

The Pacific War in Relation to Japanese Settlers in Papua and New Guinea

Hiromitsu IWAMOTO¹⁾

Abstract

The Pacific War ended the presence of Japanese settlers in Papua and New Guinea. It was a tragedy, as they were forced to leave when the war began and were never allowed to return. They lost all they had—assets, properties, friends and families. This tragedy was caused by imperial and colonial policies of both Japan and Australia. The Japanese invasion of the South Pacific made the Australian government intern the settlers in Australia. After the war, the Australian government deported them back Japan in order to reinforce their colonial rule in New Guinea. In these events, the settlers suffered the worst. Their physical losses were never compensated by either Japanese or Australian government. Their families were separated. They were too few and too powerless against great nations. In this paper, I shall analyse this case in terms of the development of war-time perceptions toward them by both Japanese and Australians, which appeared in the maturity of *nanshin-ron* in Japan and in the development of Australian fear of the invasion from the north. I also examine validity of those perceptions in an attempt to present the reality of the settlers so that I can depict comprehensively the relations between the national policies (which were greatly affected by the perceptions) and the fate of the settlers.

Key words: Pacific War, Japanese settlers, Papua and New Guinea, *nanshin*, Australia

Introduction

The Pacific War enabled both Japanese and Australians to consolidate their perceptions of the Japanese settlers in Papua and New Guinea. To the Japanese, they were patriots who pioneered the development of the tropical islands for the Empire. To the Australians, they were spies subtly mingled with Papuans and New Guineans in order to prepare the way for the Japanese invasion. The settlers were caught between those perceptions and experienced one of the most tragic events during and after the war.

1. Internment

The Australians promptly interned Germans and Italians upon the outbreak of war in

1) Collaborative researcher. Kagoshima University Research Centre for the South Pacific, Kagoshima, Japan

Europe and later Japanese and others. It was the reiteration of the exercise at the time of World War I when Germans 'were arrested, often at gunpoint in their homes or at work, and immediately imprisoned without knowing what offence they were supposed to have committed.'¹⁾ At this time the wide concept of 'enemy aliens' developed, which included naturalised or even Australian-born people who had 'enemy origin' one or two generations back.²⁾

In the late 1930s, the internment policy further developed with a wider concept of enemy aliens and stronger government power. The internment was one of the 'Special Internal Security Measures' and was executed not under the National Security Regulations but as the prerogative of the Minister:

The draft National Security Regulations include provisions for the making of orders imposing on any person such restriction as may be necessary to prevent him from acting in a manner prejudicial to the public safety or the defence of the Commonwealth. These restrictions could be applied to any suspected person, irrespective of his nationality; but they would be applied only to the individuals as such, and the internment of enemy aliens as a class would be carried out, not under these Regulations, but under the Prerogative..... Restriction orders and detention orders would be issued under the authority of the Minister, or by officers to whom this power may be delegated by the Minister.³⁾

Probably Japanese *nanshin* in French Indochina greatly affected the internment policy. The Australians regarded the Japanese as most dangerous enemy aliens and set a policy different from those for Germans and Italians. The Japanese did not receive the consideration on account of old age, although the government had previously decided not to intern enemy aliens over 70 years old or those who had resided in Australia more than 20 years.⁴⁾ This strict policy was based on the War Cabinet's view of Japanese that 'their well-known fanaticism and devotion to their country would probably lead to attempts at sabotage on the part of any Japanese here in a position to do this.'⁵⁾ Consequently, the rate of Japanese internment was the highest among enemy aliens in Australia and its territories: the Japanese 97 percent, Italians 31 percent and Germans 32 percent.⁶⁾

In the last two months before the Japanese invasion, 'leaders of the Rabaul community tried to maintain an appearance of normality.'⁷⁾ But the coming of the war was obvious to all townsfolk. From early December, Japanese reconnaissance planes appeared, which forced the War Cabinet to order compulsory evacuation of civilians from Papua and New Guinea. At the evacuation, the colonisers revealed their ugliness. They left New Guinean servants and labourers without any instruction and rejected the evacuation of about several thousand Chinese 'regardless of their request.'⁸⁾ They also distrusted New Guinean policemen and disarmed them.

As in Australia, the administration interned enemy aliens promptly in Papua and New Guinea. Germans were the first. They were interned no matter how long their residence was, as John McCarthy, a patrol officer, recollected:

Now suddenly their nationality was important. Whether they supported Hitler didn't matter; they were different from other men.⁹⁾

The same principle was applied to the Japanese, although some Japanese had already left New Guinea, because they knew that the war was about to break out. The Japanese government secretly informed them of the likelihood of the war in the near future.¹⁰⁾ They were told that the arrival of Nan'yō Bōeki's liner *Takachiho Maru* in March 1941 was the last chance for evacuation.¹¹⁾ Just before the war, the Japanese government set up the Evacuation Committee in the Department of Foreign Affairs and began to advise the Japanese in the South Seas to return to Japan. The government kept the actions top secret in order to prevent the leakage of war preparation.¹²⁾ Despite that, most Japanese (33 people) remained in New Guinea.¹³⁾ Most were long time residents for more than thirty years and had established businesses. Above all, ten of them had New Guinean or local wives and had children.

Early in the morning on 8 December 1941, as soon as the news of Japanese attack against Pearl Harbour and Malaya reached Rabaul, the internment of the Japanese, who were scattered in New Guinea, began.¹⁴⁾ At eleven o'clock, all twenty two Japanese in Rabaul were arrested and interned in the Rabaul jail.¹⁵⁾ On the following day, two plantation managers in Manus, Ikesaki and Hagiwara, were arrested.¹⁶⁾ On the same day, Kikuchi Matsukichi, a fisherman, was captured in Buka Island adjacent to Bougainville.¹⁷⁾ On 10 December, ten Japanese (Ikeda and Ishibashi families) were arrested on the same Island.¹⁸⁾ On 12 December, Nakamura was arrested in Talasea.¹⁹⁾ The last Japanese was Sasaki Hikokichi, a fisherman and a plantation hand and the only Christian Japanese (Anglican), who was arrested at Madang on 7 May 1942.²⁰⁾

The internment was a dreadful event particularly for the ten Japanese who had local wives. They were separated from their families. The administration imprisoned the husbands in the Rabaul jail with other Japanese, while keeping their wives and children in a separate compound.²¹⁾ Then the administration sent the Japanese husbands with other Japanese to Australia for internment. It also tried to take some young mixed-race Japanese, following the policy decided by the War cabinet in June 1940 to intern 'all Japanese males over 16 years within Australia and its territories, except those with diplomatic or consular privileges.²²⁾ But this attempt failed, because their mothers resisted desperately. Mapole Nakamura was one of brave mothers. She threatened to kill herself if they took her son away.²³⁾

The internment agonised Nagahama who had just married in Japan and his wife was due to join him in New Guinea soon. He married Fusae, a woman of his home village Goryō, whom he met when he was back home on a holiday from May 1938 to December 1939. But he alone came back to New Guinea because Fusae was pregnant. She delivered a baby girl in April 1940. But while she was preparing to come to New Guinea, the international situation deteriorated and finally the war broke out and she could not come to her husband.²⁴⁾

The internment caused complicated feelings to the Japanese. Although they felt that they

were betrayed by the Australians with whom they had been in good term for a long time, they still had a deep attachment to New Guinea where they had lived for over thirty years. Probably those who had experienced World War I expected that the battle would be small in scale and soon over and they would resume their civilian life. At the same time, their patriotism may have been aroused, hearing air-raid sirens and actual bombing. Some hoped in vain that Japanese troops might come to rescue them, then New Guinea would be a Japanese territory and they would enjoy all privileges that their white counterparts had. Some wrote on the wall of the jail in Japanese that they would help the troops as interpreters so that the troops would try to free them from the internment.²⁵⁾

However, without seeing the Japanese troops, they were loaded in an evacuation ship, the *Malaita*, with other white evacuees at five thirty p.m. on 8 January 1942. The ship sailed during the night to avoid Japanese planes and reached Sydney on 11 January via Kieta, Samarai, Cairns and Brisbane.²⁶⁾

In Papua, Tanaka and Murakami were interned on 9 December. The recollection of J. Gill, an Australian intelligence officer, is symbolic of the internment policy. He recalled that "I had met both Tom Tanaka and Murakama [sic] and whilst I do not think they were part of the Japanese war machine I suppose it was necessary in the interests of national security to intern them, especially as the Japanese had begun bombing Nauru and Ocean Island."²⁷⁾ Both were sent to Australia by R.A.A.F. airplane.²⁸⁾

2. Pacific War in Papua and New Guinea

On 23 January 1942, the Japanese South Seas Force, led by Major-General Horii Tomitarō, crushed a small Australian force at Rabaul in a matter of hours.²⁹⁾ The landing force was more than 5,000 men strong. And their landing was supported by about 100 planes from 4 aircraft carriers. The Australians did not have resources to counter such overwhelming force, mainly because they had not militarised New Guinea abiding by the non-military clause set to the mandate territory. The defence line was 'so thin that it was stretched to invisibility.'³⁰⁾ No major military forces had existed, apart from the New Guinea Volunteer Rifles, comprising of about eighty militiamen trained from the outbreak of the war in Europe, until March 1941 when the 2/22 Battalion arrived. Although in September the 17th Anti-Tank Battery was added, the total defence capability remained only two 6-inch guns, searchlights and three out-dated 3-inch anti-aircraft guns.³¹⁾ Then the War Cabinet, seeing the loss of *Prince of Wales* and *Repulse*, decided to reinforce Port Moresby but deserted Rabaul, arguing that "it was important to retain the garrison at Rabaul as "an advanced observation line", but its reinforcement was not possible because of the hazard of transporting a force from the mainland and of maintaining it."³²⁾

The Japanese occupation of Rabaul was followed by occupation of other New Guinea

islands. Their main aim in New Guinea and the Solomon campaigns was 'to cut the US-Australia line' in the south-west Pacific in order to defend Japanese positions in Micronesia and the Philippines.³³⁾ Ideologically the operation was performed under the whole scheme to construct the *Dai Tōa Kyōei Ken* [Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere].

