Introduction

Reynaldo Ileto’s *Pasyon and Revolution* sets off on its soul searching journey of the Philippine history with a vivid account of the Lapiang Malaya’s “uprising,” which is today referred to more often as a massacre, on Sunday, May 21, 1967. The clash between the police forces and the Lapiang Malaya members broke out at dawn on Taft Avenue in Pasay City, killing one constabulary soldier and at least 33 Lapiang Malaya members, who were armed only with bolos and anting-anting. They were led by the 86 years old “supremo” Valentine de los Santos, a charismatic leader and a perennial presidential candidate since 1957, who was diagnosed as schizophrenic and sent to the National Mental Hospital where he was allegedly mauled and beaten to death, while officially he was pronounced dead of pneumonia in the middle of June.

It was a few months after this incident that Reynaldo Ileto left for the United States to take a graduate course at the Southeast Asian studies program of Cornell University. There by the end of 1973 he completed his Ph.D. thesis, which was to be published as *Pasyon and Revolution* in 1979. In his preface to the Japanese version [*Kirisuto Junanshi to Kakumei*] published in 2005, Ileto recalled that this groundbreaking work was a reflection of a number of things he found new to him during these turbulent years of antiwar, anti-imperialist and anti-establishment movements he
himself was involved in both in the United States and the Philippines. One of the new things he learned then was the history of Philippine-American War, “America’s first Vietnam” as antiwar Asian studies scholars in the United States then called it. Ileto in his preface says, however, the war is “nearly completely forgotten” among the Filipino people while the memories of Japanese occupation during World War II are still fresh and graphic among them.4

In 2000, two decades after the publication of Pasyon and Revolution, Reynaldo Ileto tackled with the question of remembering and forgetting of the two “colonial wars” in another conference paper he presented in Tokyo, in which he argued that the forgetting of the one event (i.e., Philippine-American War) and the remembering of the other (i.e., Japanese occupation) are facilitated by such factors as (1) the purging of aging memories (of Philippine-American war) by fresh and intense experiences (of Japanese occupation years) and (2) politicizing the past by the colonial states (i.e., U.S. & the Philippine government) with meta-narratives emphasizing the difference of two wars. Ileto concluded his discussion by foreseeing, “more exhaustive micro studies and the deconstruction of historical meta-narratives” will show the two wars really are “the same bananas.”5 The word was borrowed from what Pedro Calosa, the leader of the Tayug Colorum’s Uprising in 1931, uttered in 1966 during the interview conducted by David Sturtevant and F. Sionil Jose, an American scholar and a Filipino writer. Calosa was soon to be killed by an unknown murderer in 1967, the same year as the Lapiang Malaya movement was destroyed by the government.6 The content of Calosa’s interview would later intrigue Reynaldo Ileto and one more scholar, Vicente Rafael whose arguments will be discussed later in this chapter.

The chronology of these events tempts one to think many things about the life of war memory or how memory of war would live, die, resurrect and be haunting in the course of time in either collective, individual, or intellectual ways. Particularly interesting is the significance and meaning of the “six decades after.” We (Japanese, Filipinos and Americans) all passed through the six decades after the end of World War II in 2005, while 1967, the year of Lapiang Malaya massacre, could also be the six decades after the end of the Philippine-American War if 1907, the year of Macario Sakay’s execution and the inauguration of the Philippine Assembly, could be chosen as the truly final year of the war instead of 1902, the year Theodore Roosevelt declared the “pacification” on the July 4th but the war in fact was far from over. Some might say, of course, the war’s end should be 1912, the year Felipe Salvador was executed. This will make 1972, the year of martial law declaration, “six decades after.” Whatever the case may be, the Philippine-American war did not have a clear cut end date but was only
gradually winding down during the decade between 1902 and 1912, so the “six decades after” may be placed somewhere in the decade between 1962 and 1972.

