

RECONSIDERING PLACE IN HONDA'S KAIJU EIGA 1961-1969

Shaun Wilson, RMIT University

Abstract

The critical readings of Honda's Kaiju Eiga films between 1961 and 1969 are lacking in any substantial investigation into place which brings into question the neglect of place as a philosophical enquiry within Japanese screen studies. This article reflects on a gap in current research by considering how place not only has guided Honda's films through his own personal experiences of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki but further, provides a means of accessing Kaiju Eiga films of the 1960s through a place-based lens to derive at a consideration of place as being instrumental in the way that Japanese monster films reflect national trauma and collective grief.

Keywords: Kaiju Eiga, Japan, monsters, Honda, Toho Studios

From the 1960s onwards, Japan's monster film genre Kaiju Eiga, a unique middle point thematic between horror and disaster cinemas, shared an intrinsically complex and sometimes strained relationship with place, making the decade a unique time of place-based Japanese cinema. With a history that covers the origins of various Japanese mythologies and monster theatrics of puppet theatre, especially Bunraku, the modern incarnations of giant creatures menacing cities developed in early cinema by villains including King Kong, Japanese distributor Toho Studios became Kaiju Eiga's epicentre with an auteur presentation of places of horror, especially post-war Japan, which scholars have up until recently ignored or disregarded altogether.

In the 1950s, for example, there were only a handful of notable Kaiju films from *Gojira* (dir. Honda, 1954), *Godzilla Raids Again* (dir. Oda, 1956), *Rodan* (dir. Honda, 1956), *The Mysterians* (dir. Honda, 1957) and *Varan the Unbelievable* (dir. Honda, Tsuburaya, 1958). Ten years later, though, at the end of the 1960s, there were more than 30 new instalments spawned by global distribution efforts between Japan, the United States, and elsewhere through Toho Films, which were often two unique versions of the same film recut, dubbed and censored. *Gojira*, for example, was screened in original format for Japanese audiences, and *Godzilla, King of the Monsters* (dir. Honda, Morse, 1956), as the retitled "Americanized" version containing deleted and new additional footage built around the Toho version was censored, where "references to American nuclear tests on the Pacific islands that are edited" (Eleftheriotis, p.15) made Kaiju Eiga profitable entertainment, but for various reasons. Japanese filmmakers at the time responded to national trauma, while the escapism of international audiences in the midst of the Cold War emerged from over a decade of growing fan base of children and adolescents who grew up with Kaiju Eiga in the 1950s and later discovered it by new audiences. This post-war generation drove consumer demand for Kaiju Eiga by developing a nostalgia for such films through popular culture, merchandise, comics, and monster pop-folklore, but on the basis of attention to the characters of Kaiju themselves, not the places and a sense of place for which these creatures inhabited and gratuitously

destroyed. Much discussion around Godzilla, for example, including Chon Noriega's work on otherness in the differences between Japan and the United States has led to a character-focused inquiry of Kaiju Eiga, which positions a shift away from the experiences we form with place, as shown in Toho films, which calls into question what this article considers an ignoring of place to instead remove "place," as it is known to be an experience between thinking creatures and their immediate environments, to be replaced by "places" known as the geographies that Godzilla and others destroy.

For horror, place creates an easily accessible device to create tension in a film. It is no more obvious than how Hitchcock used place as a device to create psychological horror in films including *Rear Window* (dir. Hitchcock, 1954) and later *The Birds* (dir. Hitchcock, 1963) at the same time as Honda's Kaiju incarnations. Although there must obviously be strong character relationships in the mechanics of experiencing place, insufficient recognition of place in the bulk of Kaiju's epoch invites a way to rethink Honda's films by first taking into account the monsters in play over the iteration of his body of work to define the role of place as a means of embracing the experiences shared by both human and non-human beings as an imbedded horror within his onscreen ontology.

