

The Continuing Japanese Myth on “Benguet Migrants” in the Philippines: Colonial Baguio City, Migrants, WWII, and a Hidden Dispute

Shinzo HAYASE

Professor, Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies

Waseda University, Japan

shayase@waseda.jp

Introduction

My book, “*Bengetto Imin*” no *Kyozō to Jitsuzō: Kindai Nihon-Tōnan Ajia Kankei-shi no Ichi-Kosatsu* (Myth and Reality of the Japanese “Benguet Emigrants” in the Philippines, 1903-1905: A Study of the History on Modern Japan-Southeast Asian Relations), was published 30 years ago in 1989. As I mentioned in the book, “I was apprehensive about the ‘myth’ deriving from a ‘false image’ because it could become a reason for cultural friction between the two countries” (Hayase 1989a, 250). So far, no noticeable cultural friction has occurred in the past three decades. However, when I visited Baguio for the first time after the publication of the book, my apprehension was reaffirmed when I saw the monuments and museum exhibitions regarding Japan and the Japanese. I recognized the differences in historical perception among the people concerned.

This paper first introduces how the monuments for the so-called “Benguet Migrants”—who engaged in the construction of the road to the “summer capital,” Baguio—were erected. Taking into consideration that Baguio was built as an American colonial city, I will proceed to discuss the differences in historical views with reference to museum exhibitions.¹

As I mentioned above, the historical perception regarding the construction of Benguet Road did not become an issue in the past 30 years. Then why am I bringing this up today? It is because historical remembrance, forgetfulness, and re-remembrance have become a political issue and a source of conflict. A good example is what unfolded in Central Eastern Europe and Russia after the collapse of the Cold War structure 30 years ago. This conflict recently spread to Europe and Asia and became a global issue. Likewise, in East Asia, the problems between Japan and China, as well as Japan and Korea, have come to be connected to the problems in Southeast Asia and even in Europe.² Relations between Southeast Asian countries and Japan have not yet become an apparent problem, but they could eventually create a hindrance to the development of mutual trust.³

The Monuments of “Benguet Immigrants”

There are two “Benguet Immigrants” monuments: one at Kennon Road Viewpoint, and another at the Japanese cemetery in the corner of Baguio Cemetery (also known as the Baguio Public Cemetery). For a description of the “Benguet Immigrants,” I relied on my own writing, “Benguet Road Construction,” from the *Encyclopedia of the Philippines* (Suzuki and Hayase 1992). This entry, in turn, was based on my book published in 1989. Benguet Road was formally called Kennon Road in 1922, named after Lyman W. V. Kennon (1858–1918), the last construction director.

The Benguet Road, otherwise known as Kennon Road, is 45.891 kilometers long and extends from Pozorrubio, Pangasinan Province to Baguio, Benguet Province. Later, it was designated as the only 34 kilometers of mountainous area. The duration of the construction was from 15 January 1901 to 27 March 1905. The total cost was around two million US dollars. It was built by the US which colonized the Philippine Islands to connect to the summer resort, Baguio. The initial estimation of the duration was six months, and the cost was \$75,000; however, contrary to the original plan, it was an unexpectedly hard construction

with many deaths. The laborers were mainly Filipinos, Japanese, American, and Chinese. All in all, they were from 46 countries and regions. Many Japanese laborers joined in October 1903, which eventually became known in Japan. Some works of fiction were produced based on this, such as *Bengetto Imin* (Benguet Immigrants) by Ohishi Chiyoko which was shortlisted for the ninth (the first half) Akutagawa Prize in 1939, and *Waga Machi* (My Town) by Oda Sakunosuke (1943). In Japan, it has been said that “it was the Japanese who completed the Benguet Road,” or “700 Japanese sacrificed their lives.” However, no such mentions were made in Japanese diplomatic papers or US construction reports. What had been said was an exaggeration and later exploited as heroic stories to emphasize the “excellence” of Japanese characteristics as if the difficult road construction was achieved by Japanese blood and sweat, where Americans, Chinese, or Filipinos had failed. It was the time in the mid-1930s when the so called “advance to the south” boom was on the rise, and such stories were used to emphasize the “excellence” of Japanese characteristics. It was true the Japanese workers did suffer; they were more sickly, and the death rate was higher than the other workers. Their working conditions were nothing but miserable. However, the number of deaths was about 200, mostly due to sickness. The number of Japanese was estimated to be between 500 and 1,000 at any given time, although it is difficult to ascertain since comings and goings were frequent. In 1903-1904, a little over 5,000 Japanese had entered the Philippines, of which probably more than half went to Benguet. In the final analysis, the completion of the road can be attributed to the excellent leadership of Major Kennon as well as to America’s overwhelming material resources. After the completion, a little over 200 of the Japanese “Benguet migrants” moved to Davao and laid the foundation for an *abaca* (Manila hemp) town which eventually developed to have 20,000 Japanese residents in prewar years. The Benguet Road has been impassable since July 1990 due to an earthquake. Restoration is said to be difficult. (318–19)

Kennon Road Viewpoint

Seven kilometers south of Baguio stands a two-story-high viewpoint. The signboard says, “Kennon Road Viewpoint,” “Filipino-Japanese Foundation of Northern Luzon, Inc.” There are three markers, the most recent one placed in 2003 with the following explanation:

MEMORIAL MARKER (Re-dedication)

In memory of the 2,300 Japanese immigrant workers many of whom met death by accident or by sickness during the construction of the Kennon Road, which they helped build.

This tablet serves as a grateful recognition of their valuable contribution in building a highway linking the City of Baguio and the Cordillera to the rest of the country and as a token of appreciation for their efforts, sacrifices and determination in the concrete realization of this vital highway.

This marker is being re-dedicated on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the entry of the first Japanese workers in the construction of Kennon Road.

February 20, 2003

Filipino-Japanese Foundation of Northern Luzon, Inc.
CARLOS B. TERAOKA
Chairman

(The rest, omitted)

As indicated, this marker was erected by the Filipino-Japanese Foundation of Northern Luzon, Inc. to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the importation of Japanese laborers who engaged in the construction of Kennon Road. These 2,300 Japanese workers were not mentioned in any

prewar record or during the war, but the information was inscribed on the marker set up in 1959 when Baguio City celebrated the 50th anniversary of its establishment. The death toll was not cited, simply that many died due to “accidents and sickness.”

As seen in Table 1, according to the construction supervisor’s record, from October 1903 to August 1904, 97 Japanese died, 12 due to accident, and the rest from illness (40 dysentery, 16 beriberi, 10 virulent malaria, etc.).⁴ A Japanese medical doctor, Hashimoto Otoji, one of the six Japanese doctors in Manila, said that the death toll was at 200 (Hayase 1989a, 171). The record obtained by the Japanese Consulate states 130 Japanese died in Benguet’s public hospital (169). It had been widely circulated that the Japanese died of dynamite-related accidents; however, it was mostly white laborers who handled the dynamite, and the Japanese rarely engaged in such dangerous work.⁵ There was an accident where six workers died at the same time, and their funeral photo was published. The names of the deceased were Suda Kinsaku, Yoshimura Seiichi, Matsumoto Tsunekazu, Umezu Hanzo, Ohnari Ryunosuke, and Suzuki Sakuemon (EJFANLI 1983, 91). Among them, Suda, Umezu, and Suzuki died on 31 May 1912 and were buried in Baguio Cemetery. There are no records between September 1904 and March 1905, perhaps due to the fire on 11 March 1905 at the Engineering Department building (Hayase 1989a, 16–17).

As seen in Table 2, the first Japanese who engaged in the construction on June 1903 numbered 45. Afterwards, monthly averages of 32, 46, or 65 started to arrive in Baguio. The workers recruited in Japan began to come in October. There were 116 of them, and the number increased to 500 after November. In July 1904, there were 855, and 812 in August. According to a Japanese Consulate Report dated 13 February 1905, “Hiripin-to Bengetto-shu Honpo Imin Shugyochi Junkai Fukumeisho” (Report on Visiting the Places Where the Japanese Immigrants Work in Benguet Province, the Philippine Islands) by Narita Goro, the number never exceeded 1,000 at any given time (Hayase 1989a, 102).