This chapter will pick 1967, since there is another story to tell. From November 22 to December 30 of that year, a major “bone gathering [ikotsu syusyu]” mission organized by the Kagoshima prefecture government visited the Philippines to recover remains of what they believe to be the Japanese war dead in the Philippines. The event, which made the Japanese national government a little bit nervous, marks one of the emotional beginnings of the Japanese pilgrimage tours to the former battle sites in the Philippines, which reached the peak in the middle of 1970s but continue to this date with a shrinking number. The Kagoshima mission brought more than 4,000 remains back to Japan and the memorial was erected in April 1968 on the Hanase beach in Satsuma Peninsula which is located at the southwest end of mainland Japan, where they built a spacious beautiful park named “Hanase Viewing the Philippines Park [Hanase Bo’hi Ko’en].” Since then they have had the annual memorial ceremony at the park on every March 27th. I had an occasion to observe their 38th ceremony in 2004, one year before the 60th anniversary of the end of the World War II, which turned out to be another occasion to think about the life of war memory.

These two instances of “six decades after” the wars of course cannot be “the same bananas.” We, however, may find a number of clues to understand in what manner war memory has been functioning in each society by paralleling and cross-referring these two cases. Focus will be on the issues of mourning, i.e., the people’s reaction to a sense of great loss they suffered in the past. How have the issues of mourning been addressed in the course of sixty years and beyond in each society? Asking this question would provide a good venue to discuss and understand the different but inter-related attitudes of the three peoples (Filipinos, Japanese, and Americans) toward the past. Then it may be useful to apply the psychoanalytical conception called work of mourning, which has been adapted to multiple disciplines in their discussion of the postwar and the other post-violence memories.

**Object-Loss, Mourning, and Melancholia**

Sigmund Freud’s monograph titled “Mourning and Melancholia,” which was written in 1915 and published in 1917, stands as a classic about the human reaction to the loss of “a love-object,” which can be not only a person but “some abstraction” such as “one’s country, liberty, and ideal, and so on.” Freud initially thought he could distinguish between the two types of reactions to object-loss, i.e. “normal mourning” and “ill of
melancholia,” even though they are very much alike in their appearances with such similar symptoms as obsessive behaviors, inhibition, loss of interest, and so on. In case of “normal mourning,” mourners went through psychological process Freud named work of mourning, which is painful and full of inner struggle but is expected to end after a certain period of time, enabling them (mourners) to move on. It is a normal process because mourners understand what they lost and they are sooner or later expected to accept the fact they lost it. On the other hand, Freud argued, those who are “ill of melancholia” continue to be stuck and cannot move on to the process of mourning, because the melancholic are not aware of or willing to know what they lost or, even if they know, what significance the loss has to them. In denial of loss they often tend to identify themselves with the lost ones and recreate them within the egos of themselves. 9

Object-loss has since been an important subject of clinical psychology, developmental and social psychology as well as an increasing number of various disciplines of social sciences and humanities. 10 One of the most cited works adapting object-loss theory to social and political issues was Alexander and Margarete Mitscherlich’s Inability to Mourn published in West Germany in 1967,11 which argues that the post World War II Germans have avoided the confrontation with their past of the Nazi years, using the conception of manic defense to describe the postwar Germans’ inability of mourning. Their handling of object-loss theory has been criticized as rough and the accuracy of their statement about the postwar Germans’ manic defense has been questioned. Their argument, however, has since had a tremendous impact on the German endeavors for “the overcoming of the past” which was considerably rewarded in gaining trust of the neighboring countries. 12

Recent scholarship on object-loss has paid attention to such aspects as persistence of mourning as well as indivisibility between mourning and melancholia. Freud himself recognized difficulty to distinguish between the two in his writings in response to World War I, noticing the possibility of “endless mourning.”13 Today’s clinical psychology considers work of mourning not a one-way process to move on. Instead they say “people do not necessarily ‘get over’ major loss, but learn to live with it, with struggles to do so persisting far longer than previously thought.”14

Prolonged mourning certainly is the case of World War II, whose fifty years anniversary, 1995, did not mark the ending of remembering and mourning as had previously been expected. On the contrary, 1995 pulled the trigger for the flourishing of memory politics around the world as shown by the Holocaust controversies in Europe and Middle East as well as “History Issues [Rekishi Mondai]” in North East Asia. In the
Philippines, a civic group, Memorare Manila 1945 started its quiet campaign against the forgetting of the battle for Manila in 1995. Iris Chang’s *The Rape of Nanking* was published in 1997, bringing about the storm of controversy across the Pacific. Japanese Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi revived the Yasukuni controversy by his visit to the shrine in 2001. Then the year 2005 has come and gone. We found memory politics is still lively going on in many parts of the world. In these cases, the people claim they cannot conclude their mourning satisfactory unless their sense of loss be more properly recognized, addressed, and atoned.