However, the Japanese forces were 'entirely unprepared for the geography' of New Guinea, because the army had had few interest in the area until the outbreak of the war.³⁴⁾ Most troops were transferred from China and were equipped for continental warfare. Like their counterparts, they knew little about jungle warfare and a tropical climate.

The Japanese victory did not last long. From the mid-1942, the Japanese began to lose; the Allied forces defeated the Japanese at Milne Bay and pushed back their advance on Kokoda Trail. Then the Allied forces started mopping up retreating Japanese from Morobe to West Sepik, while re-taking Manus and air-raiding Rabaul. The Japanese could not strike an effective counter-attack due to lack of their logistic planning. Although the Japanese constructed a strong fortress at Rabaul and occupied some other parts, most of Papua and New Guinea remained under Allied control. Japanese losses were enormous: about 60,000 were killed in battle and 110,000 died of sickness and starvation, whereas the Australians lost about 14,500.³⁵⁾

Some Japanese troops committed atrocities and intensified the Australian image of evil Japanese. The best-known case was the Tol Massacre that about 160 Australian soldiers were slaughtered after their surrender. Other cases are cannibalism and rape. The sinking of the *Montevideo Maru* that carried Australian internees, although it was sunk by a US submarine, also deeply affected the postwar Australian perceptions of the Japanese in New Guinea, because most internees were local residents.

However, it was undoubtedly Papuans and New Guineans who experienced most difficult and horrifying time. They were killed by bombing and forced to work for the troops (both Japanese and the Allied) and their gardens were ravaged by starving soldiers. Their suffering was immeasurable, but the decline of their population in the early postwar period can show the scale of the tremendous impact of the war.³⁶⁾

Japanese waged propaganda war. *Nanshin-ron* advocates reinforced the justification of Japanese southward invasion, while the Australians were busy depicting an evil image of barbarous and brutal 'Japs.'³⁷⁾ As a result, the images of patriotic Japanese residents in New Guinea and the cruel Japanese military (this was true in some cases) were created and both became the basis of postwar perceptions.

In Japan, publication of *nanshin* literature reached a climax. Although there is no data to cover the period from 1941 to 1945, according to the bibliography published by the Nihon Takushoku Kyōkai (Japan Colonisation Society) in 1944, the number of pieces (books and articles) for general reference on the South Seas published in 1942 alone occupies 37.9 percent of the ones published from the Meiji period.³⁸⁾ Similarly, the literature about Papua and New Guinea increased. The Society listed 40 books and articles for 1942 and 1943 against the total 84 from the Meiji period.³⁹⁾

Nanshin-ron advocates continued to emphasise historical linkages.⁴⁰⁾ Irie wrote *Meiji nanshin shikō* [History of southward advancement in the Meiji period] in 1943, in which he re-introduced Enomoto's plan to colonise South Pacific islands, in addition to introducing Meiji *nanshin-ron* advocates and the stories of the Japanese who migrated to Southeast Asia, South Pacific islands and Australia. He concluded that 'we have to express our sincere gratitude to our pioneers who devoted their lives to the South Seas and left their footprints after suffering from many hardships.'⁴¹⁾ Similarly, Sawada Ken wrote *Yamada Nagamasa to nanshin senku sha* [Yamada Nagamasa and pioneers of southward advancement] in 1942 and introduced Japanese traders and entrepreneurs who were successful in the South Seas since the 15th century. He argued that 'the Great Asia War is the expression of our national strength that our ancestors have built in the last two thousand and six hundred years since the foundation of the Empire.'⁴²⁾ Suganuma Teifū, one of the few militaristic Meiji *nanshin-ron* advocates who had been almost unknown until then, suddenly became popular. In 1942 two books were written about him: Eguchi Reishirō's *Nanshin no senku sha Suganuma Teifū den* [Autobiography of Suganuma Teifū, a pioneer of southward advancement] and Hanazono Kanesada's *Suganuma Teifū*.⁴³⁾ Ōta Kyōzaburō, a successful entrepreneur who owned a large Manila hemp plantation in Davao in the Philippines, was also admired; Nomura Aimasa wrote *Dabao no chichi Ōta kyōzaburō* [Father of Davao, Ōta Kyōzaburō].⁴⁴⁾

The Japanese in New Guinea were no exception. Komine was repeatedly introduced in five books and one journal article which devoted whole or some part to Komine and other Japanese.⁴⁵⁾ Ōno and Nagakura highlighted Komine's bravery in assisting German pacification of New Guineans and the Australian navy at the capture of the *Komet*.

Even a mixed-race Japanese was highlighted. Okada Seizō, a special correspondent of the Asahi newspaper, devoted a chapter to introduce mixed-race boys. He wrote that Wakao Yamashita (son of Yamashita Shichinosuke, one of the plantation managers in Manus) paddled from Rabaul to Manus to tell the islanders to assist the Japanese, and the islanders came to Rabaul on five hundred canoes full of provisions and surprised the Japanese. Okada also wrote about Kai Chew, a Chinese boy. According to Okada, he had been waiting for a chance to take revenge on the British because his father was killed brutally by a British official. After the Japanese occupation, Kai Chew joined the Japanese troops and served on the Kokoda Trail and was killed.⁴⁶⁾ Oral evidence as well as common sense denies these stories. Wakao never went back to Manus during the war and the islanders never paddled five hundred canoes. Kai Chew was forced to work for the Japanese but he never went to Kokoda and he was still alive when I interviewed in 1994.⁴⁷⁾

New Guineans were also used as propaganda. The writers emphasised that New Guineans were grateful for the Japanese who liberated them from Anglo-Saxon rule. Umino Jūzō, a naval correspondent, described New Guineans as 'shin kōmin (new Imperial subjects)':

We had been interested and also very worried to see what attitudes Papuans [and New Guineans] would take towards us when we appeared in front of them all of a sudden. But, contrary to our anxiety, they showed strong friendliness from the day we landed, and cooperated with us. In other words, they were waiting for the Imperial Force, and when they saw us they rushed to see us. Why did this happen? One of the reasons is the brutal treatment of their former rulers, Anglo-Saxons. Another reason is that the Japanese pioneers who had lived there over thirty years treated the natives well. Because of that, the natives respect Japan, the country of those pioneers. The third is the strength of the Imperial Force that overwhelmed the Australians whom the natives had thought the strongest race. The gentleness of the Imperial Force towards the natives also helped. The natives were deeply impressed by those things, because they are simple.⁴⁸⁾

Asahi gurafu [Asahi Photograph], a photographic magazine, conveyed a visual image of cooperative New Guineans. It showed smiling faces of local children learning Japanese in a school established by the navy at Kavieng, and of adults constructing roads: some of those New Guineans were wearing caps with the emblem of the rising sun.⁴⁹⁾

All those *nanshin* propaganda were to reinforce one of the ideological backbones of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperty Sphere—*hakkō-ichiu* (the eight corners of the world under one roof). The 'one roof' is of course Japan.

Contrary to the propaganda, the mixed-race Japanese were not always loyal to the Japanese forces. In Rabaul the Japanese occupation caused mixed feelings to the remaining families, particularly to the mixed-race children. They saw their fathers 'country's army defeat and ill-treat the Australians who were their fathers' long time friends. Perhaps some older ones rejoiced to see some friendly and kind Japanese soldiers and willingly helped them.⁵⁰⁾ But most children feared the Japanese, seeing or hearing about public beheading or other punishment, and obeyed them. Phillip, a son of Tabuchi Yoshimatsu, recalls: 'we were told to work for the Japanese, or see the consequence.'⁵¹⁾ Small ones did not understand what was happening and just did what they were told by the Japanese or white missionaries. In contrast, New Guinean wives had a different view. They simply did not want to be involved in the war, and kept away from the Japanese or went to bush to hide like other New Guineans.⁵²⁾

The sons of Yamashita, Sakane and Ikesaki, were staying at Nagahama's residence at the time of the internment. They were the oldest group of the mixed-race children. Nagahama was looking after Wakao Yamashita, after his father (Shichinosuke), committed suicide in Manus. Wakao attended the Mission School in Rabaul. Nagahama also looked after Phillip Sakane after his father died in 1934. Phillip also attended the Mission School and took a carpentry class but was dismissed from the class because of his misbehaviour. After that, he was learning boatbuilding at Izumi's yard.⁵³⁾ Nagahama told the two boys to take care of his five houses when he was taken to Australia.⁵⁴⁾ After the Japanese landed at Rabaul, Wakao and a son of Ikesaki collaborated with the Japanese. They went to Wide Bay with the Japanese troops and worked as clerks to record particulars of Australian soldiers and

civilians who escaped from Rabaul.⁵⁵⁾ In March 1942, Wakao was ordered to work as a driver.⁵⁶⁾ Probably he was working reluctantly and disobeyed the order. He was imprisoned with the Allied prisoners from January to May in 1944. During his imprisonment, he often witnessed the Japanese beating prisoners.⁵⁷⁾

Eleven mixed-race Japanese children stayed in the Vunapope Catholic Mission. Soon the Kempei (Military Police) found them and demanded that the Mission give them better treatment. The Bishop Leo Scharmach reluctantly agreed:

The Japanese children and the Sisters in charge of them were called up to the Kempei. The major [Sakakibara] was present too. The police declared that they were going to provide better food for the part-Japanese children. The youngsters got one bag of rice between them and a tin of bully beef or fish each. The Kempei impressed on the Sister: 'this food supply is exclusively for the Japanese children.' The Sister stated bluntly: 'It all goes into the one pot. I am sure the Japanese children get their share.' And off she went.⁵⁸⁾

Later the Japanese removed the five boys, telling the Father that they would educate them in the Japanese language and way of life with a qualified teacher. But they left six girls.⁵⁹⁾

