiques qui ont volontièrement sacrifié leur vie pour la nation, et l'autre les décrivant comme des victimes à l'esprit pur, forcées de soutenir et de mourir sur les champs de bataille pour l'Armée Impériale japonaise. Cette thèse explore les processus de purification de l'image du HSC dans chacun de ces récits contradictoires, essayant d'accentuer le pouvoir de persuasion de leurs arguments. Afin de considérer ces récits à partir d'une perspective socio-politique, cette thèse étudie quatres problématiques: la censure américaine vis-à-vis du cinéma et de la littérature japonaise, le soutien gouvernemental envers les anciens combattants et les familles endeuillées, le mouvement de réversion d'Okinawa vers la souveraineté japonaise, et les façons dont les créateurs de récits du HSC percevaient leur propre responsabilité des temps de guerre.

Ainsi, j'examine les récits des HSC non comme des oeuvres culturelles indépendantes, mais plutôt comme des produits à l'intersection de la culture, société et politique. Afin d'accomplir mon projet, cette thèse se concentre sur non seulement les récits mais leurs créateurs, permettant ainsi de comprendre le fond culturel, social et politique des récits à travers ceux qui les racontent.

Acknowledgments

I owe so much to so many people for their support in helping me to complete my dissertation. Here are only a few of them. I wish I could thank them all.

Professor Adrienne Hurley, I could not have survived two graduate programs without you. Your passion, energy, kindness, gracefulness, and sense of humor have been instrumental in getting me to where I am today. I still remember the day I stood in front of the door of your office in 2007. I was nervous and scared, but once we started talking, somehow we were able to talk as if we had known each other for a long time. That was just the beginning of our adventures. You were, are, and always will be a very important figure in my life. I am deeply grateful to you.

Professor Thomas Lamarre, thank you very much for your support and thoughtful insights. I was always stimulated by your advice and inspired by the new angles through which you encouraged me to see things. You have opened up new doors for me to think outside the box.

Professor Hasegawa Sumi, thank you very much for your support. Your kindness and consideration have been invaluable to me throughout this project. Thanks to you, I have learned how to better support and connect people to each other. I could not thank you more for these lessons.

Jodie Beck, how could anyone survive a graduate school without a friend like you? It is not good enough to say I was lucky to have you as a fellow of my study at McGill. We have worked together on many tough translations from English to Japanese and vice versa, through which we have exchanged a great deal of cultural, grammatical, social, and historical knowledge about English and Japanese. I do hope that our translation buddy-ship will last forever!

My parents, Koji and Noriko, and my sister, Ryoko, you are simply the best. Your understanding and support have been essential to the continuation of my journey from Kyoto, to Iowa, and eventually to Montreal. I am really lucky to have family like you; your craziness and affection always make me realize that all my troubles are of little consequence.

My final gratitude goes to Jang Heayoung, my best friend and supporter. We have had so many conversations via Skype that gave me the keys to thinking through the questions that arose in my dissertation.

This project was made possible in part by funding from Vanier Fellowship.

Japanese names, romanization, and translations

This thesis follows the Japanese convention of putting the last name first. Also, Japanese romanization follows the Hepburn system. All translations unless otherwise noted are my own.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Why is the Himeyuri Student Corps Worth Examining?

After the defeat in the Asia-Pacific War[1] in 1945, Japan regained its independence with the San Francisco Peace Treaty which was signed in 1951 and came into effect in 1952. However, due to Article 3 of the treaty, Okinawa remained under the control of the United States until 1972. Article 3 states:

> Japan will concur in any proposal of the United States to the United Nations to place under its trusteeship system, with the United States as the sole administering authority, Nansei Shoto south of 29 deg. north latitude (including the Ryukyu [Okinawan] Islands and the Daito Islands), Nanpo Shoto South of Sofu Gan (including the Bonin Islands, Rosario Island and the Volcano Islands) and Parece Vela and Marcus Island. Pending the making of such a proposal and affirmative action thereon, the United States will have the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants of these islands, including their territorial waters (…)[2]

Okinawa remained as a part of Japanese territory between 1952 and 1972, and Okinawan people held Japanese nationality. However, the new Japanese constitution was not applied to Okinawa. The U.S. authority practically monopolized the legislative, administrative, and judicial power in Okinawa until 1972 when Okinawa achieved its return to Japan's sovereignty.[3] Against this background, the sacrifice of Okinawa during the Battle of Okinawa came to take on a political meaning for both Okinawans and Japanese mainlanders.

This thesis examines the stories based upon the Himeyuri Student Corps (hereinafter referred to as HSC), who were female Okinawan students working as assistant nurses on the

---

[1] This thesis uses the term "the Asia-Pacific War" instead of "the Pacific War", which began with Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7 1941, since the latter term focuses exclusively on the battles between the United States and Japan that took place in the Pacific. The Japanese Imperial Army, however, also attacked East Asian countries in the name of releasing them from the colonization by Western countries in "the Pacific War". In order to include these countries in the scope of the damage of the war, I will use "the Asia-Pacific War".

[2] Jussi M. Hanhimäki, and Odd Arne Westad, *The Cold War: a history in documents and eyewitness accounts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003),160.

[3] Eiji Oguma, *"Nihonjin" No Kyōkai: Okinawa, Ainu, Taiwan, Chōsen, Shokuminchi Shihai Kara Fukki Undō Made* (Tokyo: Shin'yōsha, 1998), 477-482.

battlefields of Okinawa during the Asia-Pacific War. This work focuses on the different narratives which depicted the HSC, and the shifts in how the story of the HSC was narrated between 1945 and 1953. These shifts are analyzed through the various storytelling forms used to talk about the HSC, which include memoir, novelization, non-fiction work, film, and finally musical revue. Although there were other narratives about the HSC created after 1953, the discussion is limited to the period between 1945 and 1953, since it is the stated aim of this thesis to focus on the shift between the Occupation era (1945-1952) and Japan's official comeback as an independent nation. The thesis thereby aims to shed light on how the images of the war dead of the Battle of Okinawa, and that of the female students in particular, were constructed and exploited within the complicated socio-political triangle between Okinawa, the Japanese mainland, and the United States.

In this thesis, the words "purify" and "purification" are key terms. These terms are used to refer to the ways in which the complicated and even contradictory status of the HSC was glossed over or simplified for ideological purposes. After Japan's defeat in 1945, throughout the late 1940s and up until 1953, a variety of narratives about the HSC were born, and these vacillated between two primary types: one which described the female students as patriotic martyrs who had willingly and voluntarily sacrificed their lives for the nation; and one which described them as pure-minded victims who had been forced to support and die for the Japanese Imperial Army. This thesis explores the process by which each of these reductive narratives strove to purify images of the HSC in order to enhance the persuasiveness of their arguments. In order to consider these narratives from the socio-political perspective, I explore the following four issues: 1) American censorship of Japanese literature and cinema; 2) governmental aid to former soldiers and bereaved families; 3) Okinawa's reversion move-

ment to Japanese sovereignty; 4) and the ways in which the creators of the HSC narratives viewed their own wartime responsibility.

First, American censorship had a major effect on Japanese literature and cinema during the Occupation era between 1945 and 1952. Both mainland Japanese and Okinawan creators had to carefully avoid any description in the HSC narratives that American censors would find anti-American. This led to a complete adulation of American democracy that went in tandem with a criticism of Japanese feudalism in their narratives. Furthermore, pro-Christian messages also served as their means of avoiding anti-American impressions, adding a further twist to their depictions of the HSC.

The second issue, governmental aid to war veterans and bereaved families, emerged immediately after Japan regained its independence on April 28 1952. On April 30 1952, *Senshōbyōsha Senbotsusha Izoku tō Engohō* aka *Engohō* (the Act on Relief of War Victims and Survivors) was promulgated in Japan's mainland. *Engohō* aimed to provide financial aid not only to the wounded veterans and civilians employed by the military, but also to the bereaved families of the war dead. In 1953, even though Okinawa had not yet returned to Japanese sovereignty, the Japanese government decided to include Okinawans as *Engohō* recipients. Under such conditions, the students' wartime status and support to the Japanese Imperial Army rapidly took on political importance. Since the Japanese government did not provide any financial aid for civilian casualties, such as air-raid victims, the issue of whether the female students had been voluntary civilians or officially hired by the Japanese Imperial Army suddenly took on increased political and social importance. As I will discuss later in greater detail, the wartime status of the HSC was not a simple black-and-white issue, which is why various narratives about the HSC were able to construe the wartime status of the HSC in support of their arguments.

Third, the issue of Okinawa's reversion to Japan also had a profound impact on strategies for narrativizing and depicting those who died in the Battle of Okinawa. Okinawans frequently evoked the death toll from the Battle of Okinawa to argue for the need for Okinawa's return to Japan's sovereignty. Okinawans emphasized the fact that more than 120,000 Okinawans, including soldiers, civilians employed by the military, and civilians, lost their lives in the Battle of Okinawa in order to delay an American attack on the Japanese mainland. The deaths of the teenage female students working as assistant nurses in the battlefields grew in importance in the context of emphasizing Okinawa's sacrifice for the Japanese mainland, and thus, the bereaved family members not only harshly criticized any depictions of the HSC which they considered as "inaccurate", but they also eagerly disseminated an image of the HSC which they considered to be "true" in the supportive context of Okinawa's reversion movement.

Fourth, and finally, the ways in which the creators of the HSC narratives viewed their own wartime responsibility also greatly influenced their construction of the narratives themselves. Two important sites for evaluating wartime responsibility arose among the creators of the HSC narratives: the responsibility of teachers toward their students, and that of producers of wartime propaganda. Since the HSC were teenage students, there were teachers who had accompanied them in the battlefields. Some of the teachers survived the battle, and after Japan's defeat they began publishing non-fictional works, omitting any account of their own role in instilling militaristic ideas in their students as part of wartime education.

In 1953, the narratives of the HSC were adapted into a film and a revue for the first time. All three of the creators – the film director, the film scriptwriter, and the revue creator – had supported the Japanese Imperial Army as official propagandists in the past. Although their wartime work had contributed to the population's unquestioning support for the war, all

of them became even more successful in Japanese cinema and musical theatre after Japan's defeat. We will focus on how each of them took a different approach to the issue of their own wartime responsibility in their characterizations of the HSC.

In sum, I do not consider the narratives of the HSC as autonomous forms of culture production, but rather as products arising at the intersection of culture, society, and politics. As such, this thesis will focus not only on the narratives but also on their creators, seeking to understand the cultural, social, and political backgrounds of the stories and the storytellers.

The Historical Background of the Himeyuri Student Corps

Okinawa Prefecture is located at the southernmost end of Japan, and it consists of more than a hundred islands, the centre of which is the main island of Okinawa. When Japan annexed the Ryūkyū Kingdom in 1879, it became what is now Okinawa Prefecture. The historical and geographical condition of colonization led to a hierarchical relationship between the Japanese mainland and Okinawa, wherein Okinawa was considered to be less civilized than the rest of Japan. It should be noted that girls' education was expected to play an important role in filling such civilizational gaps between Okinawa and other prefectures. For example, in 1900, the Okinawan journalist and politician Ōta Chōfu (太田 朝敷) made an address at the opening ceremony of *Okinawa Kōtō Jogakkō* (Okinawa Girls' High School). In this address, Ōta emphasized the "fact" that Okinawa had weakened the degree of civilization of Japan, since Okinawa lagged behind in girls' education. He stressed the need for Okinawa to catch up with other Japanese prefectures, then made a statement: "Okinawa's urgent need today is to imitate other prefectures, in everything from A to Z. We must imitate even the way

they sneeze in other prefectures".[4] As Ōta's speech attests, education in Okinawa served as a tool to turn Okinawans into standard Japanese nationals beyond any cultural and civilizational gaps, and the vernacular culture and language of Okinawa were also rigorously standardized through the early years of the twentieth century.

Okinawa Shihan Gakkō Joshibu (the Female Division of Okinawa Normal School, hereinafter referred to as the Normal School) and *Okinawa Kenritsu Dai-ichi Kōto Jogakkō* (the Okinawa First Girls' High School, hereinafter referred to as the First High School) were the top elite schools for female students in Okinawa at the time. Normal Schools at the time were ranked higher than Girls' High Schools, and thus those who hoped to matriculate to Normal Schools first had to enter and finish 4-year program at Girls' High Schools. Normal Schools required 5 years (3-year preparatory course and 2-year regular course), while those who had graduated from Girls' High Schools were able to skip the 3-year preparatory course.[5] *Shihan Gakkō* (Normal Schools) provided training for teachers, and each prefecture had one Normal School in those days. Tsuji Chizuru (辻 千鶴), who graduated from *Tokyo Joshi Kōtō Shihan Gakkō* (Tokyo Girls' Normal School) in 1943, describes the system of Normal Schools as follows:

> In those days, the students of any Normal School were exempted from tuition, but in return, they were required to go into teaching for the first two years after their graduation. Also, the first year they had to go wherever the Ministry of Education appointed her or him. Usually, in the first year, they were appointed to a remote area or a rural backwater where ordinary female students would never want to go. However, it was an absolute must; there had been a case that one student's teaching license was confiscated because she refused to go to Sakhalin.[6]

---

[4] Chōfu Ōta,Teruo Hiyane, and Shin'ichi Isa, *Ōta Chōfu Senshū Chūkan* (Tokyo: Daiichi Shobō, 1995), 57-59, 513.

[5] Okinawaken Joshi Ichikōjo Dōsōkai, *Himeyuri heiwa kinen shiryōkan: Kōshiki gaido bukku = Himeyuri Heiwa Kinen Shiryōkan official guide book* (2004),12.

[6] Chizuru Tsuji, *Ibaruno ni shisu: dokyumento Okinawa : Himeyuri butai, Oyadomari Chiyo no rei ni sasagu* (Tokyo: Bunyōsha hatsubai,1980), 44-45.

As noted in the quote, the students of Normal Schools were exempted from tuition, and the Female Division of Okinawa Normal School was no exception. These two schools, the Normal School and the First High School, were built alongside each other, and most teachers had classes at both schools.[7] Around a quarter of the alumnae of the First High School went on to the Normal School.[8] These two top schools provided far more students for mobilization for the war than any other girls' high schools in Okinawa.

After the Asia-Pacific War broke out in 1941, education in Okinawa rapidly took on a militaristic tone. Expectations rose for female students, in particular senior students, to work as assistant nurses in order to support the Japanese Imperial Army. One survivor, who had belonged to a different female student corps than the HSC, later recalled what she was told by the principal at the beginning of March 1945, when the Battle of Okinawa was about to begin. The principal had stated:

> The time has come when even women should work for the nation. Don't even think about evacuation. It is your duty to protect your homeland and to nurse wounded soldiers. From now on, this will be a training camp for undergoing nursing training, just like soldiers do their training. You will consult with your family, and be sure to come back to school.[9]

Likewise, Miyagi Kikuko, one of the survivors of the HSC, recounted how the female students were told everyday in morning assembly:"Even girls may be awarded *Kun Hachito* (the Eighth Order of Merit) if they work hard in the battlefields, and if they work really hard and devote their lives, they will be enshrined at Yasukuni".[10] Yasukuni Shrine, originally named

---

[7] Okinawaken Joshi Ichikōjo Dōsōkai, *Himeyuri heiwa kinen shiryōkan: Kōshiki gaido bukku,* 9.

[8] Ibid., 12.

[9] *Okinawa-sen No Zenjoshi Gakutotai: Jisedai Ni Nokosu Mono Sore Wa Heiwa* (Naha-shi: Foresuto, 2006), 158-159.

[10] Nobumasa Tanaka, *Dokyumento Yasukuni Soshō: Senshisha No Kioku Wa Dare No Mono Ka* (Tokyo : Iwanami Shoten, 2007), 69-70.

Tokyo Shōkonsha, was established in Tokyo in 1869 in order to honor the souls of those who sacrificed their lives for the emperor, that is, mainly deceased soldiers from the Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895) and Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905). Being enshrined at Yasukuni meant supreme honor for the Okinawan female students, and they were encouraged to die rather than being held captive by the American forces in order to achieve this honor.

The American forces began their attack on the main island of Okinawa on March 23 1945. Both male and female students aged 13 to 19 years old were mobilized shortly before the attack to support the Japanese Imperial Army on the battlefields. Among them were 222 female students mobilized from the two girls' schools: 157 from the Female Division of Okinawa Normal School and 65 from the Okinawa First Girls' High School.[11] In addition, 18 teachers accompanied the mobilized students from the two schools to the battlefields.[12] These two elite schools provided far more students than other schools, most of which provided between 10 and 65.[13] On around May 25, the Japanese Imperial Army began a withdrawal to the southern part of the main island of Okinawa, where civilians had evacuated. The HSC accompanied the Army, but on June 18, they were suddenly relieved of duty by military order. This military order was tantamount to a death sentence for the HSC, since they were defenseless once they were out of the protection of the Japanese Imperial Army. Eventually, 123 out of the 222 students lost their lives in the battlefields, and they came to be called the

---

[11] *Okinawa-sen No Zenjoshi Gakutotai*, 314.

[12] Okinawaken Joshi Ichikōjo Dōsōkai, *Himeyuri Peace Museum Official GuidebookHimeyuri heiwa kinen shiryōkan: Kōshiki gaido bukku,* 4.

[13] *Okinawa-sen No Zenjoshi Gakutotai*, 314-315.

Himeyuri Student Corps after Japan's defeat.[14] The total death toll of the mobilized female and male students reached 1,998 in Okinawa.[15]

I will use the word "Himeyuri" in this thesis instead of other existing English translations. During wartime, the students of the two girls' schools were not addressed as "the Himeyuri Student Corps". This name became widely accepted when the first movie about the HSC was released in 1953. Until that time, they were also sometimes addressed as *Shira-yuri Butai* (The White Lilies Corps). There are several translations of the word "Himeyuri" in English, such as "the Wild Lily" or "the Red Star Lily". This is because the Japanese word "himeyuri" actually means "red star lily" in English. However, the Himeyuri Student Corps were not actually named after the red star lily flower. Rather, "himeyuri" was a coined term made by combining the names of the two girls' schools' magazines. When the locations of the First High School and the Normal School were moved to the same building site, their respective school magazines, "Oto-Hime" ("Sea Princess") and "Shira-Yuri" ("White Lily"), were also combined, becoming one school magazine named "Himeyuri".[16] In 1946, the bereaved family members of the HSC erected a small monument for commemoration of the HSC, and named it *Himeyuri no Tō* (The Tower of Himeyuri). The fact that they named the memorial as such also contributed to the misleading impression that they had already been collectively addressed as the Himeyuri Student Corps during wartime.

In terms of their military status, the HSC fell into a gray zone between "voluntary civilians" and "civilians employed by the military". From December 1944 to January 1945, there were several discussions between Okinawa Prefecture and the Japanese Imperial Army,

---

[14] Ibid., 85-86.

[15] Okinawaken Joshi Ichikōjo Dōsōkai, *Himeyuri Peace Museum Official GuidebookHimeyuri heiwa kinen shiryōkan: Kōshiki gaido bukku,* 5.

[16] Ibid.

and they reached the following two agreements: 1) In the event of the enemy landing on the mainland Okinawa, the lower-grade students of junior high schools would receive training in communications, and upper-grade female students would receive nursing training, and 2) they would be mobilized when Okinawa became a battlefield and all the residents of the prefecture are mobilized, and they would be treated either as military personnel or as civilians employed by the military.[17] By the terms of these agreements, before the Battle of Okinawa actually began, all the female students in Okinawa pursued practical nursing training courses. Once the battle began, however, the actual military status of the female students became confused and even chaotic, which led to some students to becoming "civilians employed by the military" while others remained "voluntary students".

The timing of the students' graduation contributed to this confusion. The American military attack began on March 23 1945, shortly before the senior students of the two elite schools graduated. They were immediately mobilized according to the second agreement between Okinawa Prefecture and the Japanese Imperial Army, and thus they had to hold a hasty ad hoc graduation ceremony on the battlefield on March 30. At this point, teachers, who had accompanied their students, had to make a decision about how to handle the status of students who were graduating from the Normal School and the First High School. This was because, in theory, alumnae were no longer students.[18]According to Nishihira Hideo (西平 英夫), one of the teachers at the Normal School, they eventually decided to convert the military status of the alumnae of the First High School to that of "civilians employed by the military", except for those whose admission to the Normal School had been accepted. Although there is no clear mention in Nishihira's memoir about why they reached this conclusion, it seems safe to

---

[17] Quoted in *Okinawa-sen No Zenjoshi Gakutotai*, 79.

[18] Hideo Nishihira, *Himeyuri No Tō: Gakuto Taichō No Shuki* (Tokyo: Yūzankaku, 1995), 59.

assume that those whose admission accepted by the Normal School were to remain students, while the other alumnae could not be considered students. The case of the alumnae of the Normal School was, however, more complicated, because, as we have already seen, it was mandatory for them to work as teachers after their graduation. Thus, in theory, it would not make sense to consider them students. The teachers decided to sustain their status as "students", however, because they considered the alumnae of the Normal School to be *kyōiku yōin* (educational staff).[19]

At the end of April 1945, as hostilities continued to escalate, the teachers had to think about regrouping their students, and then the question of whether the status of the "students" should be converted to that of "civilians employed by the military" reemerged. At this juncture, according to Nishihira, the female students themselves opposed the idea of converting their status to "civilians employed by the military", because they sensed a strong rivalry with professional nurses who had been working with them in a military hospital. The students thus distinguished their situation from that of these professional nurses who were working as civilians employed by the military, by affirming their status as students, that is, non-professionals whose contributions were not for recompense but were purely in the spirit of wholehearted support for the war effort.[20] The teachers displayed a variety of opinions on this question as well. According to Nishihira, some teachers opposed the idea of converting the students' status, because they wanted to protect their students. They worried that the Army might exert more authority over their students once their students' status became "civilians employed by the military".[21] As Chapter 3 demonstrates, while the accuracy of Nishihira's memoir may be

---

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid., 67-68.

[21] Ibid.

questioned, it is safe to say that the issue of the wartime status of the female students did not smoothly follow the guidelines agreed upon by Okinawa Prefecture and the Japanese Imperial Army. As a result, by default, responsibility for the decision fell onto the teachers. Teachers had to determine who would become civilians employed by the military, and who would remain voluntary civilians.

Postwar narratives on the HSC took advantage of the ambiguity of the wartime status of the HSC. They sometimes emphasized the victimhood of the HSC by depicting them as "civilians" who had been forced to go to the battlefields, and other times stressed their militaristic patriotism by portraying them as "civilians employed by the military". Little attention has been paid, however, to what lay behind the ambiguity of their wartime status. Needless to say, the Japanese Imperial Army's refusal to take responsibility for the safety of the student corps was to blame for the uncertainty surrounding their wartime status. As we have seen, the Japanese Imperial Army suddenly relieved the female students of their duty on June 18, gave up responsibility for protecting them from the enemy. The prominent historian Hayashi Hirofumi has pointed out that, until June 18, the number of the casualties of the HSC and their teachers was 19, which was only 14 percent of the eventual death toll of 136.[22] Hayashi has also stated that, if the Japanese Imperial Army had decided to hoist a white flag and a Red Cross flag at the entrance of the cave where both wounded soldiers and the HSC members took refuge, most of the casualties could have been prevented.[23] In sum, the Japanese Imperial Army did not take any measures to protect the HSC, and simply abandoned them as expendable. There is no question that the Japanese Imperial Army's disregard for human life played a crucial role in the massive losses suffered among the HSC.

---

[22] Hirofumi, Hayashi, *Okinawa-sen to Minshū* (Tokyo: Ōtsuki Shoten, 2001), 280.

[23] Ibid.

In addition, the Ministry of Education in Tokyo did not try to protect Okinawan teenage students from the hostilities, but rather encouraged and glorified the students' contribution to the Japanese Imperial Army. On May 20 1945, the HSC received a telegram from the Minister of Education, in which he expressed his gratitude for the fearless fighting spirit of the students and teachers.[24] On June 23, organized battles came to an end on the main island of Okinawa. On July 8, the Minister of Education again expressed his gratitude, with a special certificate of merit, by honoring the deeds of the Male and Female divisions of Okinawa Normal School and *Okinawa Kenritsu Daiichi Chūgakkō* (Okinawa First Junior High School).[25] The aim of the Ministry of Education was clear: at this point, it was thought that the American forces would soon attack the Japanese mainland by using Okinawa as a military base. In a statement released to explain the certificate of merit, the Minister of Education extolled the self-sacrifice of the Okinawan teenage students as a role model for mainland teenage students, and expressed high expectations that, in the upcoming decisive battle on the mainland, mainland students would contribute to and support the Japanese Imperial Army as much as the Okinawan students had done.[26] The Ministry of Education, instead of fulfilling their mission of protecting students, drove them into war and encouraged them to die for the nation.The irresponsible actions of these two institutions, the Army and the Ministry of Education, cost the Okinawan teenage students their lives.

---

[24] Nishihira, *Himeyuri No Tō,*78.

[25] Kazuhiko Kinjō, and Masao Ohara. *Minnami No Iwao No Hate Ni: Okinawa No Isho* (Tokyo: Kōbunsha, 1959),180-186.

[26] Ibid.

Methodology, Research, and Information Sources

The Himeyuri Student Corps and the Tower of Himeyuri have been mentioned in a wide range of social and historical studies both in Japan and the United States. Little attention has been paid, however, to the socio-political context that existed behind the HSC narratives between 1945 and 1953. Also, preceding studies have showed a tendency to focus exclusively on the films based on the HSC, while they have not paid as much attention to other media as they do to films. In contrast, this thesis focuses on a variety of forms including a memoir, a novel, a non-fiction work, a film, and a musical revue.

Moreover, this thesis aims to examine the historical context between 1945 and 1953 in which the HSC narratives were created, modified, and consumed in the triangle between Okinawa, the Japanese mainland, and the United States. I examine a wide spectrum of narrative forms in order to understand the ramifications of the HSC narratives during and beyond the Occupation era (1945-1952). In my analysis, I attribute greater importance to the primary information sources from that period, including government official documents, newspapers, magazines, film scripts, novels (first and later editions), revue scripts, press sheets, and publications that had limited circulation. This is not only because I need to compare and analyze three different forms of expression –literature, cinema and revue – but also because I would like to shed as much light as possible on the social, cultural, and political background of the complicated nature of political relations among Okinawa, the Japanese mainland, and the United States at that time. To this end, in 2012 and 2013, I conducted archival research in the United States, the Japanese mainland, and Okinawa.

In the United States, in August 2012, I pursued archival research at NARA (The United States National Archives and Records Administration) in Washington D.C. The primary purpose of this research was to deepen my understanding of how American cultural policy

and censorship functioned in Okinawa, and in particular to find out whether (and how) they had censored the HSC narratives between the 1940s and 1950s. Although I read through all the press releases and other related documents published by the CIE (Civil Information and Education Section) of USCAR (United States Civil Administration of the Ryūkyū Islands) from 1945 to 1953, I was not able to find any references to HSC narratives. As Chapter 4 shows, USCAR initially supported the plans for shooting a film depicting the HSC on location in Okinawa, but later they dramatically changed their policy towards shooting on location in Okinawa. Many details still remain to be clarified about USCAR's policy towards film shooting in the context of the HSC narratives.

In the Japanese mainland, I did archival research twice in Tokyo and Chiba in 2012 and 2013. It was at *Ichikawa-shi Bungaku Puraza* (Ichikawa Literature Museum) in Chiba that I discovered a second version of the screenplay for the HSC film, by the same scriptwriter. Subsequent investigations revealed that only one script was actually used for the 1953 movie, while the other one was abandoned simply because the plan to shoot the film was cancelled in 1950. Little is known about the planned yet unproduced 1950 movie about the HSC. This thesis is surely the first to consider modifications to the story occurring between these two screenplays. I also did research on old newspapers and magazines at Hōsei University Institute for Okinawan Studies, and at Ōya Sōichi Library in Tokyo. I conducted archival research in Kobe and Osaka, as well, primarily at Kobe University Library and Ikeda Bunko Library. Ikeda Bunko Library houses a collection of the scripts, magazines, brochures, and literature related to the Takarazuka Revue Company, which are not available at any other archive or library. Chapter 4 heavily relies on the discoveries I made at the above-mentioned archives and libraries.

In Okinawa, I pursued archival research in June 2013 at Okinawa Prefectural Library and at Okinawa Prefectural Archives. The research focused on the postwar activities of the bereaved families in Okinawa. The Okinawa War-Bereaved Association published several celebratory publications on milestone occasions, which are in limited circulation in Okinawa. In addition, both the library and the archives possess a variety of primary information sources, such as government official documents concerning the treatment of students killed in the war, and a recorded interview with a surviving teacher and one with a military officer. In addition, I discovered the women's magazine *Reijokai* at the library, and the first edition of the novel and non-fiction work depicting the HSC, which allowed for a comparative analysis of different editions in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3.

Overview

In each chapter, I focus on a different historical moment in narrativization of the HSC, focusing on the narratives' authors and forms of expression.

Chapter 1 focuses on the first narratives about the HSC appearing in the Japanese mainland after Japan's defeat, and I consider how (and how much) American censorship affected these narratives. The Battle of Okinawa was the biggest ground battle of the war, resulting in the death of more civilians than soldiers on Japanese territory. The Japanese mainlanders, however, initially knew very little about what had happened on Okinawa, and the narratives of the HSC thus began in a context of general ignorance. This chapter shows how narratives written by non-Okinawan war veterans created the image of the Battle of Okinawa and that of the HSC in the Japanese mainland.

Chapter 2 examines how Okinawan Christians contributed to a major shift in narratives of the HSC from 1948 to 1949. At this juncture, Okinawans themselves began narrating

the Battle of Okinawa with greater attention to civilian damage. In 1948, an Okinawan Christian minister challenged the credibility of a HSC narrative which had been dominant on the main island of Okinawa. This chapter clarifies what lay behind his motivation for modifying the dominant narrative of the HSC, and how his account of the HSC travelled to the Japanese mainland where it was later novelized, in serial form in a women's magazine. In this novel, pro-Christian messages played a crucial role, and attention also fell on the issue of teachers' wartime responsibility for having instilled militaristic ideas into their students. This chapter looks at how Okinawan counter-narratives against the soldier-centred perspectives also confronted the heavy constraints of American censorship, and how they managed to describe civilian damage by carefully avoiding any echoes of anti-American sentiment.

It took years for the surviving HSC members and teachers to break their silence about what had happened to them on the battlefields. Chapter 3 examines how the survivors constructed their experiences in non-fictional accounts. While these works prove valuable as firsthand accounts, they introduce other kinds of distortion and inaccuracy. This chapter seeks to determine how the surviving teachers argued back or ignored the controversy over teachers' wartime responsibility through their non-fictional accounts. Eventually, the issue of teachers' wartime responsibility was trivialized as personal gossip, and it never led to a larger discussion on the prewar education system on the whole. Chapter 3 not only shows how teachers evaded questions about their responsibility, but also considers how the issue of postwar governmental aid to war veterans and bereaved families contributed to the trivialization of teachers' wartime responsibility. Here, the wartime status of the HSC began to take on greater political importance in the context of Japan-Okinawa relationship, because it was directly related to whether the bereaved families of the female students were eligible for governmental aid.

The Occupation era ended on April 28 1952 in the Japanese mainland, and in 1953, the HSC narratives were adapted into a film and a revue. The film director and the screen-writer depicted the HSC as pure-minded victims who could not challenge military orders, and in response, the bereaved families of the HSC sharply criticized such narratives of victimization of the HSC, since they wanted to depict the HSC as patriotic martyrs who bravely and willingly sacrificed their lives for the nation. Chapter 4 first explores the ideological and political conflicts between the film creators and the bereaved families of the HSC. It then turns to an analysis of how the film was structured as an entertaining war film. Finally, this chapter compares the movie and the revue, focusing on the ways in which each of the creators of the movie and revue viewed his or her own wartime responsibility as a propagandist. Their different views of their own wartime responsibility created a noteworthy difference between the film and the revue. Chapter 4 thereby aims to clarify how the Himeyuri narratives were absorbed, digested and recreated as visual media after the Occupation era.

Chapter 5 shows the effects of the 1953 film in the Japanese mainland, the United States, and Okinawa. It then summarizes the arguments of each chapter, and draws conclusions as to how the narratives on the Himeyuri Student Corps functioned from 1945 to 1953 and beyond.

Chapter 1

The Memories of the Battle of Okinawa

In June 1951, Nakasone Seizen published *Okinawa no Higeki* (*The Tragedy of Okinawa*), a collective memoir of the Battle of Okinawa. This memoir consists of the personal recollective notes written by the survivors of the Himeyuri Student Corps. Nakasone was one of the teachers who accompanied the HSC during the Battle of Okinawa. After Japan lost the Asia-Pacific War, this tragic episode gradually came to be known by both Japanese mainlanders and Okinawans through a variety of narratives. In the eyes of Nakasone, however, such narratives tended to distort the tragic death of the HSC. In the Preface of his book, Nakasone writes:

> After the war, this tragedy was depicted in poems, novels, movies, theatrical plays and dance, inviting the tears of readers and audiences. The facts behind these narratives, however, have been distorted and mythified… I have a duty to present every single fact that these girls wished to record, without such distortion. This book is also my confession, considering the fact that I left deeply-wounded students behind in a cave.[27]

As Nakasone mentions above, the HSC was narrativized in a variety of ways after Japan's defeat. This is not to say that the HSC stood in the spotlight of Japanese mainland media from the beginning. The HSC was one of the aspects of the Battle of Okinawa, but not much attention was paid to the HSC until Imai Tadashi's film *Himeyuri no Tō* (*The Tower of Himeyuri*) was released in 1953. This chapter examines how, between 1945 and 1949, the focus shifted from the Battle of Okinawa to the HSC. After outlining the devastating damage of the Battle of Okinawa, a discussion will clarify the fuzzy way in which victims have been classified according to their wartime positions. In spite of suffering such heavy damage, Oki-

---

[27] Seizen Nakasone, *Okinawa no Higeki: Himeyuri no Tō wo Meguru Hitobito no Shuki*（Tokyo:Kachō Shobō, 1951), Preface.

nawa was literally forgotten by Japanese mainlanders in the late 1940s and 1950s. The first account of the Battle of Okinawa was written by Japanese soldiers from outside Okinawa, and this naturally spawned counter-narratives from Okinawans. Finally, this chapter points out how U.S. censorship actually influenced all the publications by both non-Okinawan and Okinawan writers. This chapter thus aims to organize information about how the historical background of the Battle of Okinawa was narrativized.

The Damage Caused by the Battle of Okinawa

It is not necessary for the purpose of this chapter to enter into a detailed discussion of the Battle of Okinawa. Nevertheless, it is crucially important to clarify the fuzziness of the definition of "war dead" in Okinawa, because that will clarify the fact that the seemingly neutral and unchangeable category of "war dead" has been shifting. Thus this section will mainly focus on the multiple definitions of how to classify the war casualties related to Okinawa. Okinawa Prefecture consists of several islands south of the Japanese mainland. What increased the importance of these islands during the Asia-Pacific War was their geographical location. The main island of Okinawa is within about 650 kilometers from the southern end of the Japanese mainland and Taiwan, and 700 kilometers from the Chinese mainland. As the historian Ichinose Toshiya (一ノ瀬 俊也) has argued, the Battle of Okinawa was important for the U.S. because Okinawa could potentially have been used as a base for an attack on the Japanese mainland. An attack on Okinawa could also be used to learn about Japanese fighting methods. For the Japanese, it was crucial either to win this local battle for the purposes of

making the terms of peace advantageous, or at least to keep American troops in Okinawa as long as possible, in order to delay an attack on the Japanese mainland.[28]

The Battle of Okinawa lasted from the end of March to the end of June, 1945. The incident that is commonly presumed to mark the end of the battle came on June 23 when Ushijima Mitsuru (牛島 満), a commander of the Japanese 32nd army in Okinawa, and Chō Isamu (長 勇), Ushijima's chief of staff, committed ritual suicide. Even after the commander's death, some local clashes continued until September 7 1945, when the terms of unconditional surrender were eventually signed in Okinawa. The Battle of Okinawa took a heavy toll on both sides, including local Okinawan victims of so-called "group suicide", who were actually forced, by the Japanese Imperial Army, to kill themselves. Even today, the estimated number of casualties related to Okinawa has been gradually increasing, not only because the number of casualties was so large, but also because most of the official records were lost during the hostilities. According to one study that the Himeyuri Peace Museum refers to in its official guide book, the total number of casualties of the Battle of Okinawa reached 200,656, consisting of 188,136 on the Japanese side, and 12,520 on the side of the U.S. Out of the total number of Japanese war dead in the Battle of Okinawa, 65,908 were presumed to be soldiers from outside Okinawa, and 122,228 were local Okinawans. This estimate classified the deceased local Okinawans into three categories according to their wartime statuses: 1. *gunjin* (soldiers) and *gunzoku* (civilians employed by the military); 2. *sentō sankasha* (voluntary participants in the battle who were not employed by the military); and 3. *ippan jūmin* (civilians).[29] (See Figure 1.1.).

---

[28] Toshiya Ichinose, *Nihongun to Nihonhei Beigun Hōkokusyo wa Kataru* (Tokyo:Kōdansha,2014), iBooks e-book.

[29] Okinawaken Joshi Ichikōjo Dōsōkai, *Himeyuri heiwa kinen shiryōkan: Kōshiki gaido bukku,*141.

Figure 1.1. The Presumed Number of Casualties in the Battle of Okinawa

Casualties	Number
American casualties	12,520
Japanese casualties from outside Okinawa	65,908
Local Okinawan casualties	122,228 1. soldiers and civilians employed by the military : 28,228 2. voluntary participants in the battle [not employed by the military]: 57,044 3. civilians: 36,956
Total	200,656

The Battle of Okinawa was the only ground battle on Japanese territory which claimed more civilian lives than soldiers'.[30] It is said that one out of four or five Okinawans were killed in that battle.[31] The Imperial Japanese Headquarters intended to use Okinawa as a sacrifice to delay attacks on the Japanese mainland, and the protection of local civilians was not a high priority for the Japanese Imperial Army and Navy dispatched to Okinawa. After the end of May, the Japanese Imperial Army changed its basic protection policy, withdrawing to the southern part of the island. As a result, a lot of civilians became entangled in the hostilities. For U.S. side, Okinawa was also one of the biggest battles of the War in the Pacific. The number of U.S. casualties in Okinawa reached more than 12,000, which was nearly one

[30] The Battle of Okinawa was not the only ground battle which took place on Japanese territory in the Asia-Pacific war. Strictly speaking, there were other areas in which ground battles took place, such as the Battle of Iwo Jima (February 19-March 26 1945) or the Battle of Shumshu (August 18-August 23 1945). The former battle was between the United States and Japan, and the latter was between Japan and the USSR. Nevertheless, the Battle of Okinawa tends to be considered as the ONLY ground battle fought on the Japanese islands. In 2010, the Japanese government adopted at a Cabinet meeting a redefinition of the Battle of Okinawa, in which it turned "the only ground battle" into "the biggest ground battle". See "Okinawa Chijōsen Kokunai Yuiitsu→Kokunai Saidai Seifu ga Kakugi Kettei", *Ryūkyū Shinminpō* (May 22, 2010) http://ryukyushimpo.jp/news/storyid-162452-storytopic-3.html (accessed February 4, 2014).

