

What Should the “Pacific War” be Named?

A Study of the Debate in Japan

Jun’ichiro Shoji *

Abstract

In Japan, a variety of names were given to the war Japan had fought during the World War II period because of the effects of disunity in the objectives of the war at its opening, the U.S. occupation policy after the war and the “politicalization” of the perception of Japan’s modern and contemporary history, resulting in heated arguments. Therefore, most of the names in use are ideologically biased, and the name *The Last War* is used publicly.

Among the names given, those meaning the war after December 8, 1941, are *Pacific War*, *Greater East Asia War* and *Asia-Pacific War*. Considering these names in the context of regional connotations, whereas *Greater East Asia War* and *Asia-Pacific War* indicate the battlefields where Japan waged war, *Pacific War* conveys a strong image of war between Japan and the United States in the Pacific Ocean. On the other hand, *World War II*, which is international and carries no bias, does not convey any sense of belonging, not only in time and geography but also emotionally.

Thus, although the term *Pacific War* is currently used widely, the author believes it more appropriate to call the war, including battles on the Chinese front after December 8, 1941, *Greater East Asia War* or *Asia-Pacific War*, while not attaching any ideological connotation to these two names as has previously been the practice.

Introduction

At present, a diversity of names are being used for the war Japan had fought in the Showa era, including *Pacific War*, *Greater East Asia War*, *15-Year War* and *Asia-Pacific War*.¹ Needless to say, it is not uncommon for countries to give different names to the same war,² and there are few cases where different names are used in a single country to refer to the same war.

In the case of Japan in particular, the divided historical perception of the war affects the naming of the war, giving with more political connotations involved. For instance, Ikuhiko Hata, a historian, points out, “While some people may say they cannot care less about the naming, as ‘People’s names often show what they are like,’ it is true that the naming of the war has served as an ‘allegiance test’ to determine an author’s fundamental historical perspective.”³

As recently as October 2008, when then Prime Minister Taro Aso said, “I think the Sino–Japanese War of 1894–95 and the Russo–Japanese War are a little different from the

* Director, Center for Military History, National Institute for Defense Studies.

¹ While *XV-Year War* and *Asian Pacific War* are sometimes used, the author sticks with *15-Year War* and *Asia-Pacific War* in this paper.

² For example, *Korean War* as referred to in Japan is called *War in Korea* or 6.25 in South Korea, *Fatherland Liberation War* in North Korea, *Korean War* in the United States, and the *War to Resist U.S. Aggression and Aid Korea* in China.

³ Ikuhiko Hata, *Showashi wo Jusosuru (Pass Longitudinally through the Showa History)*, Graphsha, 1984, p. 141.

so-called *Greater East Asia War* and World War II in nature,” the media reported his remarks with the headlines, “PM Phrases the War as *Greater East Asia War*,” inviting denunciations by North Korea and some other countries.⁴

An editorial on the anniversary of Japan’s surrender in World War II in one newspaper pointed out that the absence of the unified name of the war is one reason why Japan has been unable to sum up the past for so long, and though “we have written stories on *Pacific War* like an idiomatic phrase,” reporters’ perceptions of the war are being tested going forward and “the naming of the war is an important homework assignment for journalism.”⁵

And so, this paper is designed to be of some help in considering how we should deal with the naming of the war, proceeding to analyze historical developments surrounding the naming of the war, characteristics and problems, as well as the frequency of use of each name given to the war.⁶

1. Historical Developments Surrounding the Naming of the War

(1) Determination of *Greater East Asia War*

Until the name of *Greater East Asia War* was officially determined, war names with names of countries Japan was fighting against were used, such as *War against the United States, Britain, the Netherlands and Chiang*, as seen in such documents as “Plan Concerning the Promotion of the End of the War against the United States, Britain, the Netherlands and Chiang,” “Outline of the Guidance for the War against the United States, Britain, the Netherlands” and “Summary of Explanations of the Minister of Finance Concerning Judgment on the Fiscal and Financial Endurance Capacity in the War against the United States, Britain, the Netherlands.”⁷

On December 10, 1941, after the opening of the war, Imperial General Headquarters-Government Liaison Conference made the following decision on the “Matter Concerning the Naming of the Latest War and the Demarcation Point of Wartime and Peacetime”:

1. The latest war against the United States and Britain and war that may arise depending on future developments of the situation, including the China Incident, shall be named *Greater East Asia War*.
2. The demarcation point between wartime and peacetime shall be 1:30 a.m. on December 8, 1941.

⁴ *Asahi Shimbun*, October 1, 2008 and October 18, 2008; *Yomiuri Shimbun*, October 1, 2008. Then Prime Minister Yoshiro Mori in January 2001, and Hosei Norota, then Chairman of the House of Representatives Budget Committee, in February 2001, used the term *Greater East Asia War*, causing controversies.

⁵ “Shasetsu Ano Senso wo Nan to Yobuka (Editorial: How Should We Call That War?),” *Shizuoka Shimbun*, August 15, 2009.

⁶ Earlier studies on the naming of the war include Jun’ichiro Kisaka, “Aja/Taiheiyo Senso no Kosho to Seikaku (Naming and Characteristics of the Asia-Pacific War),” *Ryukoku Hogaku*, Vol. 25, No. 4, March 1993; Natsuo Sakamoto, “‘Daitoa Senso’ oyobi ‘Taiheiyo Senso’ no Kosho ni Kansuru Ichikosatsu — Ryo Kosho ni tsuiteno Iken to Sorera no Shiyo wo Chushin to Site (Jo)/(Ge) (A Study on the Naming of *Greater East Asia War* and *Pacific War* — Centering on Opinions on Both Names and Their Use (1/2)/(2/2)),” *Kurume National College of Technology Research Paper*, No. 29 and No. 30, March and August 1978.

⁷ Koki Ota, “‘Daitoa Senso’ no Kosho Kettei ni tsuite (Concerning the Determination of the Naming of *Greater East Asia War*,” *Gunjishigaku*, Vol. 13, No. 3, December 1977, pp. 16–17.

The above decision was officially endorsed at a cabinet meeting on December 12, making *Greater East Asia War* the official name. In discussions about the naming of war, the Navy pushed for *Pacific War* or *War against the United States and Britain*, arguing that the main enemies are the United States and Britain and the main theater of war is the Pacific Ocean. Various other names were also proposed, including *Koa War* (War for the development of Asia), which demonstrated naming with a clearer political purpose. However, these names were judged inappropriate particularly when the China Incident (the Chinese front) was included, and ultimately *Greater East Asia War* was adopted, in consideration of the possibility of the Soviet Union joining the war.⁸ Incidentally, it was then expressed as *Greater East Asia War* in English.⁹

The term *Greater East Asia* was first used by the second Fumimaro Koneo Cabinet in the “Basic Points of National Policy,” decided upon its inauguration on July 26, 1940, which stated that the important thing was to “build a new order of Greater East Asia on the foundation of the strong unity among Japan, Manchuria and China.” Further on August 1, 1940, Foreign Minister Yosuke Matsuoka in his statement referred to the “establishment of the Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere with Japan, Manchuria and China as part of it,” using the term “Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere” for the first time.¹⁰ In the statement, Matsuoka said that the “Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere” is “equivalent to the sphere previously referred to as the “East Asia New Order Sphere” or the “East Asia Stability Sphere” and broadly encompasses southern regions such as the Dutch East Indies and French Indochina, of which with Japan, Manchuria and China form one part.”¹¹ In other words, the “Greater East Asia” broadly meant a region that adds southern regions such as Southeast Asia to East Asia, then called “Japan, Manchuria and China.”

Following the cabinet decision, Cabinet Information Bureau on the same day issued a statement, “The latest war against the United States and Britain, including the China Incident, shall be called *Greater East Asia War*. The naming of *Greater East Asia War* means that the war has the purpose of building a new order in the Greater East Asia and does not mean that the theater of war shall be limited to the ‘Greater East Asia.’”

On February 17, 1942, the cabinet adopted Act No. 9 that stipulated, “References to the ‘China Incident’ in all laws shall be changed to *Greater East Asia War* unless otherwise prescribed by imperial decree.” Further, Imperial General Headquarters-Government Liaison Conference held on February 28 of the same year decided on “regions in the ‘Greater East Asia’ where the new order should be constructed under the leadership of the Empire of Japan,” designating regions in the “Greater East Asia” as “Japan, Manchuria and China as well as southern regions between 90

⁸ War History Office, National Defense College, Defence Agency, *Daihon’ei Rikugun-Bu 3* (Conduct of Army Operations by Imperial Headquarters Vol. 3), Asagumo Shimbunsha, 1970, pp. 192–194; War History Office, National Defense College, Defence Agency, *Daihon’ei Kaigun-Bu Rengo Kantai 2* (Conduct of Navy Operations by Imperial Headquarters and Combined Fleet Headquarters Vol. 2), Asagumo Shimbunsha, 1975, pp. 102–103; War History Office, National Defense College, Defence Agency, *Daihon’ei Rikubun-Bu Kaisen Keii 5* (Army Department of Imperial Headquarters: Transition of Circumstances as to Outbreak of the Greater East Asia War Vol. 5), Asagumo Shimbunsha, 1974, p. 569; Suketaka Tanemura, *Daihon’ei Kimitsu Nisshi* (Imperial Headquarters Confidential Journal), Fuyo Shobo, 1979, p. 146.

⁹ Ota, “‘Daitoa Senso’ no Kosho Kettei ni tsuite, p. 17.

¹⁰ Kimitada Miwa, “‘Toa Shin Chitsujo’ Sengen to ‘Daitoa Kyoeiken’ Koso no Danzetsu (Gap between the Declaration of ‘New Order of East Asia’ and the ‘Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere’ Concept),” Kimitada Miwa ed., *Saiko Teiheiyō Senso Zenya* (Revisiting the Eve of the Pacific War), Soseiki, 1981, pp. 222–226.

¹¹ *Tokyo Asahi Shimbun*, August 2, 1940 (evening edition).

degrees of east longitude and 180 degrees of east longitude and north of 10 degrees south latitude. Other regions shall be determined in accordance with developments in the situation.”

In the course of the above developments, a major issue arose. It involved the origin of the naming of *Greater East Asia War*, and the question was whether it was the geography-based naming, like *Pacific War* proposed by the Navy, or whether the naming was based on the war purpose of “building the ‘Greater East Asia New Order,’” as seen in the statement of the Cabinet’s Information Bureau. Shiro Hara (Army Major), who was then on the staff of the Imperial Headquarters, wrote in his memoirs later that he “could not help but think that the Information Bureau must have gone out of its mind” upon hearing the Information Bureau’s statement.¹² In the background was the prevailing confusion over the purpose of the war. That is, “As there were those who emphasized the purpose of the war is self-existence and self-defense, those who argued for the dual purposes of self-defense and construction of the ‘Greater East Asia new order’ and those who regarded construction of the ‘Greater East Asia new order’ as the primary war purpose, there was complete lack of unity in ideas.”¹³

At any rate, it cannot be denied that disunity over the war purpose has had a great impact on subsequent debates over the naming of the war, with the focus on the pros and cons of the term *Greater East Asia War*.

(2) Prohibition of *Great East Asia War* and the Birth of *Pacific War*

Even after the end of the war, *Greater East Asia War* was in use for a while, as seen in the promulgation of the “Greater East Asia War Investigation Committee Organization” by the Kijuro Shidehara Cabinet on November 24, 1945. On December 15, 1945, however, the General Headquarters of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Power (GHQ) issued to the Japanese government a memorandum on “Abolition of governmental sponsorship, support, perpetuation, control and dissemination of State Shinto (Kokka Shinto, Jinja Shinto)” (the so-called “Shinto Directive”) for the purpose of separating Shinto from the state, depriving Shinto doctrines of driving militaristic and ultra-nationalistic ideas, and driving Shinto education out of schools. The directive stated that “the use of such words as *Greater East Asia War* and ‘Hakko Ichiu’ (the whole world under one roof) as well as other Japanese words whose meanings are closely connected with State Shinto, militarism and ultra-nationalism in official documents shall be prohibited, and therefore the use of such words shall be stopped immediately.” In accordance with the memorandum, the “Greater East Asia War Investigation Committee” established earlier was renamed to the “War Investigation Committee” on January 11, 1946, and the term *Greater East Asia War* used in official documents was all changed to *War*.¹⁴ On December 20, 1945, The Ministry of Education conveyed the GHQ memorandum to schools and other organizations under its jurisdiction in the vice ministerial circular.

The government, meanwhile, decided to replace *Greater East Asia War* with the *Latest War* provisionally but the official name was never determined subsequently, with such terms as *Last War*

¹² Shiro Hara, “‘Daitoa Senso’ to iu Na no Senso (The War with the Name of *Greater East Asia War*),” *Daitoa (Taiheiyo) Senso Senshi Soshō* (Greater East Asia (Pacific) War War History Series), Vol. 65 Appendix, Asagumo Shimbunsha, May 1973, p. 3.

¹³ War History Office, National Defense College, Defence Agency, *Daihon’ei Rikubun-Bu Kaisen Keii* 5, p. 570.

¹⁴ Masaomi Yui, “Senryo-ki ni okeru ‘Taiheiyo Senso’ Kan no Keisei (Formation of *Pacific War* View during the Occupation Period),” *Shikan*, No. 130, March 1994, p. 5.

and *World War II* in use publicly, in addition to *Latest War*.¹⁵

The “Shinto Directive” targeted official documents, but the GHQ almost simultaneously tightened regulations on newspapers, magazines and other publications. The GHQ announced the “Memorandum on the Distribution of News” on September 10, 1945, and then the “Press Code” on September 19. Based on these, the GHQ distributed “Detailed Regulations for Guidelines for Censorship Based on the Press Code.” The detailed regulations said the GHQ would subject all publications issued in Japan to ex ante censorship or ex post facto censorship by the GHQ’s Civil Censorship Detachment, and further stated “the use of wartime terms such as *Greater East Asia War*, ‘Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere,’ ‘Hakko Ichiu’ and ‘Eirei’ (the souls of the departed war heroes) should be avoided.”¹⁶

As a result, *Asahi Shimbun* (morning edition) on December 7, 1945, the anniversary of the opening of the war, in an editorial, entitled “Repentance for the Pearl Harbor Incident,” wrote that “*Pacific War* extended from the China Incident, while the China Incident started from the Manchurian Incident,” underscoring the continuity using the term *Pacific War*. This was the first instance that *Pacific War* was used in *Asahi Shimbun* in the postwar period.¹⁷

Furthermore, between December 8, the fourth anniversary of the Pearl Harbor attack, and December 17, various newspapers published serialized articles, “The Pacific War History — The Collapse of Militarist Japan without Truth,” sponsored by the GHQ. The GHQ’s Civil Information and Education Section (CI&E) prepared the stories, which were edited by officials in charge of war history at the Assistant Chief of Staff (G-3).¹⁸ The stories depicted *Pacific War* as the war continuously fought from the China Incident and emphasized the role of the U.S. Forces in the main theater of war in the Pacific Ocean, and featured detailed descriptions of atrocities by Japanese troops, such as the Nanjing Incident and the “Bataan Death March.”¹⁹ These interpretations were consistent with the rulings of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East, which determined a series of invasions by Japan since the Manchurian Incident were the results of the “criminal conspiracy” of a group of militarists. In particular, it was pointed out that these newspaper articles “have played a historical role in that they have introduced the naming of *Pacific War* into the language space of Japanese.”²⁰

The serialized articles were published in a book, the GHQ Civil Information and Education Section (translated by Kenichi Nakaya), “The Pacific War History — From the Mukden Incident to the Unconditional Surrender,” from Takayama Shoin in March 1946. The book’s 100,000 copies were sold out, and the GHQ instructed the use of the book at schools. For the publication, the term *Greater East Asia War* used twice in the “afterword by the translator” by Nakaya, shown below, was revised to *Pacific War* in the ex ante censorship by the GHQ’s Civil Censorship Detachment.