TABLE 1: Diseases and Deaths on the Benguet Road,
1 October 1903 – 31 August 1904

Deaths and Principal Causes	**"Americans"	Chinese	Japanese	Filipinos	Total
Dysentery	-	-	40	17	57
Malaria, Pernicious	-	-	10	5	15
Beriberi	-	13	16	23	52
Accidents	8	1	12	4	25
Bronchitis, Capillary	-	1	2	5	8
Pneumonia	-	-	-	10	10
Opium Poisoning	-	8	-	-	8
Abscess of Liver	-	-	1	-	1
Cholera	1	-	4	-	5
Miscellaneous	3	7	12	19	41
TOTAL	12	30	97	83	222
Death Rate, per 1000	2.65	10.46	15.58	6.68	Average 8.52

See Hayase (2014, 34; 1989b, 302) for details.

*All workmen of American (whites and blacks) or of European origin were classified under the general heading of "Americans."

The first marker of 2003 has 20 February as the commemoration date, and it seems to have followed the 80th anniversary marker placed in 1983 (described below).

The second marker was placed when the Kennon Road Overview Pavilion opened on 18 November 1989. The upper part has a Philippine flag in the center. On the left side is a US flag, and on the right, a Japanese flag. Underneath the flags are three laborers: the American and the Filipino laborers wear Western work clothes with a hat; the Japanese don Japanese-style clothes with a towel around his head, very different from the first two. In the first half of 1904, the number of workers had a monthly average of 2,911, 48.1 percent of whom were Filipinos; 20.7 percent, Japanese; 17.1 percent, American; 9.7 percent, Chinese; and 4.3 percent, others (Hayase 1989a, 69). The marker tried to depict the cooperation of the workers from the three countries, the US, the Philippines, and Japan, in this order. Erecting the marker was a project of Japanese-Filipinos, and neither Filipinos nor Americans were involved. The names inscribed on the marker were those

of the 12 committee members, seven of which were the same names as those on the 2003 plate. This indicates the continuity of committee membership.

TABLE 2: Average Daily Number of Employees on the Benguet Road Construction, January 1901 - August 1904

Month, Year	Americans*	Japanese	Chinese	Filipinos	Others	Total
May 1903	71	-	-	334	-	405
June	-	45	-	-	-	-
July	312	32	202	611	20	1177
August	314	46	558	395	156	1469
September	333	65	385	684	156	1623
October	377	116	379	1777	165	2816**
November	392	525	329	1320	206	2772
December	364	572	299	618	37	1890
January 1904	534	598	302	744	15	2193
February	509	628	211	2329	116	3793
March	506	723	258	1150	112	2749
April	508	575	276	1457	203	3019
May	452	502	306	1379	170	2809
June	481	588	346	1350	140	2905
Jan.-June 1904 Total	2990	3614	1699	8409	756	17468
Monthly Average	498	602	283	1402	126	2911
%	17.1	20.7	9.7	48.1	4.3	
July 1904	440	855	322	1127	41	2785
August	452	812	311	1267	40	2882

See Hayase (2014, 36-37; 1989b, 304-05) for details.

*All workmen of American (whites and blacks) or European origin were classified under the general heading of “Americans.”

July 1903 was the average of only four days between July 28 and 31.

** 2814 (The total does not match)

The homepage of the Filipino-Japanese Foundation of Northern Luzon, Inc. introduces the history of the Kennon Road Viewpoint under the caption “Kennon Pavilion Park” (FJFNLI n.d.).

In 1959, the commemorative marker was unveiled on the 50th anniversary of the establishment of Baguio. It was renewed in 1983 during the city’s 80th anniversary, which I already mentioned in my book (Hayase 1989a, 242–43). On 7 September 1988, the president of the FJFNLI, Oseo

Hamada, advocated building a park around Kennon Road Viewpoint. The project started the following year. However, because of the earthquake on 16 July 1990, construction was halted. As far as the Baguio City government was concerned, it had given a permit. However, no financial support was rendered. The construction included the building of four traditional indigenous houses of the Bontoc, Ifugao, Benguet, and Kalinga tribes, a 450-meter-long sidewalk, streetlights, public toilet, and a picnic area on a slope under the Viewpoint. This was to be in conjunction with the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of Japanese immigration to the Philippines in 2003. However, only one such traditional house is standing, and no one can go beyond that point. Landslides are seen all over, which reminds us of the difficulty constructing Benguet Road. It would not be easy to maintain and manage the park built on the slope.

The third marker, the Memorial Marker, erected on 20 February 1983, commemorates the 80th anniversary of the start of construction of the Kennon Road. It is obviously a mistake because the construction started in 1901. It was October 1903 when the Japanese workers recruited in Japan joined the project. However, the marker itself says Kennon Road was built in 1904; therefore, it was not the 80th anniversary, either. I am puzzled as to why the 80th anniversary was commemorated on 20 February 1983. At any rate, for this occasion, a 94-page article titled, *Memorial: The Japanese in The Construction of Kennon Road*, was published. The third paragraph of an article entitled “Memorial Plaque (Renewal)” (FJFANLI 1983, 51) cites the following:

This plaque was first dedicated on the occasion of the Golden Anniversary of Baguio in 1959. It is being restored on the occasion of the 80th anniversary of the start of the construction of Kennon Road.

The 1983 marker omitted the fact that the 1959 marker was erected on the 50th anniversary of Baguio’s establishment as follows:

MEMORIAL MARKER

In memory of the 2,300 Japanese immigrant workers many of whom met death by accident or by sickness during the construction of the Kennon Road in 1904 which they helped build.

May this tablet serve as a grateful recognition of their valuable contribution to the opening of the City of Baguio, and as a token of appreciation for their efforts sacrifices and determination in the concrete realization of this vital highway.

This marker is dedicated on the occasion of the 80th anniversary of the start of the construction of Kennon Road.

February 20, 1983

ERNESTO H. BUENO,
Brig. Gen. AFP (Ret.)
City Mayor
Baguio

(omitted)

Then what was said in the memorial marker of 1959? The following is taken from the *Memorial* (FJFANLI 1983, 53).

MEMORIAL PLAQUE

In memory of the 2,300 Japanese, most of whom died, either in accidents or by sickness, in the construction of the Kennon Road in 1904.

May this tablet serve as recognition of their valuable contribution to the growth of the City of Baguio and as a symbol of their sacrifice, brotherhood and fruitful cooperation.

ALFONSO TABORA,
Mayor,
City of Baguio

Baguio Golden Anniversary
September 1, 1959

We see that the markers erected afterwards had agreed with the 1959 marker, that 2,300 Japanese laborers died, mostly due to accident and sickness. The 1983 marker said that the construction started in 1904, as stated on the 1959 marker. However, there was no mention of it afterwards. Since Baguio became a city on 1 September 1909, it is most understandable that it is commemorated on that day.

From these four markers, including the one in 1959, we learn the following: the one erected on 1 September 1959 commemorates Baguio's incorporation as a city; therefore, the city took its own initiative, even nominally. The one erected on 20 February 1983 had nothing to do with the start of the city. It was to commemorate the first Japanese immigrants to Baguio; therefore, the city's involvement was literally nominal. The rest, the one in 1989 and 2003, were erected by Japanese-Filipinos,⁶ and the city had nothing to do with it except to give permission.