If the mourning is not to be finished in a certain period of time as initially expected by Freud, will there be any difference between mourning and melancholia? Isn’t it that unsettled mourning with emotional expression of dissatisfaction and frustration can be nothing but melancholia? In conjunction with this question, Freud already stated in “Mourning and Melancholia” that “it is only because we know so well how to explain mourning that it does not seem pathological.” Then melancholia will not seem pathological any more if it is better explained. Eng and Kazanjian in their introduction to *Loss: The Politics of Mourning* (2003) argue that one can even appreciate potential of melancholia, since it can take much more free-wheeling forms, in which “the past remains steadfastly alive in the present” with “an ongoing and open relationship with the past --- bringing its ghost and specters, its flaring and fleeting images, into present,” while in mourning the past is clearly defined and declared resolved and dead.

With these notions in my mind, this chapter will discuss in the following that the Lapiang Malaya movement in 1967 can be understood as a melancholic popular reaction to the absence of collective mourning for the lost revolution and war, which then was diagnosed as pathological but is not seem pathological any more with better understanding given by *Pasyon and Revolution* and the following works of the Philippine history. On the other hand, the Kagoshima bone gathering mission in 1967 and the other Japanese endeavors to memorialize their war dead in the Philippines may be understood as a case of successful and smooth mourning for their loved ones as long as Japanese mourners are concerned. With its success the past would be dead and gone on the part of Japanese while it is doubtful if it can be the case on the part of the Philippines.

### 1967 Lapiang Malaya Movement

The significance of “six decades after” stems from the fact that it is difficult for any
survivors of any wars to live long after this time point except the extremely blessed ones. This makes “six decades after” more or less a pronouncement that the living memory is soon to be gone. It may, however, still stay around for several more years or even a decade, which would be the time for the last stand of the living memory. This is what we live now in the six decades after the World War II and what they lived in the six decades after the Philippine-American War in 1967. Newspapers of those days carried obituaries of the last living veterans of the war including Emilio Aguinaldo, the President of the First Republic, and Douglas MacArthur, whose life was deeply tied with the Philippines since his first assignment in 1903; both of them died in 1964 at the age of 94 and 84, respectively. The Lapiang Malaya’s “supremo” Valentine de los Santos, who was 86 years old in 1967, and a few of the senior members of the Lapiang Malaya, belonged to the very last of the generations who could claim they have the living memory of the lost revolution and war whether or not they actually participated in them.

What little is known about the movement tells that this militant and patriotic sect with 40,000 members emerged during the late 1940s. De los Santos claimed he had the spiritual power to communicate with the Deity as well as the living personalities of the dead Filipino heroes, especially with Jose Rizal. In 1957 he ran for the presidential election for the first time but received only 21,674 or 0.4% of the total vote. Their patriotism increasingly became anti-foreign in the 1960s while the members were encouraged to practice bolos, wear uniforms imagined to be bulletproof, and carry anting-anting. In October 1966 the one thousand bolo-equipped members attempted to interrupt the summit of the seven nations allied with the United States in the Vietnam War, which was proudly hosted by Ferdinand Marcos. The police dispersed them without violence. In early May of 1967, however, De los Santos called for the resignation of Marcos and declared the formation of the Lapiang Malaya government. The PC and the police forces gathered and placed a cordon around headquarter of the movement in Pasay city. The tense situation eventually led to the massacre by the heavily armed constabulary and police forces when the members allegedly attempted to break the cordon in order to proceed to Malacañang Palace seeking an audience with Marcos to receive his resignation.