Pius Yukio Kikuchi, the third child of Kikuchi Ichisuke, was among the five boys. At the Japanese camp, he did not receive much education but spent most time working for the Japanese. But Kikuchi relates that it was not a hard life for him; the Japanese were kind and taught many things about Japan. The new life was an exciting time for a young boy. He recalls:

From 1943 to 1945, I worked for the Japanese force. All mixed-race Japanese children were told to work for the Japanese force. I looked after horses and pigs and dug tunnels. I worked for the *gunshuku-han butai* [Accommodation Unit] in Toma. Bonny Shigeru Nakamura, Jo Kisaburo Nakamura, Paul Izumi and Endo were there, too. Bonny was a cook and once ran away, but caught, and beaten by the back edge of katana [Japanese sword] as punishment. I worked for Sergeant Kanai and Watanabe. Watanabe was higher than Kanai. Kanai is the one who beat up Bonny Nakamura, but usually he was a very kind gentleman. He beat Bonny to show the seriousness for disobeying the order. I also worked for Major Sakakibara. Japanese soldiers treated children well and were never cruel.⁶⁰⁾

Three sons of Asanuma Ichimatsu (Michael, Felix and Anthony) worked in the MP headquarters. They were put in a school and were taught Japanese language and songs, but they spent most time fixing boots for the soldiers.⁶¹⁾ It was alleged that the MP used the boys to punish others. At the Rabaul War Trial a white civilian witness stated that 'a [New Guinean] boy was flogged insensible by Felix Asanuma, a half-caste resident of Rabaul, then in Japanese uniform working for the Ramale Kempei.⁶²⁾ However, no oral evidence from either New Guineans or mixed-race Japanese can confirm the flogging.

Louise Asanuma, a wife of Ichimatsu, was in Rabaul when the Japanese landed, but she

fled to her Filipino father's plantation at Wide Bay to avoid the battle. Louise's sister Josephine, who married Kimura Hidejirō, was also with them. However, soon the Japanese forces advanced in Wide Bay, chasing retreating Australians. The family was caught in an awkward situation. The Japanese commander asked them about the Australians. The family probably knew where the Australians went, but they said they did not know. The Japanese believed it because they considered the family was pro-Japanese after finding out that the two women were married to Japanese. The Japanese treated the family well and provided food.⁶³⁾

In Manus, the remaining families went to the bush to hide and local people looked after them. Ikesaki family was looked after by Dipon family (a large clan in Momote).⁶⁴⁾ Yamashita family left Pityilu Plantation for the bush in the mainland Manus.⁶⁵⁾

In Papua, the remaining families were ill-treated by the Australians who feared the possibility of their assistance to the Japanese. Adults were taken to a compound at Gili Gili and were forced to construct the airfield or to do other manual labour. Children were kept in a compound at Baraga throughout the war.⁶⁶⁾ Mary Tanaka was probably the worst treated. Some villagers alleged that she looked after a wounded Japanese. The Australians believed this without investigating and locked her up in a cell until the end of the war despite her plea that it was other Papuans who helped the Japanese.⁶⁷⁾

Tashiro Tsunesuke was the only Japanese resident who came back Rabaul during the war and experienced the war in Papua and New Guinea. Probably he had the same dilemma as Komine had at the outbreak of World War I, caught between patriotism and relations with local people. Although it is hard to know how strong his patriotism was, both written and oral evidence show that he cherished his good pre-war relations and saved lives of New Guineans, white missionaries, Chinese planters and Australians.

In March 1941 he went back Japan in the last Nan'yō Bōeki liner. As soon as the war broke out, he was called up to serve the navy as a *gunzoku* (civilian).⁶⁸⁾ At that time the navy was recruiting Japanese civilians who had an experience in the South Seas.⁶⁹⁾ On 26 December he was posted to the 2nd Nazuru Naval Special Landing Party at Saipan. On 1 February 1942 he was transferred to the 8th Base Force which was commanding the operations in New Guinea. Then on 10 April he was back in Rabaul, being assigned an additional post under the command of the *minsei-bu* (civil administration department) in New Britain.⁷⁰⁾ Until the end of the war, he worked mainly as an interpreter, because he spoke fluent English and Pidgin English and had local knowledge. He was extremely useful for the navy which knew little about New Guinea. He was dispatched to Milne Bay, Bougainville, Nakanai, Talasea and Manus.⁷¹⁾

Tashiro impressed Vice-Admiral Kusaka Jin'ichi, supreme commander of the naval forces in New Guinea. Kusaka wrote about Tashiro's service in his memoir. Kusaka praised his service which saved the naval land unit in the Milne Bay and quoted Tashiro's diary fully over three pages. The following is his diary.

On 24 August [1942], I left Buna. I was assigned to the landing operation of the Sasebo

5th Special Land Battle Unit which was to attack Rabi. On the way, at midday on 25th, we stopped at Goodenough Island in the north of Rabi and were attacked by ten enemy fighters. All our seven landing boats were sunk with most of our food, ammunition and radios, and about ten were killed. Since then, 350 officers and men were isolated on the island. Every day enemy planes machine-gunned us. We maintained our strength with food from the natives, although not enough, while investigating the island and collecting information about the enemy. Then we planned to contact the main force at Buna by despatching a party on a canoe; the party had to paddle 130 miles. About one week later, we managed to obtain a canoe from the natives and despatched three men on it. However, we did not hear anything from them for a week and sent a second canoe. Around this time, the men began to die one after another because of the lack of food and medicine. Many got weak and succumbed to malaria. Still we did not hear anything from Buna, and we began to prepare a third dispatch as a last resort, this time by a cutter with a sail. Then our fighter came and dropped a communication cylinder saying 'Stick it out' and two packets of *kō* (cigarettes). At least one of our previous dispatches was successful. The whole unit was overjoyed. From this time, however, the enemy intensified their raids. The fighters machine-gunned us from daybreak to sunset. Our planes also appeared from time to time and dropped supplies of ammunition and biscuits. Meanwhile, malaria patients increased and died daily. To cremate their bodies in the jungle at night when the enemy reconnaissance plane was not in the sky was the saddest and most difficult task. Before long, our submarine arrived and unloaded a radio, chart, rice and landing boat, and picked up about sixty injured and seriously ill men. Unfortunately, the second submarine only unloaded a boat and left, as the enemy night reconnaissance plane noticed its arrival. Later, when we were radio-communicating with the 18th Unit early in the morning of 24 October, the Australian forces landed on the island. We fought for two days and finally rebuffed the enemy, although we lost a platoon leader and other ten men. At night on the 16th, we got aboard the two boats and reached the adjacent Normandy [sic]⁷²⁾ Island. At eleven o'clock at night on the 27th, we were picked up by the battleship *Tenryū*, and in the morning on the 28th, 200 of us returned to Rabaul.⁷³⁾

Since then, Tashiro engaged in the tasks such as investigating the construction site for airstrips, recruiting and placating New Guineans mainly at Rabaul and Bougainville. According to Kusaka, he once succeeded in recruiting a thousand New Guineans, and Kusaka expressed deep gratitude for Tashiro's hard work.⁷⁴⁾

However, Tashiro did not betray his local friends. In Bougainville, he acquiesced in the presence of Lieutenant Mason, an Australian coast watcher, and the leaking of information by Wong You, a Chinese planter at Kieta.

He [Wong] states that he owed his life to Tashiro, Japanese Intelligence Officer, who had told the officer in charge, who had accused of withholding information concerning myself, that 'this man has known Mason twenty years. You he has known only a day. You cannot expect him to betray a lifelong friend to a stranger.'⁷⁵⁾

According to oral evidence, Tashiro 'did not do harm to locals.'⁷⁶⁾ He was indeed instructing the islanders in Pidgin to take a neutral stand for their safety, lest other Japanese officers could understand.⁷⁷⁾ Similarly, in Rabaul he was protecting the interests of the mixed-race people and Chinese and visited the Vunapope Mission to see that children were well-

treated.⁷⁸⁾

3. Internment life in Australia

Australians treated the internees well, abiding by the letter and spirit of the Geneva Convention; the internees received the same amount of rations as the camp guards and were similarly housed.⁷⁹⁾ Most Japanese internees had no bitterness about their treatment by the camp authorities and conditions in the camps.⁸⁰⁾ It was also the Australian expectation of good treatment of their prisoners of war and internees kept by the Axis that gave the camp authorities a sense of responsibility in their conduct.⁸¹⁾

Upon their arrival at Sydney, the Japanese from Rabaul were entrained to Hay Camp in a grazing area about 750 kilometres inland. They arrived at the camp on 27 January and met Tanaka and Murakami from Samarai and the Japanese from the New Hebrides. In the camp there were already about 900 hundred Japanese mainly from Australia and New Caledonia. On the following day, the camp officers body-searched the new Japanese and confiscated all cash and other belongings.⁸²⁾

Mixing with other Japanese was a new experience to those from New Guinea. A small group, whose main social contact had been with non-Japanese, was suddenly swallowed up in a large group of the same race. Naturally that gave them a new and clear sense of their national identity. The news of Japanese victories stimulated their patriotism; they needed no longer hide their practices of Shintōism or Buddhism nor their admiration of the Empire.

Nagahama's diary shows the rise of patriotism in the camp.⁸³⁾ Hearing about the fall of Singapore, the Japanese in the camp gathered and worshiped towards the direction of Japan and prayed silently for the souls of the Japanese soldiers who perished in the battle. They also heard that the Allied bombers raided Tokyo and other cities, but presumed the news was propaganda. They celebrated the Emperor's Birthday on 29 April, singing a national anthem and praying for Japanese soldiers. They had a feast and enjoyed a *sumo* tournament. In the camp the Japanese considered the Battle of Coral Sea a Japanese victory and held a celebration with a gorgeous dinner. The news of the Japanese abortive midjet submarine attack against Sydney and Newcastle was solemnly conveyed. And from time to time, they organised a lecture series, entitled *kokusei taikai* (Conference on National Situation), delivered by academic internees in the camp. The lectures were designed to keep their morale high.