The 1959 marker was a gift from the *Firipin Kyokai* (The Philippine Society of Japan), which indicates that the main force behind the erection was Japan (Hayase 1989a, 238–42). The Philippine government signed the Peace Treaty at the San Francisco Peace Conference under American persuasion on 5 September 1951. However, Manila was dissatisfied with the war reparations clause. Therefore, the Philippine Senate shelved its ratification until 1956. On 23 July of that year, Philippine-Japan diplomatic relations formally commenced. However, the Philippine-Japan Treaty of Amity, Commerce, and Navigation signed in December 1960 was not ratified until December 1973—under Marcos' martial law regime. In 1959, anti-Japanese sentiment in the Philippines was still extremely strong. We can well surmise that erecting a Japan-related memorial, though not related to the war, must have been quite difficult.

By the time the 80th anniversary of Japanese immigration was memorialized in 1983, the situation was quite different. After the signing of the Japan-Philippine Treaty of Amity, Commerce, and Navigation, the trade between Japan and the Philippines rapidly increased. Japan became its second-largest trade partner next to the US, occupying 20 percent for both exports and imports, although they encountered various inconveniences since the treaty was not formally ratified by the Philippines until 13 years later. In some years, Japan’s investment in the Philippines exceeded that of the US. The reparations were funneled into Japanese government development aid, and the maintenance of infrastructure was boosted by onerous fund cooperation. On the other hand, the Philippines’ overseas debt kept increasing in the 1980s, and the Philippines’ national finances could not have been maintained without the direct investment of Japanese enterprises.

On 20 February 1983, the “Memorial Program of the 80th Anniversary Celebration of the Entry of Japanese Workers in the Construction of the Kennon Road” opened at 9:30 a.m. at the Zigzag Prospect Point. It began with the national anthems of both countries and concluded with the unveiling of the memorial by the wives of the Minister of Tourism, the Governor of Benguet Province, and the Mayor of Baguio City. Then the proceedings moved to the “Tower of Peace Monument” or Picnic Grounds. After lunch, Prince Takeda delivered a donation statement, followed by a presentation of a local ethnic dance and Japanese music. The event was a Japanese initiative, but the Philippine side played the main role (FJFANLI 1983).

The commemorative pamphlet carrying greetings was published on this occasion. Someone noticed “a nuanced difference in the meaning of ‘contribution’ and ‘sacrifice’ between Japan and the Philippines.” This was pointed out by an article published in the *Manira Shimbun* (*The Daily Manila Shimbun*) on 13 January 2003. Established in 1992, the *Manira Shimbun* is the first Japanese daily in Southeast Asia after the war. It published many articles on Philippine-Japanese related issues, such as Japanese-Filipinos, overseas workers, and the war. On the 100th year anniversary of Japanese immigration to the Philippines, the paper serialized several articles from

2 to 13 January 2003: “One Century of Immigration, the First Part: An After-image of the First Generation.” The third installment of the article, “Japanese ‘Contribution and Sacrifice,’” concluded,

The greetings published in the souvenir program on the occasion of the 80th anniversary of Japanese immigrants 20 years ago (1983) by the Filipino-Japanese Friendship Association of Northern Luzon, Inc. presented a subtle difference between Japan and the Philippines regarding the meaning of ‘contribution’ and ‘sacrifice.’ The following are the points emphasized: “Japanese workers took part in and made great contribution” (Japanese Ambassador to the Philippines); “Eighty years ago, the Japanese workers helped build the Kennon Road. As part of an international labor force, they underwent hardships and sacrifices” (President Marcos); “Japanese workers contributed in no small measure to the realization of a mountain resort plan” (foreword by the Association).

The names inscribed on the markers, such as Hamada, Teraoka, and Tanabe, were the executive members of the Association, who were the second generation Japanese born from the union of Japanese workers and Filipino women. They led reserved and inconspicuous lives (due to the war) and said, “Japanese workers contributed in no small measure.” But beyond this modest image, we see those who were forced to live as Filipinos and these “children of the Japanese” who are still living that way even today.

A Japanese who contributed greatly to the welfare of Japanese-Filipinos was Sister Unno Tokoyo, who lived in Baguio from 1972 till her death on 31 December 1989. She visited and persuaded them to organize themselves. It was a time when anti-Japanese sentiment was still very strong, and many had to hide their Japanese ancestry. Her effort bore fruit in the form of the organization, Filipino-Japanese Friendship Association of Northern Luzon, which was established on 2 June 1973. The organization was then duly registered as Filipino-Japanese Friendship Association of

Northern Luzon, Inc. (EJFANLI) on 2 June 1983. She established a fund on 23 September 1987 and renamed it the Filipino-Japanese Foundation of Northern Luzon, Inc. (EJFNLI). The inauguration ceremony of the Kennon Road Overview Pavilion was held on 18 November 1989, a month and a half before Sister Unno’s passing. A plaque dedicated to her had the inscriptions, “Sister Theresia Unno” and “Founder and Adviser.” She also established a scholarship in 1974 and the Benguet Agricultural Cooperative in 1983 (Kamono 2003). A day before the 80th anniversary of the Japanese immigrants held on 19 February 1983, the memorial hall was built in Baguio Cemetery, which shall be touched on below.

A bust of Kennon was erected in 2005 on the 100th anniversary of the opening of Benguet Road in front of the Viewpoint. Murals were inscribed on the four sides of the pedestal: the front has the Baguio City emblem with two Americans, one in a car, the other on a horse. Perhaps one is Kennon and the other is Worcester (described below), with indigenous people celebrating, waving national flags, and beating drums. When we walk around to the right, we see dancing indigenous people with an offering of a pig. Next, the Philippine and American flags are placed in the center, and around them are 17 different national flags. Below these flags are water buffaloes carrying their burdens, Filipino and American workers celebrating and waving flags, and Christian Filipinos dancing to the tune of a guitar. The basic theme was centered around friendly relations between the Philippines and the US, although the workers came from different countries and regions. The bust focused on the local people and Christian Filipinos celebrating the opening of the road. The day was 4 July, the US Independence Day (also Philippine-US Friendship Day). The years 1903 or 1904 do not mean anything to the Americans or the Filipinos. Kennon had invited musical bands and dancers from Dagupan every Friday night to entertain the workers. This way, he could minimize the number of those who would not return to work after leaving for home on weekends. This was also depicted on the mural.

The cost of construction and maintenance of Kennon Road ran high; it was criticized as “the most expensive road in the world,” or “cost more than the Suez Canal construction” (Reed 1999, 88; De los Reyes and De los Reyes 1986).⁷ Reed, an author of critically acclaimed academic work on Baguio, praised Kennon highly for his skillful recruitment and management methods of workers. Reed concluded that the road was completed not only at great expense but also through the sacrifice of hundreds of workers who died of sickness and accidents. He did not mention the countries or regions the workers came from (Reed 1999, 89–91; Kennon 1906, 373).

Japanese Cemetery in Baguio Cemetery

An obelisk stands in Baguio Cemetery where the front part reads, “tower of repose of departed souls and other spirits;” the lower part, “Thy dead men shall live XXVI;” the back side, “Erected by the Baguio Japanese Association on 1 May of the year Taisho 11 (1922);” and the left side, “donated by the Prime Minister and Army General Tanaka Giichi.” The English inscription, taken from the Bible in the Book of the Prophet Isaiah 26:19, signifies rebirth. When General Tanaka Giichi visited the road, he was “deeply moved by the courage and contribution of the Japanese workers and donated the fund for the tower” (*The Asahi Shimbun*, 8 January 1942, Tokyo morning edition).