One of the few contemporary scholastic accounts was written by David Sturtevant, a pioneer scholar on the Philippine popular movements and a rare sympathetic observer of the Lapiang Malaya, who deplored “the apparent willingness on the part of prominent Filipinos to dismiss the incident as a relatively unimportant and largely inexplicable event.” The credit should go to Sturtevant for his argument that
the incident had the same magnitude of significance as Pedro Calosa’s Tayug Colorum uprising of 1931 and the both movements show the persistence with the notions of independence, nationhood, and patriotism. In retrospect, however, Sturtevant’s view could also be open to criticism for its pathological treatment of the movement, which was obvious in his narratives depicting the movement as becoming increasingly “messianic,” “millennial,” and apocalyptic with a strengthening sense of “omnipotence” with the growing number of the villagers rallying to De los Santos, who was speaking about “Judgment Day.” In his thesis of dichotomy and see-saw between tradition and modernity, Lapiang Malaya represented the resurgence of traditional supernaturalism which was brought about by the failure and demise of contemporary modern secularism in the 1950s marked by the defeat of the Huk rebellion and the death of the “commoner” president Ramon Magsaysay in 1957. The other popular movements in the Philippines are anatomized in a similar synchronistic way, with the blames always going to the same evil of class division and indifference of urban elite among the each movement’s contemporaries. Americans could be guilty but only as long as they too were indifferent to the conditions of the peasant society and were collaborating with the Filipino elite and the affluent. After all he does not seem to be aware that the old war Filipinos fought against Americans had any substantial connection to the character of Philippine popular movements. His view was more or less shared by the U.S. Embassy officials, who casually noted about the incident in a dispatch of their weekly summary reports to the State Department, discarding the movement as “traceable more to the ignorance and superstition of the misguided fanatics; and it serves as a sad reminder of the uneven political and cultural development in the Philippines.”

What Sturtevant misses while Reynaldo Ileto would later salvage from the obscurity of the inexplicable, is the popular movements’ sustained devotion to the past as the lost-object, evidenced by such usage as the Lapiang Malaya’s “triangular symbols, the colorful uniforms, the title of ‘supremo’ and even the very idea of a radical brotherhood,” and ating-ating, showing their strong attachment to the tradition and cause of Katipunan of 1896. In this light, spiritual worlds of the popular movements which previously were understood as pathology of millennialism would not seem pathological any more. The Lapiang Malaya turns out to be not the fanatics but the last revolt of the living memory, protest against forgetting, and reminder to the nation of the huge loss they suffered some sixty years before. The other post Philippine-American War popular movements may be interpreted in this way as well.

In the 2000 paper, Raynaldo Ileto revealed an episode of forgetting in his own family history. His father General Rafael Ileto, born in 1920, grew up as a typical
America’s boy without knowing that his father (Ileto’s grandfather “Lolo Ysco”) once got involved in the revolution and was watched by the U.S. Army Intelligence as a “revolutionary spy,” the fact Ileto found among the archives in the United States (in the Philippine Insurgent Records). Ileto inferred that Lolo Ysco probably had kept silence since 1904 when he was recruited as a school teacher by Americans. The implication of this episode is that for many of the postwar Filipino people forgetting was a necessary survival strategy to succeed in “the new era,” then they had to forget “there ever was a war.” Forgetting by choice in one generation was then to be inherited by total ignorance about the past in the next generation, resulting in amnesia at the level of family as well as society.

It is then only natural, Freud would say if asked, that this magnitude of inhibition of mourning would touch off a revolt as an angry expression of the melancholic frustration over the mainstream society’s inability to mourn. Such might have been the case of Colorum’s uprisings including Tayug uprising led by Pedro Calosa in 1931, which occurred 24 years after the war end and the living memory could be still very fresh among many. Calosa himself claimed he knew Felipe Salvador personally in his boyhood. This does not necessarily mean that the factual history of the Philippine-American War was well shared among the participants of the movements. On the contrary, most of the younger participants might not have even the slightest idea of the war. It can still be the revolts of the memories, however, because memories of the revolution and war can be built-in into the forms and idioms of the movements as in the case of the Lapiang Malaya movement, making the participants the guardians of memory even without knowing it. In this way, the Lapiang Malaya movement certainly deserves the name of the revolt of the living memory and was the last one. The revolt carrying the Katipunan tradition with the same kind of melancholic emotion as Tayug uprising and the Lapiang Malaya movement would not appear on the Philippine political scene any more. Though tradition and idioms of the revolution would still be remembered and even revived, the mode of protest would change as the old soldiers faded away from the scene.

**1967 Kagoshima Bone Gathering Mission to the Philippines**

Turning eyes to the Japanese bone gathering mission from Kagoshima prefecture in 1967 might certainly seem abrupt and even absurd. The mission and its aftermath, however, could be interestingly paralleled, compared, and contrasted with the revolts of the memories in the Philippines if we could choose Colorum’s Tayug uprising in 1931
and the Japanese bone gathering mission from Kagoshima as the early instances of the
revolts of the memories in each case.