[31] According to the website of the Okinawa Prefectural Peace Memorial Museum, the presumed population of Okinawa in 1944 was 590,480. See "Okinawa-sen Q&A Q 3 : Okinawa-sen Tōji, Okinawa no Jinko wa Doreguraidattanoka?", *Okinawa Prefectural Government* (Okinawa Prefecture, n.d.) http://www.peace-museum.pref.okinawa.jp/heiwagakusyu/kyozai/qa/q3.html (accessed February 4, 2014).

tenth of all of American casualties in the Pacific arena. Interestingly, the Okinawa Prefectural Peace Memorial Museum adopts a different style of defining the casualties related to Okinawa. The Cornerstone of Peace memorial, which is built on the site of the Okinawa Prefectural Peace Memorial Museum, inscribes "all the names of the people who have died during the Battle of Okinawa", and as of June 2013 the total number of names had reached 241,127.[32] (See Figure 1.2.).

Figure.1.2. The Number of Names Inscribed on the Cornerstone of Peace (as of June, 2013)

Place of Origin		**Number**
Japan	Okinawa	149,291
	Other prefectures	77,364
Foreign countries	U.S.A	14,009
	U.K.	82
	Taiwan	34
	North Korea	82
	Republic of Korea	365
Total		241,227

The Himeyuri Peace Museum and the Okinawa Prefectural Peace Memorial Museum were both built in Itoman City, Okinawa, where the final phase of the Battle of Okinawa took place. They are located only 3.4 kilometers away from each other. Despite their geographical closeness, their definitions of the war dead related to Okinawa differ significantly. First of all, the Cornerstone of Peace does not classify Okinawan casualties based on their wartime sta-

[32] "Number of names Inscribed." *Okinawa Prefectural Government* (Okinawa Prefecture, n.d.) http://www.pref.okinawa.jp/site/kankyo/heiwadanjo/heiwa/7812.html (accessed February 4, 2014).

tuses. Instead, it broadens the definition of wartime casualties by adding the following five qualifications to the frameworks of "Okinawan Casualties" and "Casualties Originally from Other Prefectures or Other Countries".[33] (See Figure 1.3.).[34]

Figure 1.3. Names to be Inscribed on the Cornerstone of Peace
1. Okinawan people who died inside or outside the prefecture as a result of the 15 years conflict beginning with the Manchurian Incident
2. Okinawan people who died inside or outside the prefecture within the year following September 7th, 1945 (however the names of Okinawan people who died of the atomic bombs radiation in the following year are inscribed notwithstanding the period stated above)
3. People who died of war-related cause in the operations of the Battle of Okinawa in Japan's southwestern island area between March 22, 1944 and March 25, 1945, which was the period when Japan's 32nd Army was deployed in Okinawa
4. People who died of war-related cause in operations of the Battle of Okinawa between March 26, 1945 and September 7th 1945 in the southwestern islands area, excluding Okinawa
5. People who died of war-related cause in the year following September 7th, 1945 in OKinawa (sic) Prefecture.

The issue of civilian casualties in times of war has been open to redefinition both in the postwar societies of Okinawa and the Japanese mainland. It is also worth noting that on July 8 1945, right after the defeat of Okinawa was reported in the Japanese mainland, the Ministry of Education gave Okinawa Normal School and Okinawa First Junior High School a certificate of commendation that emphasized that both Japanese soldiers and Okinawan civilians, including male and female student corps, were united in the fight against the United States.[35] This issue is important, because postwar reparation is directly related to how civilian casualties and military casualties in Okinawa are differentiated.

---

[33] "Number of names Inscribed", *Okinawa Prefectural Government* (Okinawa Prefecture, n.d.) http://www.pref.okinawa.lg.jp/site/kankyo/heiwadanjo/heiwa/7797.html (accessed January 28, 2014).

[34] This chart is taken directly from the Okinawa Prefectural Peace Memorial Museum.

[35] Kinjō and Ohara, *Minnami no Iwao no Hate ni,* 181.

The HSC, which consisted of female high school students under the age of 20, took on special importance in this context. From the late 1940s to the 1950s, the tragic death of innocent girls was an effective way to disseminate information about the overwhelming destruction of Okinawa. Although the number of casualties in Okinawa reached such a large number, Japanese mainlanders tended to underestimate the seriousness of the war damage of Okinawa. Immediately after Japan's defeat, the image of postwar Okinawa for Japanese mainlanders was rather like a penal colony, because Okinawa was under the control of the United States.

The prominent postwar intellectual Tsurumi Shunsuke (鶴見 俊輔) has noted that in Kokura, Kyūshū (one of the main four islands of Japan), there was a rumour that Japanese people would be expelled to Okinawa and enslaved if they injured American soldiers.[36] Mori Iwao (森 岩雄), who was vice-president of Tōhō Film Company (Tokyo) at the time, also mentioned in his memoir that if the General Headquarters of the Allied Forces (GHQ) considered anyone to be problematic, he or she would have to do forced labour in Okinawa.[37] It is unclear whether the United States actually used Okinawa as a penal colony for the Japanese mainlanders, or if so, how many Japanese mainlanders were actually dispatched there. What matters here is that Okinawa was a forgotten island for Japanese mainlanders, despite the devastating damage. On August 26 1951, *Sandee Mainichi*, a weekly entertainment magazine, carried an article named "'Sengoha' Sōkessan." ("'The Postwar Generation'"As a Whole") The aim of this article was to review what had happened in the Japanese mainland during the Occupation from 1945 to 1951, since Japan would soon again become independent

---

[36] Shunsuke Tsurumi, *Atrashii Kaikoku* (Chikuma Shoboo, 2000), 386.

[37] Iwao Mori, *Watashi no Geikai Henreki*. (Tokyo: Seiabo, 1975),175.

under the San Francisco Peace Conference in September of that year. According to the article, it is not sour grapes for Japanese people to prefer the expression of *shūsen* (the end of the war) to *haisen* (the defeat in the war). The article then continues:

> First of all, the war ended before any ground battle was fought on Japanese territory. This is completely different from how Germany and Italy were defeated in the war. Our territory has never been overrun by any enemy forces, which has given us a completely different perspective about the end of the war from those of the Italian and German people.[38]

This understanding of the war, needless to say, totally omits the Battle of Okinawa. *Sandee Mainichi* was a popular magazine, and the article had multiple authors (Oōya Sōichi (大宅 壮一), Minami Hiroshi (南 博), and Mochizuki Mamoru (望月 衛), each of whom was either a university professor or an established journalist. In the aftermath of the article's publication, Oyadomari Seihaku (親泊 政博), the Okinawan publisher of *Okinawa Shinminpō*, a local newspaper targeted at Okinawans living in Kyūshū, acutely criticized the authors for their arrogance and their lack of knowledge. Here, it is important to notice that *Sandee Mainichi* ran this article just one month before the San Francisco Peace Conference was held in September 1951. For Okinawans, August 1951 was a time when they were frustrated about the foggy future of Okinawa, because whether Okinawa was able to return to Japan or remained under the control of the U.S depended on the San Francisco Peace Treaty. This explains why Oyadomari acutely criticized the authors of the article.[39] The views expressed in this article should not be reduced to the erroneous historical perception of these three intellectuals. Rather, it is more appropriate to think that the weakness of their interest in Okinawa was widely shared by contemporary Japanese mainlanders at the time. As we shall see later,

---

[38] Soichi Oōya, Hiroshi Minami, and Mamoru Mochizuki, "'*Sengoha' Sōkessan*", *Sandee Mainichi*, August 26, 1951, 5.

[39] Seihaku Oyadomari, "Okinawa o Wasureta Oōya Soichi ni Teisu", *Okinawa Shinminpō*, September 5, 1951.

even Nakano Yoshio (中野 好夫), the Japanese intellectual who was a fervent activist supporting Okinawa's reversion movement to Japanese administration, also mentioned in an open lecture held in Okinawa in 1968 that he had not heard anything about Okinawa until the middle of the 1950s. Nakano mentions:

> Frankly speaking, I am really sorry to tell you this, but I should admit that I forgot about or had little interest in Okinawa for the first ten years after the defeat of Japan, too. (…) Until the middle of the 1950s, however, there was little, if any, newspaper coverage of Okinawa in the Japanese mainland. The traffic between Japan and Okinawa was severely limited, and of course there were no mainland newspaper correspondents in Okinawa. We didn't know anything, especially about you people's lives in Okinawa Prefecture.[40]

One reason for such a low interest in Okinawa in general might have been the fact that the Japanese mainland were also severely damaged by U.S. air raids that lasted until the very end of the war in 1945. According to one study, the total number of civilian victims by air raids in the Japanese mainland reached around 509,700.[41] For the survivors in the Japanese mainland, it would have been difficult, if not impossible, to imagine the uniqueness of the Battle of Okinawa, in which soldiers and civilians were totally mixed up in the hostilities. After the defeat of Japan, the narratives surrounding the Battle of Okinawa began gradually because of this total lack of information about Okinawa.

Narratives of Former Soldiers

After Japan's defeat, veterans of the war gradually began publishing their experiences as non-fiction reading. Understandably, their descriptions tended to focus exclusively on battle action, while ignoring the damages inflicted upon local people and civilians. Okinawa was

---

[40] Yoshio Nakano, *Okinawa to Watashi* (Tokyo: Jiji Tsushinsya, 1972), 223-224.

[41] "Irei-tō Gaiyō", *Taiheiyo-Senso Zenkoku Kūbaku-Giseisha Irei Kyōkai*, (n.d.) http://www.taiheiyou-ireiky-oukai.jp/ireitou.htm (accessed February 4, 2014).

no exception. The first major account of the Battle of Okinawa was written by Furukawa Shigemi (古川 成美), who was a history major at Hiroshima Bunrika University before he was drafted and dispatched to Okinawa. He published *Okinawa no Saigo* (*The End of Okinawa*), written from a first-person perspective, and *Shisei no Mon: Okinawa-sen Hiroku* (*The Gate of Death and Birth: The Untold Stories of the Battle of Okinawa*), written from a third-person perspective, in 1947 and 1949 respectively. Furukawa was released from a POW camp in Okinawa in 1946, and then soon went to the Ministry of Health in Tokyo , in order to report the names of the soldiers he knew of who survived or were killed during the Battle of Okinawa. In a 1973 newspaper interview, Furukawa stated that what triggered him to publish his first book was a flood of letters he received from the families of dead soldiers asking how and where they died in Okinawa. Some of them actually came to Furukawa to ask him many questions directly, such as "Where did my son get shot?"or "You must have met my son somewhere". According to Furukawa, for most of those who did not actually experience the Battle of Okinawa, "the image of the Battle of Okinawa was a conventional type of battle like that fought in mainland China", and thus "they could not understand how tens and hundreds of soldiers were blown away together with the rocks of mountains in the Battle of Okinawa… the Battle of Okinawa was like a big volcanic eruption". For Furukawa, the prime reason for publishing his first book was to "at least let the families of the dead of the Battle of Okinawa know about the situations in which their sons and husbands fought and how they felt when they met their ends".[42]

---

[42] Shigemi Furukawa, "Waga Okinawa, Sono Genten to Purosesu-Shuzai Nōto o Chūshin ni- (59)", *Ryūkyū Shinpō*, October 26, 1973.

As a soldier from outside Okinawa, Furukawa's books lacked the perspectives of local Okinawan civilians who, whether by choice or not, were entangled in the hostilities. As a result, out of 214 pages in *Okinawa no Saigo* there were only a few pages describing Okinawan civilians, such as page 162, where Furukawa concisely mentioned that Okinawan civilians went through harsher experiences than soldiers. However, Furukawa did not devote much space to the details of these "harsher experiences". Furthermore, Furukawa wrote *Shisei no Mon*, his second book, based mainly on the information he had received from Yahara Hiromichi (八原 博通), the senior staff officer in charge of operations of the 32nd Japanese Imperial Army in the Battle of Okinawa, which resulted in his descriptions being even more focused on militaristic strategies.[43] This naturally led to a feeling of dissatisfaction among contemporary Okinawan readers. The following citation from the *Okinawa Shinminpō* newspaper aptly shows the context in which Okinawans felt the need to describe their own histories themselves:

> It has been said that *Okinawa-sen Hiroku,*written by Furukawa Shigemi, a professor at Hiroshima Bunrika University, is nothing more than a record of the militaristic defeat. It mentions little about the harsh realities of Okinawa and the Okinawan people, little about how the Battle of Okinawa inflicted pain on them, and little about how Okinawan cultural properties were burnt to the ground. As long as many people keep their memories about the war clear, the newspaper *Okinawa Taimusu* will compile "The Record of the Battle of Okinawa" with help from the Okinawan people.[44]

In 1982, the Okinawan literary scholar Nakahodo Masanori (仲程 昌徳) classified the war chronicles of Okinawa into four categories according to their time of publication. According to Nakahodo, the first category ranges from the 1945 defeat to 1949, when the Battle of Okinawa was described through the perspectives of soldiers from outside Okinawa. The

---

[43] Shigemi Furukawa, "Waga Okinawa, Sono Genten to Purosesu-Shuzai Nōto o Chūshin ni- (60)", *Ryūkyū Shinpō,* October 27, 1973.

[44] "Hai no Naka kara: Okinawa Senki wo Shuppan", *Okinawa Shinminpō,* July 5, 1951.

second category ranges from 1950 to the early half of the 1960s when the Okinawan survivors of the battle began publishing their own experiences. The third category falls from the latter half of the 1960s to the beginning of the 1970s, and the fourth from the beginning of the 1970s until 1982, when non-combatant Okinawans' wartime experiences were collected and recorded.[45] Furukawa's descriptions of the Battle of Okinawa fit well into Nakahodo's first category of the war chronicles of Okinawa. The year 1949 also witnessed the publication of another first-hand perspective of POW life in Okinawa, *Okinawa Furyoki* (*Japanese POW's Diary in Okinawa*), written by Miyanaga Tsugio (宮永 次雄). As a soldier from outside Okinawa, Miyanaga was held in a POW camp in Okinawa for eleven months. It should be noted that unlike Furukawa's books, Miyanaga's *Okinawa Furyoki* refers to the HSC, although the way Miyanaga wrote about the HSC was rather different from other episodes he mentioned in *Okinawa Furyoki*. Except for the chapter entitled "Himeyuri no Tō" ("The Tower of Himeyuri"), *Okinawa Furyoki* consists of Miyanaga's experiences as a POW in Okinawa. However, the episode of "Himeyuri no Tō" begins with a short explanation of how this episode was handwritten and read among Japanese POWs in the camps. Miyanaga later discovered that the real author of the story was another Japanese soldier named Mikame Tatsuji (三瓶 達司).

Mikame's 15-page description of the HSC, which he presented as factual, is characteristic of his nationalistic and self-sacrificing depiction of the female students. It also clearly outlines the contrast between Okinawan civilians and the female students according to their wartime attitudes towards Japanese soldiers. While Okinawan civilians were depicted as so irrational and egoistic that they "nourished an unreasonable feeling of hatred towards defeat-

---

[45] Masanori Nakahodo, *Okinawa no Senki* (Tokyo :Asahi Shinbun Shuppan, 1982), 12.

ed Japanese troops",[46] the female students were portrayed as rational and unselfish, devoting themselves to nursing wounded Japanese soldiers. In the climax of the story, Japanese soldiers decide to carry out a suicide attack, and some of the girls implore the soldiers to allow them to join. The story then explicitly glorifies the girls who joined the suicide attackers, by calling their tears "the most beautiful tears in the world", and then it even mentions that the girls (not the soldiers) told those who stayed behind that they would die honorably. As the situation in Okinawa became even more desperate, two sisters named Nobuko and Sadako, who were "at the centre of the popularity among the girls because of their exceptional beauty and liveliness", suddenly changed out of their filthy clothes into brand-new school uniforms, which were described as "the very symbol of the girls' purity and the last hope of their cleanliness". After they dressed, these sisters made up each other's faces. The other students naturally thought that the sisters had made themselves up in preparation to surrender to the enemy. It turned out, however, that Nobuko and Sadako killed themselves, and the other students were deeply moved by their deaths. The short story ends with a brief description of how the island people named the hiding cave "The Tower of Himeyuri", praying for the repose of their beautiful souls.[47]

Miyanaga noticed that Mikame's narrative of the HSC was based on hearsay, and even worse it contained many typographical errors and omissions, since it was transcribed and circulated by hand in POW camps in Okinawa. Nevertheless, Miyanaga decided to include Mikame's short story, thinking that this story also nicely described an aspect of POW

---

[46] Tsugio Miyanaga *Okinawa Furyoki* (Tokyo :Yūkeisha, 1949), 212.

[47] Ibid., 220-225.

life in Okinawa.[48] Mikame mentioned in a later interview that he had heard in the camp about Kinjō Washin. Kinjō had lost his own daughters Nobuko and Sadako as members of the HSC, and thus he built the cenotaph for the HSC in 1946. This inspired Mikame to write a story about the HSC, based on scant information.[49] It is uncertain whether Nobuko and Sadako actually committed suicide as described in Mikame's story. Here, it is important to note that the very first version of the narratives of the HSC obviously depicted the female students as patriotic martyrs.

Furukawa and Miyanaga both wrote their books through the perspective of war veterans, and their target audience was former soldiers and the family members of deceased soldiers. Although their descriptions were full of the vivid atmosphere of actual battle scenes and daily life in the POW camps (both of which could not have been written by anyone but former combatants) this did not mean that their descriptions were always true or correct. Apart from their erroneous descriptions based simply on their own misinterpretations or misconceptions of the facts, there existed two other non-negligible factors that influenced the nature of book: the American occupation and resulting censorship in both Okinawa and the Japanese mainland.

The Influences of American Censorship and Japanese Self-Censorship

According to Furukawa Shigemi, a reply from his publisher outlined two difficulties in publishing a book about the Battle of Okinawa: one was "a catastrophic lack of paper", and the other was "the likelihood of being banned by GHQ censorship". Even after the pub-

---

[48] Miyanaga, *Okinawa Furyoki,* 211.

[49] Teruya, Kenkichi. "Himeyuri no Tō", *Ryūkyū Shinpō*, August 18, 2009 http://ryukyushimpo.jp/news/storyid-148632-storytopic-64.html (accessed February 25, 2014).

lisher gained permission to publish, Furukawa's first draft was heavily censored by GHQ because his descriptions were replete with "animosity against America". Furukawa was forced to make a tough decision about revising his original draft. In the end, he deleted some scenes that had been considered "too disastrous", and he also revised his descriptions about American soldiers he had met in the POW camps, refraining from "writing that their academic abilities were low, that they did not read and write correctly, and that they did not even understand simple multiplication".[50]

Censorship under the Occupation led to grandiose adulations of American soldiers in Furukawa's book. Furukawa was able to speak English and therefore he seems to have had an amicable and close relationship with American soldiers in the camp. The first "positive" encounter with American soldiers he relates was with U.S. medical staff treating injured Japanese soldiers. The American soldiers' sincere attitude towards their enemies deeply impressed Furukawa, because they "were not only willing to take care of Japanese soldiers, but they even cleaned up the smelly and filthy residue, which Japanese would definitely be unwilling to do." Furukawa explains why the American soldiers were so kind to their former enemies: "It's love. Only love made it possible for them to take care of the Japanese soldiers this warm-heartedly. I cannot imagine how much Japanese would have complained if they had been in a similar situation. Their gracious faces and sympathetic gazes actually saved my life".[51] Here, it is noteworthy that Furukawa's praise of the Americans always goes in tandem with a portrayal of Japanese national inferiority. Furukawa explains the turnabout of Japanese soldiers in POW camps by emphasizing the smiles of American soldiers. According to Fu-

---

[50] Furukawa, "Waga Okinawa, Sono Genten to Purosesu-Shuzai Noto wo Chushin ni- (59)".

[51] Shigemi Furukawa, *Okinawa no Saigo* (Tokyo :Chuosha, 1949), 156.

rukawa, the American soldiers "are saturated with humanity" and they "treat us as equals without showing any sign of racial discrimination, victors' arrogance, or contempt for losers". Furukawa even mentions that nothing was more instructive than their smiles, which showed the Japanese soldiers the difference between being feudalistic and being democratic.[52]

In other words, Furukawa's description about the generous humanity of the Americans and their relative superiority fit perfectly into the ongoing process of American democratization of postwar Japanese society. It is not surprising that Furukawa's books were exported overseas in 1948 and 1949, with the permission of GHQ. Furukawa's observations regarding what he described as the low intellectual capacity of the same American soldiers he praised were eliminated from the published books. Furthermore, the books glorify the superiority of American humanity and democracy over Japanese feudalism as preferable for the development and democratization of occupied Japan.

A similarity can be found in Mikame's description of the HSC in *Okinawa Furyoki*. Although it consistently depicted the HSC as patriotic martyrs, it also avoided specifying who the opponent troops were. Throughout the 15-page story, the American troops were simply addressed either as *teki* (enemy) or *teki gun* (enemy troops) twelve times, while the word *bei-jin* (American people) appeared only once in the final scene of the story, as follows: "One year after the end of the battle, American jeeps and trucks now hurtle down Itoman Road in clouds of dust characteristic of Okinawa". "The light of new construction and integration shine there".[53] Here it is safe to assume that Miyanaga's *Okinawa Furyoki* was also under the

---

[52] Ibid., 202.

[53] Miyanaga, *Okinawa Furyoki*, 225.

constraints of American censorship, since it not only inconspicuously obscured the nationality of the enemy but also specified the United States only by connecting it with a positive image of "the light of the new construction and integration".

Whether in Okinawa or on the Japanese mainland, the obstacle of American censorship loomed large, and its shadow is evident even in the works of writers who challenged the Japanese soldier-centred perspectives. In 1950, the Okinawan newspaper the *Okinawa Taimusu* published *Tetsu no Bōfū* (*The Typhoon of Steel*), which aimed to counter the narratives by non-Okinawan veterans like Furukawa, by focusing on the local damage to Okinawan civilians. The introduction of *The Typhoon of Steel* proudly proclaimed that the aim of the book was not to understand military strategy. Rather it focused on Okinawan civilians, especially on their suffering and the war damages, about which it was claimed that no previous war chronicles had recorded. *The Typhoon of Steel* clearly aimed to counteract the soldier-centred narratives of the Battle of Okinawa, namely Furukawa's works. Nevertheless, just as Furukawa had done, the Introduction of *Tetsu no Bōfū* praised the United States as follows:

> After all these calamities, it should be noted that there is one thing we Okinawans will probably never forget until the end of our lives that is the high humanism of American troops. Thanks to their love for all mankind that goes far beyond national and ethnic borders, Okinawan survivors could take the initial steps for rehabilitation under their vital protection and every possible assistance. This is particularly worth noting.[54]

This admiration for American humanism was completely deleted from the Introduction in later revised editions of *The Typhoon of Steel.* Makiminato Tokuzo (牧港 篤三), one of the authors of *The Typhoon of Steel,* later mentioned: "We had an obsession that the U.S.

---

[54] The Okinawa Taimusu, eds., *Tetsu no Bōfū* (Tokyo: Asahi Shinbun, 1950), 3-4.

would not be happy if we wrote about American officials as they really were".[55] For the same reason, they also circumvented writing about the atrocities of the Japanese Imperial Army. They knew that one particular Japanese military officer treated a captured American officer in a highly inappropriate way. Although this American officer suffered from burns all over his body, he was provided with only leftovers to eat, and after American air raids began he was roped to a tree as a target. Eventually he was decapitated.[56] The admiration for American humanism in the Introduction of *The Typhoon of Steel* should be understood in this context. Although *The Typhoon of Steel* clearly challenges soldier-centred views of the Battle of Okinawa, it also faced the same American censorship that Furukawa had faced, and it had to contrast American humanism and inferior Japanese feudalism. Furthermore, despite the firm commitment to detailed descriptions of local damage in Okinawa, the authors of *Tetsu no Bōfū* nonetheless contributed to the creation of invisible war victims. Makiminato also mentions:

> I still regret that I could not fully write about people from the Korean Peninsula. There were Korean ladies (the special type of women who were recruited and forced to serve for Japanese military) who were not provided caves to hide from air raids, crying out "Aigo"[Oh my god!] .There were also Korean men who were recruited. They were not even provided swords, but only field caps. They were forced to work hard, and eventually abandoned.[57]

As I have mentioned, the primary purpose of *The Typhoon of Steel* was to make visible Okinawan war victims that had been ignored through soldier-centred viewpoints. While it succeeded in shedding light on the untold realities of local war damage, it also contributed to the marginalization of Korean victims who were forced to work in Okinawa during the war.

---

[55] The Okinawa Taimusu. eds., *Okinawa no Shōgen: Gekidō no Nijū-gonen-shi* (Naha: Okinawa Taimusu, 1971), 307.

[56] Ibid., 304.

[57] Ibid., 307.

The scant attention paid to the experiences of Koreans in Makiminato's account, while acknowledging the exploitation and oppression of Koreans in this context, nonetheless maintains the marginalization of Korean victims. The narratives of the Battle of Okinawa were a product of a complicated situation that involved Okinawa, the Japanese mainland, the Korean Peninsula, and the United States. Especially during the Occupation era, from 1945 to 1952, anybody who wrote about the Battle of Okinawa more or less self-censored their descriptions about American army in order to avoid being considered anti-American. In this complicated web of power, Korean victims were almost completely ignored.

Here it is important to highlight the fact that some Okinawan civilians actually considered America army to be liberators. The journalist and scholar Yoshida Kensei (吉田 健正) conducted a wide range of interviews with former American soldiers who had fought in the Battle of Okinawa. According to Yoshida, positive Okinawan views toward the U.S. were rooted in their negative views towards the Japanese Imperial Army. Yoshida writes:

> Interestingly, local civilians and former American soldiers have a lot in common regarding their memories of the Japanese Imperial Army and its soldiers. This is not simply because the local civilians have accepted history through the eyes of the victors. Even in the context of war, the Japanese Imperial Army was incredibly inhumane through the eyes of both local civilians and American soldiers. Of course, this also does not simply mean that every single U.S. soldier was humane. As we have seen, some of the U.S.'s actions were equivalent to war crimes, such as indiscriminate air raids on Naha city, the blockade of the caves where local civilians were hiding (trapping them inside to die), the slaughter of captives, and the killing of local civilians. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that many local civilians accepted the Americans as rescuers or liberators. The memories of Okinawan civilians and former American soldiers do not conflict with each other on that point.[58]

In this sense, it might be wrong to reduce the praise depicted in postwar records of the Battle of Okinawa to mere propaganda. Nevertheless, it is true that both in the Occupied Japanese mainland and in Okinawa, there were tight restrictions on the publication of books

---

[58] Kensei Yoshida, *Okinawa-sen Bei-hei wa Nani wo Mitaka* (Tokyo:Sairyusha, 1996), 230-231.

depicting American soldiers in and after the Asia-Pacific War. American censorship was often arbitrary, thus the authors constantly had to question the limits of what they could write about. Apart from the confrontation between soldier-centred viewpoints and civilian-centred viewpoints, this is another important factor that affected narratives of the war.

In order to understand what was considered to be anti-American in Okinawa immediately after the end of the war, it is worthwhile to explore the background of the erection of the cenotaphs. As I stated at the beginning of this chapter, Kinjō Washin, who lost two of his daughters as members of the HSC, built a cenotaph for the lost souls of the HSC in April 1946. He erected a total of three cenotaphs that year. The Tower of Himeyuri was the second cenotaph that Kinjō erected. The first cenotaph was *Konpaku no Tō* (The Tower of Souls), and after the Tower of Himeyuri he also erected a third cenotaph *Kenji no Tō* (The Tower of Stalwart Youth). Interestingly, this act of commemoration was considered to be anti-American and was initially prohibited. On January 23, 1946 the U.S. army appointed Kinjō as president of Mawashi village, which was then located in Mabuni, the south part of the main island of Okinawa where the final phase of the Battle of Okinawa took place.[59] Kinjō Fumi (金城 ふみ), the wife of Kinjō Washin, later recalled that even though the roads were littered with dead bodies, the Americans prohibited local people from collecting bodies and commemorating their dead.[60] When Kinjō Washin petitioned the U.S. for permission to collect the bodies, he purposely contacted a Japanese-American soldier who had been born and raised in Hawaii and thus able to speak Japanese. In trying to persuade this Japanese-American soldier, Kinjō emphasized that both Japanese people and Americans had in common a deep respect

---

[59] Jyunkoku Okinawa Gakuto Kenshou Kai. eds., *Okinawa no Senka wo Seo-ite Kinjō Washin no Shōgai* (Okinawa: Kinjō Washin Sensei Itoku Kensho Kai, 1982), 37.

[60] Kazuhiko Kinjō, *Ai to Senketsu no Kiroku: Okinawa Gakuto-tai no Saigo* (Tokyo : Zenbo-sha, 1966), 347.

for ancestors and the dead. In this context, he continued, since the dead bodies were already equal to "gods", irrespective of their former nationalities, it was the sincere hope of those who survived that they may collect these bodies to gather their souls in one place. His efforts paid off, and eventually the U.S. gave him permission,"only with the purpose of collecting the bodies".[61]According to Kinjō Fumi, even though the U.S. permitted local people to collect their dead at this point, "the U.S. army would never allow us to commemorate their souls, and everybody was afraid of even the mention of commemoration". Kinjō succeeded in erecting the three cenotaphs under such adverse circumstances, and somehow he even commemorated these lost souls with a help of a Buddhist monk named Tabaru Tadanobu (田原 唯信), chief priest of Shinkyōji temple (真教寺) in Okinawa.[62] This Buddhist-oriented way of commemoration would later create another motivation to narrativize the HSC from a different perspective, which we will explore in the next chapter.

The U.S army's prohibition of commemoration of the war dead in Okinawa should be understood in the context of the separation of state and religion. As early as December 15 1945, GHQ gave the so-called "Shinto Directive" with the aim of the "abolition of governmental sponsorship, support, perpetuation, control, and dissemination of State Shinto".[63] This directive was a response to an understanding of the ways in which the Japanese government had historically employed Shinto for the purposes of deifying the Emperor and glorifying the deaths of Japanese soldiers. According to State Shinto, every single soldier and civilian employed by the military who lost his or her life for the nation should be enshrined and hon-

---

[61] Ibid., 350.

[62] Ibid., 352.

[63] Stuart D. B. Picken, *Sourcebook in Shinto : selected documents* (Westport, Conn.:Praeger, 2004), 113.

oured at Yasukuni Shrine. State Shinto was a useful tool for the Japanese government to mobilize civilians, and therefore during the Occupation GHQ paid a great deal of attention to the separation of state and religion. It was not until May 2 1952, a few days after Japan officially regained its independence, that the first National Memorial Service for War Dead was held in Shinjyuku Gyoen National Garden on the Japanese mainland, and this ceremony was religiously neutral. In this light, the uniqueness of Okinawa becomes clear in that even though it was under the control of the U.S. until 1972, it succeeded in commemorating its war dead as early as 1946. A detailed discussion of why and to what degree the U.S. allowed Kinjō to commemorate the war dead by erecting the three cenotaphs in 1946 is beyond the scope of this study. Nevertheless, the importance of Kinjō Washin cannot be overemphasized in the context of postwar commemoration in Okinawa. As we will see later in the following chapters, Kinjō was a central figure in the Okinawa War-Bereaved Association in the demand for reparations for the war dead during the 1950s. Not only did Kinjō Washin play a crucial part in narratives of the Tower of Himeyuri, but he also served as a tough negotiator with the United States and with the Japanese mainland in terms of commemoration of and reparations for the Okinawan victims.

This chapter has explored the background information about the Himeyuri Student Corps itself and early-stage narrativizations of the HSC. Okinawa has occupied a unique place in the postwar history of Japan, since the Battle of Okinawa embroiled more than 100,000 Okinawan local civilians in battlefield combat. Although it was not the only ground battle fought on the Japanese territory in the Asia-Pacific War, it was a highly unusual battle which took the lives of more Okinawan civilians than Okinawan and non-Okinawan soldiers in the battlefield. These civilian victims would be classified according to their wartime statuses and their degrees of participation in combat in later years. This is critically important,

because this evaluation system of the war dead would later contribute to enshrining the Okinawan war dead at Yasukuni Shrine.

The ex-soldiers who succeeded in returning to the Japanese mainland within the 1940s initially played a central role in describing their wartime experiences through war chronicles. Their descriptions were full of vivid information about battlefield combat through a first-person perspective, but therefore they also tended to lack information about local civilian victims. The same is true of the Battle of Okinawa. Furukawa Shigemi's descriptions about the Battle of Okinawa in his two books sequentially published in the late 1940s mainly focused on Japan's military tactics and his positive evaluation about American troops, which naturally stirred dissatisfaction among Okinawan readers. This led the *Okinawa Taimusu* to publish a non-fictional record about the Battle of Okinawa with a heavy emphasis on civilian damage in Okinawa.

In addition to the issue of authors' standpoints, another important factor influenced the postwar descriptions about the Battle of Okinawa. Not only did American troops severely censor publications that they considered to be anti-American, but they also prohibited Okinawan survivors from collecting and commemorating the victims of the Battle of Okinawa. The first narrative of the HSC was written by a Japanese soldier named Mikame in a POW camp in Okinawa, and it was included in Miyanaga's *Okinawa Furyoki*, another record of a POW life in Okinawa. This version of the HSC story therefore highly romanticized the tragic death of the HSC, emphasizing their "honorable death" for the nation. From today's point of view, although Mikame's description is clearly chauvinistic, it is unclear whether or not it is anti-American. As we shall see in the next chapter, however, some people did actually find

Mikame's version of the HSC to be anti-American, which was a big motivation for them to create a rather different version of the HSC story from the later 1940s to the 1950s.

Chapter 2

At the Intersection of War Memories and Postwar Realities

All three of the authors who initially wrote about the Battle of Okinawa – Mikame Tatsuji, Furukawa Shigemi, and Miyanaga Tsugio – were Japanese soldiers from outside of Okinawa. Of these three authors, only Mikame Tatsuji wrote about the Himeyuri Student Corps, and he described them as patriotic martyrs.

In 1948 a Christian Okinawan author objected to Mikame's portrayal of the HSC. In the early 1950s, around the time that *Tetsu no Bōfū* (*The Typhoon of Steel*) was published, the narratives about the Battle of Okinawa entered a second stage, in which Okinawans began narrating their own views and experiences themselves.What characterized this second stage was its relationship to the construction, on the site of the Tower of Himeyuri, of a charnel chapel with a Christian cross. The Tower of Himeyuri gradually became a site of struggle between the competing religious and political narratives of Okinawan Christians, the U.S. occupying forces, and the bereaved families of the HSC. This chapter will focus primarily on the intersection of war memories and postwar realities by examining three Okinawans – Yonashiro Isamu (与那城 勇), Hiyane Antei (比屋根 安定), and Ishino Keiichirō (石野 径一郎) – all of whom served a crucial role in disseminating the image of the Tower of Himeyuri as a Christian monument. The wartime responsibility of teachers who contributed to mobilizing their students will also be discussed. This chapter thus aims to illustrate the complex nature of Okinawan writers' portrayal of the Battle of Okinawa, at the intersection of war memories and postwar realities.

Yonashiro Isamu and Christian Objection to the Nationalistic Glorification of the HSC

Published in 1950, *The Typhoon of Steel* had marked a watershed in narratives about the Battle of Okinawa, since it was the first publication that focused primarily on the local civilian damage caused by the battle, rather than focusing on military tactics. As early as 1948, however, a Christian priest named Yonashiro Isamu had already objected to the military-centred portrayal of the Tower of Himeyuri as a symbol of an Okinawan grudge against the U.S. This objection created another shift in the manner in which the HSC's story was narrated.

Yonashiro Isamu was born in 1916.[64] After working in the Korean Peninsula as a dentist from 1939 to 1945, he returned to Itoman, Okinawa, and began to preach the gospel in order to console the local people in their suffering.[65] During his days as a clergyman from 1945 to 1955, Yonashiro also published a religious magazine called *Gosuperu* (*Gospel*), for which he wrote a non-fictional article regarding the HSC, which was later included as part of a book compiled in 1974.

What inspired Yonashiro to write his own account of the HSC was his concern about the spreading of the existing HSC narrative that was both highly chauvinistic and anti-American. According toYonashiro, his interest in the Himeyuri students was sparked by an article which was said to have been written by a POW. The article was filled with patriotic descriptions such as "alongside Japanese soldiers, the girls went to attack armed with swords", or "the beautiful sisters Nobuko and Sadako killed themselves with a hand grenade", which Yonashiro "intuitively felt were fictional, far from what really happened".[66] Furthermore, the

---

[64] Isamu Yonashiro, *Ryūkyū Eden no Sono Monogatari* (Okinawa: Okinawa-Syunjyū-sya, 1974), colophon.

[65] Ibid.,75.

[66] Ibid., 79-80.

final scene portrayed the Americans as heartless and cruel, throwing gasoline and bombs into the cave and burning everyone alive, leading Yonashiro to conclude that the article must have been written by someone extremely hostile to the U.S.[67] Worried that this article would add fuel to the fire of animosity against the U.S., Yonashiro immediately did his own investigation of the narrative about the HSC and the monument of the Tower of Himeyuri, eventually publishing his account in March 1948.[68]

Yonashiro did not clearly say why he cared so much about local people's feelings about the Americans, but it is possible that he worried that growing anti-American sentiment would lead to the further oppression of Okinawans. Yoshida Shien (吉田 嗣延), who contributed to the return of Okinawa to Japanese administration, later pointed out that "the U.S. literally held life or death authority over Okinawa."[69] According to Yoshida, in the early years of the U.S. occupation of Okinawa, the American authorities distributed food and daily goods to local Okinawans for free. This free-distribution system was later replaced by a distribution-for-value system, which required local Okinawans to provide labour for the American troops in exchange for food and goods. Under both systems, in the latter half of the 1940s, the Americans had the power to seriously damage Okinawans' everyday lives simply by stopping food distribution. Yonashiro's worry about the growing local anti-American sentiment should be understood in this context. As a clergyman, Yonashiro sought to find how Christianity could soothe local people's feelings towards the U.S. Army.