On 12 April 1943, the Australian government made a new decision on the status of Japanese internees. It classified merchant seamen as prisoners of war (POW) and distinguished them from 'internees'. After this, the government decided that Hay Camp hold only POWs and Loveday Camp in South Australia only internees.⁸⁴⁾ The new status was inconsistent in the case of the Japanese from Papua and New Guinea. Technically all were engaged in maritime industry, because even planters or plantation managers had to operate

vessels to transport copra. But at this stage only Izumi, a boat builder, was considered a merchant seaman and thereby a POW, while other boatbuilders or fishermen were considered civilians.⁸⁵⁾

On 10 May 1943, 350 Japanese were transferred from Hay to Loveday Camp in South Australia. All the Japanese from Papua and New Guinea except Izumi were among them.⁸⁶⁾ The Australians thought the Loveday was 'one of the best locations chosen for the purpose of internment camps' with 'its temperate climate and its abundance of reticulated water.'⁸⁷⁾ On the contrary, Loveday did not impress the Japanese. When they arrived, a sand storm was raging. Their first impression of the camp site was that they were brought to the middle of the desert.⁸⁸⁾ About two months later, the camp authority rechecked the occupation of the Japanese and re-classified Endō, Onoue, Hatamoto, Nakamura and Kimura as POWs and sent them back to Hay Camp with about a hundred other Japanese.⁸⁹⁾

The Japanese found camp life satisfactory. Nagahama recalled no complaints about the treatment and Hatamoto recalls good treatment. Although they were forced to do various tasks (farming, carpentry, wood cutting, etc), they were not too hard. They were fed well. They could receive medical treatment in the camp hospitals. And they had time for their own pastimes such as sports or organising other entertainment. For instance, Hatamoto used to enjoy making toys for the children in the camp in his spare time.⁹⁰⁾

The Australian guards observed that the Japanese were the most placid and many were not security risks.⁹¹⁾ A Loveday camp official described:

The Japanese: Subservient, were model prisoners. Their fanatical desire to maintain 'face' made them easy to handle in their eagerness to obey all orders and instructions to the letter.⁹²⁾

However, the camp authority was concerned about Nagahama who had managed to keep substantial cash and was lending it to others. In Loveday, the Japanese suffered from minor financial hardship. Their pocket money was so little: they received from the Japanese government only 'six shillings per week on signing allegiance to the Emperor and his regime.

⁹³⁾ The camp official interviewed Nagahama about his lending and reported:

NAGAHAMA stated that he had unexpectedly been allowed to bring the money from his estate at Rabaul, and he considered that he ought to help others who had not been so fortunate and had little or no money. He lent the money without interest, and on the word of the camp leader (IJ.51736 ANYEI Morio) that those receiving loans would repay him the sums received when they returned to Japan.⁹⁴⁾

The camp authority banned transfer of money among internees, although admitting that Nagahama's lending was a bona fide action and did 'not appear to represent an attempt on his part to gain for himself "political" influence in the Compound.'⁹⁵⁾ Similarly, the authority did not approve of his lending of £ 40 to Tsurushima, which Nagahama attempted to send in exchange for three rings.⁹⁶⁾ He also tried to send money to Onoue at Hay Camp in vain.

Nagahama wrote:

About money it is most disturbing but on application to the Authorities, we were told it was absolutely impossible to send money over there, so inconvenient situation though it is, please try to bear up. Even here we have been in an awkward situation over money for 2 or 3 months—we can no longer transfer to any person more than £ 1 in a week. Everyone here, too, is inconvenienced, but as it is a Military Order we can do nothing about it.⁹⁷⁾

The authority kept watching Nagahama's money lending with deep suspicion; it even refused his offer to pay for the poultry for New Year's Day on the ground that 'this apparent generosity is really intended to extend Nagahama's influence in the compound.'⁹⁸⁾ We can only speculate how Nagahama managed to possess a large sum of cash, because usually internees' money was confiscated at the time of internment. He might have had savings in an Australian bank and made a special arrangement with the camp authority to withdraw cash or he might have been running an unauthorised business like trading rations or gambling which was very common among Allied POWs in Japan.⁹⁹⁾

Many Japanese died at Loveday, because quite a few Japanese were interned in spite of their old age: 108 Japanese died compared to 18 Italians and 7 Germans.¹⁰⁰⁾ Tanaka Taichirō was among them. He got sick and was hospitalised. In the Barmera Base Hospital his name was placed on the 'dangerously ill' list on 30 May 1945.¹⁰¹⁾ Then he recovered for some time and his name was moved to the 'seriously ill' list on 10 July.¹⁰²⁾ However, his condition deteriorated once again and his name was placed on the 'dangerously ill' list on 20 November: the cause was unresolved pneumonia.¹⁰³⁾ Then he finally succumbed to the illness. He developed a cerebral vascular accident and passed away on New Year Eve in the 64 Camp Hospital. His burial was held at eleven o'clock in the morning on New Year Day in 1946.¹⁰⁴⁾ He was 68 years old.¹⁰⁵⁾

Some Japanese experienced accident and sickness, although not fatal. At Loveday, Kikuchi Ichisuke was struck by a truck and admitted to the camp hospital, suffering from a fractured left ankle.¹⁰⁶⁾ At Tatura, Ikeda Kunizō's wife, Toshie, got sick and was taken to the camp hospital on 19 October 1945.¹⁰⁷⁾

Those who had been separated from their families in New Guinea were anxious about their safety, hearing the news of the Allied bombing of Rabaul and other areas and the battle in Manus. Lack of communication increased their anxiety, except Kikuchi and Asanuma who were lucky enough to receive letters from New Guinea.¹⁰⁸⁾ Others did not hear anything from their families although they wrote many times. Nakamura's letters never got through, and a sympathetic official of the International Red Cross Committee sought advice from the Minister of State for External Affairs on Nakamura's communication with his family.¹⁰⁹⁾ Similarly Hagiwara and Sasaki got no replies from their families.¹¹⁰⁾

In 1943 the negotiation on exchanging internees began between Japan and Australia. The Japanese government nominated 678 Japanese including four from New Guinea (Hatamoto, Mano, Nagahama and Tsurushima).¹¹¹⁾ The Australian government refused the exchange of

the four for the obvious reason that they were very likely to pass their knowledge of New Guinea to the Japanese military.

4. Deportation

The end of the war was good news to the internees. They expected to be freed from the confinement of three and half years and go home to see their families. However, through newspapers and correspondence with their families, they knew of the devastation of Rabaul. Probably they knew about a huge number of Japanese POWs and their trials: they could imagine the ill-feeling by the local white residents against themselves. They also knew the devastation of Japan—atomic bombing of Nagasaki and Hiroshima and the occupation by the Allied forces.

The Australians were determined to make New Guinea a Japanese-free area for the defence and governance of New Guineans. The Australians regarded the pre-war Japanese presence as part of *nanshin*: the Japanese were all associated with espionage activities. They also thought that the Japanese occupation undermined the Australian authority. Therefore the Australians decided that any Japanese influence had to be eliminated in order to restore their pre-war colonial rule.

The repatriation of Japanese internees began in late February 1946. According to Australian sources, at least seven Japanese from Papua and New Guinea (Murakami, Asanuma, Hagiwara, Ikesaki, Kikuchi [Matsukichi], Kikuchi [Ichisuke] and Sasaki) formally applied for release in Australia.¹¹²⁾ Then six out of the seven (leaving Kikuchi Matsukichi) were transferred to Tatura Camp.¹¹³⁾ On 21 February 1946, 18 Japanese internees from New Guinea were deported to Japan with over 2,000 other Japanese, according to Regulation 20C of the National Security (Aliens Control) Regulations. It is unknown whether they wished to return to Japan. They included families of Ikeda and Ishibashi, Arata, Kikuchi (Matsukichi), Mano, Mori, Nagahama, Segawa, Tashiro, Tsujii and Tsurushima.¹¹⁴⁾ The rest of the ten Japanese applied to return to Papua and New Guinea.¹¹⁵⁾ The Australian government could not deport the ten, because they had local wives in Papua and New Guinea who were technically British subjects, and their release had to be negotiated with the Attorney-General.¹¹⁶⁾

Roland Browne, the Acting Director-General of Security, interviewed the ten who were then moved to Rushworth Camp, following the instruction of the Attorney-General. At the interviews they all expressed their strong desire to go back to live with their families.¹¹⁷⁾ Browne found that 'in all of these cases there is no objection to release' and reported no objection to their return provided that approval be granted by the Department of External Territories.¹¹⁸⁾ The only exception was Kimura who, Browne thought, 'is an intelligent type and has a very good knowledge of New Guinea waters and it may be thought desirable that he should be required to return to his own country.'¹¹⁹⁾

However, the Department of External Territories objected, supporting the view of the administrator Murray who was firmly against their return because of the possible 'ill-effect' on the natives:

The fact that the Territory of New Guinea has been occupied for three years by a Japanese army as conquerors makes it highly undesirable to enable a native population to be in contact with Japanese nationals, both in their interests as well as in the interests of the Japanese themselves.¹²⁰⁾

The administration's first task after the war was restoration of the pre-war relationship between white masters and black servants. Any Japanese influence that undermined the authority of white masters had to be removed. White planters also feared the destruction of the pre-war colonial relations and petitioned the Minister of External Affairs:

In putting forth this request, we have taken into consideration the fact that great numbers of native inhabitants who have been under Japanese control in the occupied areas will be unfit to take on employment for some time, and, by adopting the action submitted, it will be possible to give these natives a rest period to allow them to reinstate themselves in their pre-war way of life.¹²¹⁾

Murray was aware of an ethical issue that the rejection to the return of the ten Japanese meant separation from their families. But he argued that:

In considering the separation from their families that the long war separation will act as a shock absorber and moreover it must be recollected that in some instances the bonds of affection are no greater that would be expected of the general run of irregular unions as no doubt many are.¹²²⁾

Oral evidence denies Murray's argument. Their wives and children were all longing to see the return of their husbands and fathers.¹²³⁾