While there was without doubt a small minority of nationalist intellectuals who
lamented the loss of such abstractions as prewar Japanese heroic patriotism and
masculine tradition, the prevailing feelings among the Japanese public in the mid 1960s
was still one of pacifism and anti-militarism. Postwar Japanese heroes were the victims
of wars. It was thus almost exclusively the war dead the postwar Japanese mourned and
that is why the Philippines could be so important for Japanese mourners. With over half
a million Japanese war dead (518,000 according to one of the government sources)
including civilians, which was the largest number among the Southeast Asian
countries occupied by Japan during World War II, Japanese memorial practices such as
recovery of remains, pilgrimage tours, and erecting of memorials have been more
widely held in the Philippines than any other countries outside Japan since the mid
1960s.

Japanese mourners could not be called the melancholic as defined by Freud,
since they knew what they lost all too well. They could be, however, as emotional as
melancholic especially in the early years of bone gathering and pilgrimage tours, largely
because they had a feeling of collective guilt for the delay of mourning, which left the
remains of their war dead in foreign soil for such a long time while majority of Japanese
were being obsessed with economic recoveries. Their feelings of guilt for the loved ones
sometimes turn to the rage against the Japanese national government, which in their
eyes seemed neither sympathetic nor enthusiastic enough about carrying out the project
for consoling the souls of the war dead. Here we could find at least one thing Japanese
mourners of the World War II dead shared with Filipino mourners of the lost revolution.
They both had a sense of dissatisfaction, or even anger with the mainstream society’s
indifference to mourning.

In the mid 1960s, one of the most urgent issues for Japanese mourners was a
resuming of government sponsored bone gathering missions which had officially
concluded in 1958 after having sent one mission to each former battle site country. The
Philippines was the last and the largest site, in which the mission gathered and brought
back 2,561 remains to Japan. Japanese mourners, however, were far from satisfied.
The air travel became rapidly popular after the government liberalized foreign travel in
1964. The era of high growth and the increasing income soon made foreign travel a
craze among the Japanese. Under these circumstances, it was only natural for the
Japanese mourners to think about their own travel for bone gathering and pilgrimage.

In 1965, Japan War Bereaved Association [Nippon Izoku Kai] (hereinafter
JWBA), which then was one of the most powerful pressure group and political base to the governing Liberal Democratic Party [Jiminto], incorporated into its annual petition to the Japanese government (1) resuming of recovering the war dead remains, (2) erecting memorials, (3) maintenance of cemeteries, and (4) providing financial and other assistance to the bereaved family’s pilgrimage tours to the former battle sites and cemeteries. They also demanded the bone gathering missions to be composed of not only government officials but private organizations and the bereaved family volunteers. All of these demands were to be met within a few years. The 1967 Kagoshima mission, however, was organized in impatience with indecision of the national government and visited the Philippines, to some extent, in defiance of the government.

The Kagoshima mission was originated in the civic organization founded in 1966 named “Association for the Promotion of the Bone Gathering of the War Dead in the Philippines as well as Erecting Memorial.” The association was composed of the bereaved family and veteran survivors in Kagoshima and Kumamoto prefecture and raised 15,523,217 yen (43,120 USD), of which about 5,200,000 was subsidized by the local authorities of Kagoshima and Kumamoto prefectures. Kagoshima University, though it was a national university belonged to the national government, also contributed to the project by offering its Faculty of Fisheries’ training ship Keiten-maru and its crews to bring the mission to and from the Philippines.

Local press reports at the time indicate the mission was surrounded by the ample support and emotional expectation of the local communities. It was a big event. Keiten-maru left the Kagoshima seaport on November 22, 1967 and came back with 4,049 remains (2,495 from Leyte; 1,554 from Luzon) and several abandoned cannons, machine-guns and 38 infantry rifles on December 30. As early as in April next year, the association erected the memorial on the site donated by Kaimon municipality government on the Hanase beach. They did not give over the remains to the national government but placed them under the memorial. Use of the national university’s ship, recovering and bringing back not only remains but abandoned arms, and refusing delivery of remains to the national government must have been problematic enough for the Ministry of Health and Welfare to issue the new guideline titled “About the Gathering Bones of the War Dead” in February 1968, stating they “will not allow any plans aimed at bone gathering by local authorities, private organizations, and so on in order to prevent troubles in local communities as well as in respect for the true purpose of bone gathering.”