¹⁵ Yomiuri Shimbunsha ed., *20 Seiki Donna Jidai Datta noka Senso Hen Nippon no Senso* (What Era Was the 20th Century? War Volume Japanese Wars), Yomiuri Shimbunsha, 1999, p. 520.

¹⁶ Sozo Matsuura, *Zohokaitei-ban Senryo-ka no Genron Danatsu* (Enlarged and Revised Edition Suppression of Free Speech under the Occupation), Gendai Journalism Shuppankai, 1969, 49–51, pp. 59–61.

¹⁷ Ginjiro Takeichi, “Daitoa Senso to Taiheiyo Senso (The Greater East Asia War and the Pacific War),” *Seiron*, September 1996 issue, p. 281.

¹⁸ Jun Eto, *Tozasareta Gengo Kuukan — Senryo-gun no Kenetu to Sengo* (The Closed Language Space — The Occupation Forces’ Censorship and the Postwar Period), Bungei Shunju, 1989, p. 227.

¹⁹ Yui, “Senryo-ki ni okeru ‘Taiheiyo Senso’ Kan no Keisei, p. 3.

²⁰ Eto, *Tozasareta Gengo Kuukan*, p. 230.

“For the first time, through this book, we were told that the responsibility or the cause of the latest war lay not only in *Greater East Asia War* but was traced back far to the Manchurian Incident, and we were also able to understand how reckless *Greater East Asia War* was for Japan.”²¹

After Japan regained independence upon signing the peace treaty, the “Act on Repeal of the Imperial Ordinance on Orders Issued Incidental to Acceptance of the Potsdam Declaration” (Act No. 81), promulgated on April 11, 1952, stated that orders issued incidental to the acceptance of the Potsdam Declaration “shall have the legal effects for a limited period of 180 days from the date of enforcement of this act unless measures concerning the repeal or continuation of these orders are taken under a separate act.” As the Japanese government subsequently did not take any measure either to repeal or continue with a memorandum on the abolition of the name of *Greater East Asia War*, it has now already lost its validity.

2. Characteristics and Problems of Each Naming of the War in Japan

In this chapter, the origins of the respective names of the war in Japan, reasons for their use and problems the respective names contain are analyzed.

(1) *Pacific War*

(i) Origin

Pacific War was proposed by the Navy at the time of the opening of the war, but there were cases where the name was used before that as the name of the war between Japan and the United States anticipated in the future. The oldest relevant books were *The Pacific War*, a chronicle of a future Japan–U.S. war, published in 1925, and *The Pacific War and Its Criticism*, a book on the preceding book with critical comments, published in the following year.²²

The pioneering work in the postwar period was the aforementioned “The Pacific War History” by the GHQ, first published in the serialized newspaper articles. In the 1950s, a book by Tokuzo Aoki, who was director-general of the War Committee disbanded by the GHQ, Nippon Gaiko Gakkai, and Rekishigaku Kenkyukai (the Historical Science Society of Japan) was published.²³ The book did not refer to the reason why the Historical Science Society of Japan, which subscribes to the Marxist view of history, used *Pacific War* in its joint studies. But the foreword of the new edition (Aoki Shoten, 1971–1973) stated: “The title of The History of *Pacific War* that gives too much weight to the war between Japan and the United States is not necessarily appropriate, and the History of World War II or the History of *15-Year War* focusing on Japan more closely correspond to the contents of the book, but these names of the war are not yet used commonly. And we cannot

²¹ Ibid., p. 231.

²² Hector C. Baywater, *The Pacific War*, translated by Toshikazu Hori, Minyusha, 1925 (Hector C. Baywater, *The Great Pacific War; a History of the American–Japanese Campaign of 1931–33*, London: Constable & Co. Ltd, 1925.); Hector C. Baywater, *The Pacific War and Its Criticism*, translated by Tota Ishimaru, Bunmei Kyokai Jimusho, 1926.

²³ Tokuzo Aoki, *Taiheiyo Senso Zenshi* (The History Prior to the Pacific War) [a total of six volumes], Sekai Heiwa Kensetsu Kyokai and Gakujutsu Bunken Fukyukai, 1950–1952; Nippon Gaiko Gakkai ed., *Taiheiyo Senso Genin Ron* (Pacific War Aetiology), Shinbun Gekkannsha, 1953; Rekishigaku Kenkyukai (the Historical Science Society of Japan) ed., *Taiheiyo Sensoshi* (History of the Pacific War) [a total of five volumes], Toyo Keizai, 1953–1954.

use the History of *Greater East Asia War* that glorifies Japan’s invasion. Therefore, we settled with the more widely used name of the History of *Pacific War* for reason of convenience.”²⁴

Similarly, Shigeki Toyama, Seiichi Imai and Akira Fujiwara, *Showashi* (History of Showa) (Iwanami Shoten, 1955, the new edition: 1959), which attracted public attention by causing the “Showa history debate,” also used *Pacific War*.

In the 1960s, a book edited by the Department of Research into the Cause of the Pacific War of the Japan Association of International Relations, which has the view of history different from that of Marxism, *Taiheiyo Senso heno Michi* (The Road to the Pacific War) [a total of eight volumes, Asahi Shimbun Co., 1962–1963], explained the reason why it used *Pacific War* in the book’s title as follows in response to inquiries by readers:²⁵

“After thorough discussions, we decided to adopt *Sino–Japanese War* in place of the ‘China Incident’ and *Pacific War* in place of *Greater East Asia War*. We made the decision from the standpoint of using the naming in terms of international politics that views the war from the relationships among states rather than the unilateral naming form Japan’s standpoint... Actually in the academic circles, ‘War in the Pacific’ is being used internationally.”

The naming of *Pacific War* has come to take firm root, following the subsequent publication of such distinguished books carrying *Pacific War* in their titles as Noboru Kojima, *Taiheiyo Senso* (1/2), (2/2) (*Pacific War* (1/2), (2/2)), Saburo Ienaga, *Taiheiyo Senso* (*Pacific War*), and Shigeru Hayashi, *Nihon no Rekisi 25 Taiheiyo Senso* (*Japanese History 25: The Pacific War*).²⁶

However, Ienaga explained the reason why he used the title of *Pacific War* as follows:

“Precisely speaking, it should be called *15-Year War*...However, while the naming of *15-Year War* is being used by some people and books incorporating it in their titles are being published, I do not think the term has gained enough currency to be understood by every ordinary citizen...I cannot use the term *World War II* either for this book whose perspective is limited only to the aspects that Japan was directly involved in.”

Ienaga also stated that whereas *Pacific War* does not necessarily reflect the standpoint of the United States alone as seen in the fact that the Navy proposed that naming before the opening of the war, the term “does not necessarily possess the complete scientific objectivity” in that it ignores the Chinese front and places too much weight on the war between Japan and the United States, and he “had no alternative but to use *Pacific War* as the term with relatively less inappropriateness for reasons of convenience, in addition to finding it difficult to use *15-Year War* or *World War II* as the title for [my] book for practical reasons.” He added that “*Greater East Asia War* is definitely

²⁴ Historical Science Society of Japan ed., *Taiheiyo Sensoshi 1 Manshu Jihen* (History of the Pacific War 1: The Manchurian Incident, Aoki Shoten, 1971, pp. i–iii.

²⁵ “Dokusha Dayori,” Department of Research into the Cause of the Pacific War, Japan Association of International Relations, ed., *Taiheiyo Senso heno Michi Dai Sankan* (The Road to the Pacific War Volume 3), Asahi Shimbunsha, 1962, Appendix, p. 10.

²⁶ Noboru Kojima, *Taiheiyo Senso* (1/2), (2/2) (*Pacific War* (1/2), (2/2)), Chuokoronsha, 1965–1966; Saburo Ienaga, *Taiheiyo Senso* (*Pacific War*), Iwanami Shoten, 1968; Shigeru Hayashi, *Nihon no Rekisi 25 Taiheiyo Senso* (*Japanese History 25: The Pacific War*), Chuokoronsha, 1974.

unacceptable” and he “had no other choice but to go for the practical solution by using *Pacific War* in the book’s title as the second best way.”²⁷

(ii) Problems

While the use of *Pacific War* rapidly spread within Japan as described above, numerous problems with the term have been also pointed out. Firstly, many people, while well aware of problems with the term *Pacific War* as the naming of the war, used *Pacific War* as the “second-best way” out of necessity for “reasons of convenience.” Reflecting this, many supporters of the term *Pacific War* later switched to the use of other names. For example, Ienaga, said that “neither *Pacific War* nor *Greater East Asia War* is acceptable because they blatantly reflect the political positions of specific countries,” supported *15-Year War*,²⁸ and used *15-Year War* in his book published in 1985, *Senso Sekinin* (War Responsibility) [Iwanami Shoten, 1985]. Historian Jun’ichiro Kisaka, who advocated the use of *Asia-Pacific War*, used *Pacific War* before that while acknowledging the problem that it would ignore the Chinese front, noting that “it would seem nice to use *15-Year War* but this terms would include the Manchurian Incident and the Sino–Japanese War and the Third Stage of *15-Year War* does not sound right as a book title. So, I decided to use the naming of *Pacific War* that has been widely used heretofore and made sure to also give full accounts of the Chinese front.”²⁹ Akira Fujiwara, another historian, in his book, *Taiheiyo Senso Shiron* (Essay on History of the Pacific War), wrote that while he avoids the use of *Greater East Asia War* for its ideological connotations, the use of *Pacific War* alone “needless to say, would not limit the scope of the war to the Japan–U.S. war,”³⁰ but subsequently published such books as *Jugo-nen Senso to Tenno* (The 15-Year War and the Emperor) [Azumino Shobo, 1988] and *Showa Tenno no Jugo-nen Senso* (The 15-Year War of Emperor Showa) [Aoki Shoten Publishing Co., 1991]. As seen above, many of the authors who switched from *Pacific War* to other names are Marxists and other “progressives.”

As to the second problem with the naming of *Pacific War*, there is a division over the period of the war covered. Generally speaking, the term covers the period from the Pearl Harbor attack to the end of the war, as pointed out by Kisaka, but there are many cases where *Pacific War* is used to cover the extended periods both before and after the aforementioned period. The GHQ’s “*Taiheiyo Sensoshi* (The Pacific War History),” as indicated by its subtitle, “From the Mukden Incident to the Unconditional Surrender,” covered the period from the Manchurian Incident, and this was applicable to Ienaga’s *Taiheiyo Senso* (Pacific War) as well. *Taiheiyo Sensoshi* (History of the Pacific War), edited by the Historical Science Society of Japan, a classic, deals with developments after the Manchurian Incident as the nondivisible series of wars and covers the period until after the effectuation of the peace treaty in 1952. In the main text of the book, however, *Pacific War* is used

²⁷ Saburo Ienaga, *Taiheiyo Senso* (Pacific War), iii–iv. pp. 3–4. In his foreword to the second edition of the same book, Ienaga wrote: “Since ‘15-Year War’ has come to take firm root in the academia and among the reading public, I wanted to change the book title, but could not do so because this book is the second edition of the first published edition” (“On the Occasion of Publishing the Second Edition,” *Taiheiyo Senso Dai Nihan* (Pacific War the Second Edition), Iwanami Shoten, 1986. p. viii).

²⁸ “Daitoa Senso ka Taiheiyo Senso ka — Anketo Juichi-shi ni Kiku (The Greater East Asia War or the Pacific War — A Questionnaire on 11 People),” *Sunday Mainichi*, November 29, 1970, issue, p. 46.

²⁹ Jun’ichiro Kisaka, *Showa no Rekishi 7 Taiheiyo Senso* (History of Showa 7: The Pacific War), Shogakukan, 1982, p. 17.

³⁰ Akira Fujiwara, *Taiheiyo Senso Shiron* (Essay on History of the Pacific War), Aoki Shoten, 1982, pp. 108–109.

to mean the war, including the Chinese front after the Pearl Harbor attack.

In recent years, *Kindai Nihon no Kiseki 5 Taiheiyo Senso* (Trajectory of Modern Japan 5: The Pacific War), edited by Masaomi Yui, covers *15-Year War* period from the Manchurian Incident on, but Yui points out that “it is not uncommon at all that previous books carrying the *Pacific War* in their titles cover this period extending over 15 years.”³¹ As reviewed above, *Pacific War* is being used to cover a variety of periods, including after the Manchurian Incident (*15-Year War*), after the Pearl Harbor attack, after the “China Incident” from the standpoint of “*Greater East Asia War*, including the China Incident,” or exclusively the war against the United States, Britain and the Netherlands, excluding the Chinese front, as the Sino–Japanese War continued even after December 1941.³² In any event, there are some cases where *Pacific War* is used to cover a period even before the Pearl Harbor attack, though *Taiheiyo Sensoshi* (History of the Pacific War), edited by the Historical Science Society of Japan, that extended the end of the War, is one of the rare cases.

Thirdly, in world history, there were two wars called “*Taiheiyo Senso* (Pacific War)” that occurred in Latin America. The well-known war was the one fought between Chile and Bolivia/Peru over niter resources from 1879 through 1884, referred to as “War of the Pacific,” “*la guerra del Pacifico*” in Spanish, or “*la guerre du Pacifique*” in Portuguese. The war fought between Chile/Peru and Spain in 1860–1866 was also called “War of the Pacific” (“*la guerra del Pacifico*” in Spanish). Both refer to wars fought in Latin America.

Incidentally, *Pacific War* for Japan is generally referred to as *Pacific War* in English to distinguish it from the wars in Latin America, but is called in the United States as “War in the Pacific (Theater),” “WW II-Pacific Theater or Pacific Theater in the Second World War.” In related dictionaries and chronological tables published in Japan, the wars in Latin America are listed as “*Taiheiyo Senso* (Pacific War)” along with *Pacific War* for Japan.³³ Given these historical precedents, some people argue that the naming of *Pacific War* could create a misunderstanding internationally.

(2) *Greater East Asia War*

(i) Origin

In 1953, the same year of the publication of *Taiheiyo Sensoshi* (*History of the Pacific War*), edited by the Historical Science Society of Japan, *Daitoa Senso Zenshi* (*Complete History of Greater East Asia War*) [a total of four volumes, Masu Shobo, 1953; republished in 1965 by Hara Shobo in a single volume] was published. This was authored by Takushiro Hattori, who served in the key post of the Chief of Staff for Military Operations at the Imperial Headquarters and was becoming the first representative book carrying the title of *Greater East Asia War* in the postwar period.

³¹ Masaomi Yui ed., *Kindai Nihon no Kiseki 5 Taiheiyo Senso* (Trajectory of Modern Japan 5: The Pacific War), Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 1995, p. 1.

³² Takashi Saito, “‘Daitoa Senso’ to ‘Taiheiyo Senso’ — Rekisi Ninshiki to Senso no Kosho (‘Greater East Asia War’ and ‘Pacific War’ — Historical Perception and the Naming of Wars),” *Sekai*, November 1983 issue, p. 282.

³³ Sakamoto, “‘Daitoa Senso’ oyobi ‘Taiheiyo Senso’ no Kosho ni Kansuru Ichikosatsu — Ryo Kosho ni tsuitenno Iken to Sorera no Shiyō wo Chushin to Site (Jo), pp. 4–5. Dictionaries for reference include George C. Kohn, *Sekai Senso Jiten Kaiteizohō-ban* (Dictionary of Wars Revised and Enlarged Edition), translated by Chikara Suzuki and Masako Asaoka, Kawaide Shobo Shinsha, 2006; Kyodai Seiyōshi Jiten Hensankai (Kyoto University Western History Dictionary Editorial Committee) ed., *Sinpen Seiyōshi Jiten Kaiteizohō-ban* (New Edition Western History Dictionary Revised and Enlarged Edition), Tokyo Sogensha, 1993; *Sekai Daihyakka Jiten 17* (World Encyclopedia 17), Heibonsha, 1988.