Yonashiro never explicitly named the article or its author. However, considering its publication year (no later than March 1948) and content, it is safe to assume that it was one of

---

[67] Ibid., 80.

[68] Ibid., 71.

[69] Shien Yoshida, *Chiisana Tatakai No Hibi: Okinawa Fukki No Urabanashi* (Tokyo : Bunkyō Shōji,1977), 47.

the copies of what Mikame had originally written when he was in a POW camp. However, there is one significant point worth noting about Yonashiro's interpretation of the final scene:Yonashiro found the final scene in particular to be hateful and anti-American, based on his assumption that it fabricated or exaggerated the cruelty of the American troops with its description of the killing of the female students hiding in the cave as a slaughter without warning. Yonashiro's investigation, including interviews with the survivors of the HSC, later led him to conclude that the American troops had actually encouraged the people hiding in the cave to surrender, by shouting out "Detekoi!" ["Come out!"] in Japanese again and again.[70] As mentioned in the previous chapter, Mikame's account of the HSC was based on hearsay, and it contained many descriptions that were based on misinterpretation of the facts. Since Miyanaga's *Okinawa Furyoki* was published in December 1949, it is highly likely that Yonashiro did not read the same version of Mikame's story that was adopted by Miyanaga, but instead one of the copies that was transcribed and circulated by other Japanese soldiers in POW camps in those days.

In fact, Mikame's *Okinawa Furyoki* only vaguely described the deaths of the HSC members without focusing in detail on *who* killed them. It simply stated that the girls fainted in fear with their eyes wide open, and then "a flame like the tongue of a giant snake went licking along the bodies of the collapsed girls".[71] It is unclear whether Yonashiro found this vague description to be anti-American or whether the copy he had read described the final scene in a different, more anti-American way. It is clear, however, that Yonashiro was concerned by the grudges and ill feelings that Okinawans generally felt towards the U.S. in postwar Okinawa. As an Okinawan Christian priest, Yonashiro became involved with the re-

---

[70] Yonashiro, *Ryūkyū Eden no Sono Monogatari,* 81.

[71] Miyanaga, *Okinawa Furyoki*, 225.

construction of narrative accounts of the female students in order to nullify the spreading anti-American sentiment of the Okinawan people. In fact, not only did he work on a narrative project in response to the anti-American accounts of the HSC, but he also worked on physical projects – the construction of a charnel chapel beside the Tower of Himeyuri, and also the erection of a cross on top of that chapel.

In order to understand why Yonashiro wanted to have a cross built on top of the charnel chapel of the HSC, it is necessary to consider the political and religious background of commemoration in Okinawa. As stated in the previous chapter, the U.S. occupation forces sharply distinguished between collecting the bodies of the war dead and commemoration of those slain, so even if the collection of the remains of the victims was allowed in Okinawa, the act of commemoration was strictly prohibited. Therefore, on April 7 1946, Kinjō Washin had to hold the first memorial service at the Tower of Himeyuri in secret, under the guise of cleaning up the monument.[72] Yet, when Yonashiro visited the Tower of Himeyuri sometime before March 1948, he felt that the place and monument themselves exuded a religious ambience. Thus his writings used religious words and terms to describe this war memorial and its surroundings.

In an article written in May 1950, Yonashiro described his first visit to the Tower of Himeyuri. According to the article, rocks were piled up around the cave in which the female students had been slain, its surroundings were cleaned up, and the access path to the cave was newly constructed. Wooden grave tablets were placed in the area surrounding the cave, inscribed with eulogies that lauded the female students' deaths as a sacred sacrifice for Imperial

---

[72] Jyunkoku-Okinawa-Gakuto-Kenshō-kai, eds., *Okinawa no Senka wo Seoite: Kinjō Washin no Shōgai* (Tokyo: Mei-kō-sha, 1982), 203-204.

Japan.[73] Yonashiro used the words *sandō* (the front approach to a shrine or to a temple) for "access path", and *keidai* (the precincts of a shrine or a temple) for "the area surrounding the cave", and thus it is safe to assume that he considered the Tower of Himeyuri to be a Shinto or Buddhist monument.[74] According to Yonashiro, he was afraid that the Tower of Himeyuri would become "the monument of a grudge".[75] For Yonashiro, it was not enough to correct Mikame's fictional and anti-American portrayal of the female students' ordeal by publishing his own non-fictional account of the female students. He also felt the need to present a Christian symbol of commemoration, aiming to water down or erase the hints of Buddhism and Shinto that the Tower of Himeyuri displayed.

Yonashiro's plan to put a cross on the charnel chapel materialized as a project of the Okinawan Young Men and Women's Christian Association (YMWCA). The Okinawan YMWCA also tried to hold annual memorial services in a Christian style at the Tower of Himeyuri. The families of the deceased HSC members, however, suggested that they would prefer to have Buddhist-style memorial services. Yonashiro valued this suggestion, and he cancelled the Christian-style memorial service at the Tower.[76] It is unclear exactly when the cross was put on (and later removed from) the charnel chapel. Considering the fact that the charnel chapel was constructed on June 22 1948, and that on June 24 1951 a statue of a girl was placed in the same location where the cross had been, we can conclude that the cross was located on the charnel chapel for no longer than three years (i.e. between 1948 and 1951).[77]

---

[73] Yonashiro, *Ryūkyū Eden no Sono Monogatari,* 80.

[74] Ibid., 81.

[75] Ibid., 80.

[76] Ibid., 82.

[77] Chōkei Futenma, " RE: Otoiawase no Ken nitsuite (RE: On your questions)" e-mail message to author, April 11, 2014.

Later, as the Okinawa War-Bereaved Association strengthened ties with Yasukuni Shrine in the 1950s, the cross gradually began to disappear from narratives about the HSC. This issue will be explored further in Chapter 5.

Yonashiro's wartime status differed from all other authors who had written about the Battle of Okinawa. Working as an Okinawan dentist in the Korean Peninsula, which had been colonized by Japan, he was neither a local civilian nor a soldier in the Battle of Okinawa. Yonashiro seems to have strongly sympathized with the traumatic experiences of survivors of the Battle of Okinawa, which he did not directly experience, through writing his 19-page account entitled "Himeyuri no Tō" ("The Tower of Himeyuri"). This account consisted of two parts: the first was a non-fictional account of how the female students met their end; and the second contained his analysis of why this tragedy occurred. Mikame, as a soldier who had not directly witnessed the deaths of the female students, wrote his account on hearsay from an omniscient third person perspective, and he mentioned nothing about himself as the author, nor about the purpose of the story. Yonashiro, in contrast, began his account by clarifying the purpose and intent of his piece. He confessed that he would never be able to describe the truth of this tragedy, not only because he lacked the aptitude, but also because it would be difficult for anyone to describe such a serious tragedy unless he or she had actually experienced it first-hand. That said, Yonashiro continued to say that he "took the liberty" of describing what had occurred in order to "rectify the harmful narratives that are spreading" and to "contribute to the construction of a new Okinawa."[78] In a nutshell, Yonashiro aimed to emphasize the involuntary victimhood of the female students, in response to Mikame's glorification of them as voluntary patriots. To achieve this goal, Yonashiro carefully constructed his narrative with

---

[78] Yonashiro, *Ryūkyū Eden no Sono Monogatari,* 53-54.

a focus on the cause-and-effect logic that existed behind the seemingly voluntary patriotism of the female students.

In Mikame's account, Okinawan civilians were described as irrational and egoistic people who made scurrilous attacks on the weakened Japanese soldiers.[79] No such "irrational and egoistic" civilians appeared in Yonashiro's account. In contrast, Yonashiro's work highlighted the cruelty of the Japanese soldiers who forced civilian refugees out of the shelter of their cave, in order to use it as a military battlefield hospital. This cave would later become the grave of the female students, and the site of the Tower of Himeyuri.[80] Throughout his account, Yonashiro consistently underlined the responsibility of the Japanese Imperial Army for mobilizing and misleading the female students. He condemned the Japanese troops as "magicians" who "knew the magic of making people proceed to the jaws of death willingly". Manipulated by this magic, the female students who had been "ordered to work in battlefield hospitals" willingly accepted this mission. Related to this, the Japanese military doctors fed the female students a variety of misleading information – for example, that the Japanese troops would soon turn around the desperate situation. The female students were also told by the Japanese military that the American troops would repeatedly rape and then slaughter female captives.[81]

According to Yonashiro, as a result of such brainwashing, the female students gradually developed a feeling of repugnance towards the American troops, choosing to die rather than risk capture. This drove them to an even more helpless situation when they were sudden-

---

[79] Miyanaga, *Okinawa Furyoki*, 213.

[80] Yonashiro, *Ryūkyū Eden no Sono Monogatari*, 57-58.

[81] Ibid., 59-60.

ly discharged on June 18 1945 in the middle of the battle.[82] Even after they were ordered to leave, the female students "voluntarily" decided to accompany the Japanese troops and share their fate. Here it is worth mentioning that Mikame praised, as an outburst of patriotic enthusiasm, the "voluntary" participation of the female students in a suicide attack. Yonashiro cast a skeptical gaze over such an all-encompassing glorification of their patriotism. After mentioning that the female students had raised their voices one after another to get into line with the Japanese troops, he also added that "it was like they were mesmerized into answering a leading question" and "with profoundly satisfied hearts, military officers and soldiers accepted the girls' replies".[83]

Yonashiro's criticism of the simple glorification of the Japanese Imperial Army appeared in another important scene in which American troops attacked the cave. In Mikame's description, the American soldiers slaughtered the female students who were hiding there, without any warning. Yonashiro described the same scene in a very different light. In his description, the Americans called for surrender by shouting "Detekoi, detekoi!" [Come out, come out!] in a non-native accent, and the people hiding inside also heard a female voice speaking fluently in Japanese: "Seimei no shinpai wa arimasen kara, osorenaide detekite kudasai. Hayaku hayaku detekudasai. Shokuryō mo tabako mo mizu mo agemasu" ["You don't have to worry about the risk to your life. Please don't be afraid, and come out. Come out right now. We have food, tobacco, and water for you"]. However, Yonashiro further mentioned that nobody in the cave reacted to the alerts, nor did they take any action. He implied that the reason for this passivity may have been the silent pressure from the soldiers inside the cave: "the

---

[82] Even though Yonashiro mentioned on page 60 that the dissolution order was given to the female students on June 12, this is a factual error.

[83] Yonashiro, *Ryūkyū Eden no Sono Monogatari,* 61.

soldiers and officers stared at the female students in the cave as if monitoring them".[84] In the meantime, the American soldiers continued to call out warnings: "Daremo kono ana niwa orimasenka. Daremo orimasenka. Moshi itara sugu detekudasai. Sugu detekudasai. Daremo orimasenka. Daremo orimasenka". ["Is anybody in there? Anybody there? If you are in there, hurry and come out. Hurry and come out. Anybody there? Anybody there?"]. Ultimately, nobody reacted to the repeated warnings, and finally the attack began.

Yonashiro's critical stance towards the Japanese Imperial Army also became obvious in the latter half of the article, in which he cut to the heart of the tragedy that had occurred. It is worth noting here that Yonashiro made perfectly clear that his condemnation of the Japanese Imperial Army was based on his own opinion, and that the surviving female students did not share the same opinion with him.

Yonashiro wrote the first half of his account in a third person omniscient perspective, but before going into the latter half, he inserted a direct quotation from an interview with an anonymous survivor from the cave. In the interview, Yonashiro asked the young woman: "How did you feel then? Do you hold a grudge against anyone?" She answered: "No, I don't hold any grudge. It was a war situation, so nothing could have been done. I still have just one regret though. A lot more people could have survived if we had had some water or if we had covered our faces with handkerchiefs soaked with water".[85] It is important to note that by foregrounding this interview with one of the survivors in the middle of his article, Yonashiro succeeded in adding to the credibility and factual nature of the article on the whole.

Proceeding with his argument, Yonashiro then mentioned three factors that caused the tragedy. First, he stressed the collective responsibility of Japanese leaders and Japanese peo-

---

[84] Ibid., 63.

[85] Ibid., 65.

ple for the outbreak of the war, categorically refusing to put the blame solely on the Japanese military. Yonashiro's sense of collective responsibility might seem contradictory to the overall tone of his argument, but this could be read as a criticism of the Asia-Pacific War in general rather than of the Battle of Okinawa in particular. Second, Yonashiro cited the impact of false propaganda in contributing to the tragedy. Here Yonashiro once again stressed how the female students were brainwashed into believing false information. He also quoted James 3:1-8, a biblical passage, in order to emphasize the responsibility and sinfulness of the Japanese Imperial Army, which made the female students believe that they should die rather than being taken captive:

> Consider what a great forest is set on fire by a small spark. The tongue also is a fire, a world of evil among the parts of the body. It corrupts the whole body, sets the whole course of one's life on fire, and is itself set on fire by hell. All kinds of animals, birds, reptiles and sea creatures are being tamed and have been tamed by mankind, but no human being can tame the tongue. It is a restless evil, full of deadly poison.[86]

Third, Yonashiro's condemnation of the Japanese Imperial Army's actions during the Battle of Okinawa was not limited to nameless soldiers. He pointed out the irresponsible attitude towards the Okinawan people that was displayed by Ushijima Mitsuru, commander of the Japanese 32nd Army in Okinawa. As mentioned in the previous chapter, both Ushijima and Chō, Ushijima's Chief of Staff, are believed to have committed ritual suicide on June 23 1945. While Ushijima's death was considered, at the time, to be honourable and respectable for a commanding officer responsible for defeat, Yonashiro developed a different view of Ushijima, suggesting the possibility that the Battle of Okinawa might have ended much earlier and thus the number of casualties may have been reduced drastically if Ushijima had accepted the terms of surrender. In support of this view, Yonashiro presented a document which proved that Ushijima had been called upon to surrender and that Japanese officers had been

---

[86] "James 3:1-8", *New International Version (NIV)* https://www.biblegateway.com. (accessed April 15, 2014).

notified of the fact that their commander had refused to accept the terms. Yonashiro harshly criticized this refusal, arguing that Ushijima had sacrificed thousands of precious lives in order to protect his honour as a warrior. Yonashiro concluded his article as follows:

> It is an incontrovertible fact that if Lieutenant General Ushijima had led the entirety of defense forces in Okinawa to surrender instead of worrying about being branded a coward, the tragedy of the Tower of Himeyuri would have never occurred. If I shouted out this fact right now, it would just sound like a complaint and nothing would change. We must, however, keep this fact in mind in order to make their tragic deaths perpetually relevant.
>
> We must not exhibit the Tower of Himeyuri as a symbol for the glorification of war. We must reaffirm our determination to construct a peaceful world whenever we make a pilgrimage to this tower.
>
> This tower is *the altar of a sin offering,* a sacrifice in order to atone for our sin [emphasis added].[87]

This reveals that Yonashiro not only aimed to move beyond the patriotic and soldier-centred views of Mikame, but that he also sought to redefine the religious nature of the Tower of Himeyuri. On his first visit to the Tower, Yonashiro had used words peculiar to Japanese Shinto and Buddhism – *sandō* and *keidai* – in order to describe the space surrounding the monument.[88] In the conclusion of his article, however, Yonashiro described the Tower of Himeyuri as *zaisai no saidan* (the altar of a sin offering). The word *zaisai* (a sin offering) was an extremely rare word in Japanese, which was found only in the Japanese translation of the biblical Book of Leviticus. Thus Yonashiro was surely familiar with the Book of Leviticus when he wrote this article. For example, Leviticus 5:9 says "And is to splash some of the blood of the sin offering against the side of the altar; the rest of the blood must be drained out at the base of the altar. It is a sin offering".[89] It seems that Yonashiro sought to relocate the religious nature of the Tower of Himeyuri from Japanese Shinto and Buddhism to Christiani-

---

[87] Yonashiro, *Ryūkyū Eden no Sono Monogatari*, 71.

[88] Ibid., 81.

[89] "Leviticus 5:9", *New International Version (NIV)* https://www.biblegateway.com. (accessed April 15, 2014).

ty. In this light, the reason for Yonashiro's desire to put a cross on the charnel chapel of the Tower of Himeyuri becomes clear. Yonashiro's reinterpretation of the preceding Himeyuri narratives strongly reflected his Christian views regarding chauvinistic nationalism, which he believed was deeply interconnected with Japanese Shinto and Buddhism.

How Hiyane Antei Introduced the Tower of Himeyuri to the Japanese Mainland

Yonashiro's Christian beliefs were at the root of his criticism of the Japanese Imperial Army. Yonashiro emphatically refused to glorify the deaths of the female students in Shinto or Buddhist style, aiming instead to Christianize the Tower. Hiyane Antei brought a copy of Yonashiro's article to the Japanese mainland, where he asked Ishino Keiichirō, an Okinawan writer, to novelize it. This section therefore examines how Hiyane saw the relationship between Christianity and the Tower of Himeyuri. In order to understand the connections that Hiyane drew between Christianity and The Tower of Himeyuri, it is essential to examine his unique position as an Okinawa Christian before, during, and after the Asia-Pacific War.

Hiyane's father was a person of noble lineage from the Ryūkyū Kingdom, which was later incorporated into Japan as Okinawa Prefecture, in 1879. Hiyane himself was born in 1892 and raised in Tokyo. Becoming a Methodist Christian at age 16, he took up a professorship in 1921 at Aoyama Gakuin, the predecessor of Aoyama Gakuin University, and soon established himself as an authority on Christian history in Japan. Aoyama Gakuin was established by Protestant missionaries, and thus theological education held a prominent position in its curriculum. Meanwhile, under pressure from the Japanese government, in June 1941 Protestant Christian groups were united into an organization called UCCJ (the United Church of Christ in Japan), which actively cooperated with the Japanese government in the Asia-Pa-

cific War.[90] Eventually Hiyane resigned from Aoyama Gakuin, and in 1944 started working for UCCJ. According to Charles W. Iglehart, however, since one of Hiyane's writings published in the Bulletin of UCCJ was considered to be "an implied disparagement of the new Shinto Orthodoxy, Hiyane was publicly cashiered by the government and forced to retire from all writing activities".[91] Hiyane left his position at UCCJ in 1945 after Japan's defeat, and worked for the Religion & Cultural Resources Division of the CIE (Civil Information and Education Section) of GHQ, from April 1946 to March 1949.[92] William P. Woodward, who himself worked for GHQ and worked on the issue of the continued existence of Yasukuni Shrine, provided some intriguing information about Hiyane, referring to a letter that Hiyane had published in the *Yomiuri* newspaper on March 16 1948:

> In the spring of 1948, the Yomiuri newspaper – one of Japan's Big Three – published a letter by Dr. Antei Hiyane, a Protestant Christian scholar and professor of the History of Religions at Tokyo Union Theological Seminary, in which he suggested that the mission of Buddhism had been accomplished and the time had come for it to give way to Christianity! He argued that the Emperor should become a Christian because, as the symbol of the nation, he would be able to "make atonement for the war and be beloved by all the peoples of the world".[93]

It was right after his letter was published in the *Yomiuri* newspaper that Hiyane went to Okinawa with another Okinawan Christian, Iwahara Morikatsu (岩原 盛勝), at a time when it was almost impossible for any Japanese civilian to travel between Okinawa and the Japanese mainland. According to Iwahara, they left Tachikawa Airfield, Tokyo, on April 11 1948, on a U.S. military transport airplane, and their mission was to "preach the gospel" in

---

[90] Masamichi Ogawara, *Kindai Nihon No Sensō to Shūkyō* (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 2010).

[91] Charles W. Iglehart, *A Century of Protestant Christianity in Japan* (Tokyo :The Dai Nippon Printing Company, Ltd., 1960), 255.

[92] Susumu Terasaki, *Hiyane Antei: Kusawake Jidai no Syukyo-Shika* (Tokyo : Riburo Pōto, 1995),162-163.

[93] William P. Woodard, *The Allied Occupation of Japan 1945-1952 and Japanese Religions* (Leiden:Brill, 1972), 273.

Okinawa.[94] It was at this juncture that Hiyane and Iwahara came across Yonashiro's account of the Tower of Himeyuri. They then brought a copy of it to Tokyo and asked the Okinawan writer Ishino Keiichirō to novelize it.

Hiyane did not write anything about his time at GHQ, and thus it is impossible to judge whether his pro-Christian activities were based on his personal beliefs or on GHQ policy, or both. Nevertheless, it is important to note that Hiyane Antei not only created the link between Yonashiro and Ishino, but he also played an integral part in disseminating the Christianized image of the Tower of Himeyuri. The first chapter of Ishino's novel, entitled "The Death March", was printed in the September 1949 issue of *Reijokai* (*Decent Women's World*) magazine, which was a special feature on Okinawa, including pictures of Okinawa's cultural heritage and a traditional female outfit, as well as lyrics to a school song sung by the female students. Hiyane, too, contributed a one-page essay to this feature, emphasizing the inseparability of the Tower of Himeyuri and the cross. Hiyane argued:

> At the south end of Okinawa, which we can now barely get permission to visit, an approximately 180cm-tall cross stands together with a tombstone on the surface of which is inscribed the Tower of Himeyuri.[…]It seems that the U.S. military officers stationed in Okinawa are deeply moved by the Tower of Himeyuri, too. Thus they make a pilgrimage all the way there, pray or put beautiful flowers in front of it, and don't want to leave.[…]Although Christians also rest in peace there, it was controversial to put a cross on the Tower of Himeyuri. It finally happened, though, because a cross can be understood worldwide. A cross is a symbol of sacrifice.[95]

Intentionally or not, Hiyane suggested here that the cross and the Tower of Himeyuri had been constructed as a set, stressing the positive impact that the cross could have on the U.S. military officers. A small picture of the Tower of Himeyuri and the cross was also printed in Hiyane's article, and the September issue also included a drawing of a woman paying

---

[94] Morikatsu Iwahara, "Shojo-Jyunnan-hi 'Himeyuri no Tō' o Tomurau Okinawa-tō o Iku", *Shufu no Tomo* (October 1948), 24.

[95] Antei Hiyane, "Himeyuri no Tō o Aogite", *Reijokai* (September 1949), 13.

her respects at the Tower of Himeyuri. It is noteworthy that the cross was clearly depicted in this drawing. At this point in time, it was clearly considered vital to narrate the Tower of Himeyuri in relation to Christianity and the cross. As the next section will show, Ishino faithfully followed in the steps of Yonashiro and Hiyane, making Christianity and the cross a core part of his story.

Ishino Keiichirō and the Issue of Wartime Responsibility

Ishino's *The Tower of Himeyuri* was serialized in the young women's magazine *Reijokai* in four issues from September to December 1949. The issues were entitled "The Death March" (September), "Rain Never Stops" (October), "Hostilities and Youth"(November), and "Flowers Fall, Flowers Bloom" (December). A final chapter, "The Mountain of Banyan Trees and Salts", was added after the end of the serialization. The novel was released as a separate volume in 1950, and the first filming project of the novel began the same year. Slight modifications were made in later versions, and the one published in 1977 appears to be the finalized version.

Ishino Keiichirō (real name Ishino Tomokazu) was born in Okinawa in 1909. He moved to Tokyo in 1926, and stayed there until the Great Tokyo Air Raids took place on March 10 1945. Thus Ishino, like Yonashiro and Hiyane, did not directly experience the Battle of Okinawa. When asked by Hiyane and Iwahara, Ishino readily agreed to write a novel about the female students, but he soon found that Yonashiro's 19-page account was too short and lacking in detail to base his work on. He searched for and found Okinawan refugees in Tokyo who had experienced the Battle of Okinawa, and finally managed to write a novel about the tragic deaths of the female students.[96]

---

[96] Yonashiro, *Ryūkyū Eden no Sono Monogatari,*75. First appeared in the *Yomiuri* newspaper April 4, 1969.

In fact, Ishino already had a connection to the Female Division of Okinawa Normal School, one of the two women's schools that comprised the HSC. When Ishino was a boy, he was a student at Asato elementary school in Naha, Okinawa, where many students of the Female Division of Okinawa Normal School taught as trainee teachers. Since Ishino had lost his mother in 1918, these female trainee teachers left a lasting impression on him. Ishino later stated that he was able to create the characters and plot of *The Tower of Himeyuri* relatively easily, since he had previous experience with students from the women's schools.[97]

For Ishino, who had already published several works but was far from being a famous writer at the time, this novel was challenging, since it was his first novel to be serialized in a major magazine. This undeniably affected Ishino's writing style; the postscript to the first edition of the novel states that "since the serialized magazine was targeted at girls, and the characters in the novel are female students, the first fifty some pages of my novel were strongly affected by that. After the serialization was finished, I revised everything, and added the last chapter 'The Mountain of Banyan Trees and Salts' but I doubt that I have successfully removed the sentimentality."[98] As is clear from this quote, the serialized version and the published novel differed in several important respects, although they shared the same general plot. Ishino's account revolves around the leading character, Isagawa Kana (伊差川 カナ), a fictional female student working as a battlefield nurse. And in the story Kana survived the Battle of Okinawa.

It is noteworthy that Ishino described each character in the novel in detail. Before Ishino, Mikame and Yonashiro had one thing in common in their writing styles; both of them

---

[97] Keiichirō Ishino, "Watashi no Sengoshi", in *Watakushi No Sengoshi* 9. (Naha:Okinawa Taimususha, 1986), 123.

[98] Keiichirō Ishino, *Himeyuri No Tō* (Tokyo: Sangobō, 1950), 280.

avoided using proper names as much as possible. Mikame referred specifically to only two girls, Nobuko and Sadako, who, according to Mikame, had committed suicide with a hand grenade. Otherwise, whether the female students were depicted as patriotic martyrs or as brainwashed victims, they were always addressed as nameless "girls" or "female students". In contrast, Ishino's account was unique in that it gave detailed information about multiple characters, including their names, backgrounds, and religious beliefs. The story was sometimes narrated through a first person standpoint, and other times through a third person omniscient standpoint, resulting in more detailed psychological depictions of each character. As we will see later, this was an effective means of demonstrating Kana's psychological conflict as she began to question *who* was actually responsible for the war.

Ishino himself did not clarify whether or not he was a Christian, but from the beginning of the novel's serialization, its religious message was evident. According to Ishino, at first he was not willing to incorporate pro-Christian messages into his novel, but one of his older friends strongly suggested that he should emphasize his pro-Christian message in the story. According to this friend, "Okinawa is currently in jail" and therefore, if Ishino's novel showed any sign of anti-Americanism, it would "cause a burden on the few barely-surviving compatriots".[99] Ishino went on to state:

> I was dissatisfied with his suggestion, but he did not give an inch. He said: Have you considered our fathers in jail? It might stoke U.S. military prejudice against Okinawa if you describe them as if they had a history of revolutionary thoughts or anti-American sentiments. If we had been neither defeated nor occupied, it would be possible to present a faithful account of our thoughts. But now all you can do is to take a pro-Christian stance in your novel. [100]

---

[99] Keiichirō Ishino, "Haruka ni Gokuchū no Kokyō o Nozomu Kokoro", *Minshu Bungaku No.57* (Nihon Minshyu-shugi Bungakukai: August 1970), 118.

[100] Ibid., 118-119.

This quote proves that the American occupation had a critical influence on Ishino's description of Christianity in *The Tower of Himeyuri*. Ishino worked on the plot of his novel in 1948 or 1949, thus he also had to be sensitive about his descriptions of American troops, for fear that his novel could have an adverse effect on the people of Okinawa. It is important to note that Ishino saw his pro-Christian stance as necessary for showing that Okinawans were not anti-American. From here on, this section will reveal how Ishino specifically expressed his pro-Christian stance in *The Tower of Himeyuri*.

Ishino incorporated the two symbolic Christian items into the story; the cross and the Bible. At the beginning of the first chapter, "The Death March", a noteworthy exchange takes place between the leading character, Kana, and Hosokawa Sannosuke (細川 三之介), a Japanese Imperial soldier who came from Ishikawa Prefecture.[101] Hosokawa tells Kana that she must feel sad to see her home in such a devastated state. His remark surprises Kana, because she has heard so many condescending remarks that distinguish between Okinawa and the Japanese mainland in terms of relative importance – comments such as "Imagine if this had happened in Tokyo !" or "I couldn't stand it if the *naichi* (the Imperial metropole) faced such disaster!" As an Okinawan, these remarks sounds to Kana as though the devastation of Okinawa were acceptable to mainlanders because it does not happen there.[102] Later in the same chapter, these two characters have another important exchange. Here, Kana suggests that all female students are destined to die along with Japanese soldiers. Hosokawa clearly rejects this idea: "That's not true. You must not seek death. Even if you don't seek it, death will

---

[101] Ishikawa Prefecture was where the author Ishino had temporarily evacuated from Tokyo during the war, since his wife's parents lived there. Considering the importance of Hosokawa in the story, it is likely that this Japanese soldier was at least in part a projection of Ishino himself.

[102] Keiichirō Ishino, "The Death March", *Reijokai* (September, 1949), 16. Here it is worthy to note that this usage of *naichi* implies that the status of Okinawa was low in the hierarchy of Imperial Japan, since it was not considered to be a part of *naichi,* although it technically belonged to it. Interestingly, the word *naichi* was later changed to *hondo* (the Japanese mainland) in the 1977 version.

come when it should. You must know that you have a duty to survive as long as possible. It is absolutely not your destiny to die with soldiers".[103]

Hosokawa's remark deserves special attention, because neither Mikame nor Yonashiro depicted any Japanese Imperial soldiers discouraging others from choosing to die alongside the Japanese soldiers. Mikame emphasized the deaths of the female students purely as voluntary patriotism. He did not suggest that Japanese Imperial soldiers influenced the students' decision to die in any way. In contrast, Yonashiro denounced the Japanese Imperial Army for brainwashing the female students into dying alongside the soldiers, putting the entire onus for their deaths onto the Japanese Imperial Army. In comparison with these two authors, there is no doubt that Ishino's characterization of Hosokawa was unique. However, although Hosokawa is depicted as sympathetic to Okinawa and its inhabitants, this was not the case for all of the Japanese Imperial soldiers in Ishino's novel. On the contrary, Ishino also described Japanese Imperial soldiers' condescension towards Okinawans in detail. Furthermore, what differentiated Hosokawa from such condescending soldiers was his belief in Christianity. Hosokawa, who is referred to only a few times throughout the entire story, actually plays a significant role in emphasizing the importance of the cross. Hosokawa suggests to Kana that perhaps the catastrophic devastation could ultimately benefit Okinawa: "The cross is followed by resurrection. Now maybe the current situation feels like something imposed from the outside, but if you recognize it as a sacrificial cross, then no matter how many tragedies happen from now on, Okinawa will be promised a grand resurrection in the future".[104] Kana remembers what Hosokawa says about the cross and Christianity at various points throughout the novel.

---

[103] Ibid., 24.

[104] Ibid., 23.

The cross as a symbol of Christianity performed a special role in Ishino's novel, and Ishino went so far as to refer to the actual cross that was built atop the charnel chapel on the site of the Tower of Himeyuri in 1948, even though *The Tower of Himeyuri* was based on the Battle of Okinawa in 1945. Here, non-fictional information intersected with the fictional story, stressing the inseparability of the cross and the Tower of Himeyuri. In the last chapter, "The Mountain of Banyan Trees and Salts", Ishino explicitly states:

> They began living separately in four natural caves. The final phase of their lives in the caves was about to begin. But at that time, who could have imagined that these caves at Komesu would become the burial pits for their own remains? Furthermore, who could have imagined that this area would be named the Tower of Himeyuri, that *a cross would be built there*, that people around the world including the former enemy country America would honour it, that flowers and eulogies would be dedicated to it, that it would even be addressed as the road sign towards world peace, that it would draw the tears of all people? [emphasis added][105]

Hosokawa was not the only Christian Japanese soldier in Ishino's novel. In the "The Mountain of Banyan Trees and Salts", Kana comes across Kiyomi (清見), a Christian soldier who is carrying another wounded Japanese soldier over his shoulder. Kiyomi carries around a Bible, and he encourages the wounded soldier, Fukuda (福田), by saying that the Bible will surely guarantee his recovery.[106] Kiyomi is once ordered by his military superior to give him his Bible to use as toilet paper, but Kiyomi risks his life by giving this superior his official Soldier's Notebook instead.[107] This episode strongly emphasizes the strength of Kiyomi's belief in Christianity. Furthermore, Kiyomi is portrayed as the only one who decides rationally to desert to the enemy, since defeat is obvious to everyone. After dismantling and discarding his gun, Kiyomi walks to the American soldiers to surrender. One of the American officers,

---

[105] Ishino, *Himeyuri No Tō,* 222.

[106] Ibid., 243.

[107] Ibid., 244.

who "looks a little bit weird with two silver lines inscribed on his overseas cap and a shiny cross on his chest", quickly notices the Bible in Kiyomi's chest pocket, and he cries out "Oh, a Bible!"[108] Kiyomi's Bible here serves to overcome the barrier between friends and enemies.

Here we must look more carefully into what was unique about Ishino's esteem for Christianity. As already seen, Ishino made use of a pro-Christian message in order to avoid any adverse reaction from the Americans towards Okinawans. Considering this, it is not surprising that Ishino's emphasis on Christianity went hand in hand with an image of American superiority over Imperial Japan. In fact, Ishino, Furukawa, Mikame, and Yonashiro all highlighted American superiority to some extent in their accounts of the HSC.

However, Ishino differed in one important respect from other writers, by adding a new dimension to the issue of war responsibility that of teachers. Both Yonashiro and Ishino took bold steps in their criticisms of the Japanese Imperial Army in Okinawa. However, unlike Yonashiro, Ishino also criticized the teachers, who he believed contributed to the brainwashing of their female students by feeding them misleading information. Ishino's critical stance towards teachers can be seen, for example, in a conversation between Kana and one of her friends, Akiko (暁子). Knowing that Akiko is obsessed with the act of revenge, Kana goes on to analyze what causes someone like Akiko to be unable to forgive her enemies:

> Who on earth had made this nation turn so belligerent? Then, Kana recalled Prime Minister Tōjō's shrill call to "Kill the U.S. and Britain, the enemies of Imperial Japan!" and School Principal Okanishi's shouts of "Death to the diabolical U.S. and Britain!"
>
> We make enemies of other nations in the name of our own survival, and we eliminate our enemies by killing them. How can such sinful egotism be excused? Kana remembered what her grandfather had said to her: "The tragedy of *nihon-shugi* (Japan-ism) lies in the fact that they have never experienced Christian baptism, which has a history spanning 2,000 years." She also remembered what she had learned in school about the *Soga* brothers and the *Akou* warriors. Young people had lost any

[108] Ibid., 258.

> sense of world peace, and therefore they were easily swayed when they hear strong rhetoric in favour of war.
>
> Look at what happened in Okinawa. This is the end result of war. There is no such thing as a beautiful war. What you can see here are the ultimate consequences of war.[109]

In order to fully understand the quotation above, which equated Prime Minister Tōjō and School Principal Okanishi, it is necessary to clarify some background information."Tōjō" here refers to Tōjō Hideki（東條 英機), the Japanese Prime Minister who was directly responsible for the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941. "Okanishi" refers to Okanishi Yoshikazu (岡西 義一), the fictional autocratic principal of Kana's women's school. These two men, one representing Japanese Imperial military politics and the other representing Japanese Imperial education, embodied what Ishino called "Japan-ism". In Ishino's view, the element of revenge was an important component of Japan-ism, and thus the *Soga* brothers (曽我兄弟) and the *Akou* warriors (赤穂義士), the two most famous and well-known revenge stories in Japan, were worth mentioning here, since Japanese Imperial education instilled Japan-ism into the minds of their students by glorifying these figures.[110]Akiko was a typical example of a victim of such brainwashing, and thus she was obsessed with revenge. Clearly, Ishino believed that teachers held equal responsibility for brainwashing the female students into dying for their country as the Japanese Imperial military.

In previous accounts of the female students involved in the Battle of Okinawa, there had been little or no mention of teachers, and thus the fact that some teachers actually accompanied the students to the battlefields is easy to overlook. For example, in Yonashiro's account, there was only one short description of a teacher named Kochinda (東風平) who

---

[109] Keiichirō Ishino, "Flower Fall, Flower Bloom", *Reijokai* (December, 1949), 27.

[110] The Igagoe Revenge was as famous and popular as the *Soga* brothers and the *Akou* warriors, and these three revenges are addressed as the three major episodes of revenge in Japanese culture.

conducted the students' chorus as they sang songs in a cave.[111] The story notes that when the students were exterminated, Kochinda probably sang a patriotic military song *Umi Yukaba* (*If Going to the Sea*).[112] Not surprisingly, in his analysis of wartime responsibility, Yonashiro mainly criticized the military chief commander, and he did not mention anything about the teachers' wartime responsibility.

This raises a question: what led Ishino to suddenly begin criticizing teachers? Ishino himself did not directly answer this question. It might be worth mentioning that Ishino obtained a teaching certificate at the age of 18 in 1927, and he worked for an elementary school in Tokyo for a while. Ishino later recalled that he had really enjoyed teaching his students.[113] The deaths of the female students might have struck a deep and sympathetic chord in Ishino's heart, not just because he was an Okinawan, but also because he was a teacher.

It is also important to note that Ishino's criticism of teachers' wartime responsibility went in tandem with his admiration for Christianity. The scene quoted above is important because it suggests Kana's symbolic baptism. For Kana, Akiko's obsession with revenge reveals the "fact" that Japan-ism is caused by the lack of "Christian baptism", and she then remembers her grandfather and Hosokawa, the Japanese solider who tells her not to die with the Japanese Imperial Army:

> Has Kana's family tradition, the seeds for which were sown by her grandfather and nurtured by Hosokawa, finally become her flesh and blood, as a result of all the time she spent living (although it didn't deserve to be called "living" – she was simply existing) in the caves? The religious belief that "we are afflicted in every way, but not crushed" and the hope for happiness yet to come, it is said, comes out of unconditional love for the cross.[114]

---

[111] Yonashiro, *Ryūkyū Eden no Sono Monogatari,* 60.