Although there were variants of Kaiju characters in films made popular in the 1960s, the generic variety was simply called Kaiju and, of course, contextualised sporadically as a film's antagonist, protagonist, or at other times neither, and larger and fearsome Kaiju creatures named DaiKaiju, a sea monster species named Kaijin, a humanoid-like Kaiju from outer space named Seijin, and Kaiju M.O.G.U.E.R.A, variants of future instalments of the genre, notable Japanese directors including Honda contributed a prolific production of films that propelled aspects of meaningful Japanese narratives, including the reflection of traditional Japanese culture, the Potsdam Declaration, which noted the alternative for Japan [to surrender] is rapid and complete destruction (The Department of State Bulletin), and the atomic metaphors of Japan. The original *Gojira* was as political as it was allegorical, but as soon as the genre's methodology in the late 1960s retained its legacy, these films moved away from the grief of atomic trauma and instead adopted a nostalgic legacy of the characters of those who had grown into adulthood with fascination and enjoyment of *the characters* of Kaiju Eiga. This next generation of people, mostly born after the war had ended, who were once removed from the first-hand experience of the atomic blast era - and by this also once removed from, in Japan, the attachment of traditional Japanese effacements of place in a pre-war context and, in the United States and elsewhere, the immediacy of the Second World War - embraced consumption of Kaiju Eiga as a science fiction fandom in the nuclear age, different from the first iterations of the franchise several years beforehand. By the end of the decade, however, Kaiju Eiga had become less reliant on the double play of atomic and surrender trauma to instead be focused on the subculture and legacy monster cinema created from pop-iconoclastic narratives, but more so from the rapidly advancing, and improving, visual effects pioneered with suit motion - the technique of filming an actor dressed in a monster suit moving through a miniaturised set. Such performances, if compared in context to Bunraku, as argued by Rhoads et al., allows the audience to 'forget the performers manipulating the monster puppets and enjoy the story untroubled by the mechanics of the special effects.' (McCorkle, Rhoad, p.12)

The issue here for Kaiju Eiga was that by doing so, the products of monster films that had as much to do with horror as it did with disaster were adopted by studios and audiences alike to be a part of a universally sanctioned science fiction troupe across various limited character developments synonymous to a formulaic predictability that considered Kaiju as, mostly, a

horror film character in a science fiction scenario, forged as momentous and dangerous creatures, possess god-like powers indelibly superior to human capabilities, are, in the case of antagonists including Godzilla and Ghidorah, incapable of cohabiting with humans within urban density living, and are angered enough to destroy cities as either an act of vengeance, a dislike or a defence against other less benevolent Kaiju - as in the case of Mothra - , or a misunderstood fear they themselves are being trapped and need to prevent their own demise by the perpetration of violence. Insofar as reading Kaiju beyond these stereotypes, there are recent debates amongst scholars to establish a way by which Kaiju Eiga can unpack a mutual understanding of monster films that gives rise in two camps of thought; the first is a science fiction-based argument that reads Kaiju Eiga as a hybrid horror and disaster science fiction equally split between what and who appears on screens and the fandom of audiences in popular culture; and second, as a political cinema manifesting horror from the defeat of the Japanese military in World War Two, the atomic bombings of 1945, and the Japanese public fear caused by the Daigo Fukuryū Maru incident in the 1950s. But what is completely missing in these two readings is to consider the role that place has played in the connections between the cinematic image and audiences, which, as this article will argue, has a much deeper and intrinsic way to embrace Kaiju that somehow has yet to receive the attention and importance it rightfully deserves. As such, we will explore the role of place as a horror in Kaiju Eiga throughout the 1960s to derive a new reading of Honda films starting with *Mothra* (dir. Honda, 1961) and ending with *All Monsters Attack* (dir. Honda, 1969).