Shunpei Ueyama, a philosopher, contributed his article, “Daitoa Senso no Shisoteki Imi (Ideological Significance of *Greater East Asia War*),” to the January 1961 issue of *Chuo Koron*. Regarding his choice of *Greater East Asia War* for the title of the article, Ueyama recalled that he “included the term that may be taken as weird at a glance with the intention of giving a shock” to the ideological situation in Japan where Japanese people in the postwar period misperceived *Pacific War* as if their own idea by having forgotten that the term represented the view of the United States imposed by the Occupation Forces.³⁴

In 1963, Fusao Hayashi, an author, serialized his articles, “Daitoa Senso Koteiron (Affirmation of *Greater East Asia War*)” in *Chuo Koron*, and published them as an independent book, entitled *Daitoa Senso Koteiron (Affirmation of Greater East Asia War)* in the following year. Based on his historical perception that it was *Greater East Asia 100-Year War* for the liberation of Asia by Japan from the invasion by Western powers since the arrival of the Black Ships led by Commodore Perry off Japan’s coast, Hayashi positively affirmed the *Greater East Asia War* as the part and final culmination of that liberation war. From that perspective, concerning the naming of the war, he argued that the ideal of the United States was the realization of “White Pacific Ocean,” while that of Japan was construction of the “Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere,” asserting that “It is all right for the Americans to call it *Pacific War*, but Japanese, particularly scholars, using it as it is is the doing of pseudointellectuals who do not know about the truth of history. It is more scientific and historical for Japanese to gallantly call it *Greater East Asia War*.”³⁵

Following the serialized articles of Hayashi, Ueyama further expanded on his earlier paper and published *Daitoa Senso no Imi — Gendaishi Bunseki no Shiten (Significance of Greater East Asia War — A Perspective of Analysis of Modern History)* in 1964. Explaining why he dared to use the term *Greater East Asia War*, which was considered to be a taboo at the time, Ueyama stated he used the term “because I perceived the dual mistakes in the sentiment to regard it as a taboo that while it accepts the historical view of *Pacific War* without questioning, it takes no notice of the historical view of *Greater East Asia War*.” In other words, he contended, while not only the *Greater East Asia War* historical view but also the *Pacific War* historical view, *Imperialist War* historical view and the *Anti-Japan War* historical view are all political ideologies with the intrinsic nature of “false consciousness” linked with national interests, the condemnation of *Greater East Asia War* alone is imbalanced and created the “dual mistakes.” He went on to assert that the *Greater East Asia War* historical view should be granted “equal rights” by relativizing all the historical views. Therefore, Ueyama also criticized Hayashi’s all-out “affirmation of *Greater East Asia War*” by arguing that “the objective of Japan’s war against China was the pursuit of unvarnished national interests with almost no thought of the liberation of Asian peoples. It is a more faithful account of the war to view *Greater East Asia War* as the war of colonial reorganization rather than the war of colonial liberation.”³⁶

³⁴ As a collection of a series of papers written by Ueyama, Shunpei Ueyama, *Daitoa Senso no Imi — Gendaishi Bunseki no Shiten* (Significance of the Greater East Asia War — A Perspective of Analysis of Modern History), Chuokoronsha, 1964, pp. 2–36.

³⁵ Fusao Hayashi, *Zoku Daitoa Senso Koteiron* (Sequel: Affirmation of the Greater East Asia War), Bancho Shobo, 1965, pp. 21–22.

³⁶ Ueyama, *Daitoa Senso no Imi — Gendaishi Bunseki no Shiten*, pp. 37–64.

Subsequently, the use of *Greater East Asia War* started to spread mainly among people who took the positive view of the war, as did Hayashi, though the tone was varied, leading to the ensuing debate over the pros and cons of the use of the term.

(ii) Grounds

The grounds of people who use *Greater East Asia War* are varied. The first is the position of “affirmation of *Greater East Asia War*,” as exemplified by Hayashi.

The second is the argument that *Greater East Asia War* is the official Japanese naming of the war, backed by the “legitimacy” of the decision by the cabinet (Imperial General Headquarters-Government Liaison Conference). For example, Shiro Hara, a former staff of the Imperial Headquarters who was one of compilers of “*Senshi Soshō* (War History Series),” compiled by the War History Office of the National Defense College of the Defense Agency, stated that it was officially adopted by Imperial General Headquarters-Government Liaison Conference, and though the use of the term was prohibited temporarily by the GHQ after the war, “the name of *Greater East Asia War* should be revived naturally as the directive of the GHQ would naturally become null and void with the effectuation of the peace treaty” and “*Greater East Asia War* is the historically accurate expression.”³⁷

The third is the argument that *Greater East Asia War* does not have ideological implications and simply represents the geographical naming, and as such, is best suited to describe the actual conditions of the war from the regional perspective.

For example, former diplomat Ryohei Murata, who served in such positions as Japanese Ambassador to the United States and Vice Foreign Minister, uses *Greater East Asia War* for the following reasons:³⁸

“‘Dai’ is translated to ‘greater’ in English, and ‘Toa (East Asia)’ alone often refers to only Japan, China, Korea and Mongolia. So, the Greater East Asia was used to indicate the ‘more broadly defined’ East Asia. Considering the wars in mainland China and Burma, the term of *Pacific War* imposed by the United States is rather awkward.”

Furthermore, commentator Hyoe Murakami asserted that *Pacific War* is not appropriate given that the battlefields spread broadly across Asia geographically and the naming should be *East Asia War*, including the Chinese front, but because this name “could invoke the image of the Sino–Japanese War of 1894–95/Russo–Japanese War historically,” he uses the name of *Greater East Asia War* to connote the meaning of the “major war fought in East Asia.” Therefore, he added, the term he uses is different in its meaning from *Greater East Asia War* adopted by Japan on

³⁷ Shiro Hara, “‘Taiheiyo Senso’ dehanaku ‘Daitoa Senso’ to Yobubekidearu (It Should be Called the *Greater East Asia War* Rather Than *Pacific War*),” *Kaiko*, March 1977 issue, p. 5.

³⁸ Ryohei Murata, *Murata Ryohei Kaisoroku (Gekan)* — *Sokoku no Saisei wo Jiseidai ni Takushite* (Memoir of Ryohei Murata (Second Volume) — Charging the Next Generation with the Revival of the Fatherland), Minerva Shobo, 2008, p. 342.

the basis of the idea of “Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere (New Order).”³⁹

Hara, who was on the staff of the Imperial Headquarters at the opening of the war, argued that “*Greater East Asia War* meant the ‘war to be fought in the region of East Asia’” and was not intended to build the “Greater East Asia New Order,” and recalled that the GHQ prohibited the use of the term “because the GHQ misperceived *Greater East Asia War* as the war to build the ‘Greater East Asia New Order.’”⁴⁰

Furthermore, American historian John F. Stephan, from the regional point of view, pointed out that because *World War II* refers to “too broad” and *Pacific War* is “too narrow” and neither is a “very satisfactory,” the term *Greater East Asia War*, though somewhat awkward, “remains the most accurate designation for a struggle that in Japan’s perspective encompassed the Indian and Pacific oceans, East and Southeast Asia.”⁴¹

As reviewed above, some argue that the origin of *Greater East Asia War* is simply the geography-based naming, instead of the political purpose of “construction of the ‘Greater East Asia New Order.’” If so, *Greater East Asia War* is the naming that has a measure of “legitimacy” backed by the cabinet decision, regional appropriateness and “contemporaneousness,” as described later, with no ideological connotations. In other words, just as the way *Pacific War* proposed by the Navy before the opening of the war was eventually buried in favor of *Greater East Asia War*, *Pacific War* is now being replaced by the *Asia-Pacific War*, and it was pointed out that, viewed cynically, it is “rebuttal evidence that the naming of *Greater East Asia War* is right after all.”⁴²

Even “progressives” find it difficult to argue that *Pacific War* represents only the standpoint of the United States because it was proposed by the Navy before the opening of the war, and say that *Greater East Asia War*, on the other hand, is “little different from the purport of the proposal for *Asia-Pacific War*, if put down with the geographical perception (‘the war with a broader East Asia as its theater’: the noted by the quoter)...If *Greater East Asia* is read as simply meaning the theater of the war, the grounds for criticism and confrontation might be lost altogether.”⁴³

The fourth reason to use *Greater East Asia War* is the argument that with the right or the wrong aside, the naming has “substance” or “contemporaneousness.”

Historian Seizaburo Shinobu, in his 1983 paper, “‘Taiheiyo Senso’ to ‘Daitoa Senso’ (*Pacific War* and *Greater East Asia War*),” criticized Ienaga and *Taiheiyo Sensoshi* (*History of the Pacific*

³⁹ Hyoe Murakami, *Saikensho ‘Daitoa Senso’ towa Nanika* (Reappraisal: What Is the “Greater East Asia War?”), Jiji Tsushinsha, 1992, pp. 134–138. Itsuo Kohama, a critic, points out that the absence of the established naming of the war reflects a lot of evaluations of the war and says he believes that “*East Asia War*” is the most appropriate name from the “value-neutral” standpoint (written and edited by Tetsuya Miyazaki, *Bokura no ‘Shinryaku’ Senso — Mukashi Atta Ano Senso wo Dou Kangaetara Inoka* [Our War of ‘Aggression’ — How We Should Think of That War in the Past], Yosensha, 1995, pp. 63–64).

⁴⁰ Hara, “‘Taiheiyo Senso’ dehanaku ‘Daitoa Senso’ to Yobubekidearu, p. 5; Hara, “‘Daitoa Senso’ to iu Na no Senso, p. 2.

⁴¹ John J. Stephan, *Nihon Koku Hawaii — Shirarezaru ‘Shinjuwan’ Rimenshi* (*Hawaii Under the Rising Sun: Japan’s Plans for Conquest After Pearl Harbor*), translation supervised by Takashi Takebayashi, Kobunsha, 1984, pp. 210–211.

⁴² Shiro Odamura, “Senso Kosho ‘Seimei’ Ron (Jo) — ‘Daitoa Senso’ to ‘Taiheiyo Senso’ (War Naming ‘Correct Name’ Debate (First Volume) — ‘Greater East Asia War’ and ‘Pacific War’),” *Nippon Bunka*, NO. 23, Winter 2006, p. 47.

⁴³ Makio Okabe, “Ajia Taiheiyo Senso (Asia-Pacific War),” Nakamura Masanori et al., *Sengo Nihon Senryo to Sengo Kaikaku 1 Sekaishi no Naka no Sen Kyuhyaku Yonju Go Nen* (Postwar Japan Occupation and Postwar Reform 1 1945 in World History), Iwanami Shoten, 1995, p. 26.

War), edited by the Historical Science Society of Japan as being “negligent and cowardly” for their explanations that they opted to use *Pacific War* as the “next-best way” for “reasons of convenience” just to avoid the name of *Greater East Asia War*, though they are well aware that *Pacific War* is “not necessarily the scientifically accurate name.” Citing “Japanese Writers and *Greater East Asia War*” by Donald Lawrence Keene⁴⁴ as an example, Shinobu noted that the use of *Greater East Asia War* does not mean the affirmation and support of the war, and argued that *Greater East Asia War* should be used as the “name that most accurately describes the historical nature of the war and cover the substance of the war most broadly.”⁴⁵

Particularly because Shinobu had until then used *Pacific War* and *15-Year War* from the standpoint of the Marxist view of history, this paper created broad repercussions in the academic circle, with Takashi Saito, a scholar of international politics, criticizing it harshly.⁴⁶

Furthermore, Shinobu later characterized the connections between independence movements in Southeast Asia/India and Japan as “another *Pacific War*,” and pointed out that he uses *Greater East Asia War* not only because it is the official name decided by the government but also because it implies the “historical significance” of the “war being designed for ‘Greater East Asia New Order (Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere).’”⁴⁷ The use of *Greater East Asia War* has also prompted a significant change in the historical perception from the initial historical view of the war of aggression to the evaluation of the positive role Japan has played in the independence of Southeast Asia/India. Nobuyuki Kuroda, a disciple of Shinobu, stated that “I have come to favor the name of *Greater East Asia War* recently, and have been unable to decide which of *Greater East Asia War* or *Asia-Pacific War* I should use,”⁴⁸ citing the reevaluation of Japanese troops’ contribution to Indonesia during the war.

Ken’ichi Matsumoto, a critic, who wrote “Takeuchi Yoshimi Ron (Discussion on Yoshimi Takeuchi),” said *Greater East Asia War* is “the preferred name I use constantly,” arguing that “the name of the war is historical and changing the name (to *Pacific War*, for example) in later years makes no sense because it would alter the historical nature of the war. The historical grasping of the history is all the more necessary in order to deny the history.”⁴⁹

Furthermore, Masayasu Hosaka, a nonfiction writer, argued that not using *Greater East Asia War* would be “tantamount to concealing one’s previous history,” referring to the appropriateness of the naming of *Greater East Asia/Pacific War* from the viewpoint that the perception of *Pacific War* that forms part of “discussions in public” needs to be reviewed. Hosaka asserted that “if *Greater East Asia War* was the war our country fought with the independent-minded resolve, we should be

⁴⁴ Donald Keene, “Japanese Writers and the Greater East Asia War,” *The Journal of Asian Studies*, vol.23, no.1, February 1964.

⁴⁵ Seizaburo Shinobu, “‘Taiheiyo Senso’ to ‘Daitoa Senso’ (*Pacific War* and *Greater East Asia War*),” *Sekai*, August 1983 issue, pp. 222–231.

⁴⁶ For Shinobu’s arguments and the Shinobu-Saito confrontation, see Kisaka, “Ajia/Taiheiyo Senso no Kosho to Seikaku,” pp. 39–51.

⁴⁷ Seizaburo Shinobu, “*Taiheiyo Senso*” to “*Mou Hitotsu no Taiheiyo Seiso*” (*Pacific War* and “Another Pacific War”), Keiso Shobo, 1988; *Seizaburo Shinobu, Seidan no Rekishigaku* (Historical Science of Imperial Decision), Keiso Shobo, 1992, pp. i–iii.

⁴⁸ Yomiuri Shimbunsha ed., *20 Seiki Donna Jidai Datta noka Senso Hen Nippon no Senso*, p. 519.

⁴⁹ Ken’ichi Matsumoto, *Takeuchi Yoshimi Ron* (Discussion on Yoshimi Takeuchi), Iwanami Shoten, 2005, p. 116 (pocket edition of Ken’ichi Matsumoto, *Takeuchi Yoshimi Ron*, Daisanbunmeisha, 1975).

able to position *Greater East Asia War* in history with a perception completely different from that of war leaders at the time.”⁵⁰

Fifthly, *Greater East Asia War* is being used with the double interpretation of “aggression” and “liberation.” Kisaka cites Ken’ichi Goto, a researcher on Southeast Asia, and historian Kimitada Miwa, in addition to Shinobu mentioned earlier, as examples of people who use *Greater East Asia War* with the “purpose of clarifying the double meaning of ‘aggression and liberation’ of *Greater East Asia War* to a varying degree.”⁵¹

Acknowledging that though it was the “war with a strong tinge of aggression” with the “noble cause only as a mere slogan,” there were not a few Japanese in all parts of Southeast Asia who “sought to find their own identity in the idea of *Greater East Asia War*, though only a fraction overall,” Goto argued as follows:⁵²

“In order to learn a historical lesson from the reckless war, as a wrongdoer and also as a victim, or from the fact that elderly people in Southeast Asia still talk about *Daitoa Senso* (*Greater East Asia War*), I believe we need to stick to *Greater East Asia War* at the time. In order to clearly keep a distance from the so-called ‘affirmation’ of the war, however, I would like to use *Greater East Asia War* in parentheses, in principle, throughout this paper.”