What is conspicuous here is the Japanese mourners’ obsessive desire to connect
with the souls of their loved ones in their own peculiar ways, i.e., gathering bones and/or visiting the place their loved one died. Behind this obsession is the notion that their loved ones’ souls are not free but bound to the bodily remains staying around the places they died. This makes it necessary for the mourners physically to be as close as possible to the places where their loved ones had died. There they may offer burning sticks of incense in front of the battle sites and memorials, call out the names of the dead, and weep aloud. For example, a member of the Kagoshima mission carried the audio tape player he was asked to play at the battle site by the 84 years old bereaved mother who could not join the mission. He “pushed the button,” and the tape said: “Kesakichi, it was so unfortunate that you could not come back. I am now 84 years old. I will be going to your place very soon. Now please come back with the bone gathering mission.” Not only bereaved family but also the World War II veteran “survivors” [seikansha] or “comrades” [senyu] of the war dead, always join this kind of mission. The correspondent of the South Nippon Times [Minami Nippon Shimbun] described the scenes: “Hey! Now I’m coming to pick you up! Let’s go home together!’ --- On the beach of Lingayen, at the cemeteries of Clark Field, and in the mountains of Baguio, these are the words of survivors who screamed like crazy.” Even the Manila Times covered a young woman who joined the mission and visited Montalban where his father died, reporting, “as she rode back to Manila, she kept on saying, ‘I talked with my father!’” These emotional expressions of Japanese mourners may represent a melancholic aspect of their mourning, since in these cases the lost objects are not dead in the mourners’ mind but asking the mourners’ help to free them and bring them back home. The attitude of Japanese bereaved family talking to the dead and melancholic “survivors” screaming like crazy might be diagnosed as pathological by a psychiatrist unless he or she understands it is a socially accepted way of mourning in Japan that the living addresses the misfortune and discontent of the dead by speaking loud to them.

“All the Same Bananas” or Not

The ways of connecting to the past is an interesting point of comparison between the Philippine popular movements in the early to mid 20th century and Japanese mourning of the World War II dead. Valentine de los Santos and Pedro Calosa both claimed they were communicating with the living personalities of the dead Filipino heroes. Particularly interesting is the interview Sturtevant conducted with Pedro Calosa in 1966, which was mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. It was too weird for the American scholar to use it as a factually reliable account in his own book, so Sturtevant put it in
appendix instead. The interview, however, was so intriguing that Reynaldo Ileto quotes Calosa’s account on his encounter with Felipe Salvador’s “personality” in the next cell of the prison he was jailed in Honolulu, Hawai‘i, where he was an immigrant worker and the labor activist, as a vivid example of the pasyon’s reenactment in the Philippine life.37

Vicente Rafael also examines the strange conversation between Sturtevant and Calosa in the opening pages of Contracting Colonialism published in 1988. What intrigued Rafael is that Calosa talked not only about his having been haunted by the dead Salvador, Bonifacio, and Rizal but also about his having haunted the living Manuel Quezon, Aurora Quezon, and the American Secretary of War. To explain the spiritual world according to Calosa, Rafael presented a conception of “remembering-as-haunting,” as one way of appropriation or “localizing what is outside of one.”38 Contrary to the Japanese souls of the war dead, these “personalities” don’t seem to be bound to bodily remains nor any particular place, time, or anything. There even was no distinction between the dead and the living as shown in the episode Calosa haunted Manuel Quezon and others. Here the contrast between Japanese and Filipino way to encounter the dead or lost-objects seems too obvious. Japanese souls have some serious problems that make them unable to fly back to Japan, waiting for the rescue, while the Japanese mourners play roles as desperate rescuers. Filipino souls on the other hand seem almost free-wheeling, having no problem in flying to Honolulu, and daringly ignoring the borderer between the living and the dead.