Recent debates including Barr, who argues “to immediately call a Kaiju film a science fiction work is a critical error that condemns Kaiju film to the critical backwaters as a lesser species of science fiction” (Barr, p.9) in opposition to scholars including Sontag’s *The Imagination of Disaster* who promoted such thought, have emerged that question the way in which Kaiju have been universally classified as a science fiction troupe that, in turn, have opened up new perspectives in screen thought to reflect both a need to provide, and recognising a failure to consider a deeper analysis of the relationship between monsters and the people affected by their inflicted destruction furthermore exacerbated by ignoring the critical components of place as a means to understand these relationships beyond a representation of screen monster entertainment. Moreover, one of the more polemic cases of problems for Kaiju Eiga, and especially Honda’s films of the 1960s, was understood by ignoring the relationships that audiences form with the places of monster invasions and their subsequent impact on screen characters or, as philosophy will describe, “agents” due to a superficial spatial analysis that science fiction uses in cinema, which prevents a more complex way to understand Kaiju beyond the action these actors themselves use. If, say, Kaiju were to be understood from the perspective of an analysis akin to the idea of ‘being’ from, among others, a Heideggerian sense where the screen places of Kaiju can be experienced through what he termed as Dasein which “remains wholly orientated towards the hiding task of working out Being” (Heidegger et al, p.38) in opposition to the more common assumptions of the genre as urban backdrops as a ‘thing’ trashed by rampaging lizards, space turtles and a giant moth, then an intrinsically sophisticated approach to the genre brings with it a grounding for screen agents that moves away from a spatial analysis of places, that is to say, considering place as a visual geography of ‘things’ grafted onto spaces - a tree, a building, a road, a mountain - , functioning to assume that these places are merely spaces for giant creatures to menace and destroy infrastructure, who are then either defeated by other Kaiju, the military and a group of traumatised people who fight in the midst of monster invasion or, more conveniently, find these creatures to disappear altogether into hidden places to then later return in future franchise instalments of the, then, near future. Instead, can these places be something more

insofar as the true horror of Kaiju Eiga determined by what happens to our experiences of place after Kaiju ransacks its geography?

At this point, two issues arise by interpreting a fundamental characteristic in Honda's films - the first being that a way to make an audience align with human characters is to pit them against Kaiju to employ human contrast to dehumanise the Kaiju antagonists from a uniquely human perspective. We see this occurs in the case study of Godzilla, when portrayed as an antagonist, characterised by insufficient determinism in conflict with Dasein, as further expanded by Mullhall, who terms "non-human animals have their lives determined *entirely* by the demands of survival and reproduction, [whereas] human beings *lead their lives*." (Barr, p.9) If humans dwell in the places they inhabit and, ontologically speaking, they exist through being which, by its actions, understands that their own being is intentional rather than primordial, then the same determinism is void of Godzilla, who, without the ability to hold moral judgement when portrayed as an antagonist, acts primordially as a character who recognises its own existence within place to move here and there, up and down, and in and out, but does not advance its own recognition of understanding beyond a Heideggerian structure of being as an awareness of survival unlike the human characters with an awareness of Dasein that stems *from* their awareness. The second issue addresses the embracement of human agents becoming aware that their places of dwellings are invaded by Kaiju that antagonists, specifically in early renditions of the Godzilla character, had no apparent ability to recognise Dasein, leading to a firm separation between those who recognise their geographies are invaded by Kaiju and the Kaiju antagonists who have no ability to recognise that they have invaded the places of human agents in the first instance. Here we have two different relationships with places drawn from opposite experiences, yet the problem for antagonist Kaiju is that Honda intentionally keeps them within primordial actions where their connections to places have no mechanism to expand out of what they already know, that is, to destroy anything and everything that gets in their way without the moral judgement of determinism nor the ability to consider either way. The humans of Honda's films, however, know well about their own connection to dwellings and locales from which they inhabit and move through, yet the relationship between audience and screen has yet to be prioritised in scholarship as a place-based experience, simply because science fiction propels a popular culture assumption of character dominance rather than place dominance. After all, have you ever noticed children playing out Godzilla through activities dressed in costumes of Tokyo and Fukushima? With this in mind, reading a Honda film takes on an entirely new meaning if place is thought of as an experience of horror through Dasein for the audience watching Kaiju Eiga, embracing the unfolding destruction of places defended by protagonists who desire a need to survive and protect their immediate places they themselves have intrinsic connections with. But through readings well after the last Honda film was screened, Kaiju, and especially Godzilla, was primarily still thought of by fans and cinephiles alike as a science fiction representation of a "child of economic calculation, the love of cinema and the fear of nuclear warfare" (Glownia, p.81) all rolled into one long before a serious reflection of critical gaze did explore deeper connections that dislocated itself from the grasp of a populous cold war allegory, yet as time moved on, responsive enough to consider place as the horror of Kaiju, not necessarily as the problem of Kaiju themselves.