Browne objected to Murray's view and emphasised the point that 'they have been away from Japan for many years, ranging from 29 to 45, and to separate them permanently from their wives and families now in my opinion be wrong,' and recommended that 'to return them to their home surroundings, from which they were taken into custody, is the only reasonable solution to the problem.'¹²⁴⁾

Browne and Murray kept on pressing their arguments to the Attorney-General's Department.¹²⁵⁾ However, Browne's view met overwhelming opposition from the Director-General of Security, Murray, Deputy Administrator Phillips and the Assistant Secretary of the Department of External Territories. The Director-General of Security reiterated a traditional Australian fear of Japan's *nanshin*:

Japanese who were in the islands pre-war, can only be regarded as having been part of the Japanese system of infiltration and espionage related to their so-called 'southward expansion movement'.... The South West Pacific area is a vital strategic region in which unremitting vigilance is a constant requisite. Clearly, no Japanese should again be allowed anywhere within such strategic zone..... Upon all material counts the re-entrance of any Japanese would be of ill-effect and it is strongly advised that none be allowed to proceed to any of the areas referred to.¹²⁶⁾

When Browne argued that the Japanese never exhibited anti-British sentiments before the war,¹²⁷⁾ Phillips countered saying that they simply had no chance to express such sentiments and emphasised that 'the loyalty of Japanese to their Emperor and country is so notorious that I find it hard to imagine that these Japanese would not have immediately rallied to Nippon had they still in the Territory when the Japanese forces arrived.'¹²⁸⁾ Phillips also scored a point by arguing that 'their return may constitute an extreme provocation to European, Asiatic and native residents who suffered terribly at enemy hands during the occupation.'¹²⁹⁾

The Assistant Secretary of the Department of External Territories was more aggressive. He firmly denied the ethical case, regarding the intermarriages as 'all part of the espionage and infiltration plan' and presented a blatant racist view that 'Japanese have amongst other many undesirable characteristics, a complete lack of any sense of gratitude and certainly no sense of affection or even liking for any others than their own people.' More importantly, he made a point, which was quite persuasive then, that their return would be a betrayal to the Australians killed in war in Papua and New Guinea.

Finally, and remembering the actions in New Guinea itself, of the Japanese forces before they were ejected, any permitted entrance or re-entrance of any Japanese to the Islands would be likely to be regarded by every Australian in the territory (and in Australia as well) as an affront—particularly to those bereaved as a result of Japanese aggression.¹³⁰⁾

Meanwhile the Department of the Army was eager to close the camp due to the cost of maintaining it. As a result, the issue was left to the jurisdiction of the administration, and the Japanese were to be returned to Papua and New Guinea, although their release was yet to be decided.¹³¹⁾

The Department of the Army prepared transport for their repatriation. At the last moment, Murakami changed his mind and applied for repatriation to Japan.¹³²⁾ Probably he knew that he would not live long due to his old age (75 years old then) and wished to see his home country again before his death. But his application was rejected. All ten were sent back to Papua and New Guinea. Cynically, only Murakami was released at Samarai upon his return, while the other nine were kept in custody in Rabaul.

Murray still resisted the release of the nine. They were held in a compound next to the one for the Japanese war criminals who were waiting for trial or serving their sentences in Rabaul. It was an illegal detention, and the Australian officials were aware of that. Cyril Chambers, Acting Minister of External Territories, wrote to the Cabinet:

The six civilian internees were held in pursuance of the National Security (Aliens Control) Regulations and orders for their release were signed on 27th November, 1946, and the Regulation in question expired on 31/12/1947, five of these appeared to be held illegally.....It is not clear whether the three who are regarded technically as prisoners of war who are still held.....are legally held.¹³³⁾

While they were in the compound, Izumi died of sickness. He was 54 years old, and was

buried in the cemetery near Talwat where Japanese war criminals were buried. He was not allowed to be buried in the European cemetery like other pre-war Japanese, because anti-Japanese feelings were so strong among residents, particularly among those who had suffered under the Japanese occupation. Some greatly resented the pre-war presence of the Japanese in the town and pulled out all Japanese graves (including Komine's memorial erected by Tatsue) in the European cemetery and threw them into the sea.¹³⁴⁾

Most families of the Japanese visited the compound, but the Japanese were never allowed to return to their homes even temporarily. In order to justify this illegal detention, the Australians even fabricated a story. The District Officer in Rabaul reported that 'only one wife of the Japanese internees wished for their husband's return, the native wives of their internees having re-married.'¹³⁵⁾ Oral evidence contradicts this. Most families were anxious to see the Japanese back home, and the re-marriages took place some years after the Japanese were deported to Japan.¹³⁶⁾

However, some Australians were sympathetic. Gordon Ehret, a long time friend of Asanuma, was back in Rabaul from his military service in the Middle East. He requested the administration to release them, explaining that they had nothing to do with the Japanese forces. His request was not accepted. In fact, Ehret experienced 'the most unpleasant job'¹³⁷⁾ He was appointed as a guard for the compound, as he was one of the few civilians who had military experience. Over the fence, Asanuma begged Ehret for his release. Asanuma's voice still lingers in Ehret's ears:

We are mates, aren't we? Why do you do this to me?¹³⁸⁾

Also in Manus, some Australians tried unsuccessfully to release the Japanese. Whitely and Edison, planters in Momote, requested the administration to return Ikesaki and Hagiwara to their plantations in Manus.¹³⁹⁾

The administration officials knew that they had no statutory right to deport the Japanese: 'the eight still held cannot be deported as prohibited immigrants owing to their long residence in New Guinea and in regard to the five civilians there is no war-time legislation under which they could be removed from the Territory.'¹⁴⁰⁾ But finally the officials managed to find a loophole. Under the Expulsion of Undesirable Ordinance 1935 of New Guinea, they could be deported by the discretion of the administrator. Section 2 reads:

Where the Administrator is satisfied that any person who was not born in the Territory—

(a) has since the commencement of the Laws Reprisal and Adopting Ordinance 1921 been convicted in the Territory of a criminal offence punishable by imprisonment for one year or longer: or

(b) is a person whose presence in the Territory is injurious to the peace, order, or good Government of the Territory, or whose presence in the Territory is prejudicial to the well-being of the natives of the Territory,

the Administrator may make an order for the deportation of that person.

The eight Japanese were deported in 1949, after the longest internment suffered by any of

the Japanese. They had been interned for seven years in total.

In contrast, Murray did not object to the release of Murakami in Samarai. Probably his age (75 years) was considered, but the main reason is obvious: Milne Bay did not suffer Japanese occupation and the damage to the Australian authority was minimal. The Australians rebuffed the Japanese landing, and in Buna-Kokoda the Australians eventually pushed back the Japanese advance. The postwar administration saw little physical damage or need for rehabilitation.¹⁴¹⁾ And within only two years 'almost complete rehabilitation to pre-war standard' was achieved.¹⁴²⁾ Thus by the time Murakami was back, pre-war conditions were restored and his return would have hardly affected the Australian authority.

Murakami rejoiced to meet his wife and son, but he had to bring bad news to Mary Tanaka: her father Taichirō had died in Loveday. He also brought a bunch of Taichirō's hair and gave it to Mary. It was his only legacy left to her. Tanaka's prewar assets (schooners, stores, boatbuilding yards, etc.) were all destroyed or confiscated during the war.¹⁴³⁾ Murakami was fortunate to enjoy the last moment with his family and also to have support from Timperly, a sympathetic Australian official, who was helping him by providing food. Murakami died in Kuyaro in the same year that he returned.¹⁴⁴⁾

A hard life was waiting for those deported from Australia and New Guinea. They went back to poor villages and islands where they had found no bright future and had left decades before. Most had never returned for a long time. They had no means to make a living because all their assets and properties and even petty belongings were confiscated by the Australians on internment and after the war. Moreover, chaotic social conditions in the early postwar Japan made them difficult to adapt to the new life. Even more depressing, their losses of assets in New Guinea were never compensated.

Nagahama suffered the worst financially. He lost all the wealth which he had accumulated by hard work during almost forty years in New Guinea. The administration seized, liquidated and distributed his assets, which amounted to £ 21,602, for the benefits of former Australian POWs of the Japanese, according to Article 14 of the San Francisco Peace Treaty of 1951 and to Section 13F of the Trading with the Enemy Act 1939–1957.¹⁴⁵⁾ He passed away at his home village Goryō in September 1960 while his wife was watching. His family suffered severe financial difficulties because Nagahama came back without any money and he often became sick. After his death, his wife and daughter sent a petition to the Japanese Foreign Ministry to inquire about the possibility of compensation for the loss of his assets in New Guinea.¹⁴⁶⁾ But the government did not reply.