Besides those cited above, Yoshimi Takeuchi, an expert on Chinese literature, who uses *Greater East Asia War*, pointed out that Japan’s wars against foreign countries were fought “with the pretext of stabilization of East Asia as well as self defense,” and “the largest and final one of them was *Greater East Asia War*,” and while it had “an aspect of being one part of *World War II*,” “*Greater East Asia War* had its own unique nature” in that “Japanese thought about Asia under its independent-minded perspective and put its own program into practice to make a breakthrough in the destiny of Asia.” While stating that the fact that it was a war of aggression against China cannot be denied and that he does not agree with Fusao Hayashi and others who categorically affirm the war, Takeuchi said that “I am worried that denial of a sense of Asia solidarity being shown in the form of aggression in hatred of aggression might drain a baby with hot water.”⁵³

In relation to the double meaning and the naming of the war, political scientist Yasushi Yamaguchi, while criticizing the argument for the double meaning as confusing the “intention” with the “results,” points out that the naming of *Greater East Asia War* still survives partly because of a sense of victimization by the ABCD (America, Britain, China and the Dutch) encirclement against Japan but also “due to the fact that the idea of ‘Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere’ of the ‘liberation of Asian peoples from Western European imperialism’ has been fundamentally realized

⁵⁰ Masayasu Hosaka, *Omote no Genron Ura no Genron (Discussions in Public Discussions in Private)*, Shumei Shuppankai, 1999, pp. 8–27; Masayasu Hosaka, “Daitoa Senso/Teiheiyo Senso wa Ikani Katararete Kitaka (Some Thoughts on the War in the Pacific: Fighting for National Survival?),” *Senshibu Nenpo* (The Annual of the Military History Department), No. 2, March 1999.

⁵¹ Kisaka, “Ajia/Taiheiyo Senso no Kosho to Seikaku,” pp. 48–50.

⁵² Ken’ichi Goto, *Kindai Nihon to Tonan Ajia* (Modern Japan and Southeast Asia), Iwanami Shoten, 1995, pp. 182–186.

⁵³ Yoshimi Takeuchi, *Nihon to Ajia* (Japan and Asia), Chikuma Shobo, 1993, pp. 92–96 (pocket edition of *Takeuchi Yoshimi Hyoronshu Dai 3 Kan — Nihon to Ajia* [Essays in Criticism of Yoshimi Takeuchi Volume 3 — Japan and Asia], Chikuma Shobo, 1966).

to a considerable extent after the end of World War II as a massive ‘paradox of history.’”⁵⁴

The sixth has to do with the position in favor of the use of *Greater East Asia War* on the ground that “different wars should carry different names and those names should be used.” As pointed out by Jiro Murao, who serves as chief senior specialist for textbooks at the Ministry of Education, this school of thought argues that the wars in Latin America were bestowed with the “priority rights” to call them *Pacific War*,⁵⁵ and as such, Japan’s war that broke out much later has to have a name other than *Pacific War*, and in that case, there is no appropriate name other than *Greater East Asia War*.⁵⁶

There also are people who use *Greater East Asia War* from the standpoint of denying the “affirmative view of *Greater East Asia War*.” Aiko Kurasawa, a researcher on Southeast Asia, says she finds it “simple and clear to use this name (*Greater East Asia War*) in discussing history,” with the awareness that *Pacific War* ignores wars in Southeast Asia and from the viewpoint that the name was decided by the government at the time. However, she says she calls it “*Greater East Asia War* with parentheses” because the use of the term might be misperceived as affirming the war.⁵⁷

Hisashi Yamanaka, a children’s literature author, said he persisted in the use of *Greater East Asia War* in his series of *Bokura Shokokumin* (We are the Children of the Empire) because *Pacific War* was imposed by the United States and he wanted to attach weight to a sense of contemporaneousness with the “consciousness of the war on this side,” and he also wanted to keep his eyes on the fact that he had a part in the aggression against Asia by using *Greater East Asia War* and also lodge a complaint against the affirmative view of the war.⁵⁸ However, Yamanaka later changed his preferred name to *Asia-Pacific War* by becoming aware that “many people who insist it was not a war of aggression” are fixated on the use of *Greater East Asia War*.⁵⁹

Masataka Matsuura, who published a voluminous book entitled ‘*Daitoa Senso*’ wa Naze Okitanoka (Why Did Greater East Asia War Occur?), cites the following two reasons for daring to use *Greater East Asia War* in his book. The first reason is that just like the “Manchukuo,” it was “used as the official name by the government in the historical context at the time.” Secondly, he “wanted to emphasize that the war was caused by ‘Asianism’ or Pan-Asianism.” Having said that, Matsuura added, “the name of *Greater East Asia War* is used in parentheses in the book because I

⁵⁴ Yasushi Yamaguchi, “Futatsu no Gendaishi — Rekishi no Aratana Tenkanten ni Tatte (Two Modern Histories — Standing at a New Turning Point in History),” Kentaro Awaya et al., *Senso Sekinin/Sengo Sekinin — Nihon to Doitsu ha Dou Chigakuka* (War Responsibility/Postwar Responsibility — How Japan and Germany Are Different), Asahi Shimbunsha, 1994, pp. 242–244.

⁵⁵ Jiro Murao, “Kyokasho ni Arawareta Gunjishi no Toriatsukai ni Tsuite (About the Treatment of Military History Evident in School Textbooks),” *Gunjishigaku*, Vol. 11, No. 3, December 1975, pp. 66–67.

⁵⁶ Sakamoto, “‘Daitoa Senso’ oyobi ‘Taiheiyo Senso’ no Kosho ni Kansuru Ichikosatsu (Ge), p. 5.

⁵⁷ Aiko Kurasawa, ‘*Daitoa Senso wo Shitte Imasuka* (Do You Know about the “Greater East Asia” War?), Kodansha, 2002, pp. 26–28.

⁵⁸ Hisashi Yamanaka, *Bokura Shokokumin Hokan Shokokumin Taiken wo Saguru* (We are the Children of the Empire Supplementary Volume Looking into the Experiences of Being the Children of the Empire), Henkyoosha, 1981, pp. 106–107, 152–153.

⁵⁹ Hisashi Yamanaka, *Ajia/Taiheiyo Senshi* (History of the Asia-Pacific War), Iwanami Shoten, 2005, p. vii.

deny that it was a war for the ‘liberation of Asia.’”⁶⁰

(iii) Problems

The first of problems involved is the ideological connotation that *Greater East Asia War* is believed to have. People who deny the use of the term made an issue of the idea of glorifying and affirming the war implied by *Greater East Asia War*. This argument has been presented mainly by “progressive” intellectuals, represented by Saburo Ienaga and *Taiheiyo Sensoshi (History of the Pacific War)*, edited by the Historical Science Society of Japan, as earlier discussed.

For example, Saito who criticized Shinobu for advocating the use of *Greater East Asia War* pointed to the yawning gap between his perception of the contemporary history and that of Shinobu, and argued that the name *Greater East Asia War* “should have been essentially denied by the Japanese people on their own even without the directive of the Occupation Forces” and it is “not a taboo but one of the names I want to avoid.” Countering the view that *Greater East Asia War* is simply geography-oriented naming, Saito said “the use of ‘greater’ represents the attitude of flaunting oneself” and they should “rather say simply ‘East Asia.’” He said he favors such names as *World War II* and *Pacific War* that do not include the judgment of value, and if they are inappropriate for playing down the Chinese front, he can settle with *15-Year War*.⁶¹ Sankichi Yasui also criticized Shinobu by arguing that “this naming (*Greater East Asia War*: the note by the quoter) cannot ‘cover’ the resistance put up by Asian countries.”⁶²

Similarly, foreign countries, particularly neighboring nations, have the negative image of *Greater East Asia War* as something that justifies the war and colonial rule. Recently, in “Japan–China Joint History Research,” China rated high the non-use of *Greater East Asia War* in a report presented by Japan,⁶³ while in “Japan–Korea Joint History Research,” South Korea made an issue of the use of *Greater East Asia War* in textbooks published by the “Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform.”⁶⁴

Regarding the “legitimacy” backed by the cabinet decision and the “contemporaneity” as well, it was pointed out that many of the names of the war that have come to take firm root now were given in later years and they are “not the pronouns by any reckoning and may change with the flow of the times.”⁶⁵

On the other hand, as discussed earlier, some people who deny the “affirmative view of *Greater East Asia War*,” including “progressives” such as Sjihobu, Kurasawa and Goto, used *Greater East*

⁶⁰ Masataka Matsuura, *‘Daitoa Senso’ wa Naze Okitanoka* (Why Did the “Greater East Asia War” Occur?), The University of Nagoya Press, 2010, pp. 5–13. Matsuura presented the problem by saying that Emperor Showa could not go any further than using the vague expression of the *Last War* and a variety of names are being used in academia “maybe because of the inability of historians, even now more than 60 years after the end of the war, to offer the convincing explanations about the complex process” to the war, in addition to political reasons. (Ibid., p. 12).

⁶¹ Saito, “‘Daitoa Senso’ to ‘Taiheiyo Senso,’” pp. 280–284.

⁶² Sankichi Yasui, “‘Nicchu Sensoshi Kekyu ni tsuiteno Oboegaki — ‘Jugonen Senso’ to ‘Konichi Senso’ (Memorandum on Research on Sino–Japanese War History — ‘15-Year War’ and ‘Anti-Japan War’),” *Rekish Kagaku*, the combined issue of No. 99 and No. 100, May 1985, p. 105.

⁶³ *Sankei Shimbun*, February 2, 2010.

⁶⁴ Ibid., March 24, 2010.

⁶⁵ Kisaka, “‘Ajia/Taiheiyo Senso no Kosho to Seikaku,” pp. 52–53; Saito, “‘Daitoa Senso’ to ‘Taiheiyo Senso,’” pp. 282–283.

Asia War.

Secondly, there was some confusion about the period covered by Greater East Asia War though not so much as with the case of *Pacific War*. This has to do with how to interpret the significance of the phrase, “including the China Incident,” that is, the issue of the segmentation between *Greater East Asia War* and the “China Incident.” Generally speaking, the above phrase is understood to mean the “China Incident” after December 8, 1941, not the “China Incident” retroactive to 1937, or more specifically, it is understood to include the war on mainland China. For example, Jun’ichiro Kisaka pointed out that “the phrase ‘including the China Incident’ was meant to include the war in the China region after December 8, 1941, instead of going as far back as to the ‘China Incident.’”⁶⁶

Incidentally, the “Matter Concerning the Naming of the Latest War and the Demarcation Point of Wartime and Peacetime,” mentioned earlier, stated, “The demarcation point between wartime and peacetime shall be 1:30 a.m. on December 8, 1941.”

On the other hand, the announcement made by Cabinet Information Bureau on December 12, 1941, after the opening of the war, stated that “the China Incident carried through over the past four years was designed to topple the Chongqing government that had become the mere puppet regime of the United States and Britain, and its objective is identical with that of the latest war against the United States and Britain and its substance is not different, and therefore has come to be included in *Greater East Asia War*.”⁶⁷ And the “Guideline for Explanation of ‘Bills for Revisions of Respective Laws Incidental to the Determination of the Name of *Greater East Asia War*,’” prepared to explain the key points of Act No. 9 discussed earlier, stated that “there is absolutely no difference from the China Incident that has been carried through to date in its objective and its substance, and therefore what is called *Greater East Asia War* can be described as having been generated and developed from the China Incident” and explained the meaning of the phrase “including the China Incident” as follows:

“It shows that it is not meant to distinguish the war against the United States and Britain that broke out recently alone from the China Incident to call it *Greater East Asia War*. Furthermore, this decision also means that when the name of *Greater East Asia War* is used from this point on, it includes the China Incident prior to December 8, 1941.”

The definition of the phrase of “including the China Incident” shown here is supposedly the issue of administering laws, but the expression can be easily misinterpreted, and in fact, it caused some confusion among the Japanese people. For example, at the postwar 89th session of the House of Peers of the Imperial Diet on November 30, 1945, House of Peers member Kyoichi Murakami asked the following question concerning the scope of investigation by the “Greater East Asia War Investigation Committee”:

“In the public mind, *Greater East Asia War* is generally understood to have broken out on December 8, 1941, but it is wrong in my view. As a result of provisions of the law I just mentioned (Act No. 9: note by the quoter), *Greater East Asia War* includes the China Incident

⁶⁶ Kisaka, *Showa no Rekishi 7 Taiheiyo Senso*, p. 24.

⁶⁷ *Asahi Shimbun*, December 13, 1941.

that occurred earlier and as such, I think the day when *Greater East Asia War* started should be not on December 8, 1941, but on that day of September 1937, though I do not quite recall which day.”

Minister of State Joji Matsumoto responded to this as follows:

“Then, in this proposed law, the government is proposing to change the ‘China Incident’ to *Greater East Asia War*. Given the reason why the government is presenting such a law, in that sense, *Greater East Asia War* and the ‘China Incident’ should be considered distinctly... Since there is that distinction, this law is going to have an impact on that, and thus I think they are after all of the different timing.”

In response, House of Peers member Murakami said, “only *Greater East Asia War* and this is supposed to include all wars... It still does not sound right to me.”⁶⁸

Incidentally, “*Senshi Soshō* (War History Series),” treated the fighting on the Chinese front before December 8, 1941, as the “China Incident,” as demonstrated by the coverage of *Shina Jihen Rikugun Sakusen* (Army Operations in the China Incident) [a total of three volumes] from July 1937 to December 8, 1941, and it described the war after that as *Greater East Asia War* including the Chinese front. It also divided the number of the enshrined war dead between the “China Incident” and *Greater East Asia War* and the demarcation point was also December 8, 1941.

(3) *15-Year War*

(i) Origin

Philosopher Shunsuke Tsurumi used the name *15-Year War* for the first time ever. In “Chishikijin no Senso Sekinin (War Responsibility of Intellectuals)” in the January 1956 issue of *Chuo Koron*, he used the term “*15-Year War* (1931–1945)” at the outset of the article. In explaining the reason for this use of the term in “Nihon Chishikijin no Amerika Zo (The Image of America among Japanese Intellectuals),” which appeared in the July 1956 issue of *Chuo Koron*, Tsurumi wrote that he would like to “ask modern historians to come up with a way of naming the sequence of fighting from 1931 through 1945” with the awareness that “Japanese people divide the latest major war into two parts, and view the series of the Manchurian Incident, the Shanghai Incident and the Marco Polo Bridge Incident as the war against China and *Pacific War* as the war against the United States, thinking that the latter part hit the wrong note. This way of dividing the war into two parts is blurring the war responsibility.”⁶⁹ Because Tsurumi thought that *Pacific War* would pay little attention to the prolonged war with China since the Manchurian Incident and make Japan’s war responsibility vague, he advocated the use of *15-Year War* to prevent that from happening.

What served as a catalyst for making *15-Year War* more widely used was Saburo Ienaga’s

⁶⁸ *Teikoku Gikai Kizokuin Innkai Sokkiroku 115 Showa Hen* (Imperial Diet House of Peers Committee Shorthand Records 115 Showa Volume), The University of Tokyo Press, 1999, pp. 172–174.

⁶⁹ Shunsuke Tsurumi, “Nihon Chishikijin no Amerika Zo (The Image of America among Japanese Intellectuals),” *Chuo Koron*, July 1956 issue, pp. 176–178. Later, Tsurumi dealt with this issue in a more comprehensive manner in his book, *Senjiki Nihon no Seishinshi* (Intellectual History of Japan during the War), Iwanami Shoten, p. 4, pp. 69–70, pp. 148–149.

aforementioned *Taiheiyo Senso* (Pacific War), published in 1968. Ienaga called the “indivisible sequence of Japan’s wars with other countries from the Liutiaohu Incident to Japan’s surrender—I believe the wars should be regarded that way” as *15-Year War*.⁷⁰ The first school textbook that used *15-Year War* was *Shin Nihonshi* (New Japanese History) by Ienaga (Sanseido Publishing Co., 1974), which in its explanatory notes stated: “The Japanese government at the time called the war “*Greater East Asia War*, including the China Incident.” *Pacific War* is the name that is widely used after the end of the war. However, as it has some problems as the name for the war that includes the Chinese front, some people call the sequence of conflicts since after ‘the Manchurian Incident’ *15-Year War*. This name sounds much more appropriate.”⁷¹

As discussed earlier, however, Ienaga had to use *Pacific War* in the title of his book, and as seen in the case of *Taiheiyo Sensoshi* (*History of the Pacific War*), edited by the Historical Science Society of Japan, *15-Year War* was not yet recognized as having universality as the name of the war around 1970, with authors still hesitating to use it in titles of their works.