Afterwards, the slope was filled with cenotaphs of Japanese prefectural associations and graves of individuals. After the war, Baguio City authorities believed no Japanese cemetery existed; so the unattended tomb stones were destroyed and replaced by concrete coffins for Filipinos. Sister Unno tirelessly gathered the remains of those Japanese and the soldiers who died during the war; she tried to rebuild the Japanese cemetery. However, many were destroyed by the 1990 earthquake. Whatever remained was again destroyed or damaged by the “Yamashita Treasure” hunters, who believed the treasures left by former Imperial Japanese military were hidden there. The Japanese cemetery in Mintal, Davao met the same fate. I counted more than 60 individual tomb stones during my research in 1982, but most were

destroyed after 10 years (Hayase 1983). In Baguio, when a memorial hall was constructed in 1983, about 150 names, along with their birth places and death dates, were inscribed. The oldest was 1908. There were nine in the 1910s, and most were from 1945. Some family members also died on the same day and others had no specific dates.⁸

The memorial hall has a triangular roof, with a cross placed at the beam; beneath it is a design of a gateway seen at the entrance to a Shinto shrine. The entrance to the memorial has two epitaphs, the right side in Japanese; and the left, in English, but their contents are somewhat different. The Japanese epitaph says how they lived with the Filipinos and contributed to the Filipinos' welfare; but the English version has none of these words. It is an obstacle to acquire a shared historical understanding if the Japanese and the English explanations do not match.

Assuming that most of the “Other Places” means Baguio in Table 3, the Japanese residents in 1907 in Baguio were fewer than 150. This means that not many Japanese remained in the city after the completion of Benguet Road. Afterwards, the population of carpenters increased, including those who moved from one place to another, “overnight carpenters,” and those who just arrived from Japan. From Table 3, we can see that there was a slight discontinuity between the year of completion—1905—and afterwards.

TABLE 3: Occupation of Japanese Residents in Baguio (1903–1912)

Date of Investigation/Report	Area	Occupation	Population	Regional Total	National Total
Investigated 30/6/1903	Benguet	construction worker	45	45	1,215
Reported 15/7/1904	Benguet Province	construction worker	750	778	2,096
Reported 17/8/1905	Other places	carpenter	210	629	2,142
Reported 19/11/1906	Other places	carpenter	102	568	2,085
Reported 20/7/1907	Other places	carpenter	70	433	2,180
As of 31/12/1907	Other places	carpenter	50	150	1,892
As of 31/12/1908	Around Baguio	carpenter	170	186	1,919
As of 31/12/1909	Around Baguio	carpenter woodcutter	260 41	323	2,158
As of 31/12/1910	Baguio	carpenter woodcutter	152 32	242	2,555
As of 31/12/1912	Baguio and its vicinity	carpenter woodcutter	194 38	289	3,654

See Hayase (2012b, 38–43) for details.

Baguio Museum

How do Baguio citizens view the Kennon Road construction, the Japanese workers, the Japanese who remained in Baguio after the construction, and Japanese-Filipinos? The exhibitions at the Baguio Museum could tell us something.

The museum is situated just outside the city. The ground floor exhibits the culture of indigenous people around Baguio; the second floor is dedicated to the history of the city. Regarding Kennon Road, a portrait of Kennon

and eight photos are exhibited. The accompanying explanation is based on a US report. The Japanese workers are introduced as the first group among the recruited workers, indicating their relatively important role.

For prewar Japanese, three photos of the Japanese Bazaar are exhibited. For Session Road, the main street of Baguio, the explanation starts with the Japanese bazaars. According to the *Philippine Yearbook* (1941 edition), the Japanese Bazaar “is individually owned. It sells general merchandise and medicine. It also operates a studio. Address: Baguio City. Established in 1912 with a capital of PHP 200,000. The volume of business, PHP 180,000: Owner, Hayakawa Toyohei. Telephone No. 3108; PO Box 30” (Ohtani 1940, 555).

There is a background story as to why prewar Japanese photos are exhibited. When the commemorative publication of the 100th anniversary of “Benguet Immigrants” was published in 2004, many photos of Japanese taken by photographer Furuya Hakumu (Shonosuke) were provided by his son, Einosuke (Afable 2004). This commemorative publication is introduced in the homepage of the Filipino-Japanese Foundation of Northern Luzon, Inc. Generally speaking, the publication faithfully reproduces the history and society of Baguio vis-à-vis the Japanese and Japanese-Filipinos. It came to be considered one of the basic academic works on Baguio, along with Reed’s book (1999). However, when it came to the “Benguet Immigrants,” it did not deny the “contribution” of the Japanese workers. This was perhaps due to their failure to carefully look over Japanese materials such as consulate reports.

This commemorative publication had some impact on an unexpected field. Recently, Baguio has come to be known as a place for art. One of the artists is a National Artist, Benedicto Reyes Cabrera, commonly known as BenCab. The BenCab Museum, which has been exhibiting indigenous culture recently, displayed an acrylic painting on canvas (150 by 98.5 cm) titled, “Japanese Pioneers in Baguio.” It was completed in 2004, the same year the commemorative issue was published. His name appears toward the beginning of a list of roughly 200 to whom the publication expresses

gratitude. This painting depicts many images of the Japanese. One of them in the center is a father, a mason. To his left, his Filipino wife holds a baby in her arms besides their son and daughter. This painting is based on a photo taken around 1932. The other four sons in the photo are not included in the painting (Afable 2004, 148). Another image in the upper left side is a man running at a sports day held on Emperor Meiji's birthday, 3 November. A Japanese flag is seen above the right side. This photo was taken in the 1930s (225). The next image in the lower right is a deputy director of a lumber mill in indigenous attire during the Ibaloi Festival; he is dancing around two big earthenware pots filled with locally brewed wine. This is based on a photo taken in the 1930s (248–49). Four small photos are pasted in as well—one, a Filipino mother in Japanese kimono with a son in Western clothing. They were taken in the latter half of the 1930s (235). The other photos include a group photo in front of the Japanese Bazaar, taken in the 1910s (208), a group photo of the families of a gardener, a lumber mill employee (110), and a group photo of six men and two women in front of the Session Bazaar, with one of the women holding a child. They were taken in the 1930s (178). The painted figures and photos are all taken from the commemorative publication.

Each piece depicts characteristics of prewar Japanese society: employees of bazaars, lumber mills, and a mason; those who married Filipino women; celebrations of local festivals; and a sports day held every year on Emperor Meiji's birthday. This can be confirmed in the description of the Baguio Japanese Society established in 1921. The *Philippine Yearbook* (1941 edition) remarks,

The membership counts about 320 as of August 1938. A majority of Japanese engage in commerce and agriculture, followed by employees at various gold mines.

At the time of the gold rush around 1936-1937, many companies offered employment for carpenters and laborers, and the membership counted more than 400. Afterwards, the number of workers were gradually reduced; some left for Masbate, Paracale, and Manila.

The current members were mostly permanent residents: 21 operators of bazaars, groceries, and special establishments; 62 in agriculture; about 100 are mine technicians and carpenters in mines; about 40 are lumber mill workers, and bazaar employees, carpenters, and laborers. The recent noticeable change is the increase in the number of Japanese women. This will contribute to the Japanese community becoming more permanent, a welcome development. (Ohtani 1940, 457–58)

On the one hand, the yearbook also states that carpenters and laborers were quite mobile, while on the other, the increase in the female population indicated the permanent nature of the community. This also meant that Japanese males started to take Japanese women as wives, not indigenous nor Christian Filipino women. With the increase of Japanese children, the Baguio Japanese School was established in 1925. In 1938, a total of 152 students were enrolled, 23 (15 male and 8 female students) at the higher level and 129 (58 male and 71 female students) at the elementary level (Ohtani 1940, 458–63).

Firipin Tokuhon (The Philippine Reader), published in 1938 by the Manila Japanese School, tells the false story of Benguet immigrants. The revised *Shin Firipin Tokuhon* (The New Philippine Reader), which was published in 1943 to fortify the education of imperial subjects as the Emperor’s children, tended even more to look down on Philippine culture (Kobayashi 2020). Philippine-born children of Japanese descent, who had “inferior” indigenous mothers, had no choice but to be educated to be aware of themselves as imperial subjects. Such second-generation immigrants led the construction of monuments to commemorate “Benguet Immigrants” in 1989 and 2003.