[112] Ibid., 64.

[113] Ishino, "Watashi no Sengoshi", 109-110.

[114] Ishino, "Flower Fall, Flower Bloom", 28.

After she has realized the importance of Christianity (which was described as "Kana's family tradition" in the quote above) and how it was lacking in herself, Kana survives the attack on the cave. The two Christians in the story, Hosokawa and Kana's grandfather, not only serve to open Kana's eyes to Christianity, but they also embody the superiority of Christianity, by consistently displaying rational attitudes and behaviours as an aspect of their Christian character.

This chapter has focused on three Okinawans –Yonashiro Isamu, Hiyane Antei and Ishino Keiichirō – demonstrating how Christian perspectives played an important role in their narrativizes about the Okinawan students. All of the authors were Okinawan, but none of them actually experienced the Battle of Okinawa first-hand.

Yonashiro aimed to revise the nature of the Tower of Himeyuri not only by challenging Mikame's dominant account of the female students, but also by promoting a project to build a charnel chapel and then to have a cross erected on the chapel. Yonashiro thus took a bold step toward the criticism of the Japanese Imperial Army in Okinawa, and he tried to relocate the religious nature of the Tower of Himeyuri from Shinto and Buddhism to Christianity. Hiyane followed Yonashiro's viewpoints of the Tower of Himeyuri. Not only did he bring back a copy of Yonashiro's article to the Japanese mainland, but he also emphasized the inseparability of the Tower of Himeyuri and the cross on the charnel chapel. Based on Yonashiro's account, Ishino then conducted research on the Battle of Okinawa and developed his story further, emphasizing the importance of Christianity in his account of the female students. Ishino's critical stance toward teachers should ultimately be understood in the context of his admiration for Christianity.

The next chapter will further explore how Ishino's criticism of teachers created ripples not only in the narration of the HSC, but also in postwar Japanese society as a whole. Only a few teachers were able to survive the Battle of Okinawa, and these few survivors counter-narrated Ishino's criticism of them.

Chapter 3

Teachers in the Battle of Okinawa

In the previous two chapters, we examined how the dynamics of describing the Himeyuri Student Corps in the Battle of Okinawa changed from soldier-centred perspectives (the first stage) to civilian-centred perspectives (the second stage). The work of both Yonashiro Isamu and Ishino Keiichirō should be understood in this context, but it should also be noted that neither of them had a direct experience of the Battle of Okinawa. While Yonashiro narrowed down his focus to criticism of Ushijima Mitsuru, the commanding general of the 32nd Army, Ishino widened the scope of criticism by suggesting that both the Japanese Imperial troops and the teachers of the Himeyuri students were equally responsible for brainwashing the female students. This stirred up controversy over whether – or to what degree – Ishino's account was fictional or non-fictional. It was immediately after this controversy that Nakasone Seizen, one of the teachers who actually accompanied the female students in the Battle of Okinawa, published a decisive edition of the "official" record of the HSC. Here the narratives of the HSC reached a third stage, in which the teachers of the HSC began describing their own experiences. Three teachers – Nishioka Kazuyoshi (西岡 一義), Nishihira Hideo (西平 英夫), and Nakasone Seizen (仲宗根 政善) – will be the focus of discussion in this chapter. Nakasone was the only one originally from Okinawa, while Nishioka and Nishihira were from the Japanese mainland. It is also important to keep in mind that both the Female Division of Okinawa Normal School and the Okinawa First Girls' High School were the two most elite girls' schools in Okinawa during those days, and both teachers and students from these institutions were conscious and proud of this fact. It seems that elitism thus underpinned wartime patriotic education at these two schools. All three teachers experienced the Battle of Okinawa, but how each of them took accountability for their wartime behaviours

differed significantly after Japan's defeat. Ishino opened up a Pandora's box by tackling the issue of teachers' wartime responsibility, but the controversy did not last long. Instead, two interrelated issues – postwar reparations to Okinawans and the wartime status of the female students – soon grew in importance relative to teachers' wartime responsibility. The three teachers played a key role in confirming the wartime status of their students; that is, whether they were voluntary students or civilians employed by the military. The issue of teachers' wartime responsibility thus revealed another complicated power relationship between Okinawa and the Japanese mainland, demonstrating the fact that memories of the war were neither monolithic nor unrelated to the politics between Okinawa and the Japanese mainland.

The Controversy over the Credibility of Ishino's The Tower of Himeyuri

Controversy began with the *Yomiuri* newspaper article entitled "*Kiroku Bungaku* (Documentary literature) Has Created a Ripple Again" on September 7 1949.[115] The article criticized Ishino's *The Tower of Himeyuri* (which had just began its serialization in the September issue of *Reijokai*) for having fabricated the wartime action of the school principal Nishioka Kazuyoshi, depicting him as having caused the death of his female students.

From the very beginning, this controversy took on a bizarre tangent. The *Yomiuri* article began with a broad criticism of ladies' magazines for their articles regarding the HSC and Nishioka Kazuyoshi, aiming to denounce the distortion of their portrayal of Nishioka. It stated that these articles described Nishioka as "a cruel and heartless militarist educator" who had "forced his pure-hearted girls to march more than 70 kilometers[116] as a school drill,

---

[115] This *Yomiuri* article was partly reprinted in *Reijokai* (December 1949), 35-36.

[116] The original Japanese stated that the march was more than 18 *ri*. One *ri* is equal to 3927 meters.

slapped all the students from a single class across their faces, and so on".[117] In fact, the article continued, Principal Nishioka really existed. He not only survived the Battle of Okinawa, but he also became the principal of Tokyo Gakugei University's Oiwake branch after the war. Understandably, the *Yomiuri* article insisted, Nishioka became the target of criticism both from the professors and PTA of the Oiwake branch and from the Okinawans living on the Japanese mainland, because of the distorted image of him as a militarist educator.[118]

As the previous chapter showed, Ishino "created" a school principal named Okanishi Yoshikazu, harshly criticizing him as a symbol of wartime education for having brainwashed students into becoming unquestioning patriots. The problem was that Ishino's "fictional" character "Oka-nishi Yoshi-kazu (岡西 義一)" was actually a simple modification of the name "Nishi-oka Kazu-yoshi (西岡 一義)". In particular, the *Yomiuri* article highlighted Ishino's account over all the other articles, although Ishino's first chapter had just appeared a week before in the September issue of *Reijokai* (published September 1 1949). The *Yomiuri* article stated:

> Ishino Keiichirō, the author of "The Tower of Himeyuri", has openly admitted that his "Documentary literature", although it should be non-fictional, "contains fiction", stating that he could not absolutely guarantee that everything he wrote was based on true facts. For Nishioka, however, who was an educator, the fabrication of this documentary literature had a massive impact on his life.[119]

In short, although it implied that other magazines were also spreading an inaccurate image of Nishioka, the *Yomiuri* article in fact targeted only Ishino's account and cast doubt on the credibility of his descriptions. To achieve this goal, it then introduced the eye-witness ac-

---

[117] Susumu Hanamura, "'Himeyuri' no Tō no hamon", *Reijokai* (December 1949), 35.

[118] Ibid.

[119] Ibid., 36.

counts of Nishihira Hideo, one of the teachers who accompanied the HSC until they were captured and later hospitalized in an American army hospital.

Nishihira portrayed Nishioka as the polar opposite of the "cruel and heartless militarist educator". (See Figure 3.1.). Underlying Nishihira's argument was the idea that Nishioka's seemingly pro-military attitude was actually the result of pressure from the Japanese Imperial Army. It was true that, as Nishihira stated, Nishioka had forced his students to march 70 kilometres again and again, but such military drills were unavoidable in Okinawa back then. It was also by order of the military that the students became battlefield nurses, which was against Nishioka's will. "Furthermore", Nishihira emphasized, "while the students of other women's schools, such as the Okinawa Second Girls' High School and Shuri Girls' High School, became civilians employed by the military, the HSC remained classified as students thanks to Principal Nishioka's unusual effort". In addition, Nishihira stated that Nishioka constantly visited the caves where his students were hiding during the Battle of Okinawa, dodging the hail of bullets on his way. Finally, Nishihira continued, neither the idea that all the female students killed themselves with hand grenades, nor the idea that Nishioka's education had brainwashed them into killing themselves, was true. Based on Nishihira's information, Nishioka did not deserve to be branded as "a cruel and heartless militarist educator".[120] Most importantly, Nishihira stated that the HSC were classified as students, not as civilians employed by the military. This point will take on a special importance later in this chapter. (See Figure 3.1.).

---

[120] Ibid.

Figure 3.1. Nishihira Hideo's Defence Of Principal Nishioka	
Criticisms of Principal Nishioka	Nishihira's Defence
Principal Nishioka forced his students to march more than 70 kilometres as a school drill.	Such military drills were unavoidable in Okinawa during the war.
Principal Nishioka forced his students to work as battlefield nurses.	It was by army order, not his decision. In fact, Principal Nishioka made an unusual effort to keep the HSC classified as students, not civilians employed by the military .
Principal Nishioka did not accompany his students, and instead he kept himself in a safer zone.	Principal Nishioka constantly visited the students who were hiding in caves during the Battle of Okinawa, dodging bullets on his way.
All his female students killed themselves with hand grenades, since Nishioka's teaching had brainwashed them into not surrendering.	There were only 3 hand grenades for the 200 female students. Thus it would not be possible for all his female students to kill themselves with hand grenades.

It was three months later, on December 1 1949, that Ishino and *Reijokai* fired back at the *Yomiuri* article. The December 1949 issue of *Reijokai*, the same issue in which Ishino ran his final serialization "Flowers Fall, Flowers Bloom", also ran a special report entitled "Himeyuri no Tō wa Uso ka?" ("Was *The Tower of Himeyuri* a fiction?"). This report consisted of three articles, all of which focused on the controversy that Ishino's serialization had stirred up. The very first article was written by the chief editor of *Reijokai*, Hanamura Susumu (花村 奨), and it emphasized the fact that when the *Yomiuri* article was published on September 7, it was only a week after Ishino's first chapter had appeared in the September issue of *Reijokai*. In the words of Hanamura:"In short, even if it is true that the entire novel *The Tower of Himeyuri* triggered a controversy over Mr. Nishioka Kazuyoshi, it had not yet mentioned anything in detail about him at that time", and therefore, he concluded that the *Yomiuri* article's reporting was erroneous.[121]

[121] Ibid.

Hanamura's article was followed by Ishino's response to the *Yomiuri* article. Ishino denounced the *Yomiuri* article's argument as a gratuitous accusation, because none of his descriptions of Nishioka matched those depicted by the *Yomiuri* article. Ishino also emphasized that *The Tower of Himeyuri* was not a piece of documentary literature, but a novel that "aimed to describe the damage, prayers and concerns of the Battle of Okinawa from local civilians' perspectives, by placing 'The Tower of Himeyuri' at the core of the story". Thus "it never intended to expose specific individuals or to create any kind of record".[122]

The last article of the three was written by Tsuda Ryōichi (津田 亮一), and it also completely rejected the *Yomiuri*'s argument. First, it revealed that Nishihira Hideo, the eyewitness who had defended Principal Nishioka in the *Yomiuri* article, was actually a person "who was Nishioka's right hand man and took the initiative to forcefully carry out military education by imposing cruel and illogical military traditions upon girls", categorically denying his credibility as a witness.[123] It then further detailed Nishioka's teaching career in Okinawa.

Nishioka was born in Shizuoka Prefecture in the Japanese mainland, moving to Okinawa as a teacher in 1926 immediately after he graduated from Waseda University, remaining there for twenty years. He became the *buchō* (principal) of the Female Division of Okinawa Normal School in 1941, and worked as the *kōchō (*principal) of the Okinawa First Girls' High School at the same time. The HSC was organized from both of these schools. Judging from Tsuda's report, it is safe to assume that Nishioka made a lot of enemies in Okinawa. He loved self-advertisement and took advantage of any opportunity to promote his reputation as an educator. As the principal of the two women's schools, Nishioka forced his students to march 70

---

[122] Keiichirō Ishino, "Hamon o Nageta Uso", *Reijokai* (December 1949), 38-39.

[123] Ryōichi Tsuda, "Okanishi Kōchō no Moderu", *Reijokai* (December 1949), 39.

kilometres as a school drill, unapologetically claiming that it was Nishioka-style education.[124] He built a swimming pool in his school, and gaudily held its official opening ceremony by inviting a female Japanese Olympic swimmer named Kawahata (川畑) and a male swimmer named Saitō Takahiro (齋藤 巍洋). Even before the Battle of Okinawa took place, Nishioka was notorious for being "a brown-noser",[125] but especially as the Battle of Okinawa became imminent, it seems that he behaved more like a dictator than a principal. He promptly evacuated his family from Okinawa to the Japanese mainlands, while forcing his students (whom he pejoratively addressed as "reef maggots") to engage in military work in Okinawa, gradually turning school buildings into military barracks. Tsuda stated: "The female students even had to cook and wash like orderlies by rotation in Nishioka's personal residence".[126]

In addition to his difficult personality, what confirmed Nishioka's postwar notoriety was the fact that he did not accompany his students during the Battle of Okinawa. In this respect, Noda Sadao (野田 貞雄), the principal of the Male Division of Okinawa Normal School, stood in strong contrast to Nishioka. Just as the female students of the Female Division of Okinawa Normal School were mobilized to work as battlefield nurses, the male students of the Male Division of Okinawa Normal School, aged between 14 and 17, were also mobilized to work for the Japanese Imperial troops. Noda accompanied his male students, and died in the battle. Nishioka, on the contrary, did not accompany his students, and instead he accompanied the commanding general Ushijima, which meant that he kept himself in a safer zone while his students worked in the dangerous battlefields.[127]

---

[124] Ibid., 40.

[125] Ibid.

[126] Ibid.

[127] Ibid.

Tsuda concluded his article by quoting the interview with Nishioka. Throughout this interview, Nishioka consistently shifted his own responsibility onto the Japanese Imperial Army. For example, it was not him but the Japanese Imperial Army that had decided to mobilize the female students, and he could not oppose the decision. The 70-kilometre march was a physical test, and he did not force his students to do it. Therefore, he did not have any regrets for his educational policy. In fact, he continued, some former students said that the march was hard but that it later became a happy memory. He evacuated his family from Okinawa, but it was by order of the Japanese Imperial Army. He stayed at the rear safety zone instead of accompanying his students, just because he had to circulate around several battlefield hospitals where his students were working, so he could not stay in one place. He surrendered to the U.S. troops around August 20, which was approximately two months after June 20 and 21, when 80% of the casualties among his students had occurred. As a closing remark, Nishioka added that he was aware of his ethical responsibility.[128]

In this interview, Nishioka basically did not deny anything about what he had reportedly done. He just continued to point out what was behind his seemingly pro-military action, seeking to portray himself as a victim under the control of the Japanese Imperial Army, just as his female students were. He also implied that since he was from outside Okinawa, some Okinawan local influential educators were jealous of his educational accomplishments.

Here I would like to briefly summarize the clash between the *Yomiuri* newspaper and *Reijokai.* The *Yomiuri* ran an article on September 7 1949, that criticized Ishino Keiichirō's article in *Reijokai* for its description of Principal Nishioka as a total fabrication. The *Yomiuri* article showed two specific pieces of evidence to sustain its argument: one was Ishino's statement that his documentary literature contained fictions, and the other was the eyewitness

[128] Ibid., 40-41.

testimony of Nishihira Hideo. *Reijokai* made a counter-argument against the *Yomiuri* article three months later in December 1949, which was based on the following three angles: First, Hanamura, the chief editor, pointed out the central contradiction of the *Yomiuri* article that is, the fact that Ishino's article did not mention anything in detail about Principal Nishioka as of September 1949. Second, Ishino stated that his novel *The Tower of Himeyuri* was based on the Battle of Okinawa, and that all the characters are only partially based on real people. Third, Tsuda called into question the credibility of the *Yomiuri'*s eyewitness, Nishihira Hideo, casting doubt on the entire authenticity of the *Yomiuri* argument. Tsuda did research on what Principal Nishioka had done before and during the Battle of Okinawa, and he also interviewed Nishioka to judge the truth of his research.

It is noteworthy that all three articles did not pay much attention to whether Nishioka's military education had been used to brainwash his students, but did pay much more attention to his personality and egotism. In other words, despite being a prodigious opportunity, their counterarguments against the *Yomiuri* article did not lead to more in-depth discussions on teachers' wartime responsibility in general, but rather focused on mere personal gossip about Nishioka. Hanamura, Ishino, and Tsuda each neglected an opportunity to deepen the debate on the issue of wartime responsibility, instead eagerly glossing over Ishino's remark that his *The Tower of Himeyuri* was a fiction based on facts and not documentary literature.

This controversy seems illogical in many ways, and some of the reasons can be traced back to the contemporary situation surrounding Nishioka as the principal of Tokyo Gakugei University's Oiwake branch after Japan's defeat. According to Ishino's autobiography, which ran in a newspaper series in 1985, this controversy then led to demands that Nishioka resign, which was followed by strikes within the university. Ishino simply stated: "The strikers asked

me to officially announce that the novel is true, but I did not comply with their request".[129] This ongoing power struggle within the university might have been at the root of Ishino's ambiguous statement. It is also important to note two more factors that existed behind the controversy: the heightening distrust around documentary literature, and the growing importance of civilian-centred perspectives in the narratives about the Battle of Okinawa.

The first factor, as Chapter 1 demonstrated, is the post-war publication of Japanese veterans' non-fictive experiences of the Battle of Okinawa. According to Takahashi Saburō, documentary literature became wildly popular in 1949 and a variety of magazines ran documentary literature amidst their other articles.[130] This, however, also promoted distrust towards the credibility of documentary literature on the whole. For example, on August 7 1949, the *Asahi Shinbun* newspaper ran an article on an ex-Navy *shūkeichō* (paymaster) who had examined the authenticity of documentary literature articles published in magazines. According to him, even though it was written by ex-soldiers, documentary literature was replete with so many descriptions based on misinterpretation of facts that it was dangerous to automatically assume that their descriptions were always true.[131] Likewise, the November issue of *Shōsetsu Fan* (*Fans of Novels*) magazine, published in November 1949, proudly proclaimed in its editor's postscript that Japanese society was now flooded by so-called *kiroku-mono* (a casual name for documentary literature), but this magazine carefully avoided such "epigones of documentary literature" containing only authentic ones that did not distort the truth.[132] Considering this trend, the *Yomiuri*'s argument against Ishino's *The Tower of Himeyuri* was not so

---

[129] Ishino, *Watakushi No Sengoshi,* 124.

[130] Saburō Takahashi, *"Senkimono" O Yomu: Sensō Taiken to Sengo Nihon Shakai.* Kyōto-shi (Akademia Shuppankai, 1988), 34.

[131] "Kaisenkimono ni Isshi Imamura Moto 'Atago' Shukeichō no Hanashi", *Asahi Shinbun,* August 7, 1949.

[132] *Shōsetsu Fan* (November 1949), 78.

surprising. As can be read from the *Yomiuri* article's title "Kiroku Bungaku (Documentary Literature) Has Created a Ripple *Again*"[emphasis added] shows, this argument was probably familiar to contemporary readers.

The second factor is that Ishino's descriptions of Principal Nishioka went in tandem with the other important civilian-centred narrative of the Battle of Okinawa, *Tetsu no Bōfū* (*The Typhoon of Steel*) in 1950. As Chapter 1 demonstrated, *The Typhoon of Steel* aimed to focus on the local suffering of Okinawan civilians. Although they differed in respect to whether they were fiction or non-fiction, both *The Tower of Himeryuri* and *The Typhoon of Steel* clearly criticized Principal Nishioka. The earliest article mentioning the publication of *The Typhoon of Steel* and its criticism of Principal Nishioka appears to have been published on August 25 1949. This article announced the upcoming publication of *The Typhoon of Steel* in both Okinawa and the Japanese mainlands, and it suggested that this book would cause severe criticism against Nishioka.[133] It is noteworthy that *The Typhoon of Steel* quoted Principal Noda's evaluation of Nishioka. Principal Noda accompanied his male students, and died on the battlefield alongside them. *The Typhoon of Steel* quoted a journalist's interview which took place on the battlefield. In his response to the newspaper writer's remark that "Nishioka is a horrible person, isn't he?" Noda stated:

> "He's absolutely horrible. He abandons his students, licks the boots of the army, and takes the lion's share of everything without any scruples. Just thinking about it makes me sick. I sensed something fishy about him all along. At the crucial moment, he left his students to die; he doesn't deserve to be called an educator. I'm utterly disgusted with my misfortune in getting stuck with such horrible subordinates as Nakamura and Nishioka. I myself am prepared to die in this battle, but I want someone to know that as my final message".[134]

---

[133] "Iba Nishioka-shi ra no Hiretsu Bakurosaru", *Okinawa Shinminpō,* August 25, 1949.

[134] Okinawa Taimususha, *Tetsu no bōfū,* 85.

Nakamura and Nishioka, both of whom are mentioned in the quotation above, were in charge of the Male Division and Female Division of Okinawa Normal School respectively, but Nakamura escaped from Okinawa to the Japanese mainland, and Nishioka kept himself in a safer zone without accompanying his female students. *The Typhoon of Steel* went so far as to imply that Nishioka brought a female teacher with him while he was staying away from his students.[135] Having summarized the controversy surrounding Principal Nishioka, we will now move on to the examination of whether Ishino's *The Tower of Himeyuri* was as fictional as Ishino advocated in regard to its description of Principal Nishioka.

The Relationship Between Fiction and Non-Fiction in Ishino's Mind

In his response to the *Yomiuri* article reprinted in the December issue of *Reijokai*, Ishino adamantly refused to admit that his *The Tower of Himeyuri* "intended to expose specific individuals or to create any kind of record", and thus he emphasized that *The Tower of Himeyuri* was not a piece of documentary literature but a novel that naturally contained fictions. However, looking at Ishino's other comments on his novel, it seems that his argument was inconsistent and ambiguous. For example, in one newspaper article published on September 15 1949, Ishino made the same counter-argument to the *Yomiuri* article as he would later do in the December 1949 issue of *Reijokai*, admitting in a roundabout sort of way that his description of Principal Okanishi *happened to* be alike to the real principal Nishioka. He stated:

> The characters are not based on specific individuals, but rather each of them is a composite of different models. I was surprised, however, to learn that my description of the School Principal was actually quite accurate. I had described him as a disgraceful epigone of the militarists, despised by all the girl characters. I cannot help

---

[135] Ibid., 257.

> wondering if the ghosts of the girls might have led my fictional descriptions to be accurate.[136]

This raises a question: To what extent did Ishino fictionalize this school principal? As already stated in this chapter, Ishino slightly modified the name "Nishi-oka Kazu-yoshi" (西岡 一義) to "Oka-nishi Yoshi-kazu" (岡西 義一) in his story. The first chapter, "The Death March", which ran in the September issue of *Reijokai* in 1949, referred to "Okanishi" four times. The first mention simply explained the fact that "Okanishi" served as Principal for two women's schools.[137] The other three mentions, however, suggested the strong ties between "Okanishi" and his military education. The second mention of him was made in one student's response to another student's remark: "You mean, the way of the warrior is the way of death. You are speaking like Principal Okanishi".[138] Furthermore,"Okanishi" was later described as "the most glaring example of militarist education" in terms of how much his students were brainwashed before the Battle of Okinawa.[139] The last mention of "Okanishi" appears in a scene in which Isagawa Kana, the leading character of the story, begins to have doubts about the war and the idea that winning the battle could restore Okinawa. Her internal voice responds: "Kana! Okinawa will be even better than before if we win! Don't you have faith in the teaching of Principal Okanishi? You must not doubt the divine Emperor! You must never waver!"[140] Considering these descriptions of "Okanishi", it is safe to say that from the very beginning of its serialization, Ishino decided to depict "Okanishi" as the classic example of Japanese wartime military education, and it seems that this was also true of the editorial poli-

---

[136] Keiichirō Ishino, "Boku no Seimei", *Okinawa Shinminpō,* September 15, 1949.

[137] Ishino, *Reijokai* (September 1949), 15.

[138] Ibid.,18.

[139] Ibid.,20.

[140] Ibid.,31.

cy of *Reijokai*. In the September issue of *Reijokai*, Hanamura, the chief editor, used his entire editor's postscript to talk about Okinawa and Ishino's newly-started serialization. Hanamura concluded the editor's postscript as follows:

> I heard about one despicable principal of a women's school. He forced his poor students to defend the island, shrewdly escaping the danger himself. Still now he is living somewhere in the mainland…. If what I heard is true…he should be brought to justice in the name of all the women of Japan. [141]

The critical stance of Ishino and *Reijokai* towards Principal "Okanishi" became even more evident and detailed in the second chapter, "The Rain Never Stops", in the October 1949 issue of *Reijokai*. The second chapter is also important for the analysis of the relationship between fiction and non-fiction in Ishino's mind. This chapter explored the career trajectory of Principal "Okanishi", and these details almost exactly mirrored Tsuda's report on the real principal Nishioka in the December 1949 issue of *Reijokai*. (See Figure 3.2.).

---

[141] Susumu Hanamura, "Makichō-dayori", *Reijokai,* September 1949, 96.

Figure 3.2. Ishino's Descriptions of "Okanishi" and Tsuda's Report on Nishioka

Tsuda's Report on Nishioka	Ishino's Descriptions of "Okanishi"
He became the Buchō (部長, department head/ principal) of the Female Division of Okinawa Normal School in 1941, and worked as the Kōchō (校長, principal) of the Okinawa First Girls' High School at the same time.	He became the Buchō (部長, department head/ principal) of the Female Division of Okinawa Normal School in 1941, and worked as the Kōchō (校長, principal) of the Okinawa First Girls' High School at the same time.
He built a swimming pool in his school, and gaudily held its official opening ceremony by inviting a Japanese female Olympic swimmer named Kawahata (川畑) and male swimmer named Saitō Takahiro（齋藤巍洋）.	He built a swimming pool in his school, and gaudily held its official opening ceremony by inviting a Japanese female Olympic swimmer. However, the name Kawahata was modified to Maehata (前畑), and the male swimmer Saitō was deleted in the 1950 and 1977 versions.
He forced his female student to march 70 kilometers.	He forced his female student to march 70 kilometers.
He did not accompany his students, and instead he accompanied the commanding general Ushijima, which meant that he kept himself in a safer zone while his students worked in the dangerous battlefields.	He did not accompany his students, and instead he accompanied the commanding general Ushijima, which meant that he kept himself in a safer zone while his students worked in the dangerous battlefields.
He addressed his students as "reef maggots".	He addressed his students as "reef maggots".
"Nishioka-style education"	"Okanishi-style education"

As is clear from this chart, Ishino's creation of "Okanishi" was not based on "a composite of different models", but rather it was a simple reflection of the real Principal Nishioka. Ishino insisted that his account of the Okinawan female students was fiction. But it is more accurate to say that Ishino inserted non-fictional elements into his fictional account, yet presented it as though it were a purely fictional work. This leads to another question: why did Ishino simply present the non-fictional reality of Principal Nishioka while he created many fictional characters in his story? An answer to this question can be found in the way that Ishino used a combination of real and fictional names for characters in his *The Tower of Himeyuri*. As Chapter 2 demonstrated, Ishino's *The Tower of Himeyuri* differed from other narratives about the HSC in that it gave detailed information about multiple characters, in-

cluding their names, backgrounds, and religious beliefs. Looking carefully at each character, we can recognize three patterns in the way Ishino named his characters. First, most of the characters, including the leading character Isagawa Kana, appeared under fictional names that were not based on real people at all. Second, some of the other well-known characters, such as the commanding general Ushijima and Prime Minister Tōjō, appeared under their own names. The third category needs to be considered in more detail here. (See Figure 3.3.).

Figure 3.3. The Three Patterns of Ishino's Naming Methods

Patter 1: Fictional Names not based on real persons	Pattern 2 : Real Names of Actual Persons	Pattern 3: Modification of Actual Names
Isagawa Kana (student)	Ushijima (commanding general)	Okanishi Yoshikazu (principal)
Tayama (principal)	Tōjō (Prime Minister)	Hiranishi (vice principal)
Ishikawa (teacher)		Yamakage Harumasa (militarist poet)
Azuma (teacher)		

The names categorized in Pattern 3 are fictional too, but they differ from Pattern 1 in that they are based on the modified names of actual persons, and thus it is easier to guess the real names on which they were based. For example, as already mentioned, the name "Nishi-oka Kazu-yoshi" (西岡 一義) was modified to "Oka-nishi Yoshi-kazu" (岡西 義一), Nishi-hira (西平) to Hira-nishi (平西), and Kage-yama Masa-haru (影山 正治) to Yama-kage Haru-masa (山影 治正). As already mentioned, Nishihira defended Principal Nishioka in the *Yomi-uri* article published on September 7 1949. This means that after Nishihira had appeared in

the *Yomiuri* article in September, Ishino created "Hiranishi", a character who may have been based on the actual teacher Nishihira, in the October issue of *Reijokai*. Ishino described "Hiranishi" as follows:

> Assistant Chief Principal Hiranishi was Principal Okanishi's right hand man. His students spoke of him like an unpleasant insect that always had its treacherous eyes on them. He was a peculiar man who imposed cruel and senseless military traditions on his students, doing things like collectively punishing all of them if even a single one were tardy.[142]

Once again, Ishino's description of "Hiranishi" almost completely matched Tsuda's description of Nishihira Hideo, "who was Nishioka's right hand man and took the initiative to forcefully carry out military education by imposing cruel and illogical military traditions upon girls".[143] It should be noted that Ishino did not apply this naming method to all teachers in the story. The names of teachers such as Tayama (田山) , Ishikawa (石川) and Azuma (吾妻) belong to Pattern 1, because their names and characterizations were completely different from those of the actual teachers who accompanied the female students. For example, Principal Tayama was likely based on Noda Sadao, the principal of the Male Division of Okinawa Normal School who accompanied his students on the battlefield, but Ishino did not use the same naming method as that of "Nishioka-Okanishi". It is thus safe to assume that Ishino intentionally modified the actual names of Nishioka and Nishihira into "Okanishi" and "Hiranishi" respectively, but not in the case of "Noda—Tayama". This means that these three characters whose names belonged to Pattern 3, "Okanishi", "Hiranishi", and "Yamakage", were all described in the context of military education and propaganda.[144] In addition, their real-

---

[142] *Reijokai*, (October 1949),18.

[143] *Reijokai*, (December 1949), 39.

[144] "Yama-kage Haru-masa", who was probably based on the actual militarist poet Kageyama Masaharu, was also mentioned in the critical context of those who distorted truths and misled the public.

life models, Nishioka Kazuyoshi, Nishihira Hideo, and Kageyama Masaharu, all survived the Asia-Pacific War. From these facts, it is possible to conclude that Ishino aimed to indirectly inform readers of the real names of these characters by slightly modifying their names while still claiming that the characters were fictional. Ishino's intention was to criticize wartime militaristic education, since in his mind it appeared to be as equally responsible for brain-washing the female students into dying for their country as was the Japanese Imperial military. Nevertheless, Ishino's argument on teachers' wartime responsibility did not go into a deeper discussion of the responsibility of wartime education as a whole, but rather led to a mere personal scandal about Principal Nishioka. It is undeniable that Ishino's limitations as a writer contributed to this anticlimactic end to the controversy between the *Yomiuri* and *Rei-jokai*. He did not fictionalize "Okanishi" to the extent that he did other characters, and rather paid too much attention to the actual principal's personality. It is worth mentioning, however, that Ishino's *The Tower of Himeyuri* raised questions about teachers' wartime responsibility for the death of their students by highlighting the fact that Principal Nishioka did not accompany his students.

On February 15 1950, the *Okinawa Shinminpō* newspaper reported that "the more famous the Tower of Himeyuri becomes, the louder the accusing voices become", and that the Ministry of Education had begun investigating the following five questions: 1. The truth of organizing the HSC; 2. Why Principal Nishioka did not accompany his students; 3. A shifting phase of the Battle of Okinawa and the educational policy of the Principal Nishioka; 4. The truth behind Nishioka's military drills; and 5. Principal Nishioka's language and behaviour and the relationship between him and *Taisei-yokusankai* (the Imperial Aid Association).[145] Ishino's *The Tower of Himeyuri* triggered a controversy which even the Ministry of Education

[145] "Himeyuri no Tō no Yoen Nishioka Taichō ni Semaru", *Okinawa Shinminpō,* (February 15, 1949).

could not ignore. It provided a rare occasion to consider the multi-layered nature of wartime responsibility, but soon after its publication, the non-fictional record of the survivors, which would later be canonized as *the* definitive record of the tragedy, was published: Nakasone Seizen's *Okinawa no Higeki: Himeyuri no Tō o Meguru Hitobito no Shuki* (*The Tragedy of Okinawa: Collection of Personal Notes on the Tower of Himeyuri*). This decisive account of the HSC performed a crucial role in confirming the image of the HSC as victims. However, it did not further an in-depth discussion of the wartime responsibility of teachers.

Nakasone Seizen and Teachers' Wartime Responsibility

Nakasone emphasized in the Preface of *The Tragedy of Okinawa* that "this account is not a fiction, it is rather a non-fictional record based on the notes I have collected and compiled from students who survived the war. I have ensured the accuracy of their names, dates and locations. It would be a great pleasure of mine if bereft families would read this book and remember the last days of their own daughters and sisters".[146] In a later interview, Nakasone stated that when he published *The Tragedy of Okinawa* in 1951 he had not yet read Ishino's *The Tower of Himeyuri,* but that he was deeply concerned about the misleading information regarding the HSC that was spreading through a variety of media.[147] As one of the survivors who had accompanied the HSC during the Battle of Okinawa, Nakasone's motivation for compiling *The Tragedy of Okinawa* was to present a more accurate account of what had happened to him and his students. Thus with this account, the Okinawans who had actually experienced the Battle of Okinawa finally broke their silence. The first edition of *The Tragedy of*

---

[146] Nakasone, *Okinawa No Higeki,* Preface.

[147] "Senzen no Kyōiku to Okinawa-sen-taiken", *Shin Okinawa Bungaku* vol.43 (Naha-shi: Okinawa Taimususha, November 1979), 202.

Okinawa was published by Kachō Shobō publishing company, and it consisted of the memoirs of Nakasone and fourteen students from his school. The various survivors' accounts sometimes depicted the same scene from different perspectives, successfully presenting more detailed and realistic information about what had happened than war veterans' memoirs or Ishino's novel. This does not mean, however, that the memoirs compiled in *The Tragedy of Okinawa* were genuinely untouched and unrevised. In the same interview, Nakasone candidly stated that although he had not revised depictions of any events depicted in the students' accounts, he did revise "some of the words" in their notes – specifically those regarding the American and Japanese armies.[148] *The Tragedy of Okinawa* somehow managed to escape American censorship, and Nakasone had done his best to avoid any depiction that might draw the attention of the censors.

Nakasone never clarified how and what he revised in *The Tragedy of Okinawa.* The literary scholar Nakahodo Masanori analyzed several editions of *The Tragedy of Okinawa,* exploring for the first time the process of Nakasone's revision. Nakahodo has discovered that Nakasone revised at least two descriptions in one student's memoir. In the original manuscript, upon hearing the call for surrender from the U.S. army, this student thought "what a scary voice of *kichiku* (demon)!" In the first edition published by Kachō Shobō, however, this derogatory word *kichiku* was modified to a more moderate word *bei-gun* (the American troops). In a still later edition, *bei-gun* was modified again to *bei-hei* (the American soldiers), and in the final edition it returned once again to the original expression *kichiku*. Nakahodo has further revealed that Nakasone also completely erased another description in the same student's account, which vividly described the scene in which Japanese soldiers fatally shot other Japanese soldiers swimming to an American ship to surrender. This erased scene was

[148] Ibid.

also restored in a later edition. In his analysis of these shifting modifications, erasures, and restorations in Nakasone's *The Tragedy of Okinawa*, Nakahodo has concluded that what was behind the shifting modifications of the word *kichiku* was Nakasone's self-imposed regulation to avoid American censorship, and that what was behind the later restoration of the Japanese soldiers' killing of other Japanese soldiers was Nakasone's "increasing worry about Japan's remilitarization along with the expansion of American military bases in Okinawa."[149]

There is room for further research into what Nakasone modified and erased in *The Tragedy of Okinawa*. For example, Nakahodo has paid special attention to the modification of the word *kichiku* in one student's note, but he has missed the fact that Nakasone used the same word quite casually in his own memoir in the same edition of *The Tragedy of Okinawa*:

> The students were inspired by the words 'glorified death'. At the same time, they were also afraid of *kichiku no bei-gun* (the demonic American troops). Through death, they would protect their chastity. Their hearts held both the longing for a beautiful death and their fear of the *kichiku*. They were simultaneously seduced by the charm of death as they looked up at the evening moon looming over a great rock, and scared to death as they looked down at the waves crashing below the cliffs.[150]

In the quoted part of Nakasone's memoir, he used the word *kichiku* twice: "*kichiku no bei-gun*" and "fear of the *kichiku.*" In the final edition, Nakasone later modified the second "fear of the *kichiku*" to "fear of death". Considering Nakasone's arbitrary modification of the word *kichiku,* it is evident that Nakahodo's conclusion that Nakasone's self-imposed regulation against American censorship underlay his modifications and erasures needs to be further considered from various angles. One useful angle here could be how *The Tragedy of Okinawa* tackled the issue of teachers' responsibility. Throughout *The Tragedy of Okinawa*, Nakasone

---

[149] Masanori Nakahodo, *Himeyuri Tachi No Koe: Shuki to Nikki O Yomi Toku* (Naha: Shuppanshamugen, 2012), 137-140.

[150] Nakasone, *Okinawa No Higeki,* 206.

carefully circumvented the issue of teachers' wartime responsibility in a way that hid the issue from readers and helped his manipulation of information escape from notice.