Subsequently, Kiyotaka Kuroha, Seiichi Imai, Keiichi Eguchi, and Akira Fujiwara used *15-Year War*, helping spread the use of the term.⁷²

The term of *15-Year War* was significantly characterized by the historical perception that emphasizes firstly that Japan’s aggression in Asia had been carried through with consistent intention, secondly that the three wars (the “China Northeast War” (the Manchurian Incident: note by the quoter), the Sino–Japanese War and *Asia-Pacific War*) had been inextricably linked, like contradictions created by the previous war leading to another war, and thirdly that China’s anti-Japan national liberation struggle had been the biggest driving force to keep the three wars going.⁷³

Even some authors who take positions different from those above used *15-Year War*. Historian Takashi Ito, who published *Nihon no Rekishi 30: Jugonen Senso* (Japanese History 30: The 15-Year War) [Shogakukan, 1976], while noting in the annotation that “it does not mean that all the Japanese had been doing during this period of 15 years was the war,” said he used *15-Year War* because “the period from the 1930s to the first half of the 1940s was the era of turmoil. The war was the largest aspect of the turmoil. I use *15-Year War* in that sense,” emphasizing the aspect of the 15 years of “turmoil.”⁷⁴

Jiro Murao noted that there are numerous precedents in world history of naming wars by their duration, and said that instead of being fixated on *Pacific War* or *Greater East Asia War* “what we should first consider is whether viewing the war as *15-Year War* is appropriate, and if it is appropriate, we should think that the naming of *15-Year War* is not without value.”⁷⁵

⁷⁰ Ienaga, *Taiheiyo Senso*, p. iii.

⁷¹ Hata, *Showashi wo Jusosuru*, p. 369.

⁷² Kiyotaka Kuroha, *Nicchu Jugonen Senso* (Sino–Japanese 15-Year War), a total of three volumes, Kyoikusha, 1977–1979; Seiichi Imai, *Taiei Nihon Gendaishi 2 15 Nen Senso to Higashi Ajia* (A System of Japanese Modern History 2 The 15-Year War and East Asia), Nippon Hyoronsha, 1979; Keiichi Eguchi, *Showa no Rekishi 4 Jukonen Senso no Kaimaku* (Showa History 4 The Opening of the 15-Year War), Shogakukan, 1982; Keiichi Eguchi, *Jugonen Senso Shoshi* (A Brief History of the 15-Year War), Aoki Shoten, 1986; Akira Fujiwara and Seiichi Imai eds. *Jugonen Sensoshi* (History of the 15-Year War), a total of four volumes, Aoki Shoten, 1988–1989.

⁷³ Kisaka, “Ajia/Taiheiyo Senso no Kosho to Seikaku,” pp. 56–57.

⁷⁴ Takashi Ito, *Nihon no Rekishi 30 Jukonen Senso* (Japanese History 30 The 15-Year War), Shogakukan, 1976, p. 16. Ito uses *Pacific War* for the war after the Pearl Harbor attack.

⁷⁵ Murao, “Kyokasho ni Arawareta Gunjishi no Toriatsukai ni Tsuite,” p. 67.

(ii) Problems

The term *15-Year War* has been subjected to questions and criticisms. The first question was the appropriateness of considering the three wars as a series. This approach was criticized for creating the risk of possibly overlooking various choices in avoiding or deterring war. For example, historian Katsumi Usui, while basically agreeing to the importance of war responsibility that *15-Year War* brings up, sees it inappropriate to lump developments after the Manchurian Incident together as the period of war and says that he “believes that there were several turning points between Japan and China even after the establishment of the Manchukuo and the choice of one of them led to the war,” thus questioning the continuity from the Manchurian Incident to the Sino–Japanese war.⁷⁶ Usui further argued that if *15-Year War* is to be used, the appropriate period to be covered would be between 1937 and 1951, instead of between 1931 to 1945, advocating the use of *Pacific War* that he said began in 1941 and continued until 1951. Usui asserts that the starting point of *15-Year War* was the outbreak of the Sino–Japanese War and “just as the Russo–Japanese War ended with the Portsmouth Peace Treaty, the Sino–Japanese War should be considered to have ended with the conclusion of the San Francisco Peace Treaty and the Japan–U.S. Security Treaty.”⁷⁷

Secondly, the term *15-Year War* was criticized for almost confirming the historical perception presented by the International Military Tribunal for the Far East by considering it as the “Judgment of Justice” and the “Judgment of Civilization,” as exemplified by its coverage of developments since the Manchurian Incident. Ienaga argued that the vanguard of the idea of considering the Manchurian Incident as the starting point was the GHQ’s “Taiheiyo Senshi (Pacific War History).”⁷⁸ These criticisms came not only from “conservatives” who criticized the “historical perception presented by the International Military Tribunal for the Far East” but also from “progressives” who argued that Japan should face up to its war responsibility.⁷⁹

Thirdly, there is the problem of the duration of the war. Ikuhiko Hata criticized the term *15-Year War* by pointing out “the period (from the Manchurian Incident to the end of the war) covers only 13 years and 11 months, or 14 years by rounding. They should rather call it the ‘14-Year War.’”⁸⁰ The counterargument to this is that there is no particular calculation problem with “*15-Year War*” because it is only the difference between “man (completed years)” and “ashikake (the calculation method of considering fractional days of a month at both ends as a full month).”⁸¹ Incidentally, China officially calls the war with Japan the “Anti-Japan War,” and also uses the term “8-Year Resistance” for the period after the Marco Polo Bridge Incident and the term “14-Year War” to describe the period that includes the Liutiaohu Incident in recent years, but does not use the term “15 Years” in any reference to the War between Japan and China.

⁷⁶ Katsumi Usui, *Chugoku wo Meguru Kindai Nihon no Gaiko* (Diplomacy of Modern Japan toward China), Chikuma Shobo, 1983, p. 7–10. Similar criticisms came also from Michio Fujimura, Ikuhiko Hata and Yasushi Yamaguchi (Michio Fujimura, “Futatsu no Senryo to Showashi —Gunji Dokusai Taisei to Amerika ni Yoru Senryo (Two Occupations and Showa History —The Military Dictatorship and the U.S. Occupation),” *Sekai*, August 1981 issue; Ikuhiko Hata, *Showashi wo Jusosuru*, pp. 148–151; Yasushi Yamaguchi, “Futatsu no Gendaishi,” p. 247.

⁷⁷ Usui, *Chugoku wo Meguru Kindai Nihon no Gaiko*, pp. 20–21.

⁷⁸ Ienaga, *Taiheiyo Senso*, pp. 3–4.

⁷⁹ Yamaguchi, “Futatsu no Gendaishi,” p. 246.

⁸⁰ Hata, *Showashi wo Jusosuru*, p. 151, 239, 369.

⁸¹ Yasui, “Nicchu Sensoshi Kekiyo ni tsuiteno Oboegaki,” p. 106; Keiichi Eguchi, *Jugonen Senso Shoshi*, p. 5.

(4) *Asia-Pacific War*

(i) Origin

Eijiro Yanagisama, a scholar of international politics, is said to be the first to use *Asia-Pacific War* in print, in the subtitle of a book, *Gendai Kokusai Seiji '40s–'80s* (Modern International Politics The 1940s–1980s) [Aki Shobo], published in February 1985 under the Joint authorship with Masao Kato. Yanagisama argued that while “the Japan–U.S. War was *Asia-Pacific War* as the fighting about hegemony over the Western Pacific,” “for Japan, the Japan–U.S. War was the means to establish a sphere of influence in Asia (including Southeast Asia)...therefore, the name of *Asia-Pacific War* seems to be the most appropriate in terms of international politics.”⁸²

In late 1985, Jun'ichiro Kisaka formally advocated the use of *Asia-Pacific War*. Kisaka avoided both *Pacific War* and *Greater East Asia War* by saying that the former, christened by the United States, may underestimate the weight of the Chinese front and the latter would glorify Japan's aggression, and argued that he “decided to call the war the ‘Asia-Pacific War’ in the sense that the war was fought as part of the Second World War and in East Asia, Southeast Asia and the Pacific as the battlefields and also by reflecting upon the reckless war of aggression instigated by Japan.”⁸³

The use of the term *Asia-Pacific War* spread subsequently, as it was adopted by others, including Shoichi Soejima, Keiichi Eguchi, and Yoshiaki Yoshimi.⁸⁴ And in January 1993, the first independent book using *Asia-Pacific War* in its title, Takemaro Mori, *Nihon no Rekishi 20 Ajia/Taiheiyo Senso* (Japanese History 20 The Asia-Pacific War) [Shueisha, 1993], was published.⁸⁵ In recent years, *Asia-Pacific War* was used in such books as *Iwanami Koza Ajia/Taiheiyo Senso* (Iwanami Course The Asia-Pacific War), *Senso no Nihonshi 23 Ajia/Taiheiyo Senso* (Japanese History of War 23 The Asia-Pacific War), and *Sirizuru Nihon Kin Gendaishi 6 Ajia/Taiheiyo Senso* (Series Modern and Contemporary History of Japan 6 The Asia-Pacific War).⁸⁶

(ii) Problems

Problems with the term *Asia-Pacific War* include, firstly, the duration of war it covers. In particular, because supporters of the name also support the term *15-Year War*, the relationship between these two names caused confusion. Kisaka, one of the first proponents, said that “*15-Year War* is the all-inclusive term for the three wars of the “China Northeast War” (the Manchurian Incident), the Sino–Japanese War and *Asia-Pacific War*” and that the term *Asia-Pacific War* represents the third

⁸² Kisaka, “Ajia/Taiheiyo Senso no Kosho to Seikaku,” pp. 42–43. Outside the printed world, Shoichi Soejima referred to the name of *Asia-Pacific War* in a scholarly conference report already in December 1984 (Ibid., p. 43).

⁸³ Jun'ichiro Kisaka, “‘Dainippon Teikoku’ no Hokai (Collapse of the Empire of Japan),” Historical Science Society of Japan and Japanese Society for Historical Studies eds, *Koza Nihon Rekishi 10 Kindai 4* (Course Japanese History 10 Modern Period 4), The University of Tokyo Press, 1985, pp. 338–339.

⁸⁴ Shoichi Soejima, “Nicchu Senso to Ajia Taiheiyo Senso (The Sino–Japanese War and the Asia-Pacific War),” *Rekishi Kagaku*, No. 102, November 1985, Keiichi Eguchi, *Jukonen Senso Shoshi*, Yoshiaki Yoshimi, *Kusanone no Fashizumu* (Grass-Roots Facism), The University of Tokyo Press, 1987.

⁸⁵ Kisaka, “Ajia/Taiheiyo Senso no Kosho to Seikaku,” pp. 44–51.

⁸⁶ *Iwanami Koza Ajia/Taiheiyo Senso* (Iwanami Course The Asia-Pacific War), a total of eight volumes, Iwanami Shoten, 2005–2006; Yutaka Yoshida and Shigeki Mori, *Senso no Nihonshi 23 Ajia/Taiheiyo Senso* (Japanese History of War 23 The Asia-Pacific War), Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 2007; Yutaka Yoshida, *Sirizuru Nihon Kin Gendaishi 6 Ajia/Taiheiyo Senso* (Series Modern and Contemporary History of Japan 6 The Asia-Pacific War), Iwanami Shoten, 2007

stage of *15-Year War* and covers the period after the Pearl Harbor attack.⁸⁷ In other words, *Asia-Pacific War* was not the term equivalent (or opposite) to *15-Year War* but part of it.

Many authors share Kisaka's idea of the term *Asia-Pacific War*. However, there were exceptions, as Kisaka himself said in explanatory notes that "some authors who use the name *Asia-Pacific War* are using it with the inclusion of the Sino-Japanese War, but such usage is incorrect as Japan was not waging the war in the Pacific Ocean at the time of the Sino-Japanese War."⁸⁸ For example, Yanagisawa, who used *Asia-Pacific War* in the book title for the first time, used the term to cover the period since the Sino-Japanese War and gave the name of *War against the United States=Pacific War* to cover the period since the Pearl Harbor attack. *Iwanami Koza Ajia/Taiheiyo Senso (Iwanami Course The Asia-Pacific War)* uses *Asia-Pacific War* to cover the more extensive duration that centers on the period between the Manchurian Incident and the end of the war but also includes some years before and after that period by redefining the term broadly from the narrower period since the Pearl Harbor attack with the awareness of "including not only 'wartime' but also the 'postwar period' in the range of consideration by not limiting the time and space of the fighting and focusing on the relationships between the Empire and colonies." Thus, as it covers the postwar period with the term *Asia-Pacific War*, it was negative toward the use of the term *15-Year War*, saying that it "has to be cautious about the naming that clearly limits the coverage period."⁸⁹

Therefore, historian Seiichi Imai, among others, said that "the name *Asia-Pacific War* is not mature yet, and many people interpret the term as indicating the entire *15-Year War* rather than the war after the declaration of war against the United States and Britain" and that he would like to avoid the use of *Asia-Pacific War* and instead he prefers the use of "*Pacific War* by emphasizing the inclusion of the Sino-Japanese War," though he is aware of problems with the term.⁹⁰

Secondly, because the term *Asia-Pacific War* was a term newly coined in order to do away with the terms *Greater East Asia War* and *Pacific War* it drew such criticisms as "it is a term detached from the historical conditions,"⁹¹ and "it lacks specificity, a requirement of historical terms and does not describe the initiative of the Japanese."⁹² Historian Yutaka Yoshida, who uses *Asia-Pacific War*, said he chose the term as the second best "because no other appropriate term is available to replace *Greater East Asia War* and *Pacific War*."⁹³

⁸⁷ Kisaka, "Ajia/Taiheiyo Senso no Kosho to Seikaku," pp. 56–70.

⁸⁸ Jun'ichiro Kisaka, "Ajia/Taiheiyo Senso Ron (An Argument for the Asia-Pacific War)," *Senso Sekinin Kenkyu*, No. 50, Winter 2005, p. 21.

⁸⁹ "Message upon Publication"/"Preface," Ryuichi Narita et al. eds, *Iwanami Koza Ajia/Taiheiyo Senso 1 Ima Naze Ajia/Teiheiyo Senso ka (Iwanami Course The Asia-Pacific War 1 Why the Asia-Pacific War Now)*, Iwanami Shoten, 2005, pp. v–xiii.

⁹⁰ Seiichi Imai, "Jugonen Senso Ron (An Essay on the 15-Year War)," Akira Fujiwara and Seiiichi Imai eds., *Jugonen Sensoshi 1 (15-Year War History 1)*, Aoki Shoten, 1988, p. 8.

⁹¹ Fumiaki Ema, "Senso Kosho to Kin Gendaishi Kyoiku (War Names and Education of Modern and Contemporary History)," *Kyoiku Naiyo Kenkyuu*, No. 10, March 1996, p. 11.

⁹² Michio Fujimura, "Teigen 'Show Taisen' to iu Kosho no Teian (Recommendation: Proposal for the Name of 'Showa Great War')," *Gunjishigaku*, Vol. 32, No. 3, December 1996, pp. 9–10.

⁹³ Yutaka Yoshida, *Siriizu Nihon Kin Gendaishi 6 Ajia/Taiheiyo Senso (Series Modern and Contemporary History of Japan 6 The Asia-Pacific War)*, Iwanami Shoten, 2007, p. v–vi.