The associations of Kaiju in science fiction, thought of as an unstoppable, fire breathing city destroyer, and the combination of historical atomic and fire bombings of Japanese cities, have been widely discussed over the years in terms of an agent-based analogy whereby a foreign agent - Kaiju - invades the native geography of other agents - civilians and the military - to cause mayhem and destruction. Yet this article proposes to focus on the effect of places on

characters, not the effect of characters in places through the relationships that both an audience and screen agent develop within the geographies of monster invasions in determining our deeper relationship with Kaiju and, more so, place. As the cinematic poster from the 1954 United States release of *Godzilla* exclaims ‘civilisation crumbles as its death rays blast a city of 6 million from the face of the Earth!’ (*Godzilla, King of the Monsters*. Advertisement), an audience is presented with the pretext of places invaded by an uninvited giant lizard destroying cities with fire much the same as the B-29s ‘Enola Gay’ and ‘Boxcar’ - foreign agents - did to the inhabitants - native agents - of Hiroshima and Nagasaki - places - One might argue that articulating the threat of danger exists by what happens to a place as a consequence of the destruction brought about by such a foreign agent. Quintessential Kaiju Eiga in this regards is built on the pretext of invasions of cities, infrastructures and urban resources destroyed as a backdrop to propel the commonality of Kaiju as a central character that empowers mythology in the same way that the places destroyed in these kinds of battles empower these agents as a power currency - the more fearsome and powerful a Kaiju becomes is determined by the measure of destruction and indestructibility it has over the places it thus roams. An example is found in *Godzilla vs Mothra*, where *Godzilla*, who had a tendency to incinerate cities as a token of his power, and *Mothra*, a larger scaled Kaiju prone in her lava form to “knocking down buildings” (Matthew) and in her moth form, manifesting hurricanes and poisonous clouds, both use the destruction of places as a means to benchmark their power in different ways - *Mothra* in her moth form as the benevolent protagonist and *Gozilla*, the volatile antagonist “Thematically speaking, if *Godzilla* was an allegory for the horrors of the nuclear bomb, then *Mothra* represents the protection and respect of traditional cultures.” (Matthew)

Like other multiple Kaiju films, including *King Kong vs Godzilla*, *Destroy All Monsters* and *Ghidorah, the Three-Headed Monster*, Honda uses invasion as a thematic in accelerated fashion when compared to the more sedate solitary Kaiju’s roaming in previous, singular monster films including *Mothra*, for the mere fact that the urgency and devastation of places when multiple Kaiju are violently active creates a sense of urgency for the agents attempting to expel a Kaiju antagonist, ultimately impacting on an audience's connection with those specifically watched screen places For example, when *Godzilla* and *Mothra* battle each other in *Godzilla vs Mothra*, agents rebel such an attack to create a more heightened attachment through the desperation of their own agency that pans destruction. Herein lies an example of the point of difference between the 1950s and 1960s Kaiju Eiga, where the early instances created fresh and, mostly, unseen monsters, yet after a reappearance of the same Kaiju in new films from the 1960s, audiences could then rely on their memory of those films sighted in the past and, of course, of the memories of these films mapped onto current iterations, which is a different screen experience to, say, *Gojira*

Out of all the places Honda depicted in his movies, Tokyo remains a constant location of continual attack. Where his later works of the decade, *Destroy All Monsters* in particular, depict attacks and destruction on global cities including New York, Moscow, Beijing, and London, Tokyo has over the decades become synonymous as the *Godzilla* city, being the fact it was destroyed on screen by *Godzilla* so many times that its identity on screen in the real world has fused its skyline with Kaiju Eiga narratives as a symbiotic ethnographic aesthetic. This of course is separate from other fictitious places from Honda, including Monster island using much the same concept used on screen in *Jurassic Park* (dir: Spielberg, 1993) draws a relation between Kaiju and a place ‘of Kaiju’ used in the 1970s Kaiju Eiga, making that decade different from its previous counterparts. The shift from trashing cities to the lore of a monster island returns the franchises back to its roots in the nuclearfied Pacific Rim scenario,

but simultaneously there is a long-standing connection between ships, nuclear tests and monsters in *Kaiju Eiga*, (McCorkle, Rhoads, p.22) metaphorical references to the Castle BRAVO nuclear tests involved in the Daigo Fukury Maru incident are allegorically characterised in *Gojira*. As there are two distinct types of places in *Kaiju Eiga*, actual places familiar to an audience and fictitious places which are not, it is more convincing to create a make-believe island specifically designed on the Pacific Rim concept to contain a populous scenario of native Kaiju places that house and shelter their day-to-day movements that are far more robust and able to withstand their strength and scale than it is to utilise places we know being far more fragile and vulnerable to Kaiju attacks.