The plot of *The Tragedy of Okinawa* opens on March 24 1945, with the HSC being mobilized by the Japanese Imperial Army to work for Haebaru Army Hospital. This seemingly normal beginning of the story, however, actually eliminated any detailed description of wartime education before the Battle of Okinawa began. As a result, the simultaneous and parallel controversy over Principal Nishioka did not appear in *The Tragedy of Okinawa* at all. Principal Nishioka was referred to a few times, but no critical tone can be found in such references. For example, Nakasone's description of the scene in which Nishioka gives his students a final address before their mobilization:

> "The American troops have finally landed on Okinawa. The time has come for you to put your daily training to use and devote yourselves to the nation. As members of the Himeyuri students, I would like you to put your abilities to use, and work for the Emperor's nation", said Nishioka, his face filled with emotion, and then proceeded to greet each and every student personally.[151]

The Typhoon of Steel, another non-fictional account of the Battle of Okinawa (published August 15 1950, approximately one year before the publication of *The Tragedy of Okinawa*), portrayed the same scene in a completely different light:

> (…)Nishioka Kazuyoshi(…) gave an address, and he concluded it by saying "I have been sent to the staff room of the military headquarters by the order of the 32nd Army. I would like you to support the army as much as possible with the other teachers. I wish I could go with you, but I cannot refuse army orders. But wherever we are, we are all contributing to the nation. Everyone, please do your best". He then shook the hands of each student and encouraged them.
>
> With the possibility of an American army landing becoming imminent, the students seemed deeply impressed by Principal Nishioka's handshake. School staff, however, suspected that he had manoeuvred behind the scenes in order to be sent to the staff room, so they found his performance somewhat unconvincing. At the crucial

[151] Ibid.,5.

> moment, Nishioka had put all the responsibility for the students onto other teachers, while he himself evacuated to the military headquarters, that is, the safest place.[152]

Comparing *The Tragedy of Okinawa* and *Typhoon of Steel*, it is obvious that Nakasone intentionally distanced the former from the controversy over Principal Nishioka triggered by Ishino's *The Tower of Himeyuri*. *The Tragedy of Okinawa* depicted the egregious reality of the medical activities carried out by the HSC in more detail than any other preceding fictional or non-fictional accounts. These realistic depictions undoubtedly contributed to fostering further understanding of and sympathy for the HSC in the Japanese mainland in particular, and Nakasone Seizen and his *The Tragedy of Okinawa* became an essential part of other HSC narratives published afterwards. As we will see in the next chapter, what might be termed "classic" Himeyuri scenes were first narrated in *The Tragedy of Okinawa,* and then were incorporated into other narratives regarding the HSC. Nevertheless, in terms of the issue of teachers' wartime responsibility, *The Tragedy of Okinawa* did not go into any depth. Nakasone confessed in the Preface that he had left severely-wounded students behind in the battlefield, but neither he nor the students referred to anything about the actual condition of militaristic education before the Battle of Okinawa. In this respect, *The Tragedy of Okinawa* drastically differed from the other two major contemporary accounts of the Battle of Okinawa: *Typhoon of Steel* and *The Tower of Himeyuri*.

It should be noted that as of 1951, when *The Tragedy of Okinawa* was published, even some of the former Himeyuri students had already began raising their voices to criticize Principal Nishioka, although Nakasone himself did not mention anything critical about the Principal in *The Tragedy of Okinawa*. For example, Uezu Hiroko (上江洲 浩子) stated in an interview that she could not forgive Principal Nishioka, since he had abandoned his students

---

[152] Okinawa Taimususha, *Tetsu no Bōfū*, 188.

despite his position of responsibility. Uezu continued on to state that she later discovered that Nishioka had prevented his students from evacuating from Okinawa in advance of an American landing.[153] The issue of teachers' problematic behaviour was not told by either former students or former teachers for a long time. It eventually appeared more than twenty years later, in 1974, which was after Okinawa was restored to Japan (in 1972), as a part of the project of compiling the public's civilian memories of the Battle of Okinawa. A section entitled "We Did Not Participate in the Himeyuri Student Corps" introduced nine former students from the Female Division of Okinawa Normal School, clarifying how they avoided mobilization before the Battle of Okinawa began. In July 1944, the official project of students' evacuation began in Okinawa in tandem with that of local citizens, and three Women's Normal Schools in the Japanese mainland were supposed to accept the refugee students from the two Women's High Schools. At first, the potential locations of evacuation were outside Okinawa, such as Taiwan or the Japanese mainland, but after the 10/10 Air Raids of October 10 1944, the Kunigami area, at the northern end of Okinawa island, became the main site of evacuation. The number of the students who actually evacuated from Okinawa was, however, only 49 out of 315.[154] This low ratio of evacuation was a direct result of the reluctance to give evacuation permits to students.

In the nine students' memoirs compiled in "We Did Not Participate in the Himeyuri Student Corps", a teacher addressed as "N" appears multiple times, and this "N" served a crucial role in compelling his students to stay in Okinawa. Although "N"'s identity was not revealed, considering the fact that N was referred to as either *seito-shuji* (the year-head teacher) or *shakan* (the head of dormitory house), and that he came from outside Okinawa, it

---

[153] "Himeyuri no Tō Seizonsha o Tou", *Okinawa Shinminpō,* July 5, 1951.

[154] Nahashi, *Naha-Shishi v. 2:pt. 2:no. 6 Senji kiroku* (Naha: Naha-shi, 1974), 349.

is highly likely that this "N" refers to Nishihira Hideo, who appeared in the *Yomiuri* article to defend Principal Nishioka. The portrait of Nishihira Hideo, which emerges from the students' memoirs, is quite similar to that in Tsuda's report in *Reijokai*, that is, he "was Nishioka's right hand man and took the initiative to forcefully carry out military education by imposing cruel and illogical military traditions upon the girls". All nine students uniformly noted that they had been incessantly told at their school that they would be branded as *hikokumin* (unpatriotic) and *kokuzoku* (traitor) if they evacuated.[155] The teacher "N" was in charge of giving his students permission to evacuate. He told applicants, however, not to evacuate but to stay in Okinawa, since the female students were supposed to be mobilized as nurses working for army hospitals.[156] It seems more appropriate to call "N"'s negotiation with the applicants "intimidation" than "persuasion". In those days, every student at the Female Division of Okinawa Normal School School was awarded a monthly scholarship. "N" demanded that the applicants refund all the scholarship money they had received if they wished to evacuate.[157] For example, one applicant asked for permission to temporarily leave school to evacuate to the Kunigami area, and N replied: "You said you are evacuating to Kunigami, but there is no guarantee that you will be safe there. If you die at Kunigami, you will die for nothing. Your soul will not go to Yasukuni Shrine, and you will be a traitor. If you stay here and die with your schoolmates, you will be enshrined at Yasukuni. Which do you prefer, dying as a traitor or as a martyr?"[158] Here, it is important to refer back to the quote cited in Introduction of this thesis. Miyagi Kikuko, one of the survivors of the HSC, stated that every day in morning as-

---

[155] Ibid., 354, 355, 357.

[156] Ibid., 352.

[157] Ibid., 352, 355.

[158] Ibid., 363.

sembly the female students were told the following: "Even girls may be awarded *Kun Hachi-to* (the Eighth Order of Merit) if they worked hard in battlefields, and if they worked really hard and devoted their lives, they would be enshrined at Yasukuni".[159] These teachers' behaviour and language demonstrated that wartime militaristic education aimed to create obedient subjects of the Japanese Empire, willing to die for the Emperor, and their highest honour was to be enshrined at Yasukuni after death. None of the accounts of the HSC, however, focused on how teachers brainwashed their students into dying for the Emperor, focusing instead on how the HSC carried out medical activities in abysmal conditions, and how many of them died tragically on the battlefields. Nakasone's *The Tragedy of Okinawa* was no exception. The Kachō Shobō edition of *The Tragedy of Okinawa* referred to Yasukuni Shrine only three times, two of which appeared in Nakasone's memoir. The first mention appeared when Nakasone described the first victim of the HSC, who was shot together with Japanese soldiers by U.S. troops on April 26 1945:

> Looking at her resting there peacefully, clad in a school uniform, I was struck with a feeling of reverence. She had departed together with brave soldiers in that uniform. Perhaps she had carried a beautiful picture of Yasukuni Shrine in her heart.[160]

The second mention appears on June 22 1945:

> The students were not enlightened Buddhist saints; they were simply maidens who held on to life. But they dreamed of a beautiful death in which they would fall like cherry blossoms and go to Yasukuni Shrine, which was as stately as Ryūgū castle.[161]

In these two quotations, Yasukuni Shrine was strongly connected to the idea of "beautiful death", and it was also taken for granted that students thought about Yasukuni Shrine in the face of death. However, it was not explained in *The Tragedy of Okinawa* how the mem-

---

[159] Tanaka, *Dokyumento Yasukuni Soshō,* 69-70.

[160] Nakasone, *Okinawa No Higeki*, 32.

[161] Ibid., 206.

bers of the HSC had been forced by their teachers to believe in the idea of beautiful death in the first place. There were some teachers who secretly aided their students to evacuate without letting "N" know. According to the Okinawan historian Aniya Masaaki (安仁屋 政明), there were three male teachers who voiced opposition to the idea of the mobilization of their female students in a faculty meeting, all of whom were immediately branded as unpatriotic, and expelled from the school.[162] Teachers as well as students were forced to make a difficult decision whether to be woven into the pattern of wartime militaristic education. Nevertheless, some of them did actually defy the mobilization order in an inconspicuous way. This raises a question: Why did Nakasone not write about the conflicts between teachers about the mobilization of their students? To answer this question, we have to consider two sources of information. One is a newspaper article published in 1975 reporting about the nine former students introduced in "We Did Not Participate in the Himeyuri Student Corps". In this article, Nakasone mentions that a small number of executive teachers prevented their students from evacuation, and many teachers sharply reacted against this decision.[163] This means that even though Nakasone had known about the conflicts between teachers, he did not write anything about it in *The Tragedy of Okinawa*.

The second source of information provides some clues as to why Nakasone did not break his silence about teachers' wartime responsibility. Nakasone kept a diary throughout his life, and extracts were later published. His entry for May 17 1979 is worth noting, because Nakasone wrote about his personal view of Principal Nishioka. On this day, a picture of Principal Nishioka was printed in the evening edition of a newspaper. Looking at Nishioka's aged

---

[162] Aniya, Masaaki, and Nobuyoshi Takashima. *"Uchinānumabui" Ga Kataru Nippon: "yonjūnanabanme No Nippon" Kara Mita "sokoku" No Kiki* (Tokyo : Moku Shuppan, 2000), 91.

[163] "Arekara Sanjūnen Shūsen sono Higeki o Kaerimiru", *Okinawa Taimusu,* July 14, 1975.

face in the picture, Nakasone expressed outrage not only towards the newspaper, but also towards the Japanese mass media as a whole for narrowing down their criticism to a single person. In Nakasone's view, Japan as a nation was "crazy" even before the Battle of Okinawa, and therefore it would be meaningless to criticize a person while ignoring the institutions in which he or she was located.[164] It is undeniable, however, that Nakasone consequently swept information about the complicated aspects of the wartime educational institution before the Battle of Okinawa under the rug.

Related to Nakasone's exclusion of inside information is his obfuscation of another critical truth which lay behind the mobilization of the HSC: the graduation ceremony. The Female Division of Okinawa Normal School and the Okinawa First Girls' High School had a joint graduation ceremony every year. Nakasone devoted one section of *The Tragedy of Okinawa* to describe the unusual ceremony which took place on March 29 1945. He began the section – entitled s*otsugyō-shiki* (graduation ceremony) – by stating "We had planned to have the last graduation ceremony on March 25, but the battle began before that".[165] Because the female students were mobilized on March 23, the very day when American air raids began, the teachers and students of both schools had to hold their graduation ceremony at night, on March 29, in the army barracks. The ceremony was held in the midst of the dreadful uproar of American naval gunfire, and two candles were lit in a hermetically-closed room. At the end of the ceremony, the senior students tearfully sang a patriotic song. This impressive scene emphasized the tragic and unique position of the HSC students' work as assistant nurses on the battlefield, and thus it has been repeatedly portrayed in movies, TV dramas, and theatrical productions.

---

[164] Seizen Nakasone, *Himeyuri to Ikite: Nakasone Seizen Nikki* (Naha-shi: Ryūkyū Shinpōsha, 2002), 234-236.

[165] Nakasone, *Okinawa no Higeki*, 15.

Nakasone did not explain, however, why the graduation ceremony was originally planned at the very end of March. In fact, both the Female Division of Okinawa Normal School and the Okinawa First Girls' High School normally had their joint graduation ceremony every year on March 3. The alumnae of the Female Division of Okinawa Normal School were required to work as school teachers after graduation (starting in April), so early March was the logical choice. In 1945, however, the date of the graduation ceremony was postponed first to March 10th, and then to the 15th, 20th, and eventually to the 25th. According to one of the HSC members, it was rumoured among the students that the graduation ceremony was repeatedly postponed just because the schools did not want to let go of their senior students, because they could no longer be mobilized as students once they graduated.[166] Unfortunately, U.S. attacks began on March 23, and the mobilization of female students began on the same day; the senior students could not refuse the mobilization order by the Japanese Imperial Army. Here it is useful to remember the fact that the story of *The Tragedy of Okinawa* opened on March 24 1945. Whether intentionally or not, by opening *The Tragedy of Okinawa* on March 24, the fact that the graduation ceremony had been inexplicably and repeatedly postponed became invisible.

Nakasone's *The Tragedy of Okinawa* provided detailed and realistic descriptions of the battlefields through the eyes of actual survivors. However, while it valued each student's voice, it also ignored and marginalized the teachers' roles in the mobilization of their students, depicting them as equally vulnerable and victimized as their students. This is also related to how Nakasone addressed his students. Nakasone's descriptions tend to describe the tragedy in an overly emotional way. For example, Nakasone addressed his students as *otome* or *otome-ra* (a maiden or maidens) forty seven times in the final edition of *The Tragedy of*

---

[166] Sonoko Iha, *Himeyuri No Okinawasen* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1992), 28.

Okinawa. Other accounts of the HSC also use the word *otome* or *otome-ra,* which emphasizes the purity of the HSC more than other terms of address such as *shōjo* (girl) or *joseito* (female student), but it should be noted that Nakasone also explained the cause of death for his students in connection with their feminine nature as maidens. For example, Nakasone stated in the Preface of the final version of *The Tragedy of Okinawa* that "The maidens did not die on the battlefields because they liked war. Rather they died because they were led to the battlefields by their gentle female natures, to take care of wounded soldiers there".[167] Furthermore, Nakasone repeated the same logic in another scene in which the HSC cared for wounded Japanese soldiers abandoned by the Japanese Imperial Army. He describes his students as follows:

> The students could have just saved their own lives; they were not required to take care of their patients. However, they worried incessantly about the soldiers, lying injured in people's homes or behind rocks. *Their instinctual, caregiving female nature prevented them from staying safely inside the cave*. They not only gathered the last bit of medicine to treat their patients, but they also dug potatoes and picked wild herbs to feed them. [emphasis added][168]

Nakasone's excessive usage of the word *otome* should be understood in this context. Just as Nakasone mentioned neither the students' interfered evacuation nor the postponed graduation ceremony, he never explored why his students prioritized their role as caregivers over their safety, nor did he suggest the significance of wartime militaristic education. Instead, Nakasone reduced every reason imaginable into a simplified factor of their female nature or feminine instinct. Nakasone, who emphasized that he had "ensured the accuracy of their names, dates and locations", served a crucial role in confirming the victimhood of the HSC not only by carefully excluding the topic of teachers' wartime responsibility, but also by

---

[167] In the Kachō Shobō version published in 1951, Naksone used "they" instead of "the maidens".

[168] Nakasone, *Okinawa No Higeki,* 139.

emphasizing the femininity of the HSC. As a result, however, Nakasone also foreclosed the possibility of carrying out in-depth discussions about teachers' wartime responsibility, even though he knew a lot about how militaristic education affected the female students' behaviour in battle. Ishino Keiichirō provided two crucial viewpoints in *The Tower of Himeyuri*: Christian superiority over Japanese feudalism and teachers' wartime responsibility. Nakasone's non-fictional account completely ignored and even erased these two factors, focusing in detail only on the tragic aspects of the story. The image of the HSC as pure-minded maidens served another important role in contemporary Japanese society. In terms of postwar reparations, the wartime status of the HSC gradually occupied a special place. It is to this subject that we turn.

Nishihira Hideo and the Student Corps' Wartime Status in Postwar Reparations

As Japan's situation in the war deteriorated, the scope of conscription widened in the Empire. At the end of June 1945, *Giyū Heieki Hō* (The Volunteer Fighting Conscription Law) was put into effect, by which Japanese men aged from 15 to 60 and unmarried women aged from 17 to 40 were required to enlist. However, the Battle of Okinawa began three months before the promulgation of this law, and thus there were no legal grounds for mobilizing male or female students into work for the Japanese Imperial Army in Okinawa. This complicated the issue of postwar reparations in Okinawa. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to examine the intricate nature of Japanese postwar reparations, in which the Ministry of Health and Yasukuni Shrine were deeply intertwined as they attempted to enshrine the war dead while officially denying the ties between them. Nevertheless, it is crucial to point out the fact that the issue of the wartime statuses of both male and female Student Corps played an important role in postwar reparations in Okinawa. Therefore, this section will focus on a shift in the evalua-

tion of the wartime status of the Okinawan Student Corps and how one teacher's record contributed to a radical shift in status.

During the Occupation era, the military pension and welfare system was abolished, since GHQ thought such favourable treatment of the military personnel had led to the Asia-Pacific War in the first place. On April 30 1952, just two days after Japan officially regained its independence, *Senshōbyōsha Senbotsusha Izoku tō Engohō* hereafter *Engohō* (the Act on Relief of War Victims and Survivors) was enacted in Japan's mainland, which aimed to provide financial aid not only to wounded veterans and civilians employed by the military, but also to bereaved family members, in place of the abolished military pension and welfare system. The Okinawan historian Ishihara Masaie (石原 昌家) has stated that *Engohō* financially saved the bereaved family members of veterans and civilians employed by the military, and that it also gave them the honour of enshrining the spirits of their deceased family members at Yasukuni, which the Emperor would visit in order to console their spirits. "In doing so", Ishihara has emphasized, "six years and eight months after the end of the Asia-Pacific war, a structure had already been constructed by which the bereaved families of the war dead could not question the wartime responsibility of the nation".[169]

From the very beginning, *Engohō* explicitly aimed to narrow down the scope of reparations based on the wartime status and nationality of applicants. Japanese colonial subjects, such as Koreans and Taiwanese, had already lost Japanese nationality before the promulgation of *Engohō*, and thus they were automatically excluded from reparations.[170] A double standard of nationality was applied for Japanese colonial subjects: while the postwar Japanese government barred such people from receiving postwar reparations on the grounds that they

---

[169] Iwanami Shoten, *Kiroku Okinawa "shūdan Jiketsu" Saiban* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2012),170-171.

[170] Nobumasa Tanaka, Hiroshi Tanaka, and Nagami Hata. *Izoku to Sengo* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1995),118.

were no longer Japanese nationals, the Japanese Supreme Court rejected the appeals of colonial soldiers who had been found guilty of war crimes and imprisoned in the Sugamo Prison.[171] This meant that the crimes they had committed as Japanese nationals remained while they were excluded from receiving reparations because they had lost their nationality. Likewise, Japanese casualties of air raids were also excluded from *Engohō* up to the present day, on the grounds that they did not fight on the battlefields and thus the Japanese government is not legally obligated to provide them with aid. As a result, only former military officers and civilians employed by the military (as well as their family members) enjoyed favourable treatment in terms of postwar reparations. According to one study, the total expenditure of *Engohō* from 1952 to 1997 was 43. 9925 trillion yen. Approximately 94% (over 41 trillion yen) was spent in relation to former military personnel and civilians employed by the military.[172]

Considering the severe selection criteria of *Engohō,* it might be surprising that Okinawans were eligible for postwar reparations. Japan regained its independence on April 28 1952, but Okinawa remained under the control of the United States until 1972. Nevertheless, residents of Okinawa were considered to be eligible for postwar reparations from the Japanese government. In March 1953, *Engohō* was applied to Okinawan soldiers and civilians employed by the military, and in 1958 it was also expanded to include Okinawan civilians. What lay behind this exceptional treatment of Okinawans was the uniqueness of the Battle of Okinawa, the only battle which claimed more civilian lives than those of soldiers on the territory of Japan. This also means, however, that the wartime experiences of Okinawan citizens had to be distorted to fit into the category of *sentō sankasha* (voluntary participants in the

---

[171] Ibid.

[172] Kōji Ikeya, *Robō No Kūshū Hisaisha: Sengo Hoshō No Kūhaku* (Tokyo: Kurieitibu 21, 2010), 7.

battle who were not employed by the military). For example, those who were forced out of their caves by Japanese soldiers had to fictionalize their experiences by stating that they voluntarily gave up the caves to the Japanese soldiers. What mattered here was to create a story in which Okinawan civilians "voluntarily" devoted themselves to the Japanese Imperial Army. The local Okinawans' experiences as victims were essentially rewritten to match the standards and criteria created by the Ministry of Health, and once Okinawans fit into the scope of *Engohō* as *sentō sankasha*, they were automatically enshrined at Yasukuni.

The process by which the members of former Student Corps gained eligibility for postwar reparations from the Japanese government was, however, not so smooth. At first, the Ministry of Health did not recognize the members of male or female Student Corps as either soldiers or as civilians employed by the military. This is not only because they had not reached conscription age when they were "mobilized", but also because there was no evidence to demonstrate that their devotion to the Japanese Imperial Army was equally as useful as that of soldiers and civilians employed by the military. Eventually, the Ministry of Health changed its policy and decided to treat female Student Corps as civilians employed by the military, and male Student Corps as soldiers. Behind this shift in evaluation, Nishihira Hideo, one of the teachers who accompanied the HSC, argued in detail that their wartime role was just as important as other civilians employed by the military .

As already stated in this chapter, Nishihira Hideo was Principal Nishioka's right hand man before the Battle of Okinawa, and it is highly likely that Nishihira himself was the teacher "N", who told his students not to evacuate even though he was in charge of giving students permission to leave. Unlike Principal Nishioka, Nishihira accompanied his students to the battlefields, and thus he appeared quite often in both Nakasone's and the students' memoirs in *The Tragedy of Okinawa*. After Japan's defeat in the Asia-Pacific War, Nishihira

submitted a report to the Ministry of Education in the Japanese mainland, dated January 20 1946, which he and Hata Shizuo (秦 四津生) signed. According to an article in the *Ryūkyū Shinpo* newspaper, the Ministry of Education intentionally ignored the report out of fear of the Occupation authorities. It took another eight years until the report drew attention in the context of postwar reparations, since it vividly demonstrated how the female and male Student Corps worked for the Japanese Imperial Army and died in the battle.[173]

It is debatable how much importance Nishihira had in the context of the eligibility of the former Students Corps for reparations. From the perspective of the bereaved family members of the HSC, the shift in evaluation of the wartime status of the Student Corps was a result of their tireless lobbying activities. On the other hand, from the perspective of those who have questioned the relationship between *Engohō* and Yasukuni Shrine, the shift was part of the larger picture of the Japanese government's exploitation of the Okinawan war dead. It was difficult for either side to weave Nishihira into their argument. Nevertheless, it is undeniable that Nishihira's description of the wartime activities of the Student Corps played a certain role in the context of postwar reparations, and that the media paid extensive attention to his report when it was rediscovered.

Nishihira Hideo passed away in 1954, but his daughter published a part of the report as an appendix to Nishihira's personal memoir in 1972. It clearly referred to "the request for mobilization of female students in Okinawa Prefecture from the 32nd Army Headquarters",[174] emphasizing that the mobilization was by military order. As for the activities of the female students in Haebaru Army Hospital, it also stressed their dedicated efforts and bravery by stating "... every single student toughed it out without complaining" and thus "they are truly

---

[173] "Senbotsu-gakuto-engo ni Rōhō Kichōna Hiroku Kaeru", *Ryūkyū Shinpō,* January 30, 1954.

[174] Nishihira, *Himeyuri no tō,* 173.

role models for Japanese women".[175] However, the report mentioned little about teachers' wartime responsibility. As for Principal Nishioka, it simply emphasized that he had devoted himself to his duty as principal.[176]

In his memoir, Nishihira devoted much space to the role he played as a teacher who accompanied his students on the battlefields, but he did not suggest even slight hints of negative influence which wartime military education could have had on his students. For example, he referred to the low ratio of students' evacuation and explained some reasons for that, such as financial reasons, but he did not mention anything about the teacher "N" who had interfered with the evacuation of applicants.[177] In fact, more evidence that Nishihira was "N" can be found by comparing Nishihira's memoir and the memoir of Ōta Sadako, one of the students who successfully evacuated before the Battle of Okinawa. "N" rejected Sadako's application for evacuation, and even when her father, Ōta Masahide, who was a teacher at another school, asked for his daughter's evacuation, "N" rejected the idea.[178] Eventually, Ōta Masahide made an unauthorized decision to evacuate his daughter. During the Battle of Okinawa, Ōta Masahide took refuge in a cave on his own property, and "N" and a few of his students temporarily used this cave for medical purposes. According to what Ōta Masahide told his daughter Sadako after the war, "N" begged his forgiveness on his knees, stating "I am sorry about before. I told you not to, but you ignored me and evacuated Sadako anyway. You knew better than I did about what would happen."[179] On the other hand, in his memoir,

---

[175] Ibid.,178.

[176] Ibid.,173-174.

[177] Ibid., 20-23.

[178] Nahashi, *Naha-Shishi,* 352.

[179] Ibid.

Nishihira mentioned that he met Ōta Masahide in Ōta's cave. However, all he mentioned about his meeting with Ōta was that he asked Ōta Masahide to take care of one of the wounded students Nishihira would leave behind, and Nishihira did not mention anything about his apology.[180]

It should also be noted that throughout his memoir, Nishihira stressed and glorified the voluntary and patriotic behaviour and language of his students. As the introduction demonstrated, Nishihira clearly stated that his students wanted to keep their status as students, not as civilians employed by the military, because of their rivalry with regular nurses who were hired by and worked for military medical institutions. According to Nishihira, his students wanted to maintain their pride and sacrifice themselves for the national crisis in the name of students.[181] This description contradicts, however, what Nishihira stated in his defence of Principal Nishioka in the *Yomiuri* article discussed earlier in this chapter, that is, "while the students of other women's schools, such as the Okinawa Second Girls' High School and Shuri Girls' High School, became civilians employed by the military, the HSC remained classified as students thanks to Principal Nishioka's unusual effort".[182] This demonstrates that Nishihira creatively used either students themselves or Principal Nishioka in order to explain why the HSC was not officially hired by the Japanese Imperial Army. It is true that the students of the two women's schools, the Female Division of Okinawa Normal School and the Okinawa First Girls' High School, had much pride and rivalry with other women's schools in Okinawa. Nevertheless, Nishihira obviously failed to provide a balanced description of the HSC, portraying them as monolithically voluntary and patriotic from the begin-

---

[180] Nishihira, *Himeyuri no tō,*123.

[181] Ibid., 67-68.

[182] Hanamura, "'Himeyuri' no Tō no hamon", 35.

ning. Considering these contradictions, it is safe to assume that in his report and memoir Nishihira covered up his wartime responsibility as a teacher, just as Nakasone did in *The Tragedy of Okinawa*. That said, Nishihira also made one serious confession in his memoir. After the HSC was dismissed by military order, he told his students to divide into groups to safely evacuate to the Kunigami area, in the northern part of Okinawa. In his speech, Nishihira emphasized that everyone had to do her best to survive, and that if someone got injured, other students had to abandon her to ensure their own survival. However, he concluded his speech by stating "But, don't be captured".[183] In his memoir, Nishihira suggested that he himself was conscious of the contradiction in telling his students both to survive, and not to be captured at the same time. Eventually, Nishihira himself was captured by the U.S. Army, and he survived.

This chapter examined the relationships between the narratives of the HSC and the issue of teachers' wartime responsibility. Three teachers, Nishioka Kazuyoshi, Nishihira Hideo, and Nakasone Seizen, separately made records of or expressed their views of the Battle of Okinawa and the HSC. Nishioka did not publish his memoir, occasionally appearing in interviews and repeating his excuses by placing full responsibility on the Japanese Imperial Army.[184] Nakasone compiled the survivors' memoirs and published them as *The Tragedy of Okinawa* in 1951, from which he carefully excluded anything related to teachers' wartime responsibility. Nishihira played the most multifaceted role of the three. Preceding studies have paid little attention to Nishioka and Nishihira, in comparison to Nakasone, but these three teachers are all worth considering together in terms of their responsibility for wartime

---

[183] Nishihira, *Himeyuri no tō*,118.

[184] For example, See Shōji Sakakibara, *Okinawa Hachijūyokka No Tatakai* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1994), 205-208.

militaristic education. As this chapter demonstrated, from 1949 to 1951, a wide variety of both fictional and non-fictional narratives on the HSC coexisted. As the next chapter will demonstrate, the first film and musical regarding the HSC further reinforced the image of the HSC as victims, unifying the multi-layered images of the HSC into a monolithic one.

Chapter 4

The Himeyuri Student Corps on Stage and Screen

The previous three chapters focused on how writers expressed their views of the Himeyuri Student Corps and the Battle of Okinawa, whether they had personally experienced it or not. In the 1950s, the narratives about the HSC reached a fourth stage, in which two visual narratives were created in succession: a film entitled *The Tower of Himeyuri,* based on the screenplay written by Mizuki Yōko (水木 洋子) and directed by Imai Tadashi (今井 正); and a revue also entitled *The Tower of Himeyuri,* based on the script written by Kikuta Kazuo (菊田 一夫). Both of these were released in 1953, right after Japan officially regained its independence in 1952. Both were highly commercially successful in mainland Japan, and firmly established the place of the HSC in public memory.

This chapter illustrates the process behind the filming and staging of the HSC narratives and the socio-political context within which this occurred. Throughout the narratives, the image of the HSC as victims was reinforced; anything which challenged or contradicted this image, such as references to teachers' wartime responsibility or Christian objections to the glorification of the deaths of the HSC, was carefully filtered out.

From the perspective of Japanese mainlanders, the Battle of Okinawa provided an ideal stage on which Japanese people as a whole could be depicted as victims in the Asia-Pacific War – rather than as victimizers – since the battle produced such a high ratio of civilian casualties. On the other hand, these visual representations were also a great opportunity for Okinawan people to spread information about the cruel realities of the Battle of Okinawa. In so doing, they hoped that Japanese mainlanders would pay more attention to the contempo-

rary status of Okinawa, which remained under American military control even after Japan regained its independence in 1952.

Not all Okinawans supported the film projects, however, and the filming of the HSC took on different political meanings among different groups of Okinawans. In order to shed light on the kinds of conflicts that existed between Okinawans, this chapter focuses on two distinct groups: The Bereaved-Family Association of the HSC, and Okinawan students who were enrolled at mainland universities. The Bereaved-Family Association of the HSC were emphatic in their insistence that the HSC were patriotic martyrs; thus they criticized the screenplay for the 1953 movie which they believed distorted this "truth" about the HSC. In contrast, Okinawan students enrolled at mainland universities hoped that the realization of the film would help to spread their anti-war message of global peace.

This chapter also outlines some significant factors that played a part in the scriptwriting for both the film and the revue. There were in fact two film scripts for *The Tower of Himeyuri*, both of which were written by Mizuki Yōko: one for Daiei Film in 1950, and the other for Tōei Film in 1953. This chapter will explore how Mizuki altered her screenplays for these two versions. Finally, this chapter considers how Kikuta Kazuo, a leading playwright before, during, and after the Asia-Pacific War, adapted the story of the HSC into a revue, using it as a turning point for his career. Ultimately, this chapter aims to reveal a close political connection between Okinawa and the Japanese mainland, and to show how filmic and theatrical images of the HSC were both in conflict and accord with such political influences.

The First Film Project and U.S.-Japanese Economic Ties

It is important to point out that initially two different film companies – Daiei Film (大映) and Tōyoko Film (東横) – each started working separately on their own film projects about the HSC. Both of them, however, later cancelled these projects. Ultimately, a third company – Tōei Film (東映) – succeeded in producing a film about the HSC for the first time, in 1953. This section will examine the process by which these initial film projects came to be cancelled in order to shed light on the economic and political ties that were at play between the Japanese mainland and the American army in Okinawa.

The 1953 film *The Tower of Himeyuri* did not include any on-location shooting or any Okinawans amongst the members of the cast. This film was shot in Tokyo and Chiba prefecture in mainland Japan from October to December 1952. Nevertheless, the completed film, which was released on January 9 1953, achieved significant commercial success.

Many previous studies have pointed out the immense commercial success of Tōei's 1953 film *The Tower of Himeyuri*. However, little attention has been paid to the cancellation of the initial film projects by Daiei and Tōyoko. Both film companies began their projects sometime in 1949, immediately after the serialization of Ishino Keiichirō's *The Tower of Himeyuri* began in *Reijokai* magazine. Ishino had initially considered signing a contract with Daiei Film company, but eventually it was Tōyoko Film that acquired the rights to Ishino's novel. Like Ishino, Higa Ryōtoku (比嘉 良篤), the senior managing director of Tōyoko Film at the time, was also from Okinawa, thus Ishino felt unable to refuse his request.[185] Daiei Film, however, did not stop filming its own version of *The Tower of Himeyuri*, and thus in

[185] Ishino, "Watakushi no sengoshi", 125.

1950 both companies were working separately on the filming of the HSC story at the same time.

On June 25 1950, the *Okinawa Shinminpō* newspaper ran a story about the competition between the two film companies. At this point, both companies had planned some on-location shooting in Okinawa. According to the article, on June 15 1950, Higa Ryōtoku and Ishino Keiichirō met a man named 'Mr. Simon' [*saimon*] in Tokyo. Mr. Simon, it was said, was very pleased to hear that they would be shooting in Okinawa, and promised that both the United States Military Government and Okinawan representatives would willingly support and cooperate with Tōyoko Film's shooting. Daiei Film also planned to shoot on location in Okinawa, with Imai Tadashi as director, but the article did not clarify if they had also contacted the American officer. Instead, the article stressed that Tōyoko's shooting would be "an epoch-making cultural activity for the first time since the end of war", and that this "cultural activity" would be carried out mainly by local Okinawans.[186]

Mr. Simon was described as *Ryūkyū Eiga no Shidō-Kantokukan* (officer in charge of films in the Ryūkyū islands) in the article, thus it is safe to assume that he was an American officer of the American military government in Okinawa, which had authority over films. Unlike in mainland Japan, in Okinawa there was no official "Press Code" or "Radio Code" which specified the criteria for censorship. However, Okinawan media all strictly self-censored their content in order to avoid challenging or provoking the American authorities. For example, radio broadcasting was also restarted in 1950 in Okinawa, and its content was nominally produced by local Okinawans. In fact, however, it was impossible to create these radio

[186] "Himeyuri no Tō o Shudai ni: Tōyoko to Daiei ga Kassen Sōhō tomo Okinawa Roke o Shinsei", *Okinawa Shinminpō*, June 25 1950.

programs without American permission.[187] Considering the circumstances surrounding the media in Okinawa in 1950, it is no wonder that Japanese film companies needed official support from American authorities to shoot on location.

Thus, even though the newspaper article mentioned only Tōyoko, it is likely that the initial film projects of both companies were guaranteed official American support, and were to be carried out with trilateral cooperation between Japanese mainland film companies, the American military government, and local Okinawans. In order to understand the American military's willingness to support mainland film companies, it is also important to consider the deepening economic ties between the United States and the Japanese mainland at the time.

The construction of American military bases in Okinawa began with the communist takeover of China in 1949. On October 1 1949, Major General Joseph Sheetz assumed the office of Military Governor of Okinawa, and under his administration, the establishment of permanent American military facilities in Okinawa began. This was a major opportunity for mainland Japan to revitalize its economy. At the end of November 1949, nine major mainland construction companies sent their design and survey engineers to Okinawa to estimate the costs of construction. At the end of December 1949, GHQ in Tokyo announced that the United States would purchase twenty-five million dollars worth of materials from the Japanese mainland.[188] Furthermore, the Korean War, which broke out in June 1950, created a greater demand for manufacturing and services for the American Forces.[189] The American willingness to support the filming projects thus should be understood in the context of the ties that were developing between American military forces and the Japanese economy.

---

[187] Naoki Monna, *Amerika Senryō Jidai Okinawa Genron Tōseishi: Genron No Jiyū E No Toi* (Tokyo: Yūzankaku Shuppan, 1996), 79-80.

[188] Yoshio Nakano and Moriteru Arasaki, *Okinawa Sengoshi* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1976), 39-40.

[189] Ibid., 40.

However, support for the initial film projects did not go beyond the planning stage, and both Daiei and Tōyoko suddenly cancelled their projects. According to Imai Tadashi, GHQ sent a letter to Daiei Film at the last minute, strongly suggesting that they should stop filming the story about the female students in the Battle of Okinawa, because *sensō-eiga* (war films) would influence people deeply.[190] Tōyoko also cancelled its filming project for reasons that are still unknown.

It appears that at this point, the American army in Okinawa reversed its policy towards shooting on location in Okinawa. Neither Japanese nor American film companies carried out any shooting on location in Okinawa during the 1950s. For example, *The Teahouse of the August Moon* (1956), a big-budget film which satirizes the American occupation and democratization of Okinawa, was not shot on location in Okinawa, although it was partially shot on location in the Japanese mainland. It is not clear why the United States suddenly decided to reverse its policy regarding on-location shooting in Okinawa. One likely factor for the cancellation of *The Tower of Himeyuri* is the outbreak of the Korean War on June 25 1950. Considering the rising tensions in East Asia, GHQ may well have been concerned that films that portrayed the Battle of Okinawa, which would inevitably depict the killing of Japanese soldiers and Okinawan civilians by American troops, might increase anti-American sentiment among Japanese audiences.

In any case, it was not until 1952, when Japan regained its independence, that a new film project began. In 1951, Tōyoko Film underwent a merger, becoming Tōei Film. Makino Mistuo (マキノ 光雄), the head of the production department of Tōei Film at the time, asked Imai Tadashi to film the HSC story with Tōei Film, and thus the third film project kicked into

---

[190] Shōhei Imamura, *Sengo Eiga No Tenkai* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1987),122.

gear.[191] However, Imai's leftist background and Mizuki's screenplay caused wide-ranging responses among Okinawan people.