(5) *Second World War (World War II)*

The term *Second World War* is the term widely recognized around the world. In Japan, for example, Takashi Saito, while stating that “*Greater East Asia War* is not a taboo but one of the names I would like to avoid,” said that in place of that term, “I think either *Second World War* or *Pacific War* will do, because they do not carry any value judgment.”⁹⁴ Masamichi Inoki, a political scientist, while stating that “honestly speaking, I cannot care less about the naming of the war,” said that because *Greater East Asia War* is “parochial and smacks of dogmatic militarism” and *Pacific War* does not cover the Sino–Japanese War, “the best way is to simply call it the *Second World War*.”⁹⁵

Given the antinomy between *Pacific War* and *Greater East Asia War*, both of them favor *Second World War* as it carries no ideological value and is recognized internationally. For example, Ikuhiko Hata examined various names and, after pointing out that there are cases where even officially adopted names have disappeared over time, predicted that “as <the Japanese–German War> went out of fashion and unified into <the First World War>, I expect (d) [*Second World War*: note by the quoter] over time.”⁹⁶ In a questionnaire survey conducted on a total of 11 well-known intellectuals by a weekly magazine in 1970, four of them favored the term “*Second (World) War*,” followed by the term *Pacific War* chosen by three, and the terms *Greater East Asia War* and *15-Year War* selected by two each.⁹⁷

Some problems with the term *Second World War* were pointed out, however. Some people say that it is not appropriate as the term used to discuss the particularity (the initiative of the Japanese) in the war Japan was directly involved in, particularly because it gives a strong image of the war fought in Europe. Further, the common belief has it that *Second World War* began with German’s attack on Poland in September 1939, but this does not coincide with Japan’s Pearl Harbor attack, and because of this, some people point out that it should rather be precisely called the “Second European War,” and that the term *Second World War* should appropriately indicate the war from December 8, 1941, because the war literally became global after the war between Germany and the Soviet Union and the Pearl Harbor attack. Furthermore, others question the term because it does not cover either the China Incident or the Manchurian Incident.⁹⁸ Ko Nakanishi, meanwhile, argued that the name “Second World War — the Asia-Pacific Front” would be appropriate because names like *Pacific War*, *Greater East Asia War* and *15-Year War* ignore the world history context of the *Second World War* as well as the “China Incident.”⁹⁹

(6) Others

War names based on the names of Japanese historical eras include “Showa Great War” and “Showa War.” In 1996, Michio Fujimura, a historian, proposed the name “Showa Great War (it was called *Greater East Asia War* at the time)” in consideration of the war’s double meaning of “aggression”

⁹⁴ Saito, “‘Daitoa Senso’ to ‘Taiheiyo Senso,’” pp. 283–284.

⁹⁵ Masamichi Inoki, “Ano Senso wo Nanto Yobubekika (How We Should Call That War),” *Sankei Shimbun*, August 14, 1965 (evening edition).

⁹⁶ Hata, *Showashi wo Jusosuru*, p. 369.

⁹⁷ “Daitoa Senso ka Taiheiyo Senso ka,” pp. 44–46.

⁹⁸ Kisaka, “‘Aija/Taiheiyo Senso no Kosho to Seikaku,’” pp. 69–70; Yomiuri Shimbunsha ed., *20 Seiki Donna Jidai Datta noka Senso Hen Nippon no Senso*, p. 521; Fujimura, “Teigen ‘Show Taisen’ to iu Kosho no Teian,” p. 10.

⁹⁹ Saburo Ienaga, “Nicchu Senso ni tsuite no Nakanishi Ko Shokan (Letters of Ko Nakanishi on the Sino–Japanese War),” *Chikaki ni Arite*, No. 3, March 1983, p. 55.

and “liberation” as well as the sufferings of the Japanese, including atomic bombings and the detention of former soldiers in Siberia, and particularly as the term helps “elucidate the war’s aspect of ‘liberation,’ which has been long treated as a taboo, and can bring developments after the August 15 end of the war into perspective in order to deal with what may come out when the organic link between this war and the wars in Korea and Vietnam is clarified.”¹⁰⁰ Previously, Fujimura gave the name “Showa ‘40-Year War’” to cover the period from the Manchurian Incident in 1931 and the Japan–China Joint Communiqué and the reversion of Okinawa to Japan (the end of its occupation by the United States), both in 1972. Fujimura explained that this includes Japan’s complicity in the Korean and Vietnam Wars the United States carried out in the postwar period and the resulting state of cold relations between Japan and China.¹⁰¹

Meanwhile, on August 13, 2006, Yomiuri Shimbun Co., summing up the series of newspaper articles, entitled “Kensho Senso Sekinin (Verification: War Responsibility),” pointed out that neither of the war names used to date has perpetuity in the future, and said that because the past wars fought within Japan often carry names based on historical eras and also because the series of the recent wars occurred during the Showa era, the newspaper would going forward call “the sequence of wars from the Manchurian Incident to the Sino–Japanese War and the Japan–U.S. War” tentatively as “Showa War.” However, Yomiuri Shimbun explained in the annotation that the name “Showa War” is in no way linked to Emperor Showa, saying that “we did not have Emperor Showa in choosing the name, but simply put the era name of ‘Showa’ to indicate the war that occurred in the Showa era.”¹⁰² Incidentally, many of the wars that occurred in Japan in the past carry era names, including “Jinshin War (in 671),” “Onin War (1467–1477)” and ‘Bun’ei/Koan no Eki (the first and second Mongolian invasions of Japan in 1268 and 1281, respectively). In February 1989, Yomiuri Shimbun used the term “Showa War” to describe the war since the Manchurian Incident, though just once, in the serialized articles.¹⁰³

Subsequently, Yomiuri Shimbun used the term “Showa War” in its editorial and other articles, but other newspapers and media or school textbooks did not follow suit, and Yomiuri Shimbun has been using the term along with *Pacific War* in recent years. Recently, Shoichi Watanabe uses the term “Great War of Showa.”¹⁰⁴

From the perspectives of actual conditions of wars, such as main warring countries, and characteristics of war, including ideas and actual interests involved, some wars are given names based on the names of the warring countries, such as *Japan–U.S. War* (Akira Iriye),¹⁰⁵ *Anglo-*

¹⁰⁰ Fujimura, “Teigen ‘Show Taisen’ to iu Kosho no Teian,” pp. 4–13.

¹⁰¹ Fujimura, “Futatsu no Senryo to Showashi,” p. 55.

¹⁰² “‘Showa Senso’ no Sekinin Sokatsu (Summing Up the Responsibility for the ‘Showa War’),” *Yomiuri Shimbun*, August 13, 2006; Yomiuri Shimbun War Responsibility Verification Committee, *Kensho Senso Sekinin II* (Verification: War Responsibility II), Chuokoronsha, 2006, p. 277; “Senso Sekinin” towa Nani ka (What is “War Responsibility”) (Dialogue between Tsuneo Watanabe and Masayasu Hosaka), *Ronza*, November 2006.

¹⁰³ “Showa Kensho 24 (Showa Verificaiton 24),” *Yomiuri Shimbun*, February 4, 1989.

¹⁰⁴ Shoichi Watanabe, *Nihon no Rekishi 6 Showa Hen ‘Showa no Taisen’ he no Michi* (Japanese History 6 Showa Volume The Road to the ‘Great War of Showa’), WAC, 2010.

¹⁰⁵ Akira Iriye, *Nichibei Senso (The Japan–U.S. War)*, Chuokoronsha, 1979.

Japanese War (Chihiro Hosoya)¹⁰⁶ and *the Japanese–Anglo-American War* (Hiroaki Shiozaki).¹⁰⁷ However, Iriye uses *Pacific War* together with *Japan–U.S. War*, and also is using *Asia-Pacific War* recently.¹⁰⁸

British historian Christopher Thorne pointed out the term *Pacific War* being used in Japan and the United States “failed to define the characteristics of the war’s geographical and geopolitical aspects, particularly its wide-ranging repercussions,” and proposed the name of the “Far Eastern war” from the viewpoint that the war was basically between Britain and Japan and the United States entered the war out of its relationship with Britain, not with Japan or China. Acknowledging that the name of the “Far Eastern (war)” should be criticized for being born out of a Eurocentric view of the world, Thorne said that in that sense, Japan’s naming of the war as *Greater East Asia War* instead of the “Far Eastern war” is understandable.¹⁰⁹ Among British historians, including Thorne and Alan John P. Taylor, there are views that there should not be any problem with Japan naming its own war as *Greater East Asia War* from the historical perception that Japan started the war to drive the British influence out of Asia and as a result, Britain lost its colonies and was “defeated.”¹¹⁰

On December 15, 1941, three days after the cabinet decided on the name *Greater East Asia War* the meeting of vice ministers agreed to see to it that the term “Far East” is not used in public documents as well as in newspapers, magazines, declarations and resolutions, because Japan decided on the naming of *Greater East Asia War* and “Far East” is the Britain-oriented term, “the use of the term by the Japanese themselves would bring enormous disgrace upon the Japanese and would represent an intolerable carelessness.”¹¹¹

Just as the term *15-Year War*, there are several war names based on the duration of war, but they differ in the periods covered, and starting and ending points. “100-Year East Asia War” was the term aforementioned Fusao Hayashi used in his *Daitoa Senso Koteiron (On Affirming Greater East Asia War)*, meant to describe Japan’s counteroffensive and resistance against the Whites who invaded Asia from around the arrival of the Black Ships of Commodore Perry until the end of the war.

On the other hand, from the opposite side, the camp of people who underscore Japan’s consistent aggression of Asia is proposing the terms “50-Year War,” “70-Year War” and “100-Year War.” “50-Year War,” which covers the period from the Sino–Japanese War of 1894–95 to the end of the war, was first brought up in 1973 by Hiroshi Furuya (teacher at Kyoritsu Girls’ High

¹⁰⁶ Chihiro Hosoya, “Taiheiyo Senso wa Nichiei Senso dewa Nakattaka (Wasn’t the Pacific War Actually the Anglo-Japanese War?),” *Gaiko Shiryokan Shiryo*, No. 10, October 1979; Chihiro Hosoya ed., *Nichiei Kankeishi* (History of Anglo-Japanese Relations), The University of Tokyo Press, 1982, pp. 301–302.

¹⁰⁷ Hiroaki Shiozaki, *Nichi Ei Bei Senso no Kiro* (Crossroads in the Japanese–Anglo-American War), Yamakawa Shuppansha, 1984; Sumio Hatano, “Nicchu Senso kara Nichi Ei Bei Senso he (From the Sino–Japanese War to the Japan–Britain–U.S. War),” *Kokusai Seiji* (International Relations), No. 91, May 1989, pp. 1–18.

¹⁰⁸ Akira Iriye, *Taiheiyo Senso no Kigen (The Origin of the Pacific War)*, The University of Tokyo Press, 1991 (Akira Iriye, *The Origins of the Second World War in Asia and the Pacific*, Longman, 1987); Akira Iriye, “Ajia/Taiheiyo Senso no Igi — 20 Seikishi ni okeru Sono Tamensei (The Significance of the Asia-Pacific War — Its Many Faces in the 20th Century History),” *Kokusai Mondai* (International Affairs), No. 423, June 1995.

¹⁰⁹ Christopher Thorne, *Taiheiyo Senso towa Nandatta noka* (The Issue of War: States, Societies, and the Far Eastern Conflict of 1941–1945), translated by Yoichi Ichikawa, Soshisha, 1989, pp. 3–4.

¹¹⁰ Kenichi Matsumoto, “Bakumatu kara Daitoa Senso made — Amerika no Peri Teitoku ga Mottekita ‘Shirohata’ no Koto (From the Last Days of the Tokugawa Shogunate to the Greater East Asia War — About the ‘White Flag’ Brought by America’s Commodore Perry),” *Daitoa Senso no Sokatsu*, Tentensha, 1995, pp. 71–72.

¹¹¹ *Asahi Shimbun*, December 16, 1941 (evening edition).

School) at the History Educationalist Conference of Japan.¹¹² Subsequently, in 1995, 50 years after the end of the war, Katsuichi Honda, a journalist, proposed the term “50-Year War,” reasoning that “the years from the Sino–Japanese of 1894–95 to the Manchurian Incident forms a seamless, continuous period.”¹¹³ As an epigone term of this thinking, “70-Year War” was put forward as the term that covers period from Japan’s dispatching of troops to Taiwan of 1874 until the end of the war.¹¹⁴ Furthermore, the term “100-Year War” has been coined on the basis of the view that Japan’s aggression of Asia has been consistently continuing from the Sino–Japanese War of 1894–95 to the dispatch to Cambodia of troops of the Self-Defense Forces (SDF) for peacekeeping operations in 1992.¹¹⁵

3. Public Use of War Names

(1) The Present Stance of the Government

The government has made clear its present stance on the names of war in its answers in writing to two written questions presented by then House of Representatives member Muneo Suzuki, an independent.

The first question was submitted on November 30, 2006, and the written reply was made on December 8 of the same year. The content of this question is described below:

“Question: What is the definition of *Greater East Asia War*? Please clarify the legal grounds of the name of *Greater East Asia War*.

Answer: On December 12, 1941, the cabinet decided: “The latest war against the United States and Britain and war that may arise depending on developments of the situation going forward, including the China Incident, shall be named *Greater East Asia War*.” But there is no law that provides for the definition the House of Representatives member asked about.

Question: What is the definition of *Pacific War*? Please clarify the legal grounds of the name of *Pacific War*. Does *Pacific War* include the war between Japan and China that was being waged since before December 8, 1941?

Answer: The term *Pacific War* is used in the Act on Acknowledgement of Loans Borrowed by Overseas Diplomatic Establishments, etc. (1949, Act No. 173), etc., but there is no law that provides for the definition the House of Representatives member asked about. There are no legal provisions that clarify whether *Pacific War* includes the state of war between Japan and China.

Question: When did the government suspend the use of the term *Greater East Asia War*? Please clarify the circumstances that led to the suspension as well as the legal grounds for the suspension.

¹¹² *Asahi Shimbun*, September 19, 1994.

¹¹³ Katsuichi Honda, *Honda Katsuichi Shuu Dai 24 Kan Daitoa Senso to 50 Nen Senso* (Katsuichi Honda Collection Volume 24 The Greater East Asia War and the 50-Year War), Asahi Shimbunsha, 1998, pp. 208–209.

¹¹⁴ Shizuo Maruyama, *Nihon no ‘70 Nen Senso’* (Japan’s 70-Year War), Shin Nihon Shuppansha, 1995; Toshio Higashitani, *‘70 Nen Senso’ to Heiwa no Dengon* (The “70-Year War” and Message for Peace), Nihon Kikanshi Shuppan Center, 1995.

¹¹⁵ Shigeo Kimoto, *Ajia Shinryaku no 100 Nen* (100 Years of Aggression of Asia), Shakai Hyoronsha, 1995.

Answer: Since the memorandum of the General Headquarters of the of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Power (GHQ) on December 15, 1945, the government suspended the use of the name the House of Representative member asked about in official documents.

Question: Does the government believe it appropriate to use the expression *Greater East Asia War*?

Answer: The government finds it difficult to answer categorically to the question the House of Representatives member asked because which expression the government should use in official documents depends on the context, etc.”¹¹⁶

The second question was submitted on January 26, 2007, and the written reply was made on February 6 of the same year. The content of this question is described below:¹¹⁷

“Question: What is the definition of *Greater East Asia War*?

Answer: On December 12, 1941, the cabinet decided: ‘The latest war against the United States and Britain and war that may arise depending on developments of the situation going forward, including the China Incident, shall be named *Greater East Asia War*.’

Question: What is the definition of *Pacific War*?

Answer: The term of *Pacific War* is not the term to be used under the definition of the government.

Question: Are *Greater East Asia War* and *Pacific War* identical wars?

Answer: The term of *Pacific War* is not the term the government uses and the government finds it difficult to answer the question from the House of Representatives member.”

The first thing shown by the government’s answers is that while the cabinet on December 12, 1941, decided that the war “shall be named *Greater East Asia War*, including the China Incident,” there are no legal definitions nor grounds for the terms *Greater East Asia War* or *Pacific War*. The second thing clarified is that while the term *Pacific War* is used in the texts of some laws, the use of the term depends on the context, etc. and the use of *Greater East Asia War* is not legally prohibited.

(2) Laws and Regulations

The term *Konji no Senso* (*Latest War*) adopted temporarily by the government is used only in two laws, the Act on Extraordinary Disposal of Land Lease and House Lease in Afflicted Cities (August 27, 1946, Act No. 13) and the Act on Special Cases of Demands for Acknowledgment (June 10,

¹¹⁶ “Question Concerning the Definition of the Greater East Asia War,” (Submitter: Muneo Suzuki, submitted on November 30, 2006, Question No. 197) and “Cabinet House of Representatives Question 165 No. 197” (Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, December 8, 2006).