Tokyo as a city in comparison with Monster Island may have the similarities of a Pacific locality, yet these similarities cease beyond this point as the horror embedded within real places, like Tokyo, that we know exist in the real world greatly diminish in a depopulated area like Monster Island, when the natural world dwarfs the size and power of a Kaiju, rather than a populated city. This amplifies the fragility of urban infrastructure, wherein the horror of these places once the effacements of a city have been raised from the various acts of disaster, imbue simply because there is more to destroy and a greater loss of assets and human life *for humans* in an urban environment than there are in a remote natural world locality. In essence, cities are more fragile and thus more entertaining to destroy on screen, which is why Kaiju attacks from Toho's perspective are set in these locations in the first place to sell more movie tickets, and from Honda's perspective, a platform to make allegorical commentary.

We also see this in *Monsterland*, the second fictitious home of Kaiju that appeared in *Destroy All Monsters* (1968) that guarded its inhabitants with technologies including mist and a magnetic wall, situated in the wild before the invasion of the Killaaks who freed Kaiju, who then were set onto the global population with the intent of conquering Earth. *Destroy all Monsters* marks a transition period for not only Honda but for Toho Studios, as well as the memory of past films which were already changing into a high demand monster industry, capitalised on the memories of previous films that now showed all the main characters from previous instalments to audiences buying tickets to see familiar places and monsters in new episodic editions, even though these memories of earlier monsters and places by then were based on the Kaiju instalments of the last fifteen years of distribution.

By the time Honda had established himself as a leading Japanese film director in the 1960s, he was open to the fact that his wartime service in the 1930s and 1940s impacted on the way he represented destruction in *Kaiju Eiga*, stating that “most of the visuals I got [in *Godzilla*] were from my war experiences.” (Ryfle, p.43) After being discharged from a Chinese prisoner of war camp in 1946, Honda had become staunchly opposed to war and atomic weapons, having visited “Hiroshima to witness the scale of the destruction and pay his respects to the dead.” (Glownia, p.82) The impact of witnessing this devastation, of moving through an incinerated place on such a vast scale, became a hallmark of his attention to detail in replicating these experiences through cinema, where his wartime memory and its incomprehensible trauma can be read from *Gojira* onwards as a recreation of what he experienced over his eight years of military service. Apart from the shock of the unrivalled terror that the atomic weapons inflicted on the population of Japan at the time, it was the instantaneous devastation which left survivors of both Hiroshima and Nagasaki traumatised by a new weapon that, like *Godzilla*, had arrived unannounced to be the ‘King of the Monsters’ controlled by an unstoppable invading ‘other’. Place as a horror in this respect, rather than the horror in places, becomes a horror film in itself, and most definitely not

science fiction, as Honda used as a way to shield his allegorical narratives within the sellable economics of a global science fiction, by intersecting the emotional experiences that place shares between geographies and inhabitants that people, whether they be survivors of the atomic blasts or survivors of the war who, like Honda, had come to pay respects, share emotional values with the devastation of these sites of war that once the years had passed, lived on in Honda's memories now embedded into his back catalogue of films. Yet it is perplexing to find that "critics have dismissed Honda as unworthy of serious consideration, regarding him merely as the director of entertainment films aimed at children." (Phillips and Julian Stringer, p.82)

But it *was* children of the 1960s who propelled the behemoth monster film industries of the mid to late twentieth century following the memories of these places previously watched in movie theatres and TV sets also changed the way audiences created new attachments with place as the superficial perspectives of science fiction allowed for audiences to remember other characters and places in previous Toho films as the main point of reference for new films as Kaiju crossed over from being allegorical to a symbolism of an emerging Japanese pop culture as "Godzilla became less of a menace – and more of a mascot – for the revitalised, 'new' postwar Japan." (Tsutsui, p.63) We can see this transformation in Honda's last two films of the decade as if a change in tonality whereby the portrayal of Japan became more forthright in the global operations of saving Earth and less inclined to be what human characters originally were portrayed as, especially in the mid 1950s, who are effectively two different kinds of outlooks - the conquered coming to terms with surrender and nuclear legacy in comparison with a new identity built on economic progression and a cultural pop identity.