Some were fortunate to resume their occupations, although it took many years because they had to start again from scratch. Tsurushima opened a new store in Shanghai.¹⁴⁷⁾ Ishibashi found a job as captain of a sight-seeing boat in his home in Misaki in Kanagawa, and Hatamoto managed to start a boat building business in his island in Gotō in Nagasaki.¹⁴⁸⁾ Very likely most others sought support from their relatives and suffered

hardships. Some of those who were separated from their families in New Guinea kept on writing for some years, but later some re-married in Japan.¹⁴⁹⁾

In New Guinea, most wives of the Japanese went back to their home villages. In some cases, their mixed-race children were looked after by the Vunapope Catholic Mission in Kokopo. Oral evidence indicates that the local population showed little bitterness against them. Most were treated like before the war. New Guineans knew that those wives and mixed-race children were different from the Japanese forces. This is manifested well in the oral evidence of New Guinean elders who distinguish the Japanese before the war from the ones during the war and relate their cordial relations with the former.¹⁵⁰⁾ For, example, villagers of Momote remained loyal to their former plantation manager, Ikesaki, and kept the plantation intact until his son, Peter, told them that the land was no longer Ikesaki's and would be returned to the villagers.¹⁵¹⁾

Like those in Japan, generally those left in New Guinea suffered from severe financial hardships. Their breadwinners were taken away and never came back and their pre-war assets and properties had all been destroyed or confiscated by the Japanese and the Australians since the outbreak of the war. Some years after the war, when some local residents began to receive war compensation, some descendants of the Japanese settlers asked about compensation for the losses of their fathers' assets. Andrew Nakamura inquired of the officials at Rabaul, then the Australian High Commission at Port Moresby, but received a blunt reply that he should ask the Japanese government because he was part-Japanese. He then asked an official from the Japanese Embassy, who visited Rabaul after the independence of Papua New Guinea. The official promised to consider the matter but never contacted Peter again.¹⁵²⁾

Conclusion

The Japanese in Papua and New Guinea were victims of imperial policies. Japanese *nanshin-ron* advocates created the image that they were patriots serving the expansion of the Empire. And the Japanese military realised *nanshin* by invading Papua and New Guinea. Naturally that exacerbated the Australian fear of the 'Yellow Peril'. As a result, the Australians eliminated the Japanese from New Guinea. They bitterly recognised New Guinea's strategic importance and thereby the importance to keep their colonial rule tight. This meant elimination of the pre-war Japanese influence from New Guinea, even though such elimination would cause separation of the Japanese families for ever. This was probably the least known tragedy caused by the postwar policy of the Australian government. But the direct cause of the tragedy was the Japanese aggression - the final product of *nanshin-ron*. The event represents well the nature of Japanese imperialism that forced powerless minority people to suffer the most. More depressing to the Japanese settlers and their descendants is that the postwar Japanese government has been ignoring their plea for compensation. Indeed, this is one of the explicit cases that Japanese emigrants are sometimes called

kimin (deserted people).

Notes

- 1) HARMSTORF, I. and CIGLER, M. 1985. *The Germans in Australia*, p. 129, AE Press, Melbourne
- 2) FISCHER, G. 1989. *Enemy Aliens: Internment and the home front experience in Australia 1914–1920*, p. 66, University of Queensland Press, Brisbane
- 3) Department of Defence. 1939. *War Book of the Commonwealth of Australia*, Canberra, p. 2 (Chapter II)
- 4) NAGATA, Y. 1993. *Japanese Internment in Australia during World War II*, p. 69, PhD thesis, University of Adelaide, Adelaide
- 5) Memorandum for the War Cabinet. 9 May 1941. Australian Archives (hereafter AA), MP729/6 65/401/135, 'Internment of Japanese–Policy', Melbourne
- 6) LAMIDEY, N. 1974. *Aliens Control in Australia 1936–46*, p. 53, Sydney
- 7) THRELFALL, N. 1988. *From Mangroves to Frangipani: the story of Rabaul and East New Britain*, p. 361, unpublished, Australia National University, Canberra
- 8) WU, D. 1982. *The Chinese in Papua New Guinea 1880–1980*, p. 40, Chinese University Press, Hong Kong
- 9) McCARTHY, J. 1963. *Patrol into yesterday: my New Guinea years*, p. 179, Cheshire, Sydney
- 10) Interview by the author with Tabuchi, Philip (son of Tabuchi Yoshimatsu), 4 February 1994, Kavieng, Papua New Guinea (hereafter PNG)
- 11) Interview by the author with Hatamoto Otosaku, 3 July 1993, Nagasaki, Japan
- 12) 後藤乾一 1986. 『昭和期日本とインドネシア』. 317頁, 勁草社, 東京. [GOTŌ, K. 1986. *Japan in the Showa period and Indonesia*, p. 317, Keisō shobō, Tokyo]
- 13) Australian archives present inconsistent figures on the Japanese; the Commonwealth Investigation Branch in Queensland recorded 29 Japanese (27 from New Guinea and 2 from Papua) ('Japanese internments', 9 Dec. 41, AA, BP242/1 Q39362, 'Japanese internment action', Queensland), while the Prisoners of War Information Bureau recorded 34 Japanese (33 can be confirmed coming from Papua and New Guinea but one file is misplaced) (AA, MP1103/1 MJ18500-MJ18533, 'Registers of containing "Service and Casualty" Forms ((form A.112)) of Internees and Prisoners of War held in camps in Australia, 1939–1947', Melbourne). The author uses 33 as most accurate figure.
- 14) About Japanese settlers in Papua and New Guinea, see IWAMOTO, H. 1995. 'The origin and development of Japanese settlement in Papua and New Guinea, 1890–1914', *South Pacific Study*, 15 (2): 97–133 and 'The impact of World War I on Japanese settlers in Papua and New Guinea, 1914–1918', *South Pacific Study*, 16 (2): 143–174; 'Japanese southward expansion in the South Seas and its relations to

- Japanese settlers in Papua and New Guinea, 1919–1940’, *South Pacific Study*, 16 (2): 143–174, Kagoshima University South Pacific Research Center, Kagoshima.
- 15) Diary kept by Nagahama Taichi, 8 December 1941; Nagahama’s figure of the Japanese contradicts with that of Australian record. It was sixteen, according to AA, MP1103/1 MJ18500–MJ18533, *ibid.*
 - 16) AA, MP1103/1 MJ18508 and MJ18511, *ibid.*
 - 17) *Ibid.*, MJ18514
 - 18) *Ibid.*, MJ18525, MJF18526, MJF18526A, MJ18526B, MJ18527, MJ18528, MJ18529, MJ18530, MJ18531, MJ18532
 - 19) *Ibid.*, MJ18519
 - 20) *Ibid.*, MJ18533; Dossier, AA, A367 C72587, ‘SASAKI Hikokichi’, Canberra
 - 21) Interview by the author with Andrew Nakamura (son of Nakamura Sōshichi), 23 January 1994, Rabaul, PNG
 - 22) AA, AWM54, ‘Written Records (1939–1945), 780/1/6, Report on the Directorate of Prisoners of War and Internees at Army Headquarters, Melbourne, 1939–1951, Vol. 1, Part 1, Enemy Internees’, p. 4, Australian War Memorial, Canberra
 - 23) *Ibid.*
 - 24) A letter from Nagahama Fusae to Kosaka Zentarō (Foreign Minister), September 1960, possession of Nagahama Fusae, Amakusa, Kumamoto, Japan
 - 25) Interview with Hatamoto, *op. cit.*
 - 26) Diary of Nagahama Taichi, 8 to 26 January 1942, *op. cit.*
 - 27) GILL, J. 1961. ‘The last Days of Rabaul,’ *Journal of the Royal Historical Society of Queensland*, Vol. IV, No. 3, p. 639, Brisbane
 - 28) ‘Memorandum for the Director of Prisoners of War and Internees, Department of the Army,’ 26 May 1947, AA, A518/1 BM836/1, ‘New Guinea miscellaneous. Death of Tom Tanaka (Japanese internee)’, Canberra
 - 29) McCARTHY, *op. cit.*, p. 197
 - 30) *Ibid.*, p. 188
 - 31) WIGMORE, L. 1957. *The Japanese Thrust*, p. 394, Australian War Memorial, Canberra
 - 32) *Ibid.*, p. 396
 - 33) 防衛庁防衛研修所戦史室 1967a. 『南太平洋陸軍作戦』. 56頁, 朝雲新聞社, 東京. [Defence Agency, Defence Training Institute, War History Office. 1967a. *The army’s operations in the South Pacific*, vol. 1. p. 56, Asagumo shinbun sha, Tokyo]
 - 34) 防衛庁防衛研修所戦史室 1967b. 『東部ニューギニア方面陸軍航空作戦』. 5頁, 朝雲新聞社, 東京. [Defence Agency, Defence Training Institute, War History Office. 1967b. *Eastern New Guinea area: the army’s air operations*, p. 5, Asagumo shinbun sha, Tokyo]
 - 35) RYAN, P. 1972. ‘World War II’ In: *Encyclopedia of Papua and New Guinea* (Ed. RYAN, P.), Vol. 2, p. 1223, Melbourne University, Melbourne

- 36) NELSON, H. 1993 September, 'Ol Japan: from incident to generalisation: Papua New Guinea 1942–1945', paper presented to the international conference: 'Stirrup, Sail and Plough: Continental and Maritime influence on Japanese identity', 20th to 23rd September, pp. 7–9, Australian National University, Canberra
- 37) HORNADGE, B. 1971. *The Yellow Peril: A squint at some Australian attitude towards Orientals*, p. 52, Review Publications, Dubbo
- 38) 日本拓殖協会編 1944. 『増補南方文献目録』. 大同書院, 東京. [Japan Colonisation Society (ed.), 1944. *Bibliography of the South Literature, revised edition*. Daidōshoin, Tokyo]; the total number of books and articles for general reference published since the Meiji period to the early 1943 was 2104, and the figure for 1942 was 798.
- 39) *Ibid.*, pp. 233–235, pp. 318–319. The author found about 50 more literature published from 1942 to 1945, but uses the listing of the Japan Colonisation Society because it indicates the general interest of the Japanese during the war.
- 40) About pre-war *nanshin-ron*, see IWAMOTO, H. 1996. 'Japanese southward expansion in the South Seas and its relations to Japanese settlers in Papua and New Guinea, 1919–1940', *South Pacific Study*, 16 (2): 143–174, Kagoshima University South Pacific Research Center, Kagoshima.
- 41) 入江寅次 1943. 『明治南進史稿』, p. 300, 井田書店, 東京. [IRIE, T. 1943. *History of southward advancement in the Meiji period*, p. 300, Ida-shoten, Tokyo]
- 42) 澤田謙 1942. 『山田長政と南進先駆者』, p. 2, 潮文閣, 東京. [SAWADA K. 1942. *Yamada Nagamasa and pioneers of southward advancement*, p. 2, Chōbunkaku, Tokyo]
- 43) 江口礼史郎 1942. 『南進の先駆者 菅沼貞風伝』, 八雲書林, 東京. [EGUCHI, R. 1942. *Autobiography of Suganuma Teifū a pioneer of southward advancement*, Yagumo shorin, Tokyo]; 花園兼定 1942. 『菅沼貞風』, 日本放送出版協会, 東京. [HANAZONO, K. 1942. *Suganuma Teifū Nihon hōsō shuppan kyōkai*, Tokyo]
- 44) 野村愛正 1942. 『ダバオの父 大田恭三郎』, 偕成社, 東京. [NOMURA A. 1942. *Father of Davao, Ōta kyōzaburō*, Kaisei sha, Tokyo]
- 45) 大野吉晴 1942. 『東亜共栄圏とニューギニア』, 167～176頁, 刀江書院, 東京. [ŌNO, Y. 1942. *The East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere and New Guinea*, pp. 167–176, Tōe shoin, Tokyo]; 長倉矯介 1943. 『濠洲及び南太平洋』, 317–327頁, 日本書房, 東京. [NAGAKURA K. 1943. *Australia and the South Pacific*, pp. 317–327, Nihon shobō, Tokyo]; 柴山武徳 1942. 『ニューギニア』, 73–75頁, 日本拓殖協会, 東京. [SHIBAYAMA T. 1942. *New Guinea*, pp. 73–75, Nihon takushoku kyōkai, Tokyo]; 朝日新聞社 1943. 『ニューギニア』, 61頁, 東京. [Asahi shinbun sha, 1943, *New Guinea*, p. 61, Tokyo]; 戸塚轟 1942. 『ニューギニアの開発者』 『外地評論』, 15巻43号, 86–87頁, 東京. [TOTSUKA, G. 1942. 'Developers of New