¹¹⁷ “Question Concerning the Definition of the Greater East Asia War,” (Submitter: Muneo Suzuki, submitted on January 26, 2007, Question No. 6) and “Cabinet House of Representatives Question 166 No. 6” (Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, February 6, 2007).

1949), both enacted soon after the end of the war. The term *Konji no Taisen* (*Latest Great War*) is used in a total of six laws and regulations, the oldest one being the Act on Payment of Benefits, etc. to Returnees (May 17, 1957, Act No. 109) and the newest being the Order for Organization of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications (June 7, 2000, Cabinet Order No. 246).

The term *Pacific War*, meanwhile, is used in a total of nine laws and regulations, the oldest being the Act on Acknowledgement of Loans Borrowed by Overseas Diplomatic Establishments, etc. (June 1, 1949, Act No. 173) and the newest being the Act on Special Measures Concerning the Promotion and Development of Okinawa (March 31, 2002, Act No. 14).

(3) “Remarks by the Emperor,” Speeches and Statements, etc.

Showa Emperor, in his so-called “Humanity Declaration (renunciation of divinity)” delivered on January 1, 1946, referred to the *long-lasting war*. The Emperor used the term *Last War* in his remarks for national memorial services for the war dead in August each year, and used such expressions as *that unfortunate war* and *unfortunate period* in speeches at state banquets, etc. Commenting on the Emperor’s non-use of any specific name of the war, the Imperial Household Agency explained that “the practice has come to stay while the Emperor repeatedly used expressions that do not carry any specific name of the war after that (“Humanity Declaration”: note by the quoter). It is not that the Emperor has been avoiding expressions of the so-and-so war with the specific intent.”¹¹⁸

On the other hand, the Emperor often used *Second World War* in his remarks at press conferences, etc. On this point, Ikuhiko Hata commented that “I was sort of taken aback by that. Come to think of it, the previous three names (*Pacific War*, *Greater East Asia War* and *Asia-Pacific War*: note by the quoter) has no internationality,” underscoring the advantage of the term *Second World War* in that it has internationality understandable by non-Japanese people.¹¹⁹

Meanwhile, the terms *Last War*, *War in the Past*, *Past War*, *Second World War* and other names are used in speeches and statements by prime ministers and other high government officials. For example, the so-called “Murayama Statement” (On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the war’s end) by then Prime Minister Tomiichi Murayama on August 15, 1995, stated at the outset: “The world has seen fifty years elapse since the (last) war came to an end. Now, when I remember the many people both at home and abroad who fell victim to war, my heart is overwhelmed by a flood of emotions.”

(4) Public Organizations, etc.

This section examines publications by major public organizations. As for the Cabinet, the Cabinet Secretariat ed. *Naikaku Seido Nana Ju Nen Shi* (70-Year History of the Cabinet System) [Printing Bureau, Ministry of Finance, 1955] uses the term *Greater East Asia War* while Cabinet System 100-Year History Compilation Committee ed., *Naikaku Seido Hyakunen Shi* (100-Year History of the Cabinet System) [a total of two volumes, Printing Bureau, Ministry of Finance, 1985] uses the term (*great*) *war*. In particular, the latter, in its description of the war in the main text, wrote that “in the small hours of that day, the Japanese military attacked Pearl Harbor in Hawaii and erupted into open

¹¹⁸ Yomiuri Shimbunsha ed., *20 Seiki Donna Jidai Datta noka Senso Hen Nippon no Senso*, pp. 523–524.

¹¹⁹ Ikuhiko Hata and Kenichi Matsumoto, “Tokushu Taidan Daitoa Senso to Showa Tenno (Special Dialogue The Greater East Asia War and Showa Emperor),” *Rekishu Dokuhon*, September 2008 issue, p. 52.

warfare with the U.S. and British military,” and its chronological table said “Declared war against the United States and Britain,” both avoiding reference to any specific name of the war. As for the Diet, the House of Representatives and the House of Councillors eds., *Gikai Seido Nana Ju Nen Shi* (70-Year History of the Parliamentary System) [a total of 12 volumes, Printing Bureau, Ministry of Finance, 1960–1963] uses both *Pacific War* and *Greater East Asia War* while the House of Representatives and the House of Councillors eds., *Gikai Seido Hyaku Nen Shi* (100-Year History of the Parliamentary System) [a total of 10 volumes, Printing Bureau, Ministry of Finance, 1990] used *Greater East Asia War* in the main text and *Pacific War* in its chronological table.

At the Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Finance 100-Year History Compilation Office, ed., *Okurasho Hyakunen Shi* (100-Year History of the Ministry of Finance) [a total of three volumes, Okura Zaimu Kyokai, 1969] and Finance History Office, Institute of Fiscal and Monetary Policy, Ministry of Finance, ed, *Okurasho Shi* (Ministry of Finance History) [a total of four volumes, Okura Zaimu Kyokai, 1998] both use *Pacific War*. At the Ministry of Health & Welfare, Ministry of Health and Welfare 10-Year History Compilation Committee ed., *Koseisho 20 Nen Shi* (Ministry of Health and Welfare 20-Year History) [Kosei Mondai Kenkyukai, 1960] used *Pacific War*, but added that “the war was called *Greater East Asia War* at the opening,” while Ministry of Health and Welfare 50-Year History Compilation Committee ed., *Koseisho Goju Nen Shi* (Ministry of Health and Welfare 50-Year History) [a total of two volumes, Kosei Mondai Kenkyukai, 1988] used *Pacific War*. At the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs 100-Year History Compilation Committee ed., *Gaimusho no Hyaku Nen* (100 Years of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) [a total of two volumes, Hara Shobo, 1969] uses “*Greater East Asia War (Second World War)*” in a chapter title and *Greater East Asia War* in the main text. All in all, government ministries other than the Ministry of Foreign Affairs use *Pacific War*.

In the process of determining the names they used, there appeared to be some discussions taking place over which of the terms *Pacific War* or *Greater East Asia War* is more appropriate. For example, for Ministry of Finance 100-Year Compilation Office ed., *Okurasho Hyakunen Shi* (Ministry of Finance 100-Year History), the Research and Planning Division of the Minister’s Secretariat argued for *Greater East Asia War* as it is the official name under law and in official documents, but the General Coordination Division of the Minister’s Secretariat raised an objection and asserted that the more widely used *Pacific War* should be used. Ultimately, the term *Pacific War* was adopted by arbitration of Former Vice Minister of Finance Hiroshi Tanimura, who served as adviser for the compilation of the 100-year history.¹²⁰ The reason given by Tanimura for that choice was that “the Ministry of Education at the time accepted *Pacific War* in its screening of school textbooks and most textbooks use this name.” However, then Minister of Finance Takeo Fukuda used *Greater East Asia War* in his “preface” printed at the outset of the book.¹²¹

Next, an overall situation of the use of war names by public organizations that deal with

¹²⁰ During the war, Tanimura, an inaugural-class graduate of the Navy’s short-term paymasters’ school, served as a Navy paymaster with the rank of sub-lieutenant 1st class. After the war, he held such posts as Vice Minister of Finance and President and CEO of the Tokyo Stock Exchange. He is also president of the Kaigun Rekishi Hozonkai (Naval Historical Preservation Society), and *Nihon Kaigun Shi* (History of the Imperial Japanese Navy), compiled by the society, uses *Pacific War*. (Naval Historical Preservation Society ed., *Nihon Kaigun Shi* (History of the Imperial Japanese Navy), Daiichi Hoki Shuppan, 1995).

¹²¹ Odamura, “Senso Kosho ‘Seimei’ Ron (Jo),” pp. 35–36.

modern and contemporary history, as does the Military History Department of the National Institute for Defense Studies (NIDS), is examined. The National Archives of Japan and its affiliate, the Japan Center for Asian Historical Records, use the term *Pacific War* or the term *Pacific War (Greater East Asia War)*. The Diplomatic Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs uses *Pacific War*, and diplomatic documents were published recently as Ministry of Foreign Affairs ed., *Nihon Gaiko Bunsho Taiheiyo Senso* (Documents on Japanese Foreign Policy: The Pacific War) [a total of three volumes, January 2010].¹²² On Sino–Japanese War, *Nihon Gaiko Bunsho Nicchu Senso* (Documents on Japanese Foreign Policy The Sino–Japanese War) are scheduled to be published shortly, with the demarcation line between the two being the notification of the opening of warfare in December 1941.

At the National Diet Library, classification terms such as “ordinary subjects” and “related words” are standardized as *Pacific War* that covers the period from 1941 to 1945. Other classification terms such as “Sino–Japanese War” and “Manchurian Incident” are also used. The Tokyo Metropolitan Library follow the identical classification methods.

(5) War Names Used in Publications of the Defense Agency, the Self-Defense Forces and the National Institute for Defense Studies

In publications (annals) of the Ministry of Defense, the terms *Pacific War* or *Second World War* are used as seen below.

For example, Defense Agency Self-Defense Forces 10-Year History Editorial Committee, etc., *Jietai Ju Nen Shi* (10-Year History of the Self-Defense Forces) [Printing Bureau, Ministry of Finance, 1961] and Defense Agency Technical Research and Development Institute Establishment 10th Anniversary Commemorative Function Committee ed., *Boeicho Gijutsu Kenkyu Honbu Ju Nen Shi* (10-Year History of the Defense Agency Technical Research and Development Institute) [Printing Bureau, Ministry of Finance, 1962] uses the terms *Pacific War* and *Second World War*, while Defense Agency ed., *Boeicho Goju Nen Shi* (50-Year History of the Defense Agency) [Defense Agency, 2005], Maritime Self-Defense Force 50-Year History Compilation Committee ed., *Kaijo Jietai Goju Nen Shi* (50-Year History of the Maritime Self-Defense Force) [Defense Agency Maritime Staff Office, 2003] and Defense Agency Central Procurement Office 25-Year History Compilation Committee ed., *Boeicho Chotatsu Jisshi Honbu Nijugo Nen Shi* (25-Year History of Defense Agency Central Procurement) [Defense Agency Central Procurement Office, 1980] use *Second (World) War*. In recently published Defense Facilities Administration Agency History Compilation Committee ed., *Boei Shisetsucho Shi — Kichi Mondai tomoni Ayunda 45 Nen no Kiseki* (Defense Facilities Administration Agency — 45-Year History of Dealing with Base Problems) [Defense Facilities Administration Agency, 2007], the description is *Second World War (Japan–U.S. War)*.

Teigo Kusachi et al. eds., *Jietai Shi* (History of the Self-Defense Forces) [Nippon Bouei Chosa Kyokai, 1980], a private-sector publication uses the term *Greater East Asia War*.

For annals of the National Institute for Defense Studies (NIDS), National Defense College

¹²² This is part of the “Nihon Gaiko Bunsho (Documents on Japanese Foreign Policy),” and other wars are expressed, for example, as the “Hokushin Jihen (North China Incident),” the “Nichiro Senso (Russo–Japanese War)” and the “Manshu Jihen (Manchurian Incident).”

30-Year History Compilation Subcommittee ed., *Boei Kenshujo Sanju Nen Shi* (30-Year History of the National Defense College) [National Defense College, 1984] uses both the terms *Greater East Asia War* and *Pacific War*, while National Institute for Defense Studies 40-Year History Compilation Committee ed., *Boei Kenkyujo Yonju Nen Shi* (40-Year History of the National Institute for Defense Studies) [National Institute for Defense Studies, 1993] and National Institute for Defense Studies 50-Year History Compilation Committee ed., *Boei Kenkyujo Goju Nen Shi* (50-Year History of the National Institute for Defense Studies) [National Institute for Defense Studies, 2003] use *Greater East Asia War* thus giving precedence to *Greater East Asia War*.

Furthermore, on the website <<http://nids.go.jp/research/military/history/index.html>> of the National Institute for Defense Studies, the terms *War in the Past* and *Latest War* were initially used, apparently in accordance with examples of public use in the postwar period. On the current website, after several updates, the Military History Department uses *Second World War*, *War in the Past* and *Pacific War*, while the Military Archives uses *Greater Far East War*, thus using different terms for different tasks or purposes. It may be possible to understand that the practice is in accordance with the government’s view that “which expression the government should use in official documents depends on the context, etc.” That is, the Military Archives respects the term *Greater East Asia War* the expression used in documents of the Imperial Army and Navy in its possession, and uses the term as it is.

(6) The Issue of War Names in “Official War History Series”

In the planning stage, the “Senshi Soshō (Official War History Series)” was tentatively called the “Taiheiyo Senshi (History of the Pacific War).” Therefore, a circular notice, dated November 18, 1965, by the Administrative Vice-Minister for the Defense Agency to the President of the National Defense College, which officially decided on the publication of the series based on a decision by the meeting of counselors, was entitled “Concerning the Compilation and Publication of the History of the Pacific War.” Subsequently, the naming of the war in the “War History Series” surfaced as a specific issue at the time of the publication of Volume 1 (*Advance into Malaya*) in 1966. Susumu Nishiura, then head of the War History Office, requested the adoption of the term *Greater East Asia War* as the name of the war in the first volume, arguing that (1) since the series represents the official publication of the war history, the name of the war to be used should be the one officially determined by Imperial General Headquarters-Government Liaison Conference, the supreme decision-making body at the time; (2) geographical aspects of battlefields should be considered, and (3) the term *Pacific War* was used by the United States and there are no records that indicate that the Japanese government has authorized its use.

Later, however, after many twists and turns, the use of *Greater East Asia War* failed to be officially endorsed, and as a compromise, it was decided that the term is not to be used in the series or in the title of each volume and the book is to be simply called the “War History Series.” The compromise decision also stated that “the term *Greater East Asia War* is not to be used in the preface or explanatory notes, but it can be used in the main text. However, if the terms *Greater East Asia War* and the ‘China Incident’ do not have to be used in the main text, as much effort as possible should be made to use other expressions (‘Latest War,’ for example).” Recalling the circumstances surrounding that decision, Shiro Hara, who was on the editorial staff, said, “The Defense Agency was still using *Pacific War*. The War History Office took the position that ‘the term *Greater East*

Asia War could be used in the main text but it is not to be allowed externally.”¹²³

On the other hand, Asagumo Shimbunsha Inc., the publisher, took the series to be the “officially published history of *Greater East Asia War*,”¹²⁴ and its brochure read: “A total of 102 volumes of immortal records have finally been completed!! The officially published history of *Greater East Asia War*, the book on history that should be passed on to future generations.”

Further, when the publication of the “*Senso Shido Shi* (History of the War Guidance),” after being initially suspended, was decided by the 1973 circular notice of the Administrative Vice-Minister for the Defense Agency, Shiro Hara, who was responsible for the compilation of the Imperial Army version, argued in a direct plea to Takeharu Shimanuki, then head of the War History Office, that “it is not worth publishing if the term *Greater East Asia War* is not allowed to be used,” and at the judgment of Motoo Shishido, then director of the National Defense College, the term was adopted for the first time as the volume title in *Daihon’ei Rikubun-Bu Daitoa Senso Kaisen Keii* (Army Department of Imperial Headquarters: Transition of Circumstances as to Outbreak of the Greater East Asia War) [a total of five volumes, 1973–1974]. Hara said “Though many people generally refer to *Pacific War*, that term is just a slang word. *Greater East Asia War* is the historically correct term.”¹²⁵ “Explanatory notes” to the book stated that “the names of wars and incidents used are the official names at the time, including the Manchurian Incident, the China Incident and *Greater East Asia War*.” The Army version was followed by *Daihon’ei Kaigun-Bu Daitoa Senso Kaisen Keii* (Navy Department of Imperial Headquarters: Transition of Circumstances as to Outbreak of the Greater East Asia War) [a total of two volumes, 1979].