The Third Film Project and Conflicting Values Behind the Depictions of the HSC

The *Okinawa Shinminpō* newspaper ran an article on December 15 1952, reporting that Okinawan people living in Okinawa and Tokyo displayed harsh reactions to the film script. At this point, less than one month remained until the release of the movie, but the basic scenario had already been published in a movie magazine. Knowing the storyline before the release, three organizations related to the HSC, the War-Bereaved Association of the HSC, the Association of Okinawa Teachers, and the Himeyuri Alumnae Association, went so far as to suggest a boycott of the upcoming movie. Kinjō Washin, who built the Tower of Himeyuri in 1946, was mentioned in the article as the representative of the War-Bereaved Association of the HSC.

The newspaper article consisted of two parts: the summary of a letter of protest from Okinawa, and a message of castigation entitled "We Must Protect the Tower of Himeyuri from 'Reds'", written by Kinjō Kazuhiko (金城 和彦) , who was from Tokyo. Even though the article did not clearly mention this, Kinjō Kazuhiko was the son of Kinjō Washin, thus he himself had lost his two younger sisters, Nobuko and Sadako, as members of the HSC. As we will see later in the next chapter, the father and son would play a central role in shifting the political and religious direction of the commemoration in Okinawa throughout the 1950s. This article from 1952 appears to have been their first opportunity to make their political views public.

---

[191] Ibid., 122-123.

What underlay their criticism was the notion that Imai Tadashi, who had been expelled from major studios (the so-called "Red Purge"), had distorted the image of the HSC in order to spread his leftist political ideas; that is, "national liberation and anti-American struggles, and extreme criticisms of the war".[192] They found its overall cinematic portrayal of the Japanese Imperial Army problematic, stating in a letter of protest that "the scenario emphasizes the high-handedness of the Japanese Imperial Army in an extreme way".[193]

A critical stance towards the Japanese Imperial Army was in fact evident in the movie. The climax of the story depicts a scene in which a military doctor shoots a female student named Uehara from behind, as she tries to surrender. The letter of protest found this scene "an utter and cruel fabrication",[194] because, according to the letter, "every single one of the 173 female students who lost her life as a member of the HSC, cooperated and died together with the military and the prefectural government, because of her pure love for and desire to protect her ancestral home". It went on to state that the scenario depicted Okinawans as though they belonged to a different ethnic group than the Japanese, as if they were a persecuted minority. Although the scene they were referring to was not specified in the summary, it appears to be one in which teachers are talking about spreading propaganda, in which one teacher described the history of Okinawa as "the long history of enslavement".[195]According to the letter, all these depictions were based on Imai's leftist political views, and consequently "it portrays the spirits of the maidens as though they were filled with the red of communism".

---

[192] "Eiga Himeyuri no Tō: Okinawa to Tokyo de Aka-teki Seisaku ni Kōgi", *Okinawa Shinminpō*, December 15, 1952.

[193] Ibid.

[194] Ibid.

[195] Yōko Mizuki, *Mizuki Yōko Shinarioshū* (Tokyo: Eijinsha, 1978), 46.

Furthermore, the letter insisted that Mizuki Yōko's "original" script actually plagiarized as many as 148 passages from Nakasone Seizen's *The Tragedy of Okinawa*.

Kinjō Kazuhiko's "We Must Protect the Tower of Himeyuri from 'Reds'" was even more acrimonious and grandiose than the letter of protest. It should also be noted that as an Okinawan who had been living in Tokyo for a long time, he took it for granted and emphasized that Okinawan people willingly and voluntarily sacrificed themselves for the protection of their motherland, since Okinawa had been and still was a part of Japan. According to Kinjō Kazuhiko, the Battle of Okinawa was the biggest and most unforgettable tragedy of the Asia-Pacific War, and it was also an undeniable fact that young Okinawan male and female students had abandoned their pens in order to heroically rally round the flag and to sacrifice their lives to protect their motherland Japan. In the eyes of Kinjō Kazuhiko, Imai Tadashi's *The Tower of Himeyuri* appeared to distort this "undeniable fact" about the HSC. He concluded:

> This movie has distorted the facts for political, ideological, and commercial gain. It thus disrespects the spirits of the dead, slanders the bereaved families of the Himeyuri corps, and brings misfortune on the future of Okinawa Prefecture. Therefore we, as Okinawans living on the Japanese mainland, must neither ignore nor admit this film.
>
> Alas! The maidens who once burned with genuine, pure love for the nation now rest in peace under the Tower of Himeyuri. What do their silent voices say?
>
> We, their surviving Okinawan compatriots, must listen to the voices of the fallen students, and we must protect their sacred blood, which has stained mountains and rivers. We vow to protect it.[196]

Kinjō Kazuhiko sprinkled his message with such words as *sokoku* (homeland), *bokoku* (motherland), *Okinawa Ken* (Okinawa Prefecture), and *kenjin* (people from Okinawa Prefecture), emphasizing the ties between the Japanese mainland and Okinawa Prefecture. Considering the fact that "Okinawa Prefecture" did not officially exist under the trusteeship rule of the American Forces as of December 1952, his emphasis on *Okinawa Ken* and *kenjin*

---

[196] "Eiga Himeyuri no Tō: Okinawa to Tokyo de Aka-teki Seisaku ni Kōgi," *Okinawa Shinminpō.*

instead of Okinawa and Okinawans was itself a strong message to the Japanese mainlanders that Okinawa was still part of Japan. Therefore, it is safe to assume that what Kinjō Kazuhiko meant by "misfortune on the future of Okinawa Prefecture" was that he was worried that Imai's *The Tower of Himeyuri* would aversely affect Okinawa's reversion to Japanese administration in the future.

Kinjō Kazuhiko's fear was not groundless; between 1946 and 1954, the Philippines, India, Pakistan, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia gained independence one after another, and the People's Republic of China was established in 1949. Considering this historical context, it is understandable that the Okinawans who wished to return to Japanese administration would react so harshly not only to Imai's leftist background but also to his filmic depiction of the HSC, going so far as to suggest boycotting the movie. They were seriously worried that the movie would create the impression among Japanese mainlanders that Okinawa had good reasons not to return to Japan.

In addition to such international factors, there were also domestic factors behind the harsh reactions from the Bereaved-Family Association in Okinawa. As Chapter 3 demonstrated, *Engohō* (Act on Relief of War Victims and Survivors) was promulgated on April 30 1952 in the Japanese mainland. In place of the abolished military pension and welfare system, *Engohō* aimed to provide financial aid not only to the wounded veterans and civilians employed by the military, but also to bereaved family members. Initially, Okinawa was not included within the scope of *Engohō.* In July 1952, the Japanese government established a special office called *Nanpō Renraku Jimukyoku* (Southern-Island Liaison Office) in the Prime Minister's Office, and in August it opened a branch in Naha City, Okinawa, called *Nihon Seifu Nanpō Renraku Jimusho* (Japanese Government Liaison Office at Naha). According to Yoshida Shien, who then worked for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, in those days,

the Ministry had established a Japanese Government Liaison Office in major Japanese cities such as Osaka, Sapporo, and Fukuoka, as a connection to GHQ. Having the same-titled governmental office in Okinawa meant, therefore, a declaration that Okinawa still belonged to Japan.[197] One of the tasks of the Japanese Government Liaison Office at Naha was to investigate the damages that occurred during the Battle of Okinawa.

On March 26 1953, *Engohō* officially came to be applied to Okinawa and the other Nansei islands located south of 29th north. On October 17 of the same year, the Bereaved-Family Association of Okinawa officially joined the Japan War-Bereaved Association. The production and release of the movie *The Tower of Himeyuri* in 1952 took place in the middle of the developing ties between these two Bereaved-Family Associations. Here, Kinjō Kazuhiko's emphasis on the "sacred blood" of the HSC makes more sense. Their "sacred blood" figuratively points to the blood ties between the Japanese mainland and Okinawa, and by emphasizing such blood ties, Kinjō Kazuhiko not only brought special meaning to the death of young Student Corps members, but also emphasized the image of the HSC as patriotic martyrs, in order not to destabilize the developing relationship between the Bereaved-Family Associations in the Japanese mainland and Okinawa.

It should be noted, however, that Okinawan views were not monolithic regarding Imai's movie. Unlike Kinjō Kazuhiko, some Okinawans ardently supported the filming project. According to Tobe Hideaki, the scholar of Okinawan history, Okinawan students who had been enrolled at universities in Tokyo during the Asia-Pacific War established their own association as early as January 1946.[198] In 1949, a new generation of Okinawan students came to Tokyo from Okinawa. These students were divided into several groups, and they did

---

[197] Yoshida, *Chiisana Tatakai No Hibi,* 74−76.

[198] Tobe, Hideaki. "Ekkyōsyatachi no Fukkiundō: 1950 nendai zenhan ni okeru Zainippon Okinawajingakusei no soshiki to ishiki," *Okinawa Bunka Kenkyū 38* (Tokyo: Dō Kenkyūjo, March 31, 2012), 455.

not solidify cooperative ties with each other at the beginning. However, they eventually joined forces between 1952 to 1953, with the purpose of realizing Okinawa's return to Japanese administration. Tobe researched the papers and publications from Okinawan students' organizations, shedding light on their consistent support for the creation and release of Imai's *The Tower of Himeyuri*. The ultimate purpose of the Okinawan students was to achieve the reversion of Okinawa to Japanese administration, but they thought that they had first to deal with the indifference to and lack of knowledge about the predicament of Okinawa vis-a-vis mainland Japan. Thus the Okinawan students agreed on the principle of the "exhortation and support" of *The Tower of Himeyuri*.[199]

On October 25 1952, the *Okinawa Shinminpō* newspaper reported that shooting had begun on September 18 after the filming staff, including Imai Tadashi, had examined the screenplay together with two Okinawan survivors, each of whom was a former member of the male and female Student Corps, as well as other Okinawan students.[200] Not surprisingly, the Okinawan students who supported the filming disagreed strongly with those who criticized Imai Tadashi and his pro-communist ideology. In September 1952, the Okinawans living in Tokyo held their regular meeting called *Naha-kai* (那覇会), but Itō Takerō (伊藤 武郎), the producer of *The Tower of Himeyuri*, was not permitted by the organizers to address the *Naha-kai*. The Okinawan students also attended this *Naha-kai*, and they immediately protested the organizers' decision.[201] Okinawan students' support for Imai's *The Tower of Himeyuri* should not be overrated in the context of the significant commercial success of the movie. Nevertheless, it is important to note that Okinawan views varied regarding the film

---

[199] Ibid., 464-465.

[200] "Eiga Himeyuri no Tō Hayakumo Wadai o Yobu", *Okinawa Shinminpō*, October 25, 1952.

[201] *Sengo O Tadoru: "amerika Yo" Kara "yamato No Yo" E*. (Naha-shi: Ryūkyū Shinpōsha, 2007),161.

project, and that the manner in which the Battle of Okinawa and the HSC were narrated took on even more political meaning at this point.

The film project did not only stir up controversy on the Okinawan side. It also caused controversy over the authorship of the screenplay in the Japanese mainland. As Chapter 3 demonstrated, Ishino Keiichirō's novel entitled *The Tower of Himeyuri* was published in 1950 after its serialization in *Reijokai*, and Nakasone Seizen's non-fictional account of the HSC, entitled *The Tragedy of Okinawa: Collection of Personal Notes on the Tower of Himeyuri,* was published by Kachō Shobō publishing company in 1951. As already discussed, Ishino signed a contract with Tōyoko film in 1950, and Tōyoko Film became Tōei film in 1951 after the merger. When Tōei Film restarted the filming project with Imai Tadashi and Mizuki Yōko, however, Tōei Film announced that the film would not be based on Ishino's novel, but rather on the original screenplay written by Mizuki, even though the title of the film was the same as Ishino's novel: *Himeyuri no Tō* (*The Tower of Himeyuri*).

What made things even more complicated was the explicit commercialism of Kachō Shobō publishing company. Once they heard about the film project, Kachō Shobō suddenly changed the title of Nakasone's account from *The Tragedy of Okinawa* to *Himeyuri no Tō* (*The Tower of Himeyuri*), selling the newly-titled copies with the catch line of "Soon to be Filmed by Tōei". The title was the only thing that was changed between these two versions of Nakasone's account, and it was done without Nakasone's consent. Not surprisingly, Ishino criticized both Tōei Film and Kachō Shobō for having stolen the title of his novel, *The Tower of Himeyuri,* suggesting that he might register a copyright for the title. Asked about this controversy, Tōei Film replied that it was not Tōei Film but Tōyoko Film that Ishino had made a contract with, and that Tōei Film began the project from scratch with an original screenplay. Tōei Film also denied any ties with Kachō Shobō. Kachō Shobō more blatantly replied:

> Our book is a factual story while Mr. Ishino's is a fictional novel. First of all, when we published *The Tragedy of Okinawa*, we actually wanted to title it *The Tower of Himeyuri*, but we did not do that, because we knew that Mr.Ishino's novel had already been published. However, there is no legal problem with using the word "The Tower of Himeyuri", since it is a proper noun of the actual tower in Okinawa. If Mr. Ishino registers a copyright of the title, that will mean nothing, since we have already used it. We will ask for Mr. Nakasone's consent on this matter.[202]

What can be read from this controversy over the title of *The Tower of Himeyuri* is the explicit commercialism of both the filming company and the publishing company. According to Itō Takerō, the producer of *The Tower of Himeyuri*, it took one year to persuade Ōkawa Hiroshi (大川 博), the president of Tōei Film at that time, to give permission for the film project. Ōkawa bluntly dismissed the idea at first by stating: "What is the meaning of spending money to film the story of female students suffering such bitter fate and to reproduce the war?"[203]

Behind the conflicts between anti-communist Okinawans and Okinawan students enrolled at universities in Tokyo existed the explicitly commercial-minded companies of the Japanese mainland. The director Imai Tadashi and the scriptwriter Mizuki Yōko had to face the difficult question of how to create the story based on the Battle of Okinawa without failing to awaken Japanese mainlanders' interest in it. To achieve this goal, they took a variety of measures in the shooting process.

The Modifications between Two Film Scripts

In this section, I will compare and analyze Mizuki Yōko's two screenplays of *The Tower of Himeyuri*: one was written for Daiei Film in 1950 and the other for Tōei Film in 1952. As already stated, the screenplay for Tōei Film was published in a movie magazine in

---

[202] "Shōgyōshyugi no Uzu ni Himeyuri no Tō Yuragu", *Okinawa Shinminpō*, October 15, 1952.

[203] Kyōko Kagawa, *Himeyuritachi No Inori: Okinawa No Messēji* (Tokyo : Asahi Shinbunsha, 1992),59.

1952, but the Daiei Film version did not appear in any publication, simply because the film project was cancelled in 1950. After her death, everything that Mizuki Yōko left behind, including her screenplays, information sources, and manuscripts, were donated to Ichikawa City, Chiba Prefecture. I did archival research in *Ichikawa-shi Bungaku Praza* (Ichikawa Literature Museum) in October 2012, and discovered the screenplay for Daiei Film, the manuscripts of the screenplay for Tōei Film, and other sources of information that Mizuki had collected. I discovered two separate brief overviews of the screenplay for Daiei. These were most likely project proposals, and some of the details differ from the screenplay. In the following section, I will address these two film scripts, the D version Mizuki wrote for Daiei Film, and the T version written for Tōei Film.

Mizuki Yōko[204] was one of the few female screen writers in Japanese cinema. She began her career as a writer, and during the Asia-Pacific War she was officially sent to Burma as one of the members of a group of female military writers from 1942 to 1943. It was after the defeat of Japan that Mizuki began writing screenplays. She worked with the director Imai Tadashi to create eleven films together throughout their careers.[205] This means that out of the thirty four films based on Mizuki Yōko's screenplays, Imai directed more than thirty percent of them.[206] Despite her uniqueness as a female screen writer and her contribution to Japanese cinema, little study has been done of Mizuki Yōko. Nevertheless, she was the first and probably the most influential female writer to tackle the story of the HSC. She made her own significant interpretations of the already-existing narratives on the HSC, contributing to the image of the HSC as pure-minded victims, rather than as patriotic martyrs. Comparing the two

---

[204] The name “Mizuki Yōko” was a pseudonym;her real name was Takagi Tomiko (高木 富子).

[205] Kaoru Katō, *Kyakuhonka Mizuki Yōko: Ōinaru Eiga Isan to Sono Shōgai* (Tokyo: Eijinsha, 2010), 186.

[206] Ibid., 191.

versions of her film scripts, however, it becomes evident that Mizuki's interpretation of the HSC drastically changed between the D version in 1950 and the T version in 1952.

Before outlining the differences between the two screenplays, it would be useful to review what the D version and the T version have in common. Both of them focus on two main female characters: a female teacher named Miyagi (宮城) and one of the members of the HSC named Uehara Fumi (上原 文). Miyagi was based on an actual female teacher named Oyadomari Chiyo[207] (親泊 千代). Little attention has been paid to Oyadomari, in spite of the fact that she was the only female teacher who accompanied and died with the HSC, but Mizuki created a main character based on her. Another important character in both scripts is a military doctor named Oka (岡). At the climax of the story, Oka shoots Uehara Fumi in a cave where the students were hiding, believing that she was trying to surrender. Both screenplays lead to a tragic ending in which all the characters die.

What then, were the differences between the D version and the T version? The story of the T version revolves around two teachers, Miyagi and Tamai, and one female student named Uehara Fumi. The male teacher Tamai was a newly-added character into the T version. By all indications, the character of Tamai is based on Nakasone Seizen, who published *The Tragedy of Okinawa* in 1951. The major differences between the D version and the T version can be summarized into two interrelated points: the wartime status of the HSC, and the teachers' role in the story. Both Miyagi and Tamai played a significant role in the story in this regard.

First of all, the wartime status of the female students was drastically modified. In the D version, Miyagi voices the thoughts of the Japanese military officers, reminding her stu-

[207] Oyadomari Chiyo accompanied and died with the HSC. She did not escape from Okinawa before the battle began, and she also refused to accompany the commanding general to a safer zone, unlike Principal Nishioka.

dents that their wartime status is equal to that of soldiers. In one scene, a female student is having a quarrel with her younger sister. Miyagi sternly reprimands them for their lack of awareness regarding their status: "You are soldiers! You are assigned to this military hospital as full privates!…Do you think you are properly carrying out your duty as female students?"[208] In a later scene, a more direct mention about the wartime status of students is made in a conversation between teachers:

> Kotani (小谷, a male teacher): "Miyagi, it seems that only teachers will be released from duty here. Students won't, because *they are civilians employed by the military*". [emphasis added]
> Miyagi: "How come? Why will they take only students?"
> Kotani: "Well, if teachers accompany them… I don't think we will bother them but…" "Anyway, we must follow military orders".
> Miyagi: "But we should at least ask the head of the military doctors again…"[209]

As is clear from the examples above, the D version depicts the HSC as civilians employed by the military. In contrast, the T version emphasizes that the female students were *not* civilians employed by the military, but rather that they were innocent victims forcibly mobilized by the Japanese Imperial Army. An early scene which depicts a conversation between a female student and her mother describes not only a dilemma that female students faced at the outbreak of the Battle of Okinawa, but also their vulnerable position. In this scene, the mother, carrying a baby, implores her daughter, who is about to go to the army hospital, to come along with her, since her husband has been drafted and thus she has nobody to depend on.The female student replies: "I have to go! Students must accompany their schools! Please don't try to stop me. I am leaving".[210] The mother implores her further, but she shouts: "Mother,

---

[208] The Daiei script, a-9.

[209] Ibid., b-3.

[210] Yōko Mizuki, *Mizuki Yōko Shinarioshū* (Tokyo: Eijinsha, 1978),11.

you don't want me to be a coward, do you?"[211]She leaves her mother, but later returns to the bridge where the conversation took place. Her mother has, however, already left, and she bursts into tears like a young child, shouting "Mother! Mother! Mother!"[212] This conversation in the T version suggests that this female student was pressured to "voluntarily" accompany her school, but deep down inside, she did not want to leave her family, thus clearly emphasizing her victimhood.

In a later scene, the vulnerable position of the female students is further stressed through another conversation between a military doctor and the male teacher Tamai. In this scene, Tamai clashes with the military doctor over the treatment of an injured female student. As a teacher, Tamai implores the military doctor to perform surgery on her, but the doctor refuses because he has already packed his surgical implements, having been ordered to move to a new location by the military. The doctor impatiently shouts: "Don't forget that students are soldiers, too. I will not give them any preferential treatment if they are working for us".[213] Tamai categorically refuses to follow the order by shouting back at the doctor: "We are not civilians employed by the military! We are just following the orders of the Minister of Education".[214]

In sum, in the D version, Miyagi emphasizes the students' wartime status not as civilians, but as civilians employed by the military, or even as equivalent to soldiers. The wartime status of the students is, however, completely reversed in the T version, where the male teacher Tamai emphasizes their status when he states "We are not civilians employed by the military!" Thus, it is likely that Mizuki intentionally shifted the wartime status of the students

---

[211] Ibid.

[212] Ibid., 12.

[213] Ibid., 62.

[214] Ibid., 63.

from the D version by obscuring, if not completely erasing, any militaristic attributes of the HSC.

Here it is necessary to think more deeply about why Mizuki made this change. According to Imai Tadashi, Mizuki stated that the primary motif of this movie was "the lack of the independence of mind of Japanese people", and so, "the female students never questioned their teachers; if the teachers said 'look right' they would look right; if they said 'look left' they would look left".[215] Hence, one of the reasons for the change is that Mizuki simply wanted to put more emphasis on the victimization and passive nature of the female students in order to emphasize the tragic nature of the story. However, if we consider this issue in the context of the widespread social debate regarding Japanese remilitarization at the time, another reason becomes evident.

After the defeat, the new Japanese constitution was promulgated in 1946 and went into effect in 1947. This postwar constitution explicitly renounces the use of military force, as shown in Article Nine:

> Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes.In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized.[216]

From 1950 to 1954, however, the principle of demilitarization was drastically undermined. In 1950, *Keisatsu Yobitai* (National Police Reserve) was created on GHQ request. In 1952 it was restructured into *Hoantai* (National Safety Forces), and eventually became *Jieitai* (Self Defense Forces) in 1954. Behind this drastic turnaround was the outbreak of Korean War on June 25 1950.

---

[215] Imamura, *Sengo Eiga No Tenkai,* 125.

[216] "The Constitution of Japan". *Prime Minister of Japan and His Cabinet* http://japan.kantei.go.jp/constitution_and_government_of_japan/constitution_e.html (accessed March 31, 2015).

Public sentiment toward this sudden policy removal was ambivalent. According to Japanese historian Oguma Eiji, even though the overall reaction to the idea of remilitarization was positive, extremely negative feelings still remained among Japanese regarding Japan's now-defunct Imperial Army, as well as concern about a possible return to prewar conditions. Furthermore, Japanese people felt a sense of distrust toward the U.S., since it was GHQ which had triggered Japan's remilitarization even though it had supported a demilitarization policy for Japan.[217] It was in this atmosphere of heightened international and domestic tension regarding the Korean War and Japan's remilitarization that Mizuki nullified the militaristic attributes of the Okinawan female students in her screenplay.

It is difficult to say definitely what reasoning was behind Mizuki's decision to modify the wartime status of the HSC, but the T version did become more explicitly antiwar as a result of this modification. Related to this point, the Japanese actress Tsushima Keiko (津島 恵子), who played the leading role of Miyagi, made a suggestive comment that is worth quoting. Asked about how she felt about appearing in the film, Tsushima answered:

> I have never appeared in this kind of movie before. I am honoured to have received the opportunity to appear in an antiwar film like this in the midst of controversy surrounding questions of war and peace. We tend to easily forget what causes us pain. It would be my great pleasure if this tragedy of Okinawa, "The Tower of Himeyuri", could contribute in any way to the opposition to another war.[218]

Tsushima Keiko was born in 1926. Thus when the Battle of Okinawa took place in 1945, she was still a teenager, just like the female students of the HSC. This might have affected Tsushima's impression about the story of the HSC. For the younger generation of Japanese in their twenties, who had not been old enough to go to the battlefields during the Asia-Pacific War but had to face up to the fear of another war in the 1950s, the issue of

---

[217] Eiji Oguma, *"minshu" to "aikoku"* (Tokyo: Shin'yōsha, 2002), 453-455.

[218] "Eiga Himeyuri no Tō Hayakumo Wadai o Yobu", *Okinawa Shinminpō*, October 25, 1952.

Japan's remilitarization was more critical than for any other generation, since if anything happened they would have to play a central role either as military forces or as military nurses. As Tsushima clearly mentioned in the quote stated above, as of 1952, the story of the HSC could be interpreted as an antiwar message. By depicting the HSC as civilians who had been forcibly mobilized against their will, younger Japanese – who had to face the issue of remilitarization and the possibility of military conscription – were easily able to empathize with them.

In addition to these social factors, there is another factor that cannot be ignored; that is, the surviving teachers' influence on Mizuki's screenplays. In a round-table discussion published in 1953, Mizuki explained how she constructed her screenplays for Daiei and Tōei. According to the article, the D version was based on her interview with Principal Nishioka, a female survivor who had joined another female student corps, a few other survivors of the Battle of Okinawa, and a note written by a veteran of the Asia-Pacific War. After the film project of the D version was cancelled, Nakasone Seizen's *The Tragedy of Okinawa* was published in 1951, and Mizuki included other survivors' memoirs from Nakasone's *The Tragedy of Okinawa* amongst her sources of information.[219] This article also revealed that Mizuki was inspired by her interview with Principal Nishioka to include a female teacher as a main character in the storylines.

It is noteworthy that Mizuki used the information from two surviving teachers, Nishioka Kazuyoshi and Nakasone Seizen, to construct her stories for both the D and T versions. As Chapter 3 demonstrated, Principal Nishioka drew stringent criticism for his wartime behaviour as Principal of the HSC, but Mizuki appears to pay little attention to such ongoing

[219] "Himeyuri no Tō no Shita Haku Iki wa Shiroku" *Fujin Kōron*, February 1953, 232.

gossip about Nishioka. From this perspective, the modification of the wartime status of the students takes on another meaning.

Neither Nishioka nor Nakasone directly mentioned in any media the wartime status of their students. However, as Chapter 3 demonstrated, in order to defend Principal Nishioka, another surviving teacher, Nishihira Hideo, stated that "while the students of other women's schools, such as the Okinawa Second Girls' High School and Shuri Girls' High School, became civilians employed by the military, the HSC remained classified as students thanks to Principal Nishioka's unusual efforts".[220] What can be read from this is that the issue of students' wartime status was also related to that of the wartime responsibility of teachers, and the wartime status of the HSC was considered to be directly related to whether their Principal had protected them or not. Mizuki may have modified her description of the wartime status of the HSC because she was influenced by the perspectives of the surviving teachers.

Mizuki made no reference to the teachers' wartime responsibility. In fact, her scenarios depicted teachers as selfless saints, who served as a cushion between the Japanese Imperial Army and the HSC, who inspired their students with courage, and who protected them from war. It could even be argued that in the 1953 movie teachers were more visible than their students, embodying the tragedy of the Battle of Okinawa. For example, the following conversation in the T version between two teachers, Miyagi and Tamai, illustrates how teachers in Mizuki's storytelling were not only glorified but also effectively used to emphasize the desperate and tragic situation of the Battle of Okinawa. Shortly before this scene, both female students and teachers were suddenly informed that they could be dismissed from the military combat unit that they accompanied. No longer under the protection of the Japanese Imperial Army, teachers had to face the difficult decision of whether to voluntarily stay with the mili-

[220] Hanamura, "'Himeyuri' no Tō no hamon", 35.

tary combat or to escape to a safe place. Since Miyagi had lost her hearing as a result of American bombing, the following conversation was done partly on paper.

> Tamai: "Are you writing a farewell note to your mother?"
> Miyagi: "Yes".
> Tamai: "Miyagi. You must not die now. You have to survive until the last moment. It would be meaningless to die in this war".
> Miyagi: "As a teacher, I cannot go back home alive. I have lost my students. I have hurt them. We can no longer…"
> Tamai: "Miyagi, let's run away together! We must do everything to save our students. Let's run away. Snap out of it. Let's do our best to save our students until the end! Miyagi! Are you hearing me? Are you hearing what I just said? Miyagi!"[221]

At the end of the conversation, Miyagi tearfully nods her agreement. Thus, these teachers were depicted as purely benevolent characters who felt responsible for the survival of their students. Mizuki thus artfully circumvented the issue of teachers' wartime responsibility for brainwashing their students into "voluntarily" supporting the Japanese Imperial Army. Rather, she romanticized teachers by emphasizing that they were also victims who worried deeply about their students. In any case, it is important to keep in mind that in Mizuki's scenarios, the further emphasis on the victimization of the female students went in tandem with the glorification of their teachers, and such glorification corresponded with arguments of surviving teachers.

As we have seen, Mizuki's screenplays touch on several issues that could be interpreted as social messages regarding ongoing remilitarization. However, the 1953 film did not solely focus on its didactic message. On the contrary, if we pay attention to less conspicuous details, we can see the ways in which the film creators carefully balanced the entertaining and didactic aspects of the movie. The next section will examine the important role that casting and music played in improving the entertaining aspects of *The Tower of Himeyuri*.

---

[221] Mizuki, *Mizuki Yōko Shinarioshū,* 111.

The Tower of Himeyuri as an Entertaining War Film

Before examining the importance of casting and music in the movie, it is necessary to point out the impact of the scene that comes at the climax the movie. This scene depicts the military doctor, Oka, shooting the leading character, Uehara Fumi, in a cave where Oka and the students are hiding. Since this scene emphasized that the Japanese Imperial Army did not allow surrender under any circumstances, and that they would go so far as to shoot a female student in the back, this ending was a bold new step in its criticism of the Japanese Imperial Army.

Nakasone Seizen, the author of the 1951 non-fictional account of the HSC, explicitly expressed his discomfort with the T version, and in particular with this climactic scene. In fact, both Ishino Keiichirō and Nakasone Seizen believed that Mizuki Yōko had plagiarized a great deal from their own accounts of the HSC. For example, Mizuki described the leading character and her younger sister as senior and junior students of the same school, but Ishino Keiichirō had already used the same idea in his novel *The Tower of Himeyuri* in 1949. Likewise, there are several lines spoken in the battlefield hospital scenes which are identical to lines that had already appeared in Nakasone Seizen's *The Tragedy of Okinawa*. These "similarities" must have further increased Nakasone's dissatisfaction regarding the film's climax, since he knew in the eyes of audiences, both the "similarities" and the climax would be seen as the "truth" about the HSC. In a later interview, Nakasone stated:

> (…) At first, my greatest discomfort with the Tōyoko[222] film was with the last scene. In that scene, the American soldiers encourage the people inside the cave to surrender by shouting "Come out, come out". Eventually, one of the students tries to run out of the cave, and a Japanese soldier shoots her. And then the story ends. I strongly protested and demanded that this scene be removed, simply because it did not happen. But they ignored my demand, insisting that this scene was the most important point of

[222] It was actually a Tōei film.

> the climax. We disagreed right up until the last minute before the release of the film.[223]

This quotation clearly shows one of the critical disagreements between Nakasone and Mizuki. As we saw in Chapter 3, Nakasone's *The Tragedy of Okinawa* was an anthology of memoirs written by surviving students and Nakasone himself, and Nakasone carefully modified or erased some terms or expressions that could be interpreted as criticisms of the United States or the Japanese Imperial Army. For Mizuki, however, this scene of a military doctor shooting a female student was "the most important point of the climax". Mizuki used the same climax in both screenplays, but she changed the wartime status of the HSC in the second one. Considering this, it is safe to assume that Mizuki constructed her storytelling based on new criticisms against the Japanese Imperial Army, with Oka as a symbol of its depravity.

However, Oka is not depicted as a simple villain, but rather as a two-sided character. He is a militarist and trusting believer in Japan's coming victory, but also shows a fatherly concern for the HSC and treats them as he would his own daughter. For example, in an early scene, Oka shows kindness to the HSC by giving them sweet medicine as a substitute for real sweets. In the same scene, he also shows them a picture of his own daughter, telling them that she was the same age as they are. This scene emphasizes his fatherly character in the story, making the climactic scene even more dramatic.

The actor who played this complicated character was Fujita Susumu (藤田 進). Fujita was a well-known movie star during the Asia-Pacific War; he had already played many roles as a military officer in propaganda films, such as *Hawai Marē-oki Kaisen* (*The War at Sea from Hawaii to Malay*) in 1942 and *Katō Hayabusa Sentōtai* (*Colonel Katō's Falcon Squadron*) in 1944. In *Katō Hayabusa Sentōtai*, Fujita played the role of Colonel Katō Tateo

---

[223] "Okinawa Gendaishi e no Shōgen 13: Senzen no Kyōiku to Okinawa-sen Taiken", *Shin Okinawa Bungaku* No.43, 204.

(加藤 建夫), an actual Air Force ace pilot who died in battle in 1942. The film features spectacular air battle scenes, and Fujita portrays Katō as a person of deep humanity.

Casting Fujita in the role of Oka in 1953 was, therefore, a strategic decision for the film creators. Fujita had played the roles of war heroes countless times during the war, thus he was the most suitable actor to play Oka, a character who oscillated between fatherly doctor and fanatic militarist. In the eyes of audiences, Oka's double-sidedness in the movie might have overlapped Fujita's actual transition from a war hero to a military villain on screen. Also, it is likely that the film's creators knew that casting a former big star in a postwar "war film" would have a positive impact on its marketing.

In addition to the all-star cast, Imai Tadashi's reputation as a director was expected to play a major role in the commercial success of the movie. Toēi Film provided the following suggestions in a press sheet to the Japanese media about how to advertise the movie:

★HOW TO ADVERTISE THE MOVIE★

> We can expect support from all kinds of organizations. The public is eagerly awaiting the film's release, thanks to its effective advertising thus far. The director, Imai Tadashi, boasts a degree of popularity rarely seen among Japanese film directors, and we should pay special attention to the fact that he is so well-respected among female audiences. The film is of exceptional quality and the all-star cast, headed by Tsushima Keiko, is a major draw. You could describe the film as a female version of the war film *Kike Wadatsumi no Koe* (*Listen to the Voices of the Sea*), but it is important to keep in mind that this film is primarily targeted at female audiences. Please avoid graphic catch phrases. *Rather, do your best to describe this gloomy story in a beautiful light* [emphasis added]. Also, as already mentioned, this movie has been declared a masterpiece of Japanese film, so it would be a good idea to try to appeal to fans of Western movies in addition to fans of Japanese films. Finally, allow me to point out that this film is based on an original scenario by Mizuki Yōko.[224]

Before looking more closely at Imai Tadashi, it will be useful to briefly examine the above mentioned *Kike Wadatsumi no Koe* (*Listen to the Voices of the Sea*), which was created

[224] TOEI PRESS SHEET No.133

in 1950 by Tōyoko Film, the precursor of Tōei Film. *Kike Wadatsumi no Koe* was based on a best-selling anthology of last notes written by university students who had been mobilized and in many cases died as soldiers during the Asia-Pacific War. *Kike Wadatsumi no Koe* vividly depicted the cruelty of the war and the excesses of the Japanese military institution, and was a huge commercial success. This press sheet reveals, however, that Tōei Film did not want to over-emphasize the similarities between *The Tower of Himeyuri* and *Kike Wadatsumi no Koe.* It rather sought to expand the target audience of war movies by attracting female audiences as well.The press sheet also makes no mention of the film's anti-war message. Tōei Film was likely concerned that an anti-war message would be seen as "gloomy", and sought rather to present the film "in a beautiful light" in order to appeal to female audiences. Related to this point, it should be noted that Mizuki's scripts include a conversation between Miyagi and female students about the fact that their menstrual periods stopped when the American attack began.[225] This seemingly minor description may in fact be significant, since Mizuki may have included it as a means to generate empathy among female audiences in the Japanese mainland towards the female students in the Battle of Okinawa. Since he was "so well-respected among female audiences", Imai Tadashi was an ideal director for this movie.

Today, Imai Tadashi is most strongly associated with his works that dealt with social problems, but at the beginning of the 1950s, he was also well known for having directed the tragic love story *Mata Au Hi made* (*Until We Meet Again)* in 1950. Thus it was not only his skills as a director, but also his popularity among female viewers that was expected to have a positive impact on the commercial success of the movie. Although Imai had directed an entertaining action movie called *Bōrō no Kesshitai* (*Suicide Squad at the Watchtower*) in 1943, Tōei Film, which had just been born as a result of the merger between Tōyoko Film, Ooizumi

[225] Mizuki, *Mizuki Yōko Shinarioshū*, 36-37.

Film, and Tokyo Eiga Haikyū Film, he did not have any experience shooting a war film like *The Tower of Himeyuri.* Thus, Imai watched the film *Sands of Iwo Jima* to develop his ideas about *The Tower of Himeyuri*, and then communicated his ideas and demands to the camera operator.[226]

Sands of Iwo Jima was a 1949 Hollywood war movie starring John Wayne.[227] It depicted an American Marine combat unit in the Battle of Iwo Jima, which took place on the island of Iwo Jima from February to March 1945, immediately before the Battle of Okinawa. *The Tower of Himeryuri* was based not only on Mizuki's screenplay, but also on Imai's research for another war drama. Imai did not mention specifically what kinds of ideas and demands he had communicated to the camera operator, but it is safe to assume that they related to visual images of the battlefields.

Imai believed that realism was essential to a war film. In another interview, Imai mentioned that Japanese cinema did not have many war films due to the financial cost, and that the quality of Japanese war films was not on par with that of foreign war films.[228] It should be noted that what Imai meant by "quality" in this interview was not the social message of the films, but the realism of their cinematic depictions. In the same interview, Imai continued, "…this movie (*The Tower of Himeyuri*) is not intended to be an anti-war message for Japan. It simply aims to depict the truth as realistically as possible. Then it is up to the audience to develop their own opinions". In the conclusion of the interview, when asked about the message of *The Tower of Himeyuri* and how he expected audiences to interpret the movie, Imai

---

[226] Imamura, *Sengo Eiga No Tenkai*,124.

[227] This movie was released in June 1952 in Japan.