Honda's last Kaiju film of the 1960s was *All Monsters Attack*, marking a significant shift in monster franchises that by the start of the 1970s were subject to being guided by the immersiveness from their own pop subculture propelled by television, not to mention that the Kaiju films from thereon end became self-referential to other Kaiju films, unlike the singularity of instalments at the start of the decade. *All Monsters Attack* provides an end point of a unique chapter of Kaiju Eiga then carried over into the 1970s renditions that, in time, witnessed the eventual transformation of Honda's Eiga to a much larger universe and new characters which dovetailed between Kaiju canon and new monsters battling out their own adventures. But together, the horror of place became distanced from allegory as the franchises referenced themselves to drive increased revenue of consumer-driven screen escapism. If one was to hold the position of early Kaiju being a device for Japanese people to be subversive through film making in reflecting the horrors of war and the circumstances of atomic annihilation, then Kaiju Eiga in this regard can be considered a mirror of Japanese society at the time manifested through place as a means to express this horror akin to an emotional barometer of the heart of the people.

Coming to terms with these ideas brings a structure of Honda's films that manoeuvres them well into the psychology of horror and away from science fiction. If we return to the idea of being and Dasein, a proportionate response from horror cinema is about the emotional experiences that audiences connect with what they see on screen and what is implied through the unseen. If, say, we revisit Hitchcock's *The Birds*, the implications and anxiety that something has just happened or is about to occur works effectively if there is menacing anticipation from the places of the film where the monsters, here, the birds, have invaded a territory and the residents have to fight their way out of the applied violence which these birds inflict on the local inhabitants. But it is knowing that something is wrong within a

screen place that heightens the emotional state of watching a scene play out without having the need for a director to show exactly what *is* wrong, that makes tension a part of a director's tool kit that Honda utilised in every Kaiju film he made. So if we adopt the same mechanism to Honda's films, the interrelations of Kaiju can't support invasion, surrender or demise if they don't have a place to move through. Once these invaded places are taken away from the native inhabitants, our connection with place is damaged more so than the amount of infrastructure damaged from what Kaiju can action with, bringing forth an argument that the horror of place in Kaiju Eiga is determined by the experiences of what we bring to place when we watch it superficially on screen. It is place that determines our variety of danger, from what exists as 'normal' to what could be otherwise as an 'other', precisely what Kaiju are in an organised society that builds their own survival into the capabilities of how humans control their own places. There wouldn't be, for example, an urgency to eradicate Kaiju from human territories if they served the same kinds of connection to places as we do, because a Kaiju's sense of Dasein would prescribe it not to destroy cities and facilities, rendering it as the contributing force in derailing a distinction between antagonist and protagonist. What we can determine then from this discussion is that being has a strong role to play in Kaiju films for both the human and non-human creatures of Honda's mythology, because a sense of determinism holding moral judgement would radically change a Kaiju antagonist and the role it would serve within a functioning society that they otherwise would seek to frequently destroy.