- Guinea,' *Colonial Review*, pp. 86–87, Vol. 5, No. 43, Tokyo]
- 46) 岡田誠三 1943. 『ニューギニア血戦記』, 202–203頁, 朝日新聞社, 東京. [OKADA S. 1943. *Bloody Battle in New Guinea*, pp. 202–203, Asahi shinbun sha, Tokyo]
 - 47) Oral evidence collected by the author, January to March 1994, Rabaul, Kimbe, Manus, PNG
 - 48) 海野十三, 吉岡専造 1944. 『パプア』, 118頁, 北光書房, 東京. [UMINO J. and YOSHIOKA S. 1944. *Papua*, p. 118, Kitamitsu shobō, Tokyo]
 - 49) 「南の果ての日本教育」 『アサヒグラフ』, 1942年9月2日. 朝日新聞社 1975. 『アサヒグラフに見る昭和の世相 (5)』 所収, 68–69頁, 東京. [‘Japanese education in the far South’, *Asahi gurafu* [Asahi Photograph], 2 September 1942. In: Asahi shinbun sha 1975. *Social aspects seen in Asahi gurafu in the Showa period*, pp. 68–69, Tokyo]
 - 50) All oral evidence confirm that the Japanese soldiers treated well the mixed-race Japanese children.
 - 51) Interview with Tabuchi, op. cit.
 - 52) Interview with Nakamura, Andrew (son of Nakamura Sōshichi), 23 January 1994, Rabaul, PNG
 - 53) Statement of Nagahama in the interview with camp officer at Loveday, date unknown, , A367 C66677, ‘NAGAHAMA Taichi’, Canberra
 - 54) ‘Extracts from general file No.G 7035 / 42–re Japanese internees, Taichi NAGAHAMA,’ 20 January 1943; ‘Property statement–internees, Taichi Nagahama,’ 2 March 1942, *ibid.*
 - 55) ‘Statement of L.L. Robinson of the New Guinea Volunteer Rifles to F. Holland Esquire, a member of the New Guinea Administrative Unit at Wide Bay, South Coast New Britain,’ 27 February 1942, AA, MP1587/1 97E, ‘Evacuation prior to Japanese invasion of Rabaul’, Melbourne
 - 56) ‘Full statement of atrocity or crime by Bernard Wakao Yamashita,’ 17 December 1945, *ibid.*
 - 57) *Ibid.*
 - 58) SCHARMACH, L. 1960. *This crowd beats us all*, pp. 212–213, Catholic Press Newspaper Co., Sydney
 - 59) *Ibid.*
 - 60) Interview by the author with Pius Kikuchi (son of Kikuchi Ichisuke), 18 March 1994, Brisbane, Australia
 - 61) Interview by the author with Michael Asanuma (son of Asanuma Ichimatsu), 21 March 1994, Brisbane, Australia
 - 62) ‘Full statement of atrocity or crime by Alfred Creswick,’ 12 October 1945, AA, AWM54 1010/4/172, ‘Questionnaire of civilians all captured at Rabaul, 23 January 1942’, Australian War Memorial, Canberra
 - 63) Interview by the author with Anthony Asanuma (son of Asanuma Ichimatsu), 19 March 1994, Brisbane, Australia; the same episode was introduced by 水木しげる M

- IZUKI S. (a Japanese veteran who became one of the best-known comic artists), in his factual comic, 「レーモン河畔」 1993, 『幽霊艦長』, 55–102頁, 筑摩書房, 東京. [‘By River Lemon’, *Ghost Captain*, pp. 55–102, Chikuma shobō, Tokyo]
- 64) Interview by the author with Lopar, John; Churuwas, Agnes; Chokoni, Lucas; Nabraposiu, Joseph and Lopra, Matilda (elders), 28 February 1994, Papitelai, Manus, PNG
- 65) Interview by the author with Keksan, Kamui; Pokupeal, Sotil; Ngapen, Amos; Pombuai, Hendry; Kahu, Kaspar and Sandrel, Simon (elders), 14 February 1994, Pityilu Island, Manus, PNG
- 66) Interview by the author with Namari, Kesaya (grand daughter of Tamiya Mabe), 30 December 1993, Biwa village; Tetu, Billy (grandson of Tamiya Mabei), 25 December 1993, Basilaki Island, Milne Bay, PNG
- 67) Interview by the author with Tanaka, Mary (daughter of Tanaka Taichirō), 22 December 1993, Samarai, Milne Bay, PNG.
- 68) ‘Curriculum vitae’, date unknown, AA, 471/1 81211, ‘War crimes. Proceedings of Military Tribunal. Tashiro Tsunesuke’, Canberra
- 69) Extract from 竹田光次 1943. 「南方の軍政」. 防衛庁防衛研修所戦史室編 1985. 『南方の軍政』所収, 183頁, 朝雲新聞社, 東京. [TAKEDA, K. 1943. ‘Civil administration in the South’. In: War History Office, Defence Training Institute, Defence Agency (ed.) 1985. *Civil administration in the South*, p. 183, Asagumo shinbun sha, Tokyo]
- 70) ‘Curriculum vitae’, op. cit.
- 71) ‘Curriculum vitae’, ibid.; 草鹿任一 1968. 『ラバウル戦線異常なし』, 74–77頁, 光和堂, 東京. [KUSAKA, J. 1968. *All quiet on the Rabaul Front*, pp. 74–77, Kōwadō, Tokyo
- 72) This is undoubtedly Normanby.
- 73) 草鹿, 前掲書, 75–77頁. [KUSAKA, op. cit., pp. 75–77]
- 74) Ibid., p. 77
- 75) A.I.B., Report on Bougainville–New Ireland–Choiseul (B.S.I.P.) Network, 21 Sep 44 to 31 May 1945, in LONG, G. 1963. *The Final Campaigns*, p. 137, Australian War Memorial, Canberra; a similar comment was made in FELDT, E. 1946. *The Coast Watchers*, pp. 136–137, Oxford University Press, Melbourne
- 76) Interview by the author with Pulau, Joseph (elder from Bougainville; the first Bougainvillean doctor and now lives in Rabaul), 25 January 1994, Rabaul, PNG
- 77) Read to Commander, H.Q. 8 M.D., 19 September 1946, AA, A471/1 81211, op. cit. 78)
- Interview with Asanuma, op. cit.
- 79) BEVEGE, op. cit., p. 194
- 80) NAGATA, op. cit., p. 192
- 81) BEVEGE, op. cit., p. 144

- 82) Diary of Nagahama, 27 and 28 January 1942, op. cit.
- 83) Ibid., 11 February to 20 July 1942
- 84) NAGATA, op. cit., p. 164
- 85) Diary of Nagahama, 10 May to 4 July 1943, op. cit.
- 86) Ibid., 12 May 1943
- 87) Advertiser South Australia 1946. *Internment in South Australia*, p. 21, Adelaide
- 88) Interview with Hatamoto, op. cit.
- 89) Diary of Nagahama, 4 July 1943, op. cit.
- 90) Interview with Hatamoto, op. cit.
- 91) BEVEGE, op. cit. p. 150. One exception was the uprising at Cowra Camp in August 1944. But the incident did not affect the Japanese in other camps: the Japanese in Loveday Camp indeed assured the camp authority that they did not follow suit.
- 92) Advertiser South Australia, op. cit., p. 10
- 93) Ibid., pp. 14–15
- 94) 'MJ.18518 NAGAHAMA Taichi—lending of money to internees,' 25 August 1943, AA, A367/1 C666777, op. cit.
- 95) Ibid.
- 96) 'Ref these H Q memo 8267 of 21 Aug 43,' 10 November 1943, AA, D1901 N2781, 'Taichi NAGAHAMA', Adelaide
- 97) Nagahama to Onoue, 16 November 1943, ibid.
- 98) 'Ref. this H Q memo 10044 of 10 Nov 43', 28 January 1944, ibid.
- 99) DAWS, G. 1994. *Prisoners of the Japanese: POWs of World War II in the Pacific*, pp. 307–314, William Morrow and Company, Inc., New York
- 100) Advertiser South Australia, op. cit., p. 25
- 101) 'War Diary of Intelligence Summary, 14CD Loveday camp,' 30 May 1945, AA, AWM52, 8/7/42, 'War Diaries, Loveday Internment Group, 1943–1946', Australian War Memorial, Canberra
- 102) 10 July 1945, ibid.
- 103) 20 November 1945, ibid.
- 104) 31 December 1946, ibid.
- 105) 'Coroners ACT, 1935, South Australia,' date unknown, AA, A518/1 BM836/1, 'New Guinea miscellaneous. Death of Tom Tanaka (Japanese internee)', Canberra
- 106) 'War Diary of Intelligence Summary, 14CD Loveday camp,' 24 October 1944, op. cit. 107)
Tatura Internment Group Routine Orders No. 294. Part I,' 21 October 1945, AA, AWM52, 8/7/43, 'Tatura Internment Group, 1944–1947', Australian War Memorial, Canberra
- 108) 'Interviews with Japanese internees at no. 4 camp, Tatura', 23 July 1946, AA, A367 C72533, 'ASANUMA Ichimatsu', Canberra
- 109) Morel to Evatt, 5 February 1945, AA, A1066 IC45/16/2/2, 'International co-