[228] "Himeyuri no Tō no Shita Haku Iki wa Shiroku", *Fujin Kōron*, 237.

repeated: “I am not trying to transmit any particular message to audiences. I hope that after watching this movie, every viewer will draw their own conclusions”.[229]

Imai adamantly denied the existence of any message behind *The Tower of Himeyuri*. Here, it is important to keep in mind that Imai left Japanese cinema in 1949 due to his pro-communist background, and became a freelance director. He was forced to live as a junk dealer for some time in 1950 while unemployed.[230] Therefore, it is not surprising that Imai was extremely careful about any hint of a political position behind his 1953 war movie. Nevertheless, Imai put a great deal of effort into creating realistic depictions of Okinawa, a difficult feat due to the fact that GHQ no longer supported on-location shooting in Okinawa. As already mentioned, Imai was neither able to shoot on location in Okinawa, nor able to cast any Okinawan actors. Although the story took place in Okinawa’s hot, humid season, Imai was forced to shoot the film in autumn and winter in and around Tokyo. Despite all these adverse challenges, Imai succeeded in instilling a sense of Okinawan local culture through the use of local Okinawan folk songs. One Okinawan singer in particular played an important role in this respect.

Namihira Akio (波平 暁男) was born in Okinawa in 1915. A natural-born vocalist, he performed nearly two hundred military songs during the Asia-Pacific War, including *Umi Yukaba* (*If I Go to the Sea*) and *Wakawashi no Uta* (*The Song of Young Eagles*). *Umi Yukaba* was based on an ancient poem, and made into a military song in 1937. It glorified death in the service of the emperor, and became so popular as to be called “the Second National Anthem.”[231] Meanwhile, *Wakawashi no Uta,* performed by Namihira and the non-Okinawan

---

[229] Ibid.

[230] Imai Tadashi Kantoku o Kataritsugu Kai, eds., *Imai Tadashi eiga tokuhon = Imai Tadashi* (Tokyo: Ronsōsha, 2012),30-32.

[231] Kōtarō Hidaka, *Fujichaku* (Tokyo: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha, 2004), 362.

singer Kirishima Noboru (霧島 昇), was included in the propaganda movie *Kessen no Oozora e* (*To the Giant Sky of a Climactic Battle*) in 1943. Both *Wakawashi no Uta* and the movie itself glorified Japanese boys who voluntarily became *Kaigun Hikō Yokarenshūsei* or *Yokaren* (Naval Air Force Preparatory Course Trainees), leading to an increase in the number of boys who actually joined the *Yokaren* in those days.[232] While the average hit song sold around 30,000 records, the *Wakawashi no Uta* sold more than 300,000 records.[233] Just as Fujita Susumu became popular as an actor by playing war heroes, Namihira came to be strongly associated with wartime military songs, and gained massive popularity through them.

After the defeat, however, Namihira's fortunes took a turn for the worse. His exclusive contract with a record company expired on August 15 1945, the very day that Japan's Emperor Hirohito publicly declared the end of the war on the radio, and he thereafter faded from the limelight. One of a few occasions in which Namihira drew media attention after the war, was the production of *The Tower of Himeyuri.* Namihira was listed in the movie credits as "Instructor in Adapting Okinawan Folk Songs", while Koseki Yūji (古関 裕而), a famous non-Okinawan composer, was listed as "Music Instructor". According to an interview with Namihira's nephew, it was Imai Tadashi who wanted to include Namihira in the movie's staff, although he did not know at the time that Namihira was from Okinawa. Upon learning this fact, it seems that Imai found it ironic that Namihira, who had created a series of pro-war hits during wartime, was from Okinawa, where the ground battle which embroiled the largest number of Japanese civilians took place.[234] It is clear that *The Tower of Himeyuri* was successful at the time in using local Okinawan folk songs to impress audiences. On February 15

---

[232] Ibid., 376.

[233] Ibid., 382.

[234] Ibid., 407-408.

1953, approximately one month after the release of *The Tower of Himeyuri,* the *Okinawa Shinminpō* newspaper reported:

> It seems that more and more people are either forgetting about Okinawa, or know nothing about Okinawa in the first place. Therefore, we must develop campaigns all over Japan to educate people more about Okinawa… The movie *The Tower of Himeyuri* helped draw more attention from the Japanese mainland to Okinawa, and screenings lasted as long as three weeks in major cities…In the movie, the HSC sang and danced to the song "*Tanchame* (谷茶前)". This song has now become extremely popular among male and female junior high and high school students in various locations. There are even some schools where the students hope to perform the song at their March graduation ceremonies, and have asked Okinawan students to teach them the dance. However, the tragic comedy here is that even Okinawan students do not know the song.[235]

As this article shows, Okinawan folk songs contributed not only to the realistic portrayal of Okinawa in *The Tower of Himeyuri*, but also to its economic success. It should also be remembered that this was an age in which neither DVD nor VHS existed; therefore, film scores played a significant role in audience impressions due to the relative ease of popular circulation on the radio or through record sales. Thus, *The Tower of Himeyuri* was not merely a didactic film; there was also a great deal of attention paid to its director, casting, and music to make it more appealing to female audiences. All of these factors led to the unprecedented success of the completed film. The image of the HSC as victims was reinforced in the filming process, while anything which challenged or contradicted this image, such as references to teachers' wartime responsibility or Christian objections to the glorification of the deaths of the HSC, was carefully filtered out. As we will see in Chapter 5, this "purification" of the movie led to a variety of ripples in Okinawa, Japan, and the United States.

The Tower of Himeyuri was carefully constructed as an entertaining movie as well as a didactic movie, and its underlying message could be interpreted as opposition to the on-go-

---

[235] "Okinawa o Wasurenaide Kakkai no Ugoki Kappatsu Henkan Undō ni Hakusha: Eiga Himeyuri no Tō Hayakumo Wadai o Yobu", *Okinawa Shinminpō*, February 15, 1953.

ing remilitarization of Japan.There is, however, one important issue worth examining here: that of the wartime responsibility of the film creators. As we have seen in this chapter, Mizuki Yōko was officially sent, as a non-regular staff of the Army Military of Japan, to Burma in order to write a report about Japan-dominated South-Asian countries. Likewise, Imai Tadashi directed propaganda films that would later be criticized by film scholars, such as *Bōrō no Kesshitai* (*Suicide Squad at the Watchtower)* in 1943, *Ikari no Umi* (*The Sea of Wrath*) in 1945, and *Ai to Chikai* (*Love and Vows)* in 1944. The film scholar Peter B. High made what is perhaps the most outspoken criticism of Imai as follows:

> *Love and Vows* (*Ai to Chikai*, Toho, 1945, destroyed?) appears to have been a particularly disreputable example of the subgenre. Directed by Imai Tadashi (along with his Korean collaborator, Sai Tō), it was a propaganda piece with the unforgivable intention of recruiting Korean youths for the kamikaze corps service… Since it premiered on 26 July, barely three weeks before the end of the war, and was apparently subsequently burned, Imai was able to keep his postwar reputation intact by pretending it never existed. The innocent, indeed romantic-sounding title may have helped him in this deception.[236]

It is not my intention to delve deeply into the wartime responsibility of Mizuki Yōko and Imai Tadashi for their roles in creating propaganda works and collaborating with the Japanese Imperial Army. It is important, however, to point out that in the process of filming *The Tower of Himeyuri,* neither Mizuki nor Imai openly talked about the movie in the context of their own propaganda activities during wartime, even though they agreed that the primary motif of this movie was "the lack of the independence of mind of Japanese people". Thus, Imai and Mizuki bemoaned the female students who "never questioned their teachers; if the teachers said 'look right' they would look right; if they said 'look left' they would look left",[237] while they themselves kept silent about their own roles in wartime literature and cin-

---

[236] High, Peter B. *The Imperial Screen: Japanese Film Culture in the Fifteen Years' War, 1931-1945* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2003), 488.

[237] Imamura, *Sengo Eiga no Tenkai*,.125.

ema, and how they contributed to Japanese militarism by producing works of propaganda. In order to examine this issue more closely, the next section will focus on Kikuta Kazuo, who took a sharply contrasting approach to his wartime responsibility, and the Takarazuka musical about the HSC.

Kikuta Kazuo and his Wartime Responsibility

Before analyzing Kikuta Kazuo's *The Tower of Himeyuri*, it is useful to briefly explore the history of the all-female Takarazuka Revue. The origin of the Takarazuka Revue can be traced back to 1913. Kobayashi Ichizō (小林 一三), the owner of a private railroad company in the Kansai area (the western part of the Japanese mainland), developed Takarazuka, a small spa resort town located in between Osaka and Kobe, into an amusement place in order to increase the number of passengers using his railroad. The all-girl revue was born as a result of his plan to redevelop Takarazuka. It started as an all-girl chorus group in 1913, and later in 1918 it turned into a private school for girls which trained them as performers for the Takarazuka Revue. A major turning point for the Takarazuka Revue was the Great Kantō earthquake, which struck the Tokyo metropolitan area in 1923. The influx of affluent and highly educated people from the areas around the capital who moved to the Kansai area in the aftermath of the earthquake ultimately contributed to its cultural prosperity.[238] In 1934, the Takarazuka Revue began to give regular performances in its own exclusive theatre in Tokyo. During wartime, the Takarazuka Revue also performed war propaganda revues that glorified Japanese imperialism.

In previous studies of the narratives about the HSC, little attention has been paid either to Kikuta Kazuo or to the Takarazuka musical *The Tower of Himeyuri* (Himeyuri no Tō)

[238] Kaoru Tamaoka, *Takarajennu No Taiheiyō Sensō* (Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 2004), 52.

that was based on his script, while a great deal of attention has been paid to movies based on the HSC, and to Imai's *The Tower of Himeyuri* in particular. Likewise, studies of the Takarazuka revue have made little effort to investigate the significance of Kikuta's *The Tower of Himeyuri*. For example, in her comprehensive analysis of the Takarazuka Revue, Jennifer Ellen Robertson devotes only one paragraph to Kikuta's *The Tower of Himeyuri* (*Himeyuri no Tō*):

> Of course, the Revue's self-referential exoticism and public image as a dreamland effectively places it outside Japanese history. Consequently, Japan's imperial past has not been revisited in its productions since the "emergency situation" revues of the wartime period. One exception was the performance in 1953 of *The Tomb of the Red Star Lily* (*Himeyuri no tō*), a tragic story about a volunteer brigade of Japanese schoolgirls who perished in the Battle of Okinawa. The playwright, Kikuta Kazuo, who was inactive during the height of the war with the United States, acknowledged that this was an atypical Takarazuka revue, but he replied to his critics that he wished to produce an antiwar drama to help kindle the spirit of constitutional democracy in postwar Japan (Kikuta 1982). Of course, just as the Revue exploited the wartime need for emergency-minded entertainment, so it seized the opportunity to amplify the antiwar sentiments spreading through the public immediately after the war: the new social climate called for a new corporate strategy. However, *The Tomb of the Red Star Lily* focused not on Japanese imperialism but on the intrepid spirit of the vanquished girls—it was an antiwar play that drew the line at criticizing Japanese warmongers. Generally speaking, the postwar Revue administration decided early on to stage only revues that recalled a safely distant Japanese past or conjured up fantastic visions of exotic lands across the ocean.[239]

Robertson's overall evaluation of Kikuta's *The Tower of Himeyuri* is summed up in the statement that "it was an antiwar play that drew the line at criticizing Japanese warmongers". If we take a careful look at Kikuta's *The Tower of Himeyuri*, however, we realize that Robertson has laboured under false assumptions. In fact, Kikuta Kazuo did not draw "the line at criticizing Japanese warmongers". Rather, Kikuta addressed his own wartime responsibility as one of said "warmongers" as the basis for his version of The *Tower of Himeyuri*. The brochure for *The Tower of Himeyuri*, whose performance lasted from July 1 to 30 in

---

[239] Jennifer E Robertson. *Takarazuka: Sexual Politics and Popular Culture in Modern Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 210-211. Internet resource.

Takarazuka and from September 3 to 27 in Tokyo in 1953,[240] included not only the plot of the revue, but also a long message from Kikuta Kazuo to audiences:

> To accept war is to accept not only one's own death, but also the deaths of others; it is a stupid position that only godless monsters could take. Those who fear only their own deaths while driving others to war are despicable war criminals.
>
> Until August 15 1945, I was such a godless monster or war criminal. I was also a coward; on the eve of August 15, I secretly escaped from air-bombed Tokyo to where my family had evacuated, as one of my close friends of Jōhō Kyoku (Information Agency) had managed to purchase a train ticket for me.
>
> I was afraid of being captured as a war criminal by the Occupation Forces. In fact, the executives of a company where I worked were later expelled because of my war propaganda plays. One month after the end of the war, I returned to Tokyo, turning myself in to the Occupation Forces to see an officer in charge. I told him about my wartime works as proof of my cooperation with the war effort. Against all expectations, I was neither captured nor expelled, since they merely considered me to be a hired person during wartime. In fact, I received compliments from them for my unusual honesty. However, the Japanese Communist Party had already submitted a list of nine writers whom they considered to be war criminals, of which I was one. This is my lamentable, heart-wrenching story.
>
> Did the female students of *The Tower of Himeyuri* accept the war deep down in their hearts and die with great joy? Some insist that they did. They could be right, because girls are pure-minded, sinless and naive. However, others insist that they must have questioned the war and died with great anger towards those who had driven them to their deaths. They too could be right, because even I, who had once been a monster and a war criminal, had wondered why this was happening to me as I sat in my burning house under the horrific air bombings; I couldn't help bursting into tears and cursing the war. Even so, I stayed in the capital until the very end in order to continue holding productions of my plays that supported the war.
>
> On one hand, I believe that the Himeyuri girls questioned the war and cried for its cruelty. On the other hand, however, I also believe that they docilely followed orders, sacrificed their lives for the nation, fought, and ascended to heaven. Hopefully, their tragedy will never be repeated again. I truly believe that every single person, including the Himeyuri survivors and their surviving teachers, sincerely pray for this.[241]

As is clear from this quotation, Kikuta candidly admitted his responsibility as a propaganda playwright for having driven audiences to war. He thus took a very different view of the Himeyuri students from that of Mizuki Yōko and Imai Tadashi. It was Mizuki and Imai

---

[240] Masao Hashimoto, *Aishite Koishite Namidashite: Takarazuka to Kikuta Kazu*o (Tokyo:Yomiuri Shinbunsha, 1982), 102-103.

[241] *Takarazuka Kageki Kyakuhonshū Shichigatsu Yukigumi*, July 1, 1953: 8.

who drew the line at criticizing their own wartime responsibility as warmongers, which enabled them to focus only on "the lack of the independence of mind of Japanese people" in their movie *The Tower of Himeyuri*. Kikuta, on the other hand, recognized that the Himeyuri students could not be reduced to an image of unquestioning obedience.

It is neither my aim here to defend Kikuta Kazuo nor to absolve him from his wartime responsibility. Rather, I aim to explore the ways in which Kikuta wove the issue of wartime responsibility into his revue, and how his approach differentiated his revue from other narratives of the HSC.

This raises the question: what differentiated Kikuta from Mizuki and Imai? One clue is to be found in Kikuta's enormous productivity during wartime. Kikuta Kazuo was born in 1908 in Yokohama, and he began writing his first play in 1931. His career gained momentum when he started working with the legendary comedian Furukawa Roppa (古川ロッパ), and he wrote a total of around seventy plays between 1936 and 1945, including a number of war propaganda plays.[242] In his biography of Kikuta Kazuo, the playwright Obata Kinji (小幡 欣治) stated that in addition to his productivity, what underpinned Kikuta's reputation as the best-known propaganda playwright during wartime was his skillful construction of stories based on the concept of *messhi-hōkō* (self-annihilation for the sake of one's nation), which impressed wartime audiences more than the work of any other playwright.[243] Unlike Mizuki (born in 1910) and Imai (born in 1912) whose careers culminated after the defeat, Kikuta had already made a big name for himself in the field of Japanese theatre as early as the late 1930s by creating a large number of propaganda works. This did not automatically mean that Kikuta

---

[242] Yoshie Inoue, *Kikuta Kazuo No Shigoto: Asakusa, Hibiya, Takarazuka* (Tokyo: Shakai Hyōronsha, 2011), 48-50.

[243] Kinji Obata, *Hyōden Kikuta Kazuo* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2008), 111.

took greater responsibility for supporting the war than Imai and Mizuki, but it is true that Kikuta was much more explicit and conspicuous in the eyes of the audiences in those days as a creator of propaganda.

Furthermore, there is one more important issue worth mentioning with regards to Kikuta's adaptation of the story of the HSC. Before the defeat, Kikuta wrote only one play for Takarazuka in 1940, and it explicitly depicted the devotion of the Japanese Red Cross nurses working at the Chinese front. Titled *Seki-jyūji-ki wa Susumu* (*The Red Cross Flag Goes On*), the play focuses on a head nurse who donates her blood to a Chinese girl. This Chinese girl is initially depicted as unsupportive of the Japanese Red Cross; she refuses to let them use her parents' home as a battlefield hospital, blatantly telling them that she is disgusted by the blood of Japanese soldiers.[244] The girl gets injured by a bullet from the Chinese Army, and the head nurse of the Japanese Red Cross voluntarily donates her blood to the girl in the hope that this act would help her see the good nature of the Japanese. As a result, the Chinese girl drastically changes her attitude, but the head nurse dies of cholera following her blood donation. At the end of the play, the Japanese soldiers and the Red Cross nurses, both of whom are played by Takarazuka girls, sing in chorus glorifying the self-sacrifice of the Japanese Red Cross.[245]

Kikuta did not mention anything about a correlation between his two Takarazuka scripts, *The Red Cross Flag Goes On* and *The Tower of Himeyuri*, but it should be kept in mind that his first Takarazuka musical is an explicit war propaganda piece that glorifies the self-sacrifice of Red Cross nurses for creating a "friendship" between the Japanese and the Chinese. Kikuta may have found something in common between the story about Okinawan

---

[244] *Takarazuka Shōjo Kageki Kyakuhonshū Showa Jyūgonen Gogatsu Yukigumi Kōen*, May 1940: 46.

[245] Ibid., 61.

female students who worked as nurses in the battlefield and his propaganda revue based on the Red Cross nurses at the Chinese front.

The foremost characteristic of Kikuta's *The Tower of Himeyuri* is that the story focuses on the relationship between the "present" (which means 1953 when the revue was made) and the "past". It is narrated through the past memories of fictional Okinawan survivors directly to Japanese mainlanders who understand neither the Battle of Okinawa nor the HSC well. As we have seen, the preceding narratives on the HSC all presented their stories as completed events of the past, and no connections are drawn between the past and the present. In contrast, Kikuta's *The Tower of Himeyuri* sought to address the HSC as an ongoing issue by focusing on this missing link between the past and the present, as well as the link between Okinawa and the Japanese mainland.

The revue begins with a scene of the wedding ceremony of an Okinawan couple in Naha, Okinawa, in 1953. In the middle of the ceremony, the groom's uncle, after having had several drinks, starts to tease the bride, whose name is Namihira Keiko. This uncle lived in the Japanese mainland during wartime, so he had heard of the HSC, but nothing more. He reveals that she is one of the survivors of the HSC who was captured by the enemy, and makes sarcastic comments about the fact that she chose the dishonour of capture rather than death. The groom defends her and confesses that he was also captured by the enemy in the Battle of Okinawa, and the wedding hall goes into an uproar. Finally, a man who was hiding in a hallway raises his voice. It turns out that the man is a surviving teacher who accompanied the HSC. In order to counter the uncle's comments, he begins talking to the wedding guests about what actually happened in the Battle of Okinawa and how the bride was captured. After his story ends, the uncle admits that he was wrong and apologizes to Namihira. In

the final scene, the souls of the dead female students appear in the form of pink sailor-suited school girls, climbing up grand staircases to Heaven.[246]

As I have already noted, this revue began at least six months after the release of Imai Tadashi's *The Tower of Himeyuri*; it ran from July 1 to 30 in Takarazuka, and from September 3 to 27 in Tokyo in 1953.[247] Not surprisingly, Kikuta Kazuo saw the movie before he completed his script.[248] He thus imagined that audiences would already know what to expect in the revue, that is, that most of the HSC die in the end, simply because both the movie and the revue were based on the historical facts. At this time in 1953, Kikuta was no longer able to construct the story from scratch, simply because the movie had already made the HSC well-known to audiences; all he could do was to follow the main plot of the movie with modifications. At first glance, Kikuta's *The Tower of Himeyuri* does not seem so different from Imai's *The Tower of Himeyuri*. If we take a closer look at how the obedience of the female students and the wartime responsibility of teachers were presented, however, it becomes clear that Kikuta inconspicuously added significant modifications to Imai's movies. The next section will examine how Kikuta portrayed the tension between the students' independence of mind and lack thereof in his revue.

Kikuta Kazuo's Portrayals of the HSC

First of all, Kikuta describes the willingness of the female students to participate in the HSC in more complex ways than did Imai and Mizuki. As we saw earlier in the scene featuring the conversation between the female student and her mother, Imai's movie emphasized

---

[246] "'Himeyuri no Tō' no Butai o Kataru", *Kageki* No.334 July 1953: 46.

[247] Hashimoto, *Aishite Koishite Namidashite*, 102-103.

[248] *Kageki* No. 334: 46.

the victimhood of the HSC by depicting how they were pressured to "voluntarily" accompany their school. Kikuta describes this in a different light. He inserts teachers into the scene of a similar conversation between a student and her mother. The teachers try to persuade the student not to accompany her school, but rather to stay with her mother, not only because it is not mandatory to accompany the school, but also because she is the only one whom her mother can depend on. She adamantly refuses, however, insisting that she does not want to betray her schoolmates and teachers. In the end, she decides to leave her mother in order to accompany the school.[249]

Likewise, in a later scene after the female students have begun to work as battlefield nurses, another female student is urged by her teachers to leave the HSC and go back to her parents in a safer zone, since she had hidden the fact that she did not have permission from her parents to join the HSC. The teachers continue trying to persuade her to leave the HSC, and this time they succeed. After refusing a couple of times, the girl reluctantly agrees to leave the HSC.[250]

It is important to note that the aim of these two contrasting scenes was to highlight the tensions between the students' independence of mind and lack thereof. Both of these students showed an equally strong reluctance to escape from the battlefields to their families, and did not immediately comply with the teachers. In this light, it becomes clear that the teachers played a significant role here in creating the impression that their students chose to stay in the HSC voluntarily. In Kikuta's revue, the Himeyuri students were described as fully responsible for their own decisions; that is, they were described as having made their own choices even

---

[249] *Takarazuka Shōjo Kageki Kyakuhonshū Showa Jyūgonen Gogatsu Yukigumi Kōen,* May 1942: 12.

[250] Ibid., 20.

under the pressure of their teachers. This is the polar opposite of Mizuki and Imai's portrayals of the HSC, in which the students never tried to challenge or resist any orders.

It is also important to point out that whether they ultimately succeeded in persuading their students to go back to their families or not, the goodwill of the teachers is never questioned in Kikuta's revue. The benevolent nature of teachers had already been emphasized in the movie *The Tower of Himeyuri*, but Kikuta used it uniquely as a tool to shed light on another example of the students' independence of mind. To achieve this goal, Kikuta put the spotlight on Principal Nishioka from a different angle. As Chapter 3 detailed, the actual Principal Nishioka stirred up a controversy over his wartime actions. As we have seen, Mizuki Yōko depicted almost nothing about the principal. In contrast, Kikuta Kazuo took full advantage of this on-going scandal over the principal in his revue.

Initially, Principal Yamaoka (a slight modification from "Nishioka" which means "west hill" in Japanese to "Yamaoka" which means "mountain hill") is portrayed accurately based on the historical facts. At the beginning of the revue, he announces to the students and teachers that they will be going to a battlefield hospital in order to work for the Japanese Imperial Army. Then he adds that according to military orders, he will not be accompanying the HSC to the battlefield hospital, but instead will be going to stay at the Japanese Imperial Army headquarters, which was located in a safer zone. Principal Yamaoka does not physically appear in the story after this announcement, but students and teachers refer to him frequently throughout the story. It soon becomes clear through these references that the character of Yamaoka has been actually drastically modified from his model, the actual Principal Nishioka. For example, Yamaoka is described as the uncle of one of his students, Namihira Keiko, who appears as the bride at the beginning of the revue. This also means that Yamaoka is an Okinawan, even though the actual Principal Nishioka is from outside Okinawa. Fur-

thermore, Yamaoka dies in the middle of the revue by taking a bullet for male students.[251] It seems safe to assume that Kikuta combined two different Principals, Nishioka Kazuyoshi and Noda Sadao, and turned them into one character. As Chapter 3 revealed, Nishioka survived the Battle of Okinawa, but Noda, the principal of the Male Division of Okinawa Normal School, accompanied his male students and died in the battle with them.

Here it is important to examine the role of this fictional Principal Yamaoka in Kikuta's revue. Throughout the story, all of the students, including his own niece Namihira, are highly critical of Principal Yamaoka. For example, even Namihira doubts whether Principal Yamaoka is actually being sent to headquarters on military orders, going so far as to say that she hates her uncle because he is a coward.[252] The students' distrust towards Principal Yamaoka reaches its apex when he does not appear at their graduation ceremony, which takes place in a cave on the battlefield. In this scene, students begin criticizing him openly, making comments such as "He must have escaped", "I smell a rat from scratch", and "The Principal is a coward! Everybody says that he saved only himself by running away to the military headquarters in the safest place".[253] These suspicions later turn out to be wrong, because Yamaoka ultimately dies protecting his students from a bullet. What matters here is that students openly condemn Principal Yamaoka as a symbol of those who drive them to war. Just as they challenge the orders from their teachers to go back to their families, they doubt the authority of their own Principal as well. It is now clear that Principal Yamaoka's character serves as another example of the independence of mind of the students, which never appeared in Mizuki and Imai's portrayal of the HSC.

---

[251] Ibid., 26.

[252] Ibid., 15.

[253] Ibid., 26.

This chapter has examined the movie and revue versions of *The Tower of Himeyuri.* The revue portrayed the HSC as more complex in character than did the movie. This does not, however, simply mean the revue was "better" than the movie. Although Kikuta candidly admitted his wartime responsibility as a creator of propaganda, that does not mean that he successfully wove the issue of wartime responsibility into his revue. Although Principal Yamaoka symbolizes warmongers in Kikuta's revue, the issue of his wartime responsibility is ultimately played down by the depiction of him dying to protect his students. Nevertheless, it should be also kept in mind that neither Mizuki Yōko nor Imai Tadashi acknowledged any personal responsibility for having driven Japanese people to war. In this respect, Kikuta Kazuo's approach to the HSC was completely different from that of Mizuki and Imai. Although he did not delve deeply into the issue of warmongering, he did manage to avoid portraying the HSC as uni-dimensional, pure-minded victims.

The year 1953 saw the historical facts about the HSC adapted into both a movie and a theatrical revue. These two performative narratives were highly commercially successful in the Japanese mainland, and firmly established the place of the HSC in public memory. The image of the HSC as victims was reinforced; anything which challenged or contradicted this image, such as references to teachers' wartime responsibility or Christian objections to the glorification of the deaths of the HSC, was carefully filtered out at this stage. The next, and final chapter examines how this "purification" of the image of the HSC later created ripples in various ways.

Chapter 5

The Narratives of the Himeyuri Student Corps and their Rippling Effects

Thus far, this thesis has examined how the narratives of the Himeyuri Student Corps changed, and in particular how their depictions of the wartime status of the HSC vacillated between that of "civilians" and that of "civilians employed by the military". This chapter shows the rippling effects of such narratives in the Japanese mainland, the United States, and Okinawa. It then summarizes the arguments of each chapter, and draws conclusions as to how the narratives on the Himeyuri Student Corps functioned from 1945 to 1953 and beyond.

Reactions of the Japanese Cinema Industry to the Success of The Tower of Himeyuri

Among all the narratives that this thesis has examined, the 1953 movie had the biggest impact on public memory of the HSC. According to Kagawa Kyōko, the leading actress in the movie, Imai Tadashi later stated on a television interview that the total production cost of *The Tower of Himeyuri* was 36 million yen.[254] It was more than three times as large as Tōei's average production cost at the time of 10 million yen, but sales at the box-office reached 150 million yen, which ultimately saved the deficit-ridden Tōei.[255] The movie was later used as a tool to highlight the tragedy of Okinawa and draw attention to Okinawa's reversion movement. For example, the *Okinawa Shinminpō* newspaper reported that a group of Okinawans were organizing a rally in Amagasaki, Hyogo Prefecture, in order to appeal for the return of Okinawa to Japan. It also reported that at the end of the rally, they planned to run a preview of *The Tower of Himeyuri.*[256] However, the commercial success of *The Tower*

---

[254] Kagawa, *Himeyuritachi No Inori*, 60.

[255] Ibid.

[256] "Okinawa o Kaese: Amagasaki de Taikai," *Okinawa Shinminpō*, June 15, 1953.

of Himeyuri did not significantly impact the viewers' understanding of the war. *The Tower of Himeyuri* did, however, usher in a boom in war movies in Japanese cinema.

Fred Saito, an AP correspondent, reported on March 13 1953, that Japanese movie companies were competing with each other to produce war films, each of which glorified Japanese wartime heroes, such as Yamamoto Isoroku, "who [had] ordered Pearl Harbor bombed" and Yamashita Tomoyuki, "who [had] been executed by the Allies as a war criminal". The report went on to explain what had triggered this trend:

> The present hectic activity of all the movie studios in Japan to produce war pictures was apparently spurred by the sensational success of *a horror picture* released in January. [emphasis added]
>
> "HIMEYURI NO TOO" (The Wild Lily Tower) is regarded by many moviemen as an all-time Japan record box office success. The semi-documentary picture of the Okinawa battle, the last great one in World War II, cost its producer 41 million yen ($114,000) and has already drawn 180 million yen ($500,00).
>
> The Wild Lily Tower is actually a monument erected on Okinawa to hundreds of students in the Okinawa girls schools who volunteered as nurses in the imperial army and perished. The movie descries how these school girls were killed.
>
> Many people commented after seeing it, "Compared with it, the 'A-Bomb Orphans' was just a sissy tear-jerker".
>
> The "A-Bomb Orphans" was released shortly after the Hiroshima anniversary last year and it was a smash hit. *The Hiroshima picture did not contain horror scenes*. Unlike publications about Hiroshima sold simultaneously, it depicted the life survivors of the A-bomb. [emphasis added][257]

It should be noted here that this article described *The Tower of Himeyuri* as a horror movie. What can be read from this comparison is that audiences in those days did not pay attention to the antiwar message of the movie, but rather to its graphic depictions of the battlefields and casualties. As we saw in Chapter 4, Imai Tadashi did research beforehand on the Hollywood war movie *Sands of Iwo Jima* in order to improve the realism of *The Tower of Himeyuri*. As a result, audiences at the time found this war film to be like "a horror picture",

---

[257] Fred Saito, "Films to Glorify Japan War Leaders", *Pacific Stars and Stripes* (March 13, 1953) http://newspaperarchive.com/jp/japan/tokyo/pacific-stars-and-stripes/1953/03-13/page-22?tag=himeyuri&rtserp=tags/himeyuri?ndt=by&py=1953&pey=1954 (accessed March 14, 2015).

which was so graphic that the war movie "A-Bomb Orphans" felt like "just a sissy tear-jerker".

The *Asahi Shinbun* newspaper, one of the major newspapers in Japan, also noted this new trend in Japanese cinema. It ran a story on March 8 1953 that sheds light on what was behind the war-film boom in Japanese cinema. It reported that almost all movie companies, with the exception of Daiei Film, had produced war films. The "comeback" of Fujita Susumu, the actor who had played the military doctor Oka in *The Tower of Himeyuri*, was also mentioned in this article, including his comment: "I played a military officer so many times during wartime, and I thought that it was my mission as an actor. But now, I cannot help feeling disturbed holding a military uniform in my hands".[258]

While Fujita Susumu reluctantly expressed his feelings of discomfort regarding the war-film boom, Makino Mitsuo, the head of the production department of Tōei Film at the time, was blatantly honest. Tōei Film, the company that produced the box-office champion *The Tower of Himeyuri*, declared itself "an expert in war films."[259] Asked about the upcoming Toei film *Higeki no Shogun Yamashita Tomoyuki* (*The Tragic General Yamashita Tomoyuki*), Makino stated in a Kyoto dialect: "Japan is no longer under occupation; we are now an independent nation. We have to overcome the past servility of occupation, and foster patriotism. This is why we filmed the life of General Yamashita, who fought for the nation until the last moment but was ultimately executed by hanging. Of course, we also expect that it will be a big hit".[260]

---

[258] "Atama o Motageta Kōsen-Eiga," *Asahi Shinbun*, March 8, 1953.

[259] Ibid.

[260] Ibid.

As Chapter 4 demonstrated, Makino was the very person who had asked Imai Tadashi to film the HSC story with Tōei Film. As his comments on *The Tragic General Yamashita Tomoyuki* explicitly demonstrated, however, Makino had little interest in the antiwar message of movies. This was not because he was particularly commercial-minded. According to the same *Asahi* article, the advertisement department of Shin-Tōho Film stated: "We have received complaints from movie theatres. They tell us that nowadays only graphic movies can draw large audiences. This is why we have developed new movie projects based on war chronicles, something similar to 'Himeyuri'".[261] *The Tower of Himeyuri* surely contained some elements that could be interpreted as an antiwar message, but film creators and audiences paid more attention to its realistic depictions of the war as an entertainment. Although this triggered the boom in Japanese war movies, the issue of wartime responsibility for creating propaganda films was left largely unaddressed.

The Tower of Himeyuri as an Anti-American Film

While the commercial success of *The Tower of Himeyuri* was seen as a positive new trend for the Japanese cinema, the United States was not impressed with this sudden turnaround that immediately followed the end of the Occupation. On April 16 1953, one month after he ran the first story, Fred Saito ran a similar report on the Japanese cinema, in which he stated: "Until the Allied occupation which ended last April, Japanese were banned from producing any 'militaristic' pictures or books. As soon as the lid was off, memoirs written by Japanese soldiers and sailors became best sellers".[262]

---

[261] Ibid.

[262] Fred Saito,"Japanese Movie-Makers Playing Up National Heroes In New Pictures", *Morning Herald* (April 16, 1953) http://newspaperarchive.com/us/maryland/hagerstown/morning-herald/1953/04-16/page-4?tag=himeyuri&rtserp=tags/himeyuri?ndt=by&py=1953&pey=1954 (accessed March 14, 2015).

Fred Saito laboured under a false assumption here. As Chapter 1 demonstrated, war stories had flourished even in the Occupation era, but they were under the strict censorship of GHQ and critical of Japan's now-defunct army. With the end of the Occupation and the success of *The Tower of Himeyuri*, however, Japanese cinema no longer refrained from shooting war stories in a "patriotic" light. In this respect, *The Tower of Himeyuri* was certainly a monumental piece of postwar Japanese cinema, and it was actually considered to be an anti-American film by contemporary standard. According to Imai Tadashi, Tōei Film planned to let Makino Mitsuo visit Hollywood studios as a reward for the historical success of *The Tower of Himeyuri*, but the U.S. Embassy rejected his visa application, since he was the producer of the "anti-American" film *The Tower of Himeyuri*.[263]

The career of Imai Tadashi was also affected by *The Tower of Himeyuri*. In one interview, he explained that when his movie *Kome* (The Rice People) was screened on the West Coast of the United States in 1957, a local veterans' association barged into the movie theatres and slashed the movie screens because the director was a "communist".[264] Imai believed that *The Tower of Himeyuri* had negatively influenced American veterans and thus provoked their harsh reactions to *Kome*. In the same interview, Imai spoke briefly about one Japanese critic's review of *The Tower of Himeyuri.* This critic had written that Imai created an anti-U.S. film simply because he was a communist, but Imai insisted that he had not intended to create an anti-U.S. film at all, but rather he had simply wanted to focus on the negative aspects of war.[265] Here again, Imai did not seem to think about the war in relation to his own wartime responsibility for creating propaganda pieces. Imai Tadashi shot *The Tower of*

---

[263] Imamura, *Sengo Eiga No Tenkai,* 125.

[264] *Imai Tadashi No Eiga Jinsei* (Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha, 1992), 28.

[265] Ibid.

Himeyuri again in 1982 "based on the same script by Mizuki Yōko, and with the same spirit".[266] Critically as well as commercially, however, it paled in comparison to the 1953 movie.

The Bereaved Families of the HSC: Kinjō Washin and Kinjō Kazuhiko

For the Okinawa War-Bereaved Association, the huge success of the 1953 movie was a mixed blessing. On one hand, it drastically boosted the profile of the HSC among movie audiences, contributing to the privileged position of the HSC in public memory of the Battle of Okinawa. As Chapter 4 demonstrated, however, the bereaved family members of the HSC protested strongly against the 1953 movie, and went so far as to appeal for its boycotting. The movie's depiction of the HSC as innocent-minded victims contrasted with the image that the bereaved families wanted, that is, an image of voluntary patriots who willingly sacrificed their lives for the nation. In October 1953, the Okinawa War-Bereaved Association succeeded in officially joining the Japan War-Bereaved Association. Central to this movement was Kinjō Washin, who had lost two of his daughters, Nobuko and Sadako, as members of the HSC.

As Chapter 1 demonstrated, although the American army officially banned the collecting and commemorating of the war dead, Kinjō Washin had succeeded, after tenacious negotiations, in erecting three cenotaphs in Okinawa for the first time since Japan's defeat: *Konpaku no Tō* (The Tower of Souls), *the Himeyuri no Tō* (The Tower of Himeyuri), and *Kenji no Tō* (The Tower of Stalwart Youth) in 1946 alone. On February 10 1952, the bereaved families of the war dead in Okinawa established *Okinawa I-Kazokukai* (The Association of Okinawa Bereaved-Families of the War Dead), which later became *Okinawa Izoku Rengō-kai* (The Okinawa War-Bereaved Association), which required the Japanese government to in-

[266] Ibid.

clude Okinawan bereaved families within the scope of *Engohō* (Act on Relief of War Victims and Survivors).[267] Furthermore, the Okinawa War-Bereaved Association gradually cemented their ties with Yasukuni Shrine, because being enshrined at Yasukuni meant not only honour for bereaved families, but also an admission ticket to *Engohō*.