Most people involved in the compilation of the “War History Series” were those who used to serve in the Imperial Army or the Imperial Navy, and in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the end of the war, former Army and Navy officials published their own series of war history. Former Army officials published Fusao Okumura ed., *Kindai Nihon Senso Shi* (War History of Modern Japan) [a total of four volumes, Dodai Keizai Konwa Kai, 1995], while former Navy officials published Naval Historical Preservation Society ed., *Nihon Kaigun Shi* (History of the Imperial Japanese Navy) [a total of 11 volumes, Daiichi Hoki Shuppan, 1995]. The Dodai Keizai Konwa Kai (Dodai Economic Club) is an organization of business people who graduated from the Army War College, while the Naval Historical Preservation Society is a juridical foundation under the supervision of the Defense Agency formed on the basis of the Suikokai, an organization of former Navy officers, designed for the collection of materials and research study on history of the Imperial Navy. The former uses *Greater East Asia War* and the latter prefers to use *Pacific War*. As a sequel to *Kindai Nihon Senso Shi* (War History of Modern Japan), Fusao Okumura ed., *Daitoa Senso no Honshitu* (The Very Nature of Greater East Asia War) [Dodai Keizai Konwa Kai, 1996] has been published.

The use of the different war names indicates the difference between the Army and the Navy. It is assumed that the War History Office requested the use of *Greater East Asia War* partly because it was under the stronger influence of former officers of the Imperial Army.

¹²³ Hara, “‘Taiheiyo Senso’ dehanaku ‘Daitoa Senso’ to Yobubekidearu,” p. 5.

¹²⁴ “‘Daitoa Senso’ to ‘Taiheiyo Senso’ (The Greater East Asia War and Pacific War),” National Defense College 30-Year History Compilation Subcommittee ed., *Boei Kenshujo Sanju Nen Shi* (30-Year History of the National Defense College), National Defense College, 1984, p. 92.

¹²⁵ Hara, “‘Taiheiyo Senso’ dehanaku ‘Daitoa Senso’ to Yobubekidearu,” p. 5.

4. Frequency of Use of War Names

This chapter is dedicated to an analysis of the frequency of use of the four representative war names — *Pacific War*, *Greater East Asia War*, *15-Year War* and *Asia-Pacific War*.¹²⁶

(1) Newspapers, Books and Magazines

(i) Newspapers

The results of the database-based analysis of the war names used in major newspapers are shown below.

Table 1: The Number of Times the War Names Were Published in Major Newspapers¹²⁷

| | Pacific War | Greater East Asia War | 15-Year War | Asia-Pacific War |
|------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------|------------------|
| Asahi Shimbun | 13846 | 611 | 594 | 387 |
| Yomiuri Shimbun | 7332 | 251 | 158 | 41 |
| Mainichi Shimbun | 8150 | 341 | 271 | 128 |
| Chunichi/Tokyo Shimbun | 8194 | 359 | 260 | 91 |

For each newspaper, the term *Pacific War* commands an overwhelming share, followed by *Greater East Asia War*, *15-Year War* and *Asia-Pacific War* in that order.

Currently, *Asahi Shimbun*, *Mainichi Shimbun*, *Yomiuri Shimbun*¹²⁸ and *Shimbun Akahata* (renamed from *Akahata* in April 1997) use *Pacific War*, while *Nihon Keizai Shimbun* uses *Last War* and *Sankei Shimbun* *Greater East Asia War*. *Shimbun Akahata* also uses *Asia-Pacific War* along with *Pacific War*. The Japan Newspaper Publishers & Editors Association (Nihon Shinbun Kyokai) (a total of 158 newspapers, broadcasters and news agencies are its members currently) holds meetings of its task force on words and terms regularly to exchange views on words and terms used in news articles, but has had no formal discussions on the war names to date.¹²⁹

(ii) Books and Magazines

An analysis of Japanese book titles by the bibliographic retrieval service of the National Diet Library (NDL-OPAC) (as of April 7, 2010) shows a total of 1,576 titles using *Pacific War*, followed by 592 with *Greater East Asia War*, 287 with *15-Year War* and 91 with *Asia-Pacific War* in that order.

Looking at the latest five years (since 2005), however, book titles carrying *Pacific War* numbered 323, *Greater East Asia War* 59, *15-Year War* 76 (the number is high because a total of 43

¹²⁶ The following data is not statistics in its true sense in terms of both samples and methods used. For example, *Greater East Asia War* may have been counted in the frequency of use even when it is used in the negative sense. As such, the data should be interpreted as just one source of information to grasp an overall trend of the dissemination of the respective war names.

¹²⁷ The databases used are “Kikuzo II” (*Asahi Shimbun*, records of articles in 1985 onward), “Yomidas Rekishikan” (*Yomiuri Shimbun*, records of articles in 1986 onward), “Mainichi News Pack” (*Mainichi Shimbun*, records of articles in 1987 onward), and “Chunichi Shimbun/Tokyo Shimbun article database” (*Chunichi Shimbun*, records of articles in 1987 onward; *Tokyo Shimbun*, records of articles in 1997 onward). For all the databases, the data is as of March 2010.

¹²⁸ As mentioned earlier, Yomiuri Shimbun Co. advocates the use of “Showa War.”

¹²⁹ *Yomiuri Shimbun*, July 27, 1998.

volumes in the series are included), and *Asia-Pacific War* 47, showing that books with *Asia-Pacific War* in their titles are on the gradual rise.

The results of a time series-based analysis of titles of magazine articles, also with the assistance of the bibliographic retrieval service of the National Diet Library (NDL-OPAC) (as of April 7, 2010), are shown in a table below.

Overall, the aggregate total indicates the same order of *Pacific War*, *Greater East Asia War*, *15-Year War* and *Asia-Pacific War* as with newspapers. However, the times series analysis of magazines shows that while *Greater East Asia War* took precedence over *15-Year War* until 1969, the order of these two war names reversed from the 1970s to the mid-1990s. But *Greater East Asia War* came back above *15-Year War* in recent years. The latest reversal came presumably because people using *15-Year War* switched again to *Asia-Pacific War* without altering their historical perception (though, precisely speaking, the periods covered by the two war names are different).

Table 2: The Number of Times the War Names Were Published in Magazine Article Titles

| | Pacific War | Greater East Asia War | 15-Year War | Asia-Pacific War |
|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------|------------------|
| –1969 | 257 | 73 | 4 | None |
| 1970–1983 | 112 | 38 | 66 | None |
| 1984–1995 | 201 | 47 | 98 | None |
| 1996–2000 | 157 | 82 | 63 | 29 |
| 2001–2004 | 181 | 52 | 39 | 26 |
| 2005– | 369 | 102 | 50 | 85 |
| Total | 1277 | 394 | 320 | 140 |

(2) School Textbook Descriptions

Under the current “school curriculum guidelines,” the war is described as “Nikka Jihen,” which means the Sino–Japanese War and the “Second World War related to Japan” for elementary schools, *Second World War* and “(great) war” for junior high schools, and *Second World War* for high schools.

The status of the use of the war names in authorized textbooks for elementary, junior high and high schools¹³⁰ is as follows.¹³¹ Textbooks for elementary schools (“Elementary Social Studies for Sixth Grade Volume 1,” a total of four types) all use *Pacific War*, and in textbooks for junior high schools (“History,” a total of nine types), *Pacific War* is adopted by eight types, *Greater East Asia War* by two and *Asia-Pacific War* by one. Among textbooks for high schools (“Japanese History A” and “Japanese History B,” a total of 18 types), 17 types use *Pacific War*, five types *Greater East Asia War*, and four types *Asia-Pacific War*.

In each of elementary, junior high and high schools, *Pacific War* is most widely used, followed

¹³⁰ Textbooks are those authorized in 2004 for elementary schools, in 2005 and 2009 for junior high schools and from 2002 through 2007 for high schools.

¹³¹ Authorized descriptions were limited to those in the main texts, excluding explanatory notes. Since some textbooks use multiple terms in parentheses in the main texts, there may be overlapping in the aggregate total in some cases.

by *Greater East Asia War* and *Asia-Pacific War*.

The use of *Asia-Pacific War* was not authorized initially in the school textbook screening by the Ministry of Education for the reason of “not being widely accepted.”¹³² Following the growing acceptance in recent years, however, the term has gradually come to be authorized for junior high and high school textbooks. In the case of high schools in particular, 10 out of the 18 types of textbooks, including explanatory notes, now use *Asia-Pacific War*. For elementary schools, meanwhile, textbooks using the term *Asia-Pacific War* (the editions of Mitsumura Toshio and Nihon Bunkyo Shuppan) were submitted for authorization for the first time ever. However, after they received revision suggestions in the authorization process for of the reason that it was “hard to understand,” the Mitsumura Toshio edition changed the term to *Pacific War*, and the Nihon Bunkyo Shuppan edition with *Asia-Pacific War* passed only after adding the explanation that “the war is generally called *Pacific War*.”¹³³ However, *Asia-Pacific War* used in school textbooks is the name adopted in place of *Pacific War*, and as such, it indicates the war since the Pearl Harbor attack in December 1941.

The term *15-Year War*, meanwhile, came to be used in the main texts of junior high and high school textbooks only in the 1990s after discussions between the Ministry of Education and textbook authors in the authorization process,¹³⁴ but the term is now used in an annotation of only one type of high school textbooks. In this textbook, the term is described in the annotation entitled “How to Name This War” as follows:

“Immediately after the opening of the war, the government decided to call it *Greater East Asia War*, including the ‘China Incident’ since 1937...After the start of the war, the United States named the war *Pacific War*...In recent years, the war came to be more frequently called *Asia-Pacific War* in light of the fact that Japan’s aggression extended to the entire Asia-Pacific region. On the other hand, the term *15-Year War* is often used to cover the period from the Liutiaohu Incident to the end of *Pacific War*. Since the state of war effectively continued for about 15 years, it may be said that the expression that focuses on Japan’s impulse for outward aggression is the *15-Year War*. As just described, it is important to understand that the name of war includes the characteristics and objectives of that war.”¹³⁵

Conclusions

Recently, author Natsuki Ikezawa wrote the following in an article, entitled “Tochi no Na/Senso no Na Koshō no Konnansei (Name of Land/Name of War Difficulty in Naming)”:¹³⁶

“*15-Year War*...There is the counterargument that the war did not continue during the whole of this period. This sounds unrealistic to me as it is too abstract. The name of the ‘Showa War’

¹³² *Yomiuri Shimbun*, July 27, 1998.

¹³³ *Yomiuri Shimbun*, March 31, 2010.

¹³⁴ For the textbook authorization process and descriptions of *15-Year War*, see Keiichi Eguchi, *Jugo Nen Senso Kenkyū Shi Ron* (An Essay on History of Research on the 15-Year War), Azekura Shobo, 2001, pp. 334–344, etc.

¹³⁵ Akira Tanaka et al., *Nihonshi A Gendai kara no Rekishi* (Japanese History A History from the Modern Times), Tokyo Shoseki, p. 148 (authorized in 2007).

¹³⁶ Natsuki Ikezawa, “Owari to Hajimari (The End and the Beginning),” *Asahi Shimbun*, August 3, 2010 (evening edition).

is getting nowhere because it ignores the postwar history in my view...In present-day Japan, it seems common to call it *Asia-Pacific War*. But isn't Asia too wide to cover? Afghanistan or Turkey was in the theater of the war."

In Japan, a variety of names have been used to describe the war because of the effects of disunity in the objectives of the war at its opening, the U.S. occupation policy after the war and the "politicalization" of the perception of Japan's modern and contemporary history, with the war at its center, resulting in heated arguments. And these arguments have yet to be settled, as indicated in Ikezawa's impression above.

For this reason, most of the war names in use are ideologically biased. Overall, there has been the apparent trend that people who justify and affirm the war call it *Greater East Asia War*, those who are relatively neutral use the term *Pacific War*, and those who view it as the war of aggression against Asia use the terms *15-Year War* and *Asia-Pacific War*. Therefore, none of these war names offer internationality that holds good throughout the world. Even the term *Pacific War* has the weakness that it might be confused with the wars fought in Latin America in terms of global history.

On the other hand, it cannot be denied that there are persistent arguments against the term *Second World War* that apparently has internationalist overtones and is at the same time ideologically valueless, as it just does not sound right "emotionally" to many people, on top of temporal and geographical problems involved.

An attempt to find a new name is also extremely difficult, as seen in the failure of the term "Showa War," advocated by Yomiuri Shimbun, to get widely accepted. Thus, we probably cannot but end up going over the existing names of the war again.

Let us take an overview of the characteristics of the four representative names — *Pacific War*, *Greater East Asia War*, *15-Year War* and *Asia-Pacific War* from the perspectives of both "time" (period) and "(geographical) space."

There are various schools of thought about the "time," i.e. the period of war to be covered, but the representative views can be summarized as the following:

Table 3: Periods Covered by the War Names

| | 1931– | 1937– | 1939– | 1941– |
|---------------------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|
| Pacific War | □ | □ | | ○ |
| Greater East Asia War | | □ | | ○ |
| 15-Year War | ○ | | | |
| Asia-Pacific War | □ | □ | | ○ |
| Second World War | | | ○ | |
| Manchurian Incident | ○ | | | |
| Sino–Japanese War | | ○ (–1945) | | |
| China Incident ("War History Series") | | ○ (–1941) | | |

Note: ○ indicates representative views, while □ indicates minority views.

Though things change depending on where to set the beginning of the war, as shown above, in order to cover the war since December 8, 1941, the name to be used should be either *Pacific War*, *Greater East Asia War* or *Asia-Pacific War*.

When it comes to the “space,” or the geographical aspects of the battlefields, *Greater East Asia War* and *Asia-Pacific War* explicitly cover East Asia, centering on the Chinese front, Southeast Asia (including India) and the Pacific Ocean. In terms of the general idea, *15-Year War* also falls under this category, though not clearly specified in the name. On the other hand, the term *Pacific War*, from its name, has the strong image of the war between Japan and the United States, with the Pacific Ocean as its main battlefield. Because of this, some people, mostly “progressives,” have changed their preferred war name to *Asia-Pacific War* in recent years.

In terms of the frequency of use, *Pacific War* overwhelms all other names broadly in newspapers, magazines and school textbooks. In recent years, there is a notable trend among intellectuals to switch from *Pacific War* to *Asia-Pacific War*.

There also are some intellectuals who steadfastly stick to the use of *Greater East Asia War*. Consequently, we are now observing a strange structure where the general public seems comfortable with *Pacific War*, while intellectuals favor *Asia-Pacific War* or *Greater East Asia War*.

Looking at the public use of war names, laws and regulations use *Latest War* or *Pacific War*, both of which came to be adopted temporarily after the use of *Greater East Asia War* was prohibited, while *Last War*, *War in the Past* or *Second World War* are being used in “Remarks by the Emperor” and speeches/statements by high government officials. In annals and other publications of public organizations, *Pacific War* is mainly used. But the Cabinet, the Diet and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, among others, still use *Greater East Asia War*, an interesting situation in comparison with the broad use of *Pacific War* among the general public.

A comprehensive examination of the advantages and disadvantages of the names of the war since December 8, 1941, including the Chinese front, produced the following results. The term *Pacific War* is broadly and generally accepted in newspapers, magazines and school textbooks, etc., but has some geographical problems. The term *Greater East Asia War* has the advantages in geographical suitability, “contemporaneity” and a certain measure of “legitimacy” backed by the cabinet decision, but is not free from the impression of strong ideological bias. In the case of *Greater East Asia War*, its strong ideological bias is particularly seen as a major problem, but there are some views that the term does not necessarily incorporate the war objective of liberation of Asia. Furthermore, as discussed in this paper, the ideological stand and the name of the war do not necessarily go hand-in-hand definitely. For example, some “progressive” intellectuals are arguing for the use of *Greater East Asia War*. While *Asia-Pacific War* has geographical suitability and the freshness as against *Pacific War* or *Greater East Asia War*, it does have a strong ideological bias opposite to *Greater East Asia War*.

In conclusion, while the current status of use indicates a high degree of acceptance of the term *Pacific War*, if things are considered comprehensively, by keeping the future prospects in mind, it might be advisable to consider the use of either *Greater East Asia War* or *Asia-Pacific War*, after shedding their respective ideological biases, as the appropriate name for the war since December 8, 1941, including the Chinese front, from the perspective of the total picture of the war.