- operation communications with enemy countries. Japanese occupied territories. Rabaul', Canberra
- 110) 'Interviews with Japanese internees at no. 4 camp, Tatura', 22 July 1946, AA, A367 C72534, 'HAGIWARA Hikota'; A367 C72587, 'SASAKI Hikokichi', Canberra
- 111) The Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs, London to Prime Minister's Department, Canberra, 22 July 1943, AA, A1608/1 AF20/1/1 Part 2, 'Prime Minister's Department War Records—prisoners of war—Part 2', Canberra
- 112) Memorandum for the camp commandant, Loveday, S.A., 8 February 1946, AA, A1066/4 IC45/1/11/5, 'Internees in Australia Japanese. Release', Canberra. Some petitions of ex-residents in Australia to release in Australia are kept in the same file. 113)
- Nominal roll: internees marched out to Tatura Internment Group, 28 February 1946, AA, AWM52, 8/7/42, 'War Diaries, Loveday Internment Group, 1943–1946', Australian War Memorial, Canberra
- 114) 'Order for repatriation under Regulation 20C of the National Security (Aliens Control) Regulations,' Minister of State for Immigration, 23 February 1946, AA, A437 46/6/72, 'Japanese Internees (a) Release in Australia (b) Deportation Part 1', Canberra
- 115) Minister for Immigration to Attorney-General, March 1946, *ibid.*
- 116) Col. Lloyd to Attorney-General, 24 January 1946, *ibid.*
- 117) 'Interview with Japanese internees,' 22 July 1946, AA, A367 C72533, 'ASANUMA Ichimatsu'; C72534, 'HAGIWARA Hikota'; C72537, 'IKEZAKI Tokuyoshi'; C72538, 'IZUMI Eikichi'; C72539, 'ENDO Shigetaro'; C72540, 'KIMURA Hideichiro', C72546, 'KIKUCHI Ichisuke'; C72587, 'SASAKI Hikokichi' and C72588, 'MURAKAMI Heijiro', Canberra
- 118) Browne to the Secretary of the Department of External Territories, 23 August 1946, AA, A373/1 11505/48, 'Japanese internees', Canberra
- 119) 'Case No. 91. KIMURA Hideichiro,' date unknown, *ibid.*
- 120) Secretary of the Department of External Territories to the Director-General of Security, 25 September 1946, *ibid.*
- 121) Secretary of the Pacific Territory Association to Minister of External Affairs, 18 August 1945, AA, A518/1 BB836/2, 'New Guinea miscellaneous use of Japanese prisoners of war—T.N.G.', Canberra
- 122) Secretary of the Department of External Territories to the Director-General of Security, 25 September 1946, *op. cit.*
- 123) Interview by the author with the descendants of Ikesaki, Kikuchi, Asanuma, Izumi, Endō, Nakamura, Murakami and Tanaka families, December 1993 to March 1994, PNG and Australia
- 124) Browne to Secretary of Attorney-General's Department, 2 October 1946, AA, A373/1 11505/48, *op. cit.*
- 125) *Ibid.*; Murray to Secretary of Attorney-General's Department, 20 February 1947,

- ibid.
- 126) 'Japanese Internees Ex-islands', 5 September 1947, AA, A472 W32123, 'Re-admission of Japanese to Papua-New Guinea Island Group and related area', Canberra 127)
Browne to Secretary of Attorney-General's Department, 5 March 1947; Murray to Secretary of Attorney-General's Department, 20 February 1947, AA, A373/1 11505 /48, op. cit.
- 128) 'Re Return to the Territory of Japanese Internees' by Phillips, 12 January 1948, ibid.
- 129) Ibid.
- 130) Notes taken from telephone conversation with the Assistant Secretary of the Department of External Territories for inclusion in a Minute to the Minister for External Territories, 29 September 1947, ibid.
- 131) Browne to Colonel Griffin, 15 April 1947, ibid.
- 132) 'New Guinea Japanese Internees,' 1 August 1947, AA, A437 46/6/72, op. cit.
- 133) Chambers to the cabinet, 6 January 1949, AA, A6006/1 2nd CHIFLEY NOV.46–DEC.49, 'Deportation of Japanese internees from Papua New Guinea', Canberra
- 134) Interview by the author with Uradok (elder from Matupi, a tour guide for Japanese veterans), 17 January 1994, Rabaul, PNG; only two graves were not thrown into the sea and are now kept in the Kokopo Museum.
- 135) Chambers to the cabinet, 6 January 1949, op. cit.
- 136) Interview by the author with the descendants of Ikesaki, Kikuchi, Asanuma, Nakamura, Endō and Izumi, January to March 1994, PNG and Australia
- 137) Interview by the author with Ehret, Gordon, 22 March 1994, Brisbane, Australia
- 138) Ibid. Ehret was sobbing when he was telling this to the author. He now has very good relations with Asanuma's sons in Brisbane who migrated to Australia.
- 139) Interview by the author with Pearse, Dick (ex-administration official and now an agent of customs in Manus), 14 February 1994, Lorengau, Manus, PNG
- 140) Chambers to the cabinet, 6 January 1949, op. cit.
- 141) *Territory of Papua Report 1945–1946*, p. 13, Canberra
- 142) *Territory of Papua Report 1946–1947*, p. 14, Canberra
- 143) Interview with Tanaka, Mary, op. cit.
- 144) Interview by the author with Murakami, Kalo (son of Murakami Heijirō), 4 January 1994, Misima, Milne Bay, PNG
- 145) 'War damage to property regulations: claims of Taichi Nagahama, D.J. Hill, Delegate of the Controller of Enemy Property,' 11 September 1961, AA, A1379 EP/J/851 Sect O, 'Taichi Nagahama & Others. Claim on Aliens Compensation Fund', Canberra
- 146) A letter from Nagahama Fusae to Kosaka Zentarō (Foreign Minister), September 1960, possession of Nagahama Fusae, Amakusa, Kumamoto, Japan

- 147) A letter to the author from Satō Sadako (grand daughter of Tsurushima), 4 June 1993
- 148) A letter to the author from Hatamoto Otosaku, 26 May 1993
- 149) Asanuma, Ikesaki and Nakamura re-married in Japan.
- 150) Oral evidence collected by the author, December 1993 to March 1994, PNG and Australia
- 151) Interview by the author with Peter Ikesaki (son from the third wife of Ikesaki Tokuyoshi), 26 January 1994, Rabaul, PNG
- 152) Interview with Nakamura, *op. cit.*; the author also inquired to the Japanese Embassy in Port Moresby about the compensation but have not received a reply, either.

(Accepted 1 December, 1996)

The campaign in New Guinea. Allied reorganization. The Central Pacific Islands. The Japanese war plan, aimed at the American, British, and Dutch possessions in the Pacific and in Southeast Asia, was of a rather makeshift character. The first draft, submitted by the chiefs of the Army and Navy General Staff, was accepted by Imperial General Headquarters early in September 1941. The lateness of the draft was due largely to the long indecision about going to war with such powerful countries, but partly to the complicated system of command. Learn about Japan's pre-World War II invasions, joining of the Axis powers, and attack on Pearl Harbor. Key dates for New Zealand military involvement in the Pacific during the Second World War. 13 December: Battle of the River Plate - New Zealand cruiser HMS Achilles involved in battle with German pocket battleship Admiral Graf Spee. 1940. 5 January: First Echelon embarks for the Middle East. 5 June: New Zealand begins raising an infantry brigade group for Fiji. 10 June: Italy declares war on Great Britain and France. 11 June: Australia, New Zealand and South Africa declare war on Italy. 20 August: German raider Orion sinks the steamer Turakina off Cape Egmont. 16 August: Heavy Allied air attacks on Japanese at Wewak, Papua New Guinea. 3 October: 3 NZ Division secures Vella Lavella. 5 October: US force attacks Wake Island. "War in the Pacific" redirects here. For the war between Chile, Bolivia, and Peru in 1879-1884, see War of the Pacific. "Pacific Theater of World War II" redirects here. For the US military area of operations, see Pacific Ocean Areas. In the United States, the term Pacific Theater was widely used, although this was a misnomer in relation to the Allied campaign in Burma, the war in China and other activities within the South-East Asian Theater. However, the US Armed Forces considered the China-Burma-India Theater to be distinct from the Asiatic-Pacific Theater during the conflict. These units assisted the Japanese war effort in their respective territories.[citation needed]. Germany and Italy both had limited involvement in the Pacific War. Tai Noson Shakairon [The Dynamic Relationship between Thai Peasant Society and the Outside World from a Diachronic Perspective]. By Kitahara Atsushi. Tokyo: Keisoshobo, 1990. Pp. viii, 485. Pictures, Illustrations, Tables, Notes, Bibliographies, Index. [In Japanese and Thai.] - Volume 26 Issue 2 - Harumi Furuie. Read more. Join ResearchGate to discover and stay up-to-date with the latest research from leading experts in New Guinea and many other scientific topics. Join for free. ResearchGate iOS App. By HIROMITSU IWAMOTO. Canberra: The Journal of Pacific History, 1999. Pp.viii, 179, Tables, Maps, Illustrations, Bibliography, Index. HIROSHI SHIMIZU (a1). (a1). Aichi Shukutoku University. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022463401210054>. Published online by Cambridge University Press: 08 October 2001.