The exchange between Japanese-Filipinos and children of repatriated former Japanese residents, which became active in the 1980s, was based on their connection as students who went to school together in the Japanese elementary schools before and during the war. Japanese was taught as the “national language” in these Japanese elementary schools, and most

Japanese children spoke Japanese both at home and in school, very rarely speaking in the local language. On the other hand, mixed-race children of Japanese descent, who spoke different languages at home and in school, were bilingual or multilingual. Many of the Japanese families spoke in a Japanese dialect, and it was the Filipino-Japanese who spoke in proper standard Japanese. This situation with regards to language was indicative of the relationship between colonial rulers and subjects. Though there was no prejudice against children of repatriated Japanese, this relationship was carried over into their exchanges after 1980, the historical perception of the Japanese as “colonizers” has spread among the Japanese-Filipinos.

Chinese Laborers

Workers on Benguet Road included some Chinese. From July 1903 to June 1904, there were on average 283 workers every month (the Japanese, 602) and the death rate was 10.46 per 1,000 (the Japanese, 15.58). How did the Baguio Chinese remember this event and hand down the story to later generations? Cheng and Bersamira (1997) can give us some insight.

They were recruited in China, mostly from Guandong Province. While they did start the work around the same time as the Japanese, we cannot say that the Japanese were supplemented because the Chinese alone could not perform the work. The Chinese stayed on after the completion and engaged in maintenance, repair work, and other construction-related jobs, so the book places the duration of construction from 1902 to 1911. Perhaps not many left Baguio, unlike the Japanese. Cheng and Bersamira (1997) do not mention how many died during the construction; they only refer to those who were blinded and suffered injuries due to dynamite explosions, even if they did not handle it directly.

After construction, some of the Chinese workers became carpenters, and among them was the first casket maker in Baguio. Others included cooks and vegetable growers. Many Japanese believe that the Japanese started growing Baguio vegetables, but the Chinese also engaged in it. In fact, those

who are most active in vegetable growing in Baguio today are Chinese-Filipinos. Initially, growing vegetables was encouraged by the Americans. They established an agricultural experiment station in La Trinidad as early as 1902, followed by an agricultural school. Coffee was cultivated as well (De los Reyes and De los Reyes 1986, 40–42). Just like the Japanese, some Chinese married indigenous or Christian Filipino women; they started as peddlers and later opened *sari-sari* stores (small-scale bazaars). Those who became successful established bazaars on Session Road.

The 1918 census in Benguet states there were 9,039 Filipinos (5,145 male, 3,894 female); 197 Americans (155 male, 42 female); 156 Chinese (146 male, 10 female); and 164 Japanese (132 male, 32 female). This indicates that the size of Chinese and Japanese communities was almost the same. As indicated, there were fewer numbers of Chinese females. Therefore, many men seemed to have married local women. This means they assimilated to the local society earlier than the Japanese.

Colonial Baguio

Modern historical education tries to emphasize a common historical understanding so that a good nation would be produced. It aims to stress nationalism not only through textbooks but also through exhibitions at national museums, or national radio and TV broadcasts with news and other programs. In the Philippines, statues of a foremost national hero of the Revolution, José Rizal (1861–1896), were erected not only in the capital city of Manila but also in provincial cities. The area surrounding the statue is usually designated as Rizal Park. In Baguio, the statue of Rizal stands between city hall and Burnham Park. The streets are named after revolutionary heroes, such as Andres Bonifacio (1863–1897) and Apolinario Mabini (1864–1903); Philippine presidents, such as Manuel L. Quezon (1878–1944; 1935–1944 in office) and Manuel Roxas (1892–1948; 1946–1948 in office); and American governor-generals, such as William Howard Taft (1857–1930; 1901–1904 in office) and Francis Burton Harrison (1873–1957; 1913–1921 in office). Provinces, cities, towns, and villages were named

after Christian saints such as San Juan. When we look at these names, we get an impression that the people are expected to be good Philippine citizens, Christians, and/or pro-Americans.

The Baguio Museum introduces 19 “people,” starting with W. Cameron Forbes (1870–1959), Daniel Hudson Burnham (1846–1912), Dean C. Worcester (1866–1924), and Kennon in this particular sequence. These four are said to have built the city of Baguio. The rest include two colonial officials, two military personnel, two missionaries, one architect, one lawyer, and a group of educators. American Christian missionaries who opened schools were educators as well. Belgian missionaries contributed to vocational education, such as silver metalwork.

After the war, Christian Filipinos engaged in educational work. We count three cases in the field of education, and have an impression that two Indians engaged in commerce before and after the war. Also, as we know, Japanese and Chinese bazaars lined up along Session Road in the prewar era. Among the 19 featured in Baguio Museum, there are three Baguio-born Filipinos: the first Miss Carnival of 1915, a Japanese-Filipino who was active in newspaper publication, and an urban architect.

The creation of a summer capital was due to the fervent desire of American colonial officials. Baguio was not only considered a holiday site or an R-and-R location during the summer months. The summer heat around April in Manila was so intense that it could be a matter of life and death, especially for Americans. The fact that a sanitarium was built in Baguio even before the opening of Benguet Road tells us the urgency of the need for a summer capital. When Sister Unno fell ill, she went to Baguio for recuperation; this was how she became a resident of the city. At the turn of the 20th century, American soldiers had been fighting against never-ending guerrilla attacks by Filipino revolutionaries who sought refuge in the mountains. The American soldiers wished to have a “fortress,” and Baguio was a perfect place. There were some conflicts among the indigenous people who could threaten Americans. Some Americans had begun developing mines during the Spanish colonial period. They expected a good prospect

of mineral resources such as gold and copper; others hoped to develop forest resources and hydroelectric power. As colonial rule became stable, the education of their children became an issue. This colonial development was beneficial for Americans, militarily and economically. The cost of constructing a colonial city came mostly from Filipinos’ taxes. After the completion of the road, the Japanese were hired as carpenters, masons, gardeners, wood cutters, and vegetable growers.

Although the building of a summer capital was necessary for US colonial rule and development, some Americans who were involved in the project had a negative influence on Philippine society. In those days, many Americans in the colonial administration did not think embezzling public funds was such a crime. In 1914, 15 officials in the provincial financial administration were arrested. They must have committed serious crimes, or they were simply unlucky. For instance, Worcester, who was deeply involved in the construction of Baguio, bought land rights even before Baguio was developed. His brother and nephew followed suit. Worcester bought ten acres for \$30; he also purchased 88 acres for \$14 to construct a future country club. His nephew rented 2,500 acres for a minuscule price. Worcester was indeed a Baguio booster (which can mean supporter or thief), as the museum explanation has it. Even Forbes bought 15 acres for \$43. Many influential Filipinos received some leftover land, and so no legal problems arose. While many American clubs in Manila were not open to the Filipinos, the Baguio Country Club accepted them as early as 1910. The first Republic President, Emilio Aguinaldo y Famy (1869–1964; 1899–1901 in office) received not only a salary from the Worcester-connected company but also expenses for his household, as well as for his son’s education in the US. The first missionary bishop to the Philippines, Charles Henry Brent, sent by the Episcopal Church in the United States, enjoyed playing golf in the country club (Gems 2016, 67, 74, 93, 115–16).

Students of Brent School were all Caucasians (Halsema 1988). Education given to the Filipinos was a “false education,” as Renato Constantino (1919–1999) called it. They were not taught that the “Filipino

export of raw material could pay for consumer goods imported from the US.” Instead, they learned that “the Philippines is an agricultural country; therefore, she could not become an industrial country” (Constantino 1977, 89–90; De los Reyes and De los Reyes 1986, 47–56). As a result, the construction of Baguio as a colonial city, along with education and missionary work, produced Filipinos who came to be spiritually and materially subordinate to the US. However, not all residents were subservient to the Americans.⁹ The cover of Gem’s book (2016) has a photo: the upper part has an American flag; the lower part features a photo of indigenous people playing baseball. A player is holding a bat and wearing a cap, but he is wearing a g-string. They accepted the sport, but refused to wear a uniform. Sports had been used to instill colonialism and Americanization, and the YMCA aggressively incorporated it as part of the school curriculum. The Manila Carnival started in 1908 and held a trade fair. During the fair, sports competitions saw the participation of various schools. In 1913, the Oriental Olympic Games were held, and Japan and China sent players. In 1915, it became the Far Eastern Championship Games, of which there were 10 meetings until 1934. They were strongly supported by the YMCA and Governor-General Forbes (1909–1912 in office) (Gems 2016, 94–100; Takashima 2017).