October 22 1953, the *Tokyo Mainichi Shinbun* newspaper reported that Kinjō Washin had visited Yasukuni Shrine as the representative of twelve people who had lost family members in the Battle of Okinawa, who had been officially invited to Yasukuni Shrine. Kinjō brought sand from the former battlefields of Okinawa instead of the remains of the war dead. He buried a portion of the sand on the shrine ground, and told a news reporter that the rest of the sand he had brought would be given through the Japan War-Bereaved Association to the bereaved family members of the deceased Japanese soldiers in the Battle of Okinawa.[268] It should be noted that at that time Kinjō had already clarified his view that the war dead in Okinawa should be enshrined at Yasukuni irrespective of their wartime status. He argued:

> The bloodiest battles took place in the southern half of Okinawa, starting from Yomitan village in Nakagami District, located in the middle part of Okinawa, wiping out even local civilians. Thus, it is impossible to collect the remains of all Japanese military officers who died there. In addition to military officers, approximately 150,000 civilians, including junior high school students, female students, and elementary school students, died in the battlefields. Yasukuni Shrine has invited only some naval military officers this time; it is my hope not only that all military officers will be enshrined, but also that these elementary and junior high school students, civilians who died together with the military officers, will also be enshrined.[269]

After his visit to Yasukuni Shrine, Kinjō Washin became executive director and bureau chief of the Okinawa War-Bereaved Association in 1954.[270] Until his death in 1978, Kin-

---

[267] *Okinawa no Senka o Seoite: Kinjō Washin no Shōgai*. Kinjō Washin Sensei Itoku Kenshōkai, 1982: 295.

[268] Ibid.,175.

[269] "Okinawa no Suna, Yasukuni Shatō ni: Higan no Izoku Daihyō Hatsu no Sanpai," *Tokyo Mainichi Shinbun*, October 21, 1953 reprinted in *Okinawa no Senka o Seoite: Kinjō Washin no Shōgai*, 175-176.

[270] *Okinawa no Senka o Seoite: Kinjō Washin no Shōgai*, 278.

jō Washin never stopped devoting himself to expanding the category of who could qualify as a recipient of *Engohō*. For example, the Ministry of Health in Tokyo had originally planned to divide the wartime status of deceased male students according to whether they had been over 17 years old during wartime or not. In this plan, male students over 17 were considered to be "military officers", while those under 17 were classified as "civilians employed by the military", and female students, regardless of age, were considered to be "civilians employed by the military".[271] After two years of negotiations between the Okinawa War-Bereaved Association and the Ministry of Health, however, the initial plan was modified; all the deceased male students came to be categorized as "military officers" irrespective of their age.[272]

It is worth remembering here how the 1953 movie categorized the Himeyuri students. As Chapter 4 demonstrated, the fictional male teacher Tamai described the female students and teachers as follows: "We are not civilians employed by the military! We are just following the orders of the Minister of Education".[273] Now we can fully understand the frustration and dissatisfaction that the Okinawa War-Bereaved Association must have felt with regards to the movie, because it directly challenged the status of the female students as "civilians employed by the military".

Kinjō Washin went to Tokyo quite often in order to file claims to the Ministry of Health. According to a round-table talk at the fifty-year anniversary of the Okinawa War-Bereaved Association, which took place after his death, Kinjō Washin went to Tokyo two or three times every year, staying for around two months each time in order to negotiate with the Ministry of Health.[274] What enabled Kinjō Washin to stay so long in Tokyo was his son's

---

[271] *Okinawa no Izokukai Gojūnenshi*. Wakanatsu-sha, 66.

[272] Ibid.,69.

[273] Ibid., 63.

[274] Ibid., 338-339.

support; Kinjō Washin never stayed at a hotel in Tokyo, but stayed at the house of his son, Kinjō Kazuhiko.[275]

One of the attendants of the round-table talk jokingly introduced one episode about how the Ministry of Health was afraid of Kinjō Washin. Apparently, the special team of the Ministry of Health which was in charge of the issue of the war dead in Okinawa, referred to Kinjō Washin as "the Atomic Bomb"; whenever he visited the Ministry of Health, they would say "Here comes the Atomic Bomb from Okinawa."[276] It seems that both the bureaucrats from the Ministry of Health and the attendants of the round-table talk noticed only superficial satire that lay behind this joke, that is, that Kinjō Washin was as "tough" or "troublesome" as a negotiator as were the atomic bombs that the United States had dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Neither seemed to notice, however, the deeper irony of addressing the representative of the Okinawan bereaved families of the war dead caused by the American military attack as the most deadly of American weapons.

As we have seen, Kinjō Washin was one of the central and most conspicuous figures of the Okinawa War-Bereaved Association, but his son, Kazuhiko, is also worth highlighting not only in the context of his support for his father, but also in terms of how he used his position as a bereaved family member of the HSC in order to justify himself as an ultra-nationalist. While lobbying for the expansion of the category of the war dead in Okinawa, Kinjō Washin did not publish any books to express his views. In contrast, Kinjō Kazuhiko eagerly published books regarding the Battle of Okinawa and the HSC, even though he had not directly experienced the battle himself.

---

[275] *Okinawa no Senka o Seoite: Kinjō Washin no Shōgai*, 285.

[276] *Okinawa no Izokukai Gojūnenshi,* 338-339.

After finishing junior high school in Okinawa, Kinjō Kazuhiko left Okinawa in order to study at a high school in Tokyo, and during wartime he was recruited as a factory worker in Kanagawa Prefecture.[277] This means that he was not in Okinawa during wartime. It was not until two years after Japan's defeat that he was able to contact his parents and confirm their survival, since there had been no lines of communication between Okinawa and the Japanese mainland. It was also then that he was informed that his two younger sisters, Nobuko and Sadako, had lost their lives as members of the HSC.[278] It was six years after the defeat, in the winter of 1951, that he was finally able to return to Okinawa.[279] After 1951, despite not having experienced the Battle of Okinawa personally, Kinjō Kazuhiko began expressing an explicitly nationalistic account of the Battle of Okinawa, the HSC in particular. As Chapter 4 demonstrated, in 1952 Kinjō Kazuhiko harshly criticized Imai Tadashi and his *The Tower of Himeyuri*, arguing that it distorted the truth of the HSC. In 1959, six years after the release of Imai's *The Tower of Himeyuri*, Kinjō Kazuhiko published his first account regarding the male and female students in the Battle of Okinawa, in collaboration with a writer from the *Asahi Shinbun* newspaper.

In this book, Kinjō Kazuhiko repeated his criticism of Imai's movie, arguing in the Introduction that "the story of the movie considerably contradicted what had actually happened".[280] He then referred to his own as "the record of the truth about the Okinawan students".[281]In order to portray the male and female students in a different light than the movie, Kinjō Kazuhiko avoided discussing the negative aspect of the Asia-Pacific War, and he nar-

---

[277] Kinjō and Ohara. *Minnami No Iwao No Hateni,* 240.

[278] Ibid.,187.

[279] Ibid.,188.

[280] Ibid., 5.

[281] Ibid.

rowed the issue down to the pure-mindedness of the students. He stated: "In today's language, they were just 'teenagers', but they treasured their nation, loved their home island, and fought bravely without fear of death; these were all the signs of their pure-mindedness, and I think such pure-mindedness is precious, something beyond the issue of whether the war was right or wrong".[282] Kinjō Kazuhiko later published three more books about the Battle of Okinawa, each of which paid special attention to the HSC: *Ai to Senketsu no Kiroku* (*The Record of Love and Fresh Blood*) in 1966, *Himeyuri Butai no Saigo* (*The End of the Himeyuri Student Corps*) in 1966, and *Aa Okinawa-sen no Gakutotai* (*Alas! The Student Corps in the Battle of Okinawa*) in 1978. As their titles suggest, his ultra-nationalistic and emotional description of the HSC later became even more ostentatious and explicit.

It should be noted that Kinjō Kazuhiko needed to rely on the survivors of the Battle of Okinawa as sources of information in order to publish his books. In this respect, Kinjō Kazuhiko held an especially privileged position; he was a bereaved family member of the HSC, his father was at the centre of the Okinawa War-Bereaved Association, and his wife was also a survivor of the HSC.[283] Furthermore, all of his books included memoirs by his mother, Kinjō Fumi, which described the past days of her daughters, Nobuko and Sadako, and how her husband, Kinjō Washin, and she had succeeded in collecting the remains of the war dead and having war memorials built in their honour. Such kinds of "family support" enabled Kinjō Kazuhiko, despite his lack of direct experience with the Battle of Okinawa, to write three books on the same topic, that is, how Okinawan students "willingly" devoted their lives to sacrificing themselves for the nation. Here, the image of the HSC became very simi-

---

[282] Ibid.,3.

[283] Ibid.,240.

lar to the very first version of the account written by the former soldier Mikame Tatsuji, described in Chapter 1.

Kinjō Kazuhiko's ultra-nationalistic ideas appear to have reached an extreme in one particular article entitled "Nihon Seishin o Okinawa ni Miru" ("We Can See Japanese Spirit In Okinawa"),written in 1966, six years before Okinawa's reversion to Japanese sovereignty in 1972. This article mourned the loss of "Japanese spirit" in the Japanese mainland, and then argued that Okinawa, its role model in this regard, should be returned to Japanese administration as soon as possible. Here, Kinjō Kazuhiko created an interesting twist of logic whereby the Japanese mainland and Okinawa were placed in an inferior-superior relationship in terms of Japanese spirit. According to Kinjō Kazuhiko, this difference could be seen the way the two commemorated the war dead. In the Japanese mainland, Kazuhiko suggested, the loss of Japanese spirit could be seen in a general disrespect towards the war dead in journalism between 1945 and 1952 or 1953. He argued that they "thoughtlessly criticized their own nation, going so far as to curse the war by calling Japan a nation of war-criminals".[284] However, he portrayed Okinawa in a very different light:

> However, in Okinawa in those days, people erected as many as three hundred war memorials to commemorate the spirits of the war dead. Here, we can see how the Japanese spirit is thoroughly alive in Okinawa. Furthermore, Okinawans were directly embroiled in the battles; their mountains and rivers were destroyed, and they lost family members and relatives. If mainland journalists are to be believed, they should have cursed the war more than anyone else.
>
> Twenty-one years have passed since the end of the war. The time has come for us to correct this trend that will ruin our nation, and bring back the spirit that used to exist in Japan.[285]

It is hardly surprising that Ikeda Ryōhachi (池田 良八), the g*on-gūji* (vice chief priest) of Yasukuni Shrine, included a one-page endorsement in Kinjō's *Ai to Senketsu no*

---

[284] Kazuhiko Kinjō, "Nihon Seishin o Okinawa ni Miru", *Nagare* (1966): 22.

[285] Ibid.

Kiroku (*The Record of Love and Fresh Blood*) in 1966. As the Okinawa War-Bereaved Association attempted to link Yasukuni Shrine and the Okinawan war dead, anything that could challenge these ties was carefully filtered out of the Okinawa War-Bereaved Association's discourse. For example, as Chapter 2 demonstrated, a charnel chapel was built behind the Tower of Himeyuri in 1948, and a huge cross was built on and located at it between 1948 and 1951. This fact has been completely erased from any official record published by the Okinawa War-Bereaved Association. In the process in which the Okinawa War-Bereaved Family "purified" the HSC, other religious elements were also "purified".

Conclusion

In conclusion, I would like to point out what was done behind the purification of the HSC from 1945 to 1953 and beyond.

War veterans and the bereaved families tended to depict the HSC as patriotic martyrs who voluntarily and willingly sacrificed their lives along with soldiers for the nation. At first, however, they began with two polar opposite viewpoints: a soldier-centred one and a civilian-centred one. However, after the 1950s, their discourses began taking on more and more similarities in the way they glorified the beautiful and brave deaths of the HSC, since both war veterans and the bereaved families had one thing in common: patriotism. Patriotism served as a powerful motivation during wartime, and in the postwar era, it also began serving as a tool to emphasize the unity of Japan, that is, the unity of Okinawa with the rest of Japan. The strong ties between Yasukuni Shrine and governmental aid also helped to shorten the distance between war veterans and bereaved families in the name of patriotism. Yasukuni Shrine symbolically honoured the deaths of the HSC by enshrining them as "civilians employed by the military" along with deceased soldiers, and governmental aid financially supported them as

"civilians employed by the military". This "purification" of the HSC understandably avoided any reckoning with war responsibility, simply because patriotism is absolute and tends not to be challenged or even questioned. In extreme cases, both of them went so far as to glorify the Japanese Imperial Army and the Asia-Pacific War on the whole in order to heighten the value of the deaths of the HSC.

On the other hand, Okinawan Christians and surviving teachers tended to depict the HSC as victims who were forced to die on the battlefields. Naturally, they have the advantage of raising questions about who or what – such as the Japanese Imperial Army, teachers, or Japanism – was responsible for the deaths of the innocent girls. Ironically, the Occupation era (1945-1952) saw more radical and diverse discussions about the question of the responsibility for the deaths of the HSC than at any other time in Japan. This is in part because American censorship prohibited any negative descriptions about the U.S., and therefore they had to avoid a rough and ready conclusion that the U.S. was solely responsible for everything. However, this trend rapidly vanished immediately after the Occupation era ended.

Imai Tadashi's movie appeared in January 1953, the transitional year between the Occupation and Japan's independence. This movie narrowed down the issue of responsibility to the girls' innocence itself. In this movie, the focus is no longer on *who or what* was responsible for the deaths of the girls. It is rather on "the pure-mindedness", "the naiveness", and "the lack of independent mind" of the girls. Whether intentionally or not, Imai Tadashi and Mizuki Yōko explicitly diminished the issue of wartime responsibility, turning it into a tear-jerker drama dressed up as a war-action movie. The movie occupied the biggest place in public memory of the HSC, and the issue of responsibility faded away. However, the movie was not the sole factor in the minimization of the issue of responsibility for the HSC. Nakasone

Seizen, the most eloquent of the surviving teachers, did not hesitate to exert his authority in correcting any "misinformation" about the HSC.

As chapter 4 demonstrated, Nakasone protested the ending of the 1953 movie in which a military doctor named Oka shot one of the female students in the back. His protest was disregarded at that time, but he succeeded in exerting his authority over the revision of the story of another film. In 1980, Nakasone wrote in his diary that he had received a screenplay for the upcoming movie *Taiyō no Ko* (*The Child of the Sun*). It is unclear why the movie director Urayama Kirio (浦山 桐郎) sent the screenplay to Nakasone, but it is safe to say that Nakasone was considered to be an expert on the Battle of Okinawa. *The Child of the Sun* was based on the best-selling novel of the same title, but the screenplay added a twist to the original story: in the flashback of one major character, a female student who belongs to the Shirayuri (White Lily) Student Corps, is raped by a Japanese soldier. Upon noticing this scene in the screenplay, Nakasone immediately demanded its deletion. In his diary, Nakasone explained the reason for his demand:

> As time goes by, I can see more and more people trying to blow the lid off the wartime activities of the Himeyuri maidens. They think that my descriptions of the tragedies of Okinawa are simply superficial and pretty words, and that numerous ugly truths must hide behind such pretty words. They want to highlight these ugly truths in order to draw attention from readers and viewers.[286]

Later in his diary, Nakasone mentions that he was notified that the story had been modified in such a way that the female student barely escapes without being raped. He then writes, "I still wish that the entire scene would be deleted".[287] It seems that Nakasone had no awareness of his own authority over and tendency to purify the image of the HSC. While serving a role as

---

[286] Nakasone, *Himeyuri to Ikite*, 256.

[287] Ibid., 257.

a guardian angel of the HSC, Nakasone never mentioned what lay behind the militaristic education in Okinawa.

The purification of the HSC was done not only by those who glorify the Asia-Pacific War, but also by those who condemn it. In order to overcome the purification of the HSC, we must know more about the dynamics that lay behind the mechanism of construction of the HSC narratives.

Bibliography

Websites

https://www.biblegateway.com

http://www.himeyuri.or.jp/JP/info.html

http://japan.kantei.go.jp/constitution_and_government_of_japan/constitution_e.html

http://newspaperarchive.com

http://www.peace-museum.pref.okinawa.jp/index.html

http://ryukyushimpo.jp

http://www.taiheiyou-ireikyoukai.jp/ireitou.htm

Periodicals

Asahi Shinbun

Fujin Kōron

Morning Herald

Nagare

Okinawa Shinminpō

Okinawa Shinpō

Okinawa Taimusu

Pacific Stars and Stripes

Reijokai

Ryūkyū Shinpō

Sandee Mainichi

Shōsetsu Fan

Shufu no Tomo

Uruma Shinpō

Special Information Sources Possessed by Ichikawa Bungaku Praza

A digest of The Tragedy of Okinawa: *The Tower of Himeyur*i (206110019)

A digest of The Tragedy of Okinawa: *The Tower of Himeyuri* (206110020)

The Screenplay for Daiei Film

TOEI PRESS SHEET No. 133 (203410034)

Special Information Sources Possessed by Ikeda Bunko

Kageki

Takarazuka Kageki Kyakuhonshū

Takarazuka Shōjo Kageki Kyakuhonshū

Articles

Angst, Linda. 1997. “Gendered Nationalism: The Himeyuri Story and Okinawan Identity In Postwar Japan”. PoLAR: Political <Html_Ent Glyph="@Lt;" Ascii="≪"/ >Html_Ent Glyph="@Amp;" Ascii="<Html_Ent Glyph="@Amp;" Ascii="&Amp;"/ >"/<Html_Ent Glyph="@Gt;" Ascii="≫"/> *Legal Anthropology Review*. 20 (1): 100-113.

Hasegawa, Ayako. “Ishino Keiichirō ‘Himeyuri no Tō’”. *Minshu Bungaku* 420 (1996): 96-99.

Ishihara, Masaie. “Beigunseika okinawa ni okeru yasukuni jinja goshi mondai jo yasukunikasareta okinawa karano dakkyaku o mezashi”. *Okinawa Kokusai Daigaku Syakai Bunka Kenkyū* 11 (2008): 23-41.

————————. “Beigunsei ka okinawa ni okeru yasukuni jinjagoshi mondai ge engoho ga motarashita yasukuni jinjagoshi”. *Okinawa Kokusai Daigaku Syakai Bunka Kenkyū* 12 (2010): 33-83.

Ishino, Keiichirō. “Haruka ni Gokuchū no Kokyō o Nozomu Kokoro”. *Minshu Bungaku* 57 (1970): 118-119.

Kami, Shoichiro. “Futasu no himeyu no to”. *Nihon Kosho Tsushin* vol.77 Issue 2 (2012): 42-43.

Kashihara, Hamako. “Himeyuri no bohyo o koete”. *Bungei Shunjū* 47 Issue 8 (1969): 166-176.

Kinjō, Kazuhiko. “Nihon Seishin o Okinawa ni Miru”. *Nagare* (1966): 22.

Nakada, Akiko. “‘Himeyuri’ o meguru shogensetsu no kenkyū: Amerika senryō-ka no Okinawa de hakkōsareta shinbunkiji-shiryō o chūshin ni”. In *Amerika senryōka ni okeru Okinawa bungaku no kisoteki kenkyū*: *Heisei 13-nendo-Heisei 16-nendo kagaku kenkyūhi hojokin*, edited by Nakahodo, Masanori, 57-101. Okinawa-ken : Ryūkyū Daigaku Hōbun Gakubu. 2005.

Nakahodo, Masanori. “‘Himeyuri’ no yomarekata: Eiga ‘Himeyuri no Tō’ Yonhon o megutte”. *Nihon Tōyō Bunkaronshū* no.9 (2003):1-14.

Tobe, Hideaki. “Ekkyōsyatachi no Fukkiundō: 1950 nendai zenhan ni okeru Zainippon Okinawajingakusei no soshiki to ishiki” *Okinawa Bunka Kenkyū* 38 (2012): 435-508. http://repo.lib.hosei.ac.jp/bitstream/10114/7175/1/12_oki_38_tobe.pdf

Books

Aikawa, Mieko. *Jidō Yomimono No Kiseki: Sensō to Kodomo O Tsunaida Hyōgen*. Kyōto: Ryūkokugakkai, 2012.

Aniya, Masaaki, and Nobuyoshi Takashima. *“Uchinānumabui” Ga Kataru Nippon: “yonjūnanabanme No Nippon” Kara Mita “sokoku” No Kiki*. Tokyo: Moku Shuppan, 2000.

Arakawa, Akira. *Ryūko no shiroi hata: Okinawa ikusa monogatari*. Tokyo: Tsukiji Shokan Kabushiki Kaisha, 1985.

Asada, Jirō, and Jirō Kitagami. *Tō, Okinawa, owaranu sensō*. Tokyo: Shūeisha, 2012.

Arasaki, Moriteru. *Dokyumento Okinawa Tōsō.* Tokyo: Aki Shobō, 1969.

———————. *Okinawa Gendaishi E No Shōgen:1*. Naha: Okinawa Taimusu Sha, 1982.

———————. *Okinawa Gendaishi E No Shōgen: 2*. Naha: Okinawa Taimusu Sha, 1982.

Ch'oe, Sŏng-uk. *Imai Tadashi: Senji to Sengo No Aida*. Tokyo: Kurein, 2013.

Dower, John W. Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War Ii. New York: W.W. Norton & Co, 1999.

Field, Norma. *In the Realm of a Dying Emperor*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1991.

Fukuma, Yoshiaki. *“Hansen” No Media-shi: Sengo Nihon Ni Okeru Seron to Yoron No Kikkō*. Kyōto-shi: Sekai Shisōsha, 2006.

Furukawa, Shigemi. *Okinawa no saigo*. Tokyo: Kawade Shobō, 1967.

———————. *Shisei no mon: Okinawasen hiroku*. Tokyo: Chūōsha, 1949.

Haitani, Kenjirō. *Haruka nirai kanai*, Tokyo: Rironsha, 1997.

———————. *Taiyō No Ko*. Tokyo: Rironsha, 1980.

Hanhimäki, Jussi M., and Odd Arne Westad. *The Cold War: a history in documents and eyewitness accounts.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Hara, Makoto. *Kokka O Koerarenakatta Kyōkai: 15-nen Sensō Ka No Nihon Purotesutanto Kyōkai*. Tokyo: Nihon Kirisuto Kyōdan Shuppankyoku, 2005.
Hara, Takeshi. *Shōwa Tennō*. Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten, 2008.

Hashimoto, Masao. *Sumire no hana wa arashi o koete Takarazuka kageki no Shōwa shi*. Tokyo: Yomiuri Shinbunsha, 1993.

——————— eds. *Aishite Koishite Namidashite*. Takarazuka: Takarazuka Kagekidan, 1982.

Hayashi, Hirofumi. *Okinawa-sen ga Tou Mono*. Tokyo: Ōtsuki Shoten, 2010.

———————. *Okinawa-sen: Kyōseisareta "Shūdan Jiketsu"*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2009.

———————. *Okinawa-sen to Minshū.* Tokyo: Ōtsuki Shoten, 2001.

Hidaka, Kōtarō. *Fujichaku*. Tokyo: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha, 2004.

High, Peter B. *The Imperial Screen: Japanese Film Culture in the Fifteen Years' War, 1931-1945*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2003.

Himeyuri Heiwa Kinen Shiryōkan, *Okinawasen no zen gakutotai.* Itoman: Okinawaken Joshi Ichikōjo Himeyuri Dōsōkairitsu Himeyuri Heiwa Kinen Shiryōkan, 2008.

Hiyane, Antei. *Kirisutokyō Nyūmon*. Tōkyō: Dainihon Yūbenkai Kōdansha, 1947.

Ichinose, Toshiya. *Nihongun to Nihonhei: Beigun Hōkokusho Wa Kataru*. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 2014. iBooks.

Iglehart, Charles W. *A Century of Protestant Christianity in Japan.* Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle, 1959.

Iha, Sonoko. *Himeyuri no okinawasen*.Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1992.

Ikemiyagushiku, Shūi. *Okinawa ni ikite*. Tokyo: Saimaru Shuppankai, 1970.

Ikeya, Kōji. *Robō No Kūshū Hisaisha: Sengo Hoshō No Kūhaku*. Tokyo: Kurieitibu 21, 2010.

Imai Tadashi Kantoku o Kataritsugu Kai. *Imai Tadashi eiga tokuhon = Imai Tadashi*. Tokyo: Ronsōsha, 2012.

Imamura, Shōhei. *Sengo Eiga No Tenkai*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1987.

Inoue, Yoshie. *Kikuta Kazuo no shigoto: Asakusa, Hibiya, Takarazuka*. Tokyo: Shakai Hyōronsha, 2011.

Iwanami Shoten. *Kiroku Okinawa "shūdan Jiketsu" Saiban*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2012.

Ishino, Keiichirō. *Himeyuri no Tō*. Tokyo: Sangabō, 1950.

———————. *Himeyuri Butai*. Tokyo: Shuppan Tokyo, 1952.

———————. *Jissetsu Himeyuri No Tō: Okinawa No Kokoro, Fukki, Tami*. Tōkyō: Gendai Shuppansha, 1973.

———————. *Okinawa No Tami*. Tokyo: Tōhō Shuppansha, 1971.

———————. *Tsushimamaru Jiken: Okinawa no Higeki*. Tokyo: Kodansha, 1978.

———————. "Watashi no Sengoshi". In *Watakushi no sengoshi. 9*, edited by Okinawa Taimususha, 103-131. Naha-shi: Okinawa Taimususha, 1986.

Jyunkoku Gakuto Kensyōkai eds. *Okinawa no Senka o Seoite: Kinjō Washin no Shōgai*. Naha-shi: Meikōsha, 1982.

Kagawa, Kyoko. *Himeyuritachi No Inori: Okinawa No Messēji*. Tokyo : Asahi Shinbunsha, 1992.

Kai, Yuzuru. *Ghq Ken'etsukan*. Fukuoka-shi: Ashi Shobō, 1995.

Kamura, Kikuo. *Itoshi no takarazuka e*. Kobe: Kobe Shinbun Shuppan Sentā, 1984.

Katō, Kaoru. *Kyakuhonka Mizuki Yōko: Ōinaru Eiga Isan to Sono Shōgai*. Tokyo : Eijinsha, 2010.

Katō, Tetsurō. *Sengo Shoki Okinawa Kaihō Undō Shiryōshū: 3*. Tokyo: Fuji Shuppan, 2005.

Katsuoka, Kanji. *Okinawasen shūdan jiketsu kyokō no "gun meirei": masukomi no hōdō de wa wakaranai kenmin shūdan jiketsu no shinsō ni semaru!* Tokyo: Miseisha, 2009.

Kikuta, Kazuo. *Shibaitsukuri 40-nen*. Tokyo: Orion Shuppansha, 1968.

Kim, Sŏng-su, and Hiroo Fujita. *Shōi gunjin Kimu Sonsu no "sensō": sengo hoshō o motomeru Kankokujin moto Nihonhei*. Tokyo: Shakai Hihyōsha, 1995.

Kitamura, Tsuyoshi, and Tsuyoshi Kitamura. *Shishatachi No Sengoshi: Okinawa Senseki O Meguru Hitobito No Kioku*. Tokyo: Ochanomizu Shobō, 2009.

Kinjō, Kazuhiko, and Masao Ohara. *Minnami No Iwao No Hateni: Okinawa No Isho*. Tokyo: Kōbunsha, 1959.

Kinjō, Kazuhiko. *Ai to senketsu no kiroku: Okinawa gakutotai no saigo*. Tokyo: Zenbōsha, 1966.

———————. *Himeyuri Butai No Saigo: Taiheiyō Sen Okinawa Gakutotai No Higeki*. Tokyo: Kaiseisha, 1966.

Kishimoto, Hideo, Tsuneya Wakimoto, and Keiichi Yanagawa. *Kishimoto Hideo Shū: 5*. Tokyo: Keiseisha, 1976.

Klein, Christina. *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination, 1945-1961*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

Kobayashi, Teruyuki. *21-seiki No Himeyuri*. Tokyo: Mainichi Shinbunsha, 2002.

Kuroko, Kazuo. *Haitani Kenjirō: Sono "bungaku" to "yasashisa" No Kansei*. Tōkyō: Kawade Shobō Shinsha, 2004.

Kyō, Machiko. *Cocoon*. Tōkyō: Akitashoten, 2010.

Martin, Jo N. *A Princess Lily of the Ryukyus*. Tokyo: Shin Nippon Kyoiku Tosho, 1984.

Miyagi, Etsujirō. *Okinawa Senryō No 27-Nenkan: Amerika Gunsei to Bunka No Hen'yō*. Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten, 1992.

Miyagi, Kikuko. *Himeyuri No Shōjo: Jūrokusai No Senjō*. Tokyo: Kōbunken, 1995.

Miyanaga, Tsugio. *Okinawa furyoki*. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1982.

Miyara, Saku. *Nihongun to Sensō Mararia: Okinawasen No Kiroku*. Tōkyō: Shin Nihon Shuppansha, 2004.

Mizuki, Yōko. *Mizuki Yōko Shinarioshū*. Tokyo : Eijinsha, 1978.

Monna, Naoki. *Amerika Senryō Jidai Okinawa Genron Tōseishi: Genron No Jiyū E No Toi*. Tokyo: Yūzankaku Shuppan, 1996.

Mori, Iwao. *Watakushi No Geikai Henreki*. Tokyo: Seiabō, 1975.

Nagata, Kishun, and Tae Gushi. *Senkō No Naka De: Okinawa Rikugun Byōin No Shōgen*. Naha-shi: Niraisha, 1992.

Nahashi, *Naha-Shishi v. 2:pt. 2:no. 6 Senji kiroku.* Naha: Naha-shi, 1974.

Naha-shi Rekishi Hakubutsukan. *Sengo o tadoru: "Amerika yo" kara "Yamato no yo" e*. Naha-shi: Ryūkyū Shinpōsha, 2007.

Nakahodo, Masanori. *Himeyuri Tachi No Koe: Shuki to Nikki O Yomi Toku*. Naha: Shuppanshamugen, 2012.

———————. *Okinawa no senki*. Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1982.

Nakano, Toshiko. *Chichi Nakano Yoshio no koto*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1992.

Nakano, Yoshio. *Okinawa to watakushi*. Tokyo: Jiji Tsūshin Sha, 1972.

———————. *Saigo no Okinawa-ken chiji*. Tokyo: Bungei Shunjū Shinsha, 1961.

Nakano, Yoshio, and Moriteru Arasaki. *Okinawa Mondai 20nen*. Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten, 1965.

———————————————. *Okinawa Sengoshi*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1976.

Nakamura, Kiyoshi. *Honne no Okinawa mondai*, Tokyo: Kōdansha, 2012.

Nakasone, Seizen. *Himeyuri to Ikite: Nakasone Seizen Nikki.* Naha-shi: Ryūkyū Shinpōsha, 2002.

———————. *Ishi Ni Kizamu*. Okinawa-ken Naha-shi: Okinawa Taimususha, 1983.

———————. *Okinawa No Higeki: Himeyuri No to O Meguru Hitobito No Shuki*. Tokyo:Kachō Shobō, 1951.

Nampō Dōhō Engokai. *Nampō Dōhō Engokai jigyō no aramashi*. Tokyo, 1963.

Nishihira, Hideo. *Himeyuri No Tō: Gakuto Taichō No Shuki*. Tokyo: Yūzankaku, 1995.

Nozato, Yō. *Omei: Dainijūrokudai Okinawa Kenchiji Izumi Shuki*. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1993.

Obata, Kinji. *Hyōden Kikuta Kazuo*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2008.

Ōe, Kenzaburō. *Okinawa Nōto*. Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1971.

Ogawara, Masamichi. *Kindai Nihon No Sensō to Shūkyō*. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 2010.

Oguma, Eiji. "*minshu" to "aikoku"*. Tokyo: Shin'yōsha, 2002.

———————. "*Nihonjin" no kyōkai: Okinawa, Ainu, Taiwan, Chōsen, shokuminchi shihai kara fukki undō made*. Tokyo: Shin'yōsha, 1998.

Okabe, Itsuko. *Okinawa no hone*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1997.

Okinawa Taimusu Sha. *Idomareru Okinawa-sen: "shūdan jiketsu" kyōkasho kentei mondai hōdō sōshū*. Naha-shi: Okinawa Taimususha, 2008.

———————. *Tetsu no bōfū: genchijin ni yoru Okinawa senki*. Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1950.

———————. *Watakushi no sengoshi dai 9shū*. Naha: Okinawa Taimusu Sha,1986.

Okinawaken Izoku Rengōkai. *Okinawa no Izokukai Gojyūnen-shi*. Naha-shi: Wakanatsusha, 2002.

Okinawaken Joshi Ichikōjo Dōsōkai. *Himeyuri heiwa kinen shiryokan: Kaikan to sonogo no ayumi*, 2002.

———————————. *Himeyuri heiwa kinen shiryōkan: Kōshiki gaido bukku = Himeyuri Heiwa Kinen Shiryōkan official guide book*, 2004.

Okinawa-sen No Zenjoshi Gakutotai: Jisedai Ni Nokosu Mono Sore Wa Heiwa. Naha-shi: Foresuto, 2006.

Orr, James J. *The Victim As Hero: Ideologies of Peace and National Identity in Postwar Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001.

Ōshiro, Masayasu. *Okinawa-sen no shinjitsu to waikyoku*. Tokyo: Kōbunken, 2007.

Ōta, Chōfu, Teruo Hiyane, and Shin'ichi Isa. *Ōta chōfu senshū*. Tokyo: Daiichi Shobō, 1995.

Ōta, Masahide. *Chi De Aganatta Mono: Tekketsu Kinnō Shihantai, Shōnentachi No Okinawa-Sen.* Okinawa-ken Haebaru-chō: Naha Shuppansha, 2000.

———————. *Shishatachi wa imada nemurezu: irei no imi o tō*. Tokyo: Shinsensha, 2006.

Robertson, Jennifer Ellen. Takarazuka sexual politics and popular culture in modern Japan. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb.94082.

Sakakibara, Shōji. *Okinawa Hachijūyokka No Tatakai*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1994.

Shin Nihon Shuppansha. *Imai Tadashi no eiga jinsei*. Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha, 1992.

Sono, Ayako. *Aru Shinwa No Haikei: Okinawa Tokashikijima No Shūdan Jiketsu*. Tōkyō: Bungei Shunjū, 1973.

Suda, Shintarō, Kōji Yabe, and Hiromori Maedomari. *Hondo no ningen wa shiranaiga okinawa no hito wa minna shitteiru koto*. Tokyo: Shosekijōhōsha, 2011.

Takahashi, Saburō. *"senkimono" O Yomu: Sensō Taiken to Sengo Nihon Shakai*. Kyoto-shi: Akademia Shuppankai, 1988.

Takarazuka Eigasai Jikkō Iinkai. *Takarazuka Eiga Seisakusho: yomigaeru "eiga no machi" Takarazuka*. Kōbe: Kōbe Shinbun Sōgō Shuppan Sentā, 2001.

Takashima, Nobuyoshi. *Kyōiku chokugo to gakkō kyōiku: shisō tōsei ni hatashita yakuwari*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1990.

Tamaoka, Kaoru. *Takarajennu no Taiheiyō Sensō*. Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 2004.

Tamura, Yōzō. *Okinawa no shimamori: Naimu kanryō kaku tatakaeri*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Shinsha, 2003.

Tanaka, Nobumasa. *Dokyumento Yasukuni Soshō: Senshisha No Kioku Wa Dare No Mono Ka*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2007.

Terasaki, Susumu. Hiyane Antei: Kusawake Jidai No Shūkyōshika. Tōkyō: Riburo Pōto, 1995.

Tokumoto, Eiichiro. *Eikoku Kimitsu Fairu No Shōwa Tennō*. Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 2007.

Tsuganesawa, Toshihiro, and Kumi Kondō. *Kindai Nihon no ongaku bunka to Takarazuka*. Kyōto-shi: Sekai Shisōsha, 2006.

Tsuji, Chizuru. *Ibaruno Ni Shisu: Dokyumento Okinawa : Himeyuri Butai, Oyadomari Chiyo No Rei Ni Sasagu*. Tokyo:Bunyōsha Hatsubai, 1980.

Tsuji, Norihiko. *Takarazuka maboroshi no rain dansu: sensō de yume ga kieta otometachi*. Kōbe-shi: Kōbe Shinbun Sōgō Shuppan Sentā, 2011.

————————. *Otokotachi no takarazuka: yume o otta kenkyūsei no hanseiki*. Kōbe: Kōbe Shinbun Sōgō Shuppan Sentā, 2004.

Tsurumi, Shunsuke. *Atarashii Kaikoku*. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 2000.

Ueda, Shinji. *Takarazuka: hyaku nen no yume*. Tokyo: Bungei Shunjū, 2002.

Utsumi, Aiko, Yasuaki Ōnuma, Hiroshi Tanaka, and Yōko Katō. *Sengo Sekinin: Ajia No Manazashi Ni Kotaete*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2014.

Wadatsumikai. *Kike wadatsumi no koe: Nihon senbotsu gakusei no shuki*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1982.

Watanabe, Hiroshi. *Takarazuka kageki no hen'yō to Nihon kindai*. Tokyo: Shinshokan, 1999.

Wauke, Isao. 2005. *Nanda koryā Okinawa: manga, eiga, zasshi no naka no ajiwaibukaku egakareta Okinawa o motomete*. Naha-shi: Bōdā Inku, 2005.

Woodard, William P. *The Allied Occupation of Japan 1945-1952 and Japanese Religions*. Leiden: Brill, 1972.

Yahara, Hiromichi. *Okinawa Kessen: Kōkyū Sanbō No Shuki*. Tōkyō: Yomiuri Shinbunsha, 1972.

Yamakawa, Yasukuni. *Hiroku okinawa senki*. Tokyo: Yomiuri Shinbunsya, 1969.

Yasukuni Retsujo Itoku Kenshōkai.*Yasukuni Retsujoden*. Tōkyō: Shuppan Bunka Kenkyūkai, 1941.

Yomiuri Shinbunsha. *Okinawa Shiraume no hiwa.* Tokyo: Yomiuri Shinbunsha, 1983.

Yonashiro, Isamu. *Ryūkyū eden no sono monogatari*. Ryūkyū-Eden-kai, 1989.

Yoshida, Kensei. *Okinawa-sen Beihei wa nani o mita ka: 50-nengo no shōgen.* Tokyo: Sairyūsha, 1996.

Yoshida, Shien. *Chiisana tatakai no hibi: Okinawa fukki no urabanashi*. Tokyo:Bunkyō Shōji, 1977.

Yoshida, Tsukasa. *Himeyuri Chūshingura*. Tokyo: Ōta Shuppan, 1993.

Yoshimi, Shun'ya, and Tessa Morris-Suzuki. *Tennō to Amerika*. Tōkyō: Shūeisha, 2010.