Does this show freedom of the Filipino souls and the straitjacketed personality of the Japanese even after their death? There could be other explanations. Vicente Rafael argues that for Pedro Calosa “the past appears metonymically as a series of names, dates, and events interspersed by moments of visiting and being visited by the spirits of historical personages.”39 The recurring experiences of being subdued by overwhelming power in the numerous pasts and the present may have made the distinction among many pasts and present nebulous one. In other words, the Filipino experiences of loss and defeat in the past and the present may have put all the different past events and even the present ones on the same plane, making not only the past and present Filipino heroes and victims to be imagined but also those who imagine the encounters “all the same bananas.” Such chemistry of interrelationship between the living and the dead or the imagining and the imagined as recorded by Sturtevant and reinterpreted by Ileto and Rafael may best exemplify Eng’s and Kazanjian’s conception of melancholia as “an ongoing and open relationship with the past.”

On the contrary, the distinction between the rolls played by the Japanese living
mourners and the war dead is clear and not reversible. This suggests that the Japanese war dead mourning, despite its pathetic appearances, in fact allows the mourners to enter the work of mourning in the most classical definition given by Freud, which would eventually enable them to finish and conclude mourning and move on. The remarkable number of both the bone gathering missions and the people going to the Philippines since the 1960s to this date shows how strong and long lasting has been the desire of the living for the work of mourning. So does it show how satisfactory their aspiration has been met. What made this possible is the transformation of the postwar Philippine-Japan relations from one of hatred to reconciled, which itself was the result of interplay between the improvement of political and economic relations and emergence of amity between the two peoples greatly enhanced by grassroots exchanges through the war dead memorialization. Attention should be paid, however, to the fact that the Japanese mourners’ satisfaction cannot be secured without quiet comfort given to them by the Filipino counterparts, who are very likely the living victims and the mourners of the over one million dead victims of Japanese aggression, oppression, and atrocities.\textsuperscript{40}

Filipino surprising generosity toward the pilgrimage tourists from Japan may be explained in terms of reciprocity, which seems to have existed between the comfort given by the Filipinos and the gratitude shown by the Japanese in various ways from the donation to the local communities to the massive ODA by the Japanese government. This sort of reciprocity works, however, only as long as the both parties share the understanding of the past events, for which Japanese mourners are expected to have feelings of apologies toward the Filipinos as victims of Japanese aggression. What has happened in the recent Philippine-Japan relations, however, is that Japanese public memories of war in the Philippines are miserably wearing thin with time to near-total amnesia, while the “History Issues” between Japan and its Northeast Asian neighbors serve as a constant reminder of their contentious past events.\textsuperscript{41}

If the gentle silence of the Philippine government and people has come from their desire to keep reciprocity and amity with Japanese by not confronting their amnesia because Japan is a major donor country, it almost comes to the same as has been found in the Philippine-U.S. relations, in which defeat in war and colonial submission left the former revolutionaries no other choice but to suppress their memories to survive and succeed in “the new era.” Then it won’t be surprising at all if we face more revolts of the memories against amnesia in some way or another in the near future.
2004: The 38th Memorial Ceremony

At noon of March 27, 2004, one year before the 60th anniversary of the end of the World War II, I was holding a handycam among the gathering crowd of people coming to the Hanase Viewing the Philippines Park to attend the annual memorial ceremony honoring “the Philippine Islands War Dead.” There was a large attendance at the ceremony, which was in formality sponsored by the Philippine Islands War Dead Memorial Association [Hito Senbotsusha Irei Kensho Kai] but in fact managed by the municipal government of Kaimon, a rural community at the base of Mount Kaimon, the 924 meter high conical shaped volcano in the southern end of Satsuma Peninsula in Kyushu.

In spite of the name given to the park, it is of course impossible to get a view of the Philippine Islands from there. It is considered, however, that one can spiritually see the islands beyond the East China Sea from the park, since it is located on the southwest end of mainland Japan. Then one may connect oneself with the heroic spirits [ei’rei] of his or her loved ones, who are supposed to be unable to leave the far away islands. Based on such imagination, the park was opened in 1968 with the dedication of the park’s central memorial named “the Doors to the Life and Death [Shisei no Tobira]” produced by a prominent local sculptor and the professor of Art at Kagoshima University, NAKAMURA Shinya, who was to be commissioned to produce all the monuments in the park. The epigraph of the central memorial reads: “If it is allowed / We would like to erect the memorial of grievance in the Philippines/ Faraway islands where the spirits remain/ And lie down and pray in front of it/ We have no choice but to erect the memorial/ At the southernmost land of Japanese Islands/ We think together and wish together/ And Pray, ‘May the souls rest in peace.’”