As we have explored these different perspectives of place, let us focus now on leaving 1960s Kaiju to consider that if 1950s Eiga was thought of as a collective of grief, and the 1960s Eiga being the horror of repatriation, then the 1970s Eiga was most certainly about hope through the building of an expanded mythology as Japanese society developed its own war time recovery by embracing a popular culture it invented to effectively overcome a proportion of the barriers of war trauma. The horror of place, its mechanics of experience, and the affordance of memory to become intertwined within such places all transcend an emotional dependency on the identities of belonging and the sorrows of destruction that the places of Kaiju Eiga depicted. For both the monsters and the people evading them, Honda directed films as an outlet of despair for the Japanese people who, with the perseverance of Toho Studios, drove monster movies into global success at a time when monster cinema was still in its infancy. Whether it be considered a political allegory or a popular culture universe, Kaiju Eiga was shaped by Honda at a time of significant disruption for the Japanese people who manifested trauma through these creatures without knowing the process of healing that the genre would then create. While the generation who were permanently scarred from the horrors of war created ongoing films spread across multiple franchises by the construction of disaster and fantasy stories, the mechanism of addressing this trauma afforded the places in Honda films to be the horrors he remembered as a place-based device that has until now been vastly ignored. Many buildings or bridges destroyed by Godzilla, nor the monuments and towers toppled by Mothra, or even the trains and houses crushed by King Kong, are only a part of a much wider conversation in Kaiju Eiga. We are only now starting to articulate beyond the fascination and popularity of the characters, now celebrities, in Japanese cinema. Yet by focusing our attention on these creatures of horror in a story devoted to science fiction, it fails to embrace the intention of Honda in making such films, where the memories of the past and the societies that since recalled shared an interwoven emotional connection with their own senses of place profoundly impacted the lives of those who survived such horror by the escapism in places that the Kaigu era affords.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barr, J (2016). *The Kaiju Film: A Critical Study Of Cinema's Biggest Monsters*. Reprint, Jefferson, McFarland & Company.

Eleftheriotis, D, Needham, G (2006). *Asian Cinemas*. 1st ed. Reprint, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.

Glownia, D (2013). "Socio-Political Aspects Of Kaijū Eiga Genre: A Case Study Of The Original Godzilla". *Silva Iaponicarum* no.

Godzilla, King of the Monsters. Advertisement. Toho Studios.

Heidegger, M (2001). John Macquarrie, Edward Robinson, and Martin Heidegger. *Being And Time*. 21st ed. Reprint, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

Honda, I (dir) 1954, *Gojira*. Reprint, Toho Studios, Japan.

Honda, I (dir) 1956, *Godzilla, King of the Monsters* Toho Studios, Japan.

Honda, I (dir) 1955, *Godzilla Raids Again* Toho Studios, Japan.

Honda, I (dir) 1956, *Rodan* Film Toho Studios, Japan.

Honda, I (dir) 1957, *The Mysterians* Toho Studios, Japan.

Honda, I (dir) 1958, *Veran the Unbelievable* Toho Studios, Japan.

Honda, I (dir) 1961, *Mothra* Toho Studios, Japan.

Honda, I (dir) 1969, *All Monsters Attack* Toho Studios, Japan.

Inuhiko, Y (2008). "The Menace from the South Seas: Honda Ishiro's *Godzilla* (1954)." In *Japanese Cinema: Texts and Contexts*. Edited by Alastair Phillips and Julian Stringer, 102–111, Routledge, New York.

Kalat, D (2010). *A Critical History and Filmography of Toho's Godzilla Series*. Jefferson, McFarland.

Oda, M (1955). *Godzilla Raids Again*. Film. Reprint, Toho Studios, Tokyo.

McCorkle, B, and Rhoads, S (2018). *Japan's Green Monsters: Environmental Commentary In Kaiju Cinema*. Reprint, McFarland & Company Incorporated.

Mulhall, S (2003). *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook To Heidegger And Being And Time*. 2nd ed. Reprint, Routledge, London.

Phillips, A, Stringer, J (2007). *Japanese Cinema: Texts And Contexts*, Reprint, Oxon Routledge, London.

Ryfle, S (1998). *Japan's Favorite Mon-Star*. Reprint, Toronto [Ont.]: ECW Press, 1998. The Department of State Bulletin, Vol. XIII, No. 318, July 29, 1945, iBiblio.org. [Last Accessed 30 April 2021] <http://www.ibiblio.org/pha/policy/1945/450729a.html>

Tsutsui, W. M (2004). *Godzilla On My Mind: Fifty Years Of The King Of Monsters*, 1st ed. Reprint, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Matthew, T (2020). "VOD Film Review: Mothra (1961) | Vodzilla.Co | Where To Watch Online In UK | How To Stream". Vodzilla.Co, 2020. [Last Assed 15 May 2021] <https://vodzilla.co/reviews/monster-movie-monday-mothra-1961/>