Beauty contests had been held as a part of the Manila Carnival, which played the role of “easing apparent confrontation and strengthening colonial rule” (Takashima 2017, 120–27). The beauty contest started in Baguio in 1915.¹⁰

These actions of the Americans stemmed from racial prejudice. All Filipinos were inferior, and there was no need to treat them equally. The Americans could use public money more “efficiently;” there was no need to teach science and technology to the Filipinos. This attitude was inherited by the lowland Christian Filipinos toward the indigenous people. Many of the former were Ilocanos who occupied important posts after the Americans left. They considered the Igorots “uncivilized people.”

Concluding Remarks

We have seen that the historical recognition of Baguio was centered on Japanese-Filipinos, drawn from memorials and museum exhibitions. It is also obvious that their historical recognition and those of others are generally different. The latter’s narrative, unlike that of the Japanese-Filipinos, did not particularly emphasize the sacrifice and achievement of the “Benguet Road Immigrants.” They were treated simply as a group of laborers who engaged in road construction.

In his study of Filipino laborers of Kennon Road, Bankoff (2005) mentioned American workers, but did not discuss either Japanese or Chinese workers. He concludes that the completion of Kennon Road came from the modern labor management techniques employed by Kennon and the unity of Filipino workers under good working conditions.

Corpuz’s work (1999, 138–55), based on his Ph.D. dissertation, praised the hardworking Igorot who labored three times harder than lowland Christian Filipinos. He did not particularly mention the Japanese and Chinese laborers except when he touched on salaries and the distribution of food. Even if the Japanese and the Chinese contributed, can we still say that it was for the sake of the Philippines even after its independence in 1946? One-fourth of the budget at that time was spent on the construction. The colonial government needed a large budget after its financial exhaustion due to the Philippine-American War (1899–1902). On 19 August 1911, *The Philippines Free Press* carried a cartoon showing a gigantic elephant—labeled “our white elephant” and named “BAGUIO”—supported by suffering Filipinos, whose money is pouring into the elephant’s feeder.

The Japanese laborers who grew up under a popular slogan after the Meiji Restoration—“Enrich the Country, Strengthen the Armed Forces”—witnessed how Japan became a strong military power. The victory in the Russo-Japanese War (1904–1905) gave them confidence and pride as Japanese. The construction sites were divided into areas which were assigned to each nationality; this drove them to work harder and show they were superior and could do better than other laborers. Their sacrifice and

contributions were exaggerated, which propelled the “advance to the south” idea. Thus, a “false image” became an established “fact.” This process was already mentioned in my book (Hayase 1989a).

It is true the construction was difficult, and many died. But if the Japanese and the Japanese-Filipinos keep telling their own exaggerated story, it would create a problem, especially for the latter because they lived as Filipinos, with roots in the community. In the Philippines, the official narrative is that Philippine society was built on Philippine-US friendship. The war monument in Corregidor Island is one such example (Hayase 2012a, 171). Another example is the Kennon bust at the Kennon Road Viewpoint. It says the road was completed with the cooperation of the Philippines and the US; it contributed to the development of local society, and was welcomed by Filipinos, including the indigenous people.¹¹

The Filipino people would not deny others’ historical recognition, even though they find it different. It is because they basically belong to a maritime society with intense mobility and high regard for relations with other people. At the same time, they would insist on their own recognition without confronting others. The case in point is the greetings published in the commemorative issue of 1983. If we do not understand this nuanced difference, perhaps creating trusting relationships with each other would be difficult.

I mentioned in the introduction that the differences of historical recognition became political and created conflicts in Russia and Central Eastern Europe. In order to avoid such conflicts, some states established a historical research institute in order not only to solve problems from an objective point of view, but also to justify their own historical view (Hashimoto 2017, xii–xv). An important point of solving the issue of historical recognition is that research based on primary sources should be made public and respected. Based on these actions, discussions should follow in order to reach a solution. However, when we see how a government has been ignoring historical research on, say, the comfort women issue, or the peace security laws of 2015 created by legal scholars for instance, we fear a solution won’t be easy to come by.

Originally, Baguio was constructed as a colonial city for Americans in the Philippines and gradually, it attracted people who sought a livelihood. In the beginning, there was no coherence yet as a regional community.

It was after the “master” left the country in 1946 and the Republic of the Philippines was established—which was achieved after the US-Japan War—that Baguio sought development to boost tourism, with the “Summer Capital” as a selling point. By this time, a unified, closely-knit community began to develop, a community with a common cultural and historical understanding. Some artists such as BenCab and Kidlat Tahimik have been creating a new Baguio culture, with an emphasis on indigenous people (Shimizu 2013).

However, when it comes to a historical perspective, there is no consensus. The Japanese-Filipinos had to live quietly, hiding their ancestry owing to strong anti-Japanese sentiment in the postwar period. The 100th year commemorative publication (Afable 2004) on “Benguet Immigrants” made them recognize their Japanese roots. At the same time, this gave them an opportunity to reminisce about their Japanese community in the good old prewar days. However, the publication allotted only two pages for the war in the “Epilogue 1941-1945: The Baguio Japanese,” and does not present any opportunity to start a conversation with other Baguio residents (293–94).

When the war commenced, Manila was declared an “Open City,” so there was not much material destruction. However, the Japanese occupation was a period of terror and trial for the Filipinos. Strong anti-Japanese guerrilla activities started early and tormented the Japanese military. In turn, the military forced absolute obedience from Filipinos. Those who ignored orders were slapped or tortured. In the worst cases, they were executed. Rape occurred daily. Foodstuff, money, and valuables were confiscated. People suffered from hunger and disease. Those Filipinos who “collaborated” with the Japanese became the target of anti-Japanese guerrilla attacks. In the end, Baguio was ruined due to the carpet bombings by returning Americans. The population of the Ifugao was said to have diminished to 50,000 from 70,000 in prewar time (De los Reyes and De los

Reyes 1986, 61–97; Shimizu 2013, 220–61). The Japanese as well as Japanese-Filipinos, whose “homeland” is Baguio, must face this historical fact.

Looking for Japanese-Filipinos who were hiding was the right thing to do in the 1970s and 1980s, so that Japanese-Filipino society could be organized and their lives could be uplifted through education and scholarships. The Philippine government needed Japanese governmental development aid and investment from civilian enterprises. The relations between the Japanese-Filipinos and Japan proper were important for Tokyo and Manila. However, today, Japanese influence on the Philippine economy is not as great as it was in the past. Instead, the Philippines’ relations with China and ASEAN countries have been getting stronger. A citizen who is connected to a foreign country could become either a bridge between the two countries or pose a conflict.

Cheng and Bersamira (1997) emphasized how Chinese-Filipinos contributed to, influenced, and unified the state, as well as the Baguio local community. The Japanese-Filipinos relied on financial support like scholarship from Japanese fellow soldier associations, war bereaved societies, and religious organizations.

When relations between China and the Philippines deteriorated because of the territorial dispute over the West Philippine Sea (official name of the Philippines) or the South China Sea, the Philippine Association for Chinese Studies published *Philippines-China Relations: Sailing Beyond Disputed Waters* (See and Sta Romana 2013), which tried to present material that could be used to help resolve the problem. In June 2019, when a Philippine fishing vessel was sunk by a Chinese ship in the West Philippine Sea (South China Sea), Chinese-Filipinos offered assistance to the Filipino fishermen.