The memorial service I attended was the 38th since its first in 1968. Although nation-widely little known, the Hanase park’s memorial service is one of the very few remaining annual gatherings to honor the Japanese war dead in the Philippines. It definitely has been the largest one in terms of the size of attendance. The memorial service was conducted by the three priests from the nearby Hirasaki Shrine in a pure or even neo-essentialist Shinto religious rite style, which started with the purification and the mystic prayer to invite the heroic spirits of the war dead from somewhere in haven all the way down to the Hanase Park. After the heroic sprits were imagined to descent to the memorial site, the priests left. Then traditional chant of a memorial poem was performed by the five senior gentlemen accompanied by a bamboo flute [Shakuhachi], followed by the women in white dresses singing in chorus a melancholic song titled “the Song dedicated to the Philippine Islands War Dead Memorial.” SDF (Self Defense
Forces) generals showed up and the Ground SDF military brass band played such military memorial tunes as “If you go to the sea [Umi Yukaba]” during the ceremony. The climax of the whole program came when the Maritime SDF’s P3C patrol aircraft flew over the park for three times, to which the official program of the ceremony referred to as the “offering prayers from the air [Kuchu Sampai].”

What I felt there, however, was the atmosphere that could not hide hollowing out of the memorialization among the attendants, bulk of whom were not the bereaved family nor surviving veterans but the people of Kaimon community mobilized by the municipal government. Though the basic concept of the ceremony and the park itself is based on a longing to connect with the souls stuck in the faraway islands, I could not but feel the absence of that longing among the attendants. To some extent, it may be because there actually were not many bereaved family at the service. It may be, however, more because years of satisfactory work of mourning in form of bone gathering missions, pilgrimage tours, and annual services have taken that longing away from the Japanese mourners. With the completion of mourning work, the lost object which once disturbed the mourners from far away becomes a part of the mourner’s inner self, which tamely stays in the mourner’s memories. Thus, they don’t have to view the Philippines because the place is irrelevant to their mourning anymore. Instead they do wave at the P3C patrol aircraft, cheerfully.

Conclusion

This chapter has tried to apply psychological conceptions of mourning and melancholia (1) to the understanding of the Lapiang Malaya incident in 1967 and (2) to the Japanese mode of memorialization of the war dead in the Philippines as shown in the 1967 Kagoshima mission for bone gathering and the present form of mourning found in Hanase memorial ceremony in 2004. What is ironical is that in case of the Philippine-American War, whose memory was suppressed and forgotten, the dead heroes were still literally alive in the melancholic imagination of De los Santos and Pedro Calosa even six decades after the war end, while completion of Japanese mourning seems to have made the war dead really dead.

Equally important is the fact that the Lapiang Malaya’s tragic end as well as the Pedro Calosa’s final year interview stirred the imagination of Reynaldo Ileto and the following generation of scholars in their endeavors to reconstruct and recreate history under totally different light from the previous scholarship. In this sense, 1967 marked as much the beginning of the next life of the war memory as the end of its first. Then for
almost 40 years from 1967 to the present, it is historians who have decided the course of the war memory, or the memory war, which itself can be a very interesting subject of the Philippines-U.S. history.

Does this history of one war memory tell anything to another one, which is going to experience the next four decades after the 60th anniversary from now on? My answer is affirmative. The collaboration between Japanese desire to memorialize their own war dead and the Filipino accommodation to them may have prompted mutual amity between the two countries, while erasure of war memories may result in unsettling the bases of mutual understanding. Completion of Japanese work of mourning prompted the forgetting of the once so well remembered war, which has become the undeniable reality in Japan during the last decade. Kagoshima’s instance seems to confirm Japanese amnesia by showing the people do not “view” the Philippines any more. If Sturtevant’s failure to understand Calosa and the Lapiang Malaya resulted from his inability to imagine the gravity of loss Filipinos suffered in the lost war, Sturtevant himself can be called a casualty of American amnesia. This episode can be a caution to the Japanese scholars who are now vulnerable to the same failure.

How to avoid forgetting then? We probably can learn something from Pedro Calosa about function and utility of melancholic experiences of being haunted and haunting, dead or alive. We don’t need supernatural power today to haunt and be haunted, thanks to the Internet. It is, however, more desirable to haunt and be haunted by directly facing each other. Naoko Jin, a young Japanese woman