Perhaps BenCab painted and exhibited Japanese-Filipinos in his museum because he intended to embrace and integrate them into Baguio society and connect them to the wider world. It is time to find one’s place and connect with the world around us, from global, regional, national, and local points of view. The same can be said about Japanese-Filipinos in Baguio:

they must contemplate how to connect with the Baguio local community and the state, and for that matter, with Japan, by taking advantage of their being Japanese-Filipinos. In this way, they could contribute to local society as well as to the state. In order to do so, their history and culture should become an integral part of the community and the state. The fact that many of them are of mixed blood with indigenous people can bring them closer to Chinese-Filipinos.¹² The first Japanese-Filipinos were born at a time when “advance to the south” was being advocated; it was an imperialistic era when Japanese superiority was emphasized. Later, they were at the mercy of a “myth” which was revived in the postwar period when Japan achieved its miracle economic recovery, becoming an economic superpower. It is time for Japanese-Filipinos to abandon their old historical understanding. Instead, they should have a new historical view that could be shared by the state, society, and the Baguio community.

It is also important for the Baguio community to think about what kind of society they want to build. Burnham’s original plan was to build a city of 20,000. The 1939 census shows the population stood at 24,117. After the war, the population saw a steady increase, which surpassed that of the national growth; in 2000, it became 250,000 and 340,000 in 2015. Many houses had been built on a slope, and if a large-scale earthquake like the one in 1990 were to hit the area, it is obvious that great damage would occur. Many who moved to Baguio or were born after 1990 do not know the scale of the damage. The exhaust fumes in the city were so great that it might have killed the pine trees. Baguio City indeed faces a variety of large problems: how to embrace minority indigenous people, long-time residents, and newcomers; how to build regional identity; and how to connect with the Philippine state, ASEAN-East Asian regions, and global societies.

About the Author

Shinzo Hayase (shayase@waseda.jp) is a professor at the Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies, Waseda University, Japan. He has a Ph.D. in History from Murdoch University, Australia. He has published several books and journal articles on the history of Asia, maritime Southeast Asian history, modern history of Asia-Japan relations, ethnohistory, and modern history of Philippine-Japan relations. Some of his works are *Parallel Historical Recognition* (in Japanese, 2022), *Sports and Nationalism in Southeast Asia: SEAP Games/SEA Games, 1959-2019* (in Japanese, 2020), *Globalizing Yasukuni Controversy from the Perspective of Southeast Asia* (in Japanese, 2018), *A Walk Through War Memories in Southeast Asia* (2010), and *Mindanao Ethnohistory beyond Nations* (2007).

Declaration of Funding and/or Conflict of Interest

The research is funded personally by the author. The author did not declare any conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments

The research for this paper was conducted between 15 and 17 April 2019 during my sabbatical leave supported by Waseda University and as a distinguished visiting professor of De La Salle University. I would like to thank the following people: Chair Ernesto Villaluz Carandang II of the Departamento ng Filipino (Department of Philippine Studies), Deborah S. Anastacio, and the students of the De La Salle University. I would like to give special thanks to one of the students, John A. Amatalao (originally from Baguio), who took photos of the Japanese Cemetery. I am indebted to Dr. Terami-Wada Motoe for translating this paper into English and Julz Riddle for proofreading it. This paper was presented to the 18th Annual International Conference in Japanese Studies at Ateneo de Davao University, Davao City, Philippines on 31 January–1 February 2020. This version represents a copyedited version courtesy of the editorial staff of *Asian Studies: Journal of Critical Perspectives on Asia*. They sought to preserve as much of the English translation, but introduced edits to avoid redundancies and improve syntax, and to accommodate the journal's house style, including the change from APA to Chicago citation format.

Endnotes

- 1 The Japanese paper, which this is based on, discusses war memorials as well as monuments and museum exhibitions; however, they are omitted in this paper. For more details, see “Hikitsuzuku ‘Bengetto Imin’ no Kyozo: Shokuminchitoshi Bagio, Imin, Senso, Soshite Rekishi Ninshiki no Surechigai” (Continuing Japanese Myth on “Benguet Migrants” in the Philippines: Colonial City, Migrants, WWII, and a Hidden Dispute), *Ajia-Taiheiyo Tokyu* (Journal of Asia-Pacific Studies) 37 (2019): 1–48.
- 2 For more details, see Hashimoto (2017, 2018) and Hayase (2018).
- 3 A part of Hayase (2018) is included in Hashimoto (2018), Chapter 7, “Tonan Ajia kara Mita Yasukuni Mondai: Hyomenka Sasenai ‘Funso’” (The Yasukuni Issue from Southeast Asian View: ‘Conflict’ Not Yet Come into the Open). This appeared in English as: “The Yasukuni Shrine Controversy from the Perspective of Southeast Asia: A Hidden Dispute,” *Ajia-Taiheiyo Tokyu* (Journal of Asia-Pacific Studies) 36 (2019): 109–29.
- 4 According to Afable (2004, 28), a cholera epidemic broke out in the latter part of 1903, and 300 Japanese were said to have been buried in Balangabang, Twin Peaks alone (Furuya 1936, 90). However, an American report placed four Japanese and one American (a total of five), who died from cholera between October 1903 and August 1904. It was said that the Japanese died where there was no American jurisdiction. Before the Japanese workers arrived in October 1903 from Japan, the number of Japanese was small; therefore, it is hard to imagine that 300 died. Japanese Consul Narita Goro’s report says seven Japanese died due to cholera in the month of November 1903; Narita wrote, “[a]ccording to the report by a representative of an immigration agency, 93 Japanese laborers in the island died” (Narita 1905, 39). Mori Teizo, who worked at the construction, says the real number would be hard to know, which might have been the case (“Zadankai” 1939, 33). Another says, “As far as I remember, the causes of death were due to lack of sanitary facilities, over exhaustion, and malnourishment. Many lost lives to beriberi and malignant dysentery. Relatively small number died of injuries” (Amano 1939, 27). It is hard to believe many deaths occurred at the same time since the cause of death was unclear and the number of workers was relatively stable.
- 5 Some did engage in dangerous work with extra pay.
- 6 The word “Nikkei-jin” (Japanese descent or ancestry) has been widely used, not “Nikkei Firipin-jin” (Japanese-Filipinos). The former gives an impression that they are closer to Japanese rather than Filipinos. I use “Japanese-Filipinos” in this paper as they are part of Philippine society. Sometimes “Nikkei-jin” is used, depending on the context.
- 7 The book of De los Reyes and De los Reyes (1986) has a 13-page long portion (no page number) equivalent to an introduction entitled “The Star-Spangled Curtain.” I call this portion “Introduction.”

- 8 “Installment 11: Living with the Filipinos - graph 1,” *The Manila Shimbun*, 13 January 2003; (Kamono 2003: 136-37).
- 9 In early days, the churches were built as “fortresses” due to the rebellions by indigenous people, and missionaries always carried guns. Perhaps they were in constant communication with the Philippine Constabulary (De los Reyes and De los Reyes 1986, “Introduction”).
- 10 In 1912, an Ifugao tribal chief went to Manila in an airplane. The US colonial government wanted to show Americans’ superior culture. The Manila Carnival was held for the same purpose (De los Reyes and De los Reyes 1986, 44). Likewise, the Japanese government set up a tourism initiative in order to show Japan’s advancement to the indigenous Taiwanese.
- 11 Philippine-US friendship became the official narrative; however, anti-American sentiment among Filipinos, who experienced the Philippine Revolution/Philippine-American War (1896–1902), and their descendants has existed (De los Reyes and De los Reyes 1986, “Introduction”).
- 12 When the Japanese and Chinese relations are discussed, hardly any mention of the indigenous people is made (Finin 2005).

Bibliography

- Afable, Patricia Okubo, ed. 2004. *Japanese Pioneers in the Northern Philippine Highlands: A Centennial Tribute 1903-2003*. Baguio City: Filipino-Japanese Foundation of Northern Luzon, Inc.
- Amano, Yonekichi. 1939. “Bengetto Doro no Omoide (Reminiscing Benguet Road).” *Umi wo Koete II* (12): 27–29.
- Bankoff, Greg. 2005. “These Brothers of Ours: Poblete’s Obreros and the Road to Baguio 1903–1905.” *Journal of Social History* 38 (4): 1047–72.
- Cheng, Charles, and Katherine Bersamira. 1997. *The Ethnic Chinese in Baguio and in the Cordillera Philippines: The Untold Story of Pioneers*. Baguio City: Unique Printing Press.

- Constantino, Renato. 1977. “Firipinjin no Uketa Ese Kyoiku (False Education Given to the Filipinos).” In *Firipin Nashonarizumu-ron* (On the Discussion of Philippine Nationalism), Volume 1, edited by Tsurumi Yoshiyuki, 78–109. Tokyo: Imura Bunka Jigyosha.
- Corpuz, Arturo G. 1999. *The Colonial Iron Horse: Railroads and Regional Development in the Philippines 1875–1935*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Crossette, Barbara. 1999. *The Great Hill Stations of Asia*. New York: Basic Books.
- De los Reyes, Angelo, and Aloma De los Reyes, eds. 1986. *Igorot: A People Who Daily Touch the Earth and the Sky*. Vol. 2. Baguio City: Cordillera Schools Group.
- Filipino-Japanese Foundation of Northern Luzon, Inc. (FJFNLI). n.d. “Kennon Pavilion Park.” Filipino-Japanese Foundation of Northern Luzon, Inc. (website). Accessed 5 May 2019. <https://www.abong.org.ph/Kennon-Pavilion-Park/>.
- . n.d. “Japanese Pioneers.” Filipino-Japanese Foundation of Northern Luzon, Inc. (website). Accessed 7 May 2019. <https://www.abong.org.ph/Japanese-Pioneers/>.
- Filipino-Japanese Friendship Association of Northern Luzon, Inc. (FJFANLI). 1983. *Memorial: The Japanese in the Construction of Kennon Road*. Baguio City: FJFANLI.
- Finin, Gerard A. 2005. *The Making of the Igorot: Contours of Cordillera Consciousness*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Furuya, Hakumu. 1936 (1935). “Bagio Hojin Konjaku Monogatari (The Baguio Japanese Yesterday and Today).” In *Hiripinjin Zairyu Hojin Shogyo Hattenshi* (History of Commercial Development of the Japanese in the Philippines), edited by Kaoru Watanabe, 63–101. Tokyo: Nan’yo Kyokai.
- Gems, Gerald R. 2016. *Sport and the American Occupation of the Philippines: Bats, Balls, and Bayonets*. New York and London: Lexington Books.

- Halsema, James J. 1988. *Bishop Brent's Baguio School: The First 75 Years*. Baguio: Brent School Inc.
- Hashimoto, Nobuya, ed. 2017. *Semegiau Chuto'ou-Roshia Rekishi Ninshiki Mondai: Nachizumu to Shakaishugi no Kako wo Meguru Katto* (Struggle of Historical Recognition in Central Eastern Europe and Russia: Conflict of the Past between Nazism and Socialism). Kyoto: Mineruva Shobo.
- . 2018. *Funso-ka Saserareru Kako: Ajia to Yوروبا ni okeru Rekishi no Seiji-ka* (The Past that Dragged into Dispute: Politicization of History in Asia and Europe). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Hau, Caroline S. 2014. *The Chinese Question: Ethnicity, Nation, and Region in and Beyond the Philippines*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Hayase, Shinzo. 1983. "Dabao no Nihonjin Bochi Chosa (Research on the Davao Japanese Cemeteries)." *Dabao* (Dabao kai) 32: 59–65.
- . 1989a. "*Bengetto Imin*" no *Kyozo to Jitsuzo: Kindai Nihon-Tonan Ajia Kankei-shi no Ichi-Kosatsu* (Myth and Reality of the Japanese "Benguet Emigrants" in the Philippines, 1903-1905: A Study of the History on Modern Japan-Southeast Asian Relations). Tokyo: Dobun-kan.
- . 1989b. "Diplomats of Meiji Japan in the Philippines." *Philippine Quarterly of Culture & Society* 17 (4): 290–308.
- . (2007) 2012a. *Senso no Kioku o Aruku - Tonan Ajia no Ima* (A Walk Through War Memories in Southeast Asia). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten; 2010. In English, Quezon City: New Day Publishers.
- . 2012b. *Firipin Kingendaishi no Naka no Nihonjin: Shokuminchi no Keisei to Imin, Shohin* (Japanese in the Philippine Modern History: Immigrants and Goods). Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
- . 2014. *Japanese in Modern Philippine History*. Tokyo: Waseda University, Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies (Research Series 5).
- . 2018. *Gurobaruka-suru Yasukuni Mondai: Tonan-Ajia kara no Toi* (Globalizing Yasukuni Shrine: Controversy from the Perspective of Southeast Asia). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

- Kamono, Mamoru. 2003. *Bagio no Niji: Shisuta Unno to Firipin Nikkeijin no Hyakunen* (The Rainbow of Baguio: Sister Unno and a Hundred Years of Japanese Filipinos). Tokyo: Art Village.
- Kennon, Lynan W. V. 1906. “Report of Officer in Charge of Construction of Benguet Road.” In *Sixth Annual Report of the Philippine Commission, 1905*, Part 3 of 4 (31 August 1905): 359–403. Washington DC: Government Printing Office.
- Kobayashi, Shigeko. 2020. *Senzenki Nihonjin Gakko no Ibunka Rikai e no Apurochi* (Approach to Cross-cultural Understanding of Prewar Japanese Schools). Tokyo: Akashi Shoten.
- Manila Shimbun. 2013. “Imin Isseiki, Dai Ichibu: Issei no Zanzo (A Century of Immigration, Part One: Persistent Image of the First Generation).” *Manira Shimbun*, 2–13 January.
- Narita, Goro. 1905. “Hiripin-to Bengetto-shu Honho Imin Shugyochi Junkai Fukumeisho (38-nen 2-gatu 13-nichi Duke Zai Manira Teikoku Ryojikan Hokoku) (Report on Visiting the Places Where the Japanese Immigrants Work in Benguet Province, the Philippine Islands Dated 13 February 1905 by Imperial Consulate in Manila).” *Tsusho Isan* 35: 32–41.
- Ohtani, Jun’ichi, ed. 1940. *Hiripin Nenkan (Showa 16 Nendo-ban)* (Philippine Yearbook 1941 Edition). Tokyo: Ishokumin Jijo Kenkyu-kai.
- Reed, Robert R. 1999. *City of Pines: The Origins of Baguio as a Colonial Hill Station and Regional Capital*. 2nd ed. Baguio City: A-Seven Publishing.
- See, Teresita Ang and Chito Sta. Romana, eds. 2013. *Philippines-China Relations: Sailing beyond Disputed Waters* (Chinese Studies Journal 10). Quezon City: Philippine Association for Chinese Studies.
- Shimizu, Hiromu. 2013. *Kusanone no Gurobarizeshon: Sekai Isan Tanada Mura no Bunka Jissen to Seikatsu Senryaku* (Globalization at Grassroots: Cultural Practice in a Village at Terraced Rice Fields of World Heritage and Its Strategy of Livelihood). Kyoto: Kyoto University Press.

- Suzuki, Shizuo and Shinzo Hayase, eds. 1992. *Firipin no Jiten* (Encyclopedia of the Philippines). Kyoto: Dohosha.
- Takashima, Ko. 2017 “Firipin Kanibaru kara Kyokuto Orinpikku e: Supotsu, Minshushugi, Bijinesu (From Philippine Carnival to Far Eastern Olympic Games: Sports, Democracy, and Business).” *Kyoto Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyu Kiyō* (Memoirs of the Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University) 56: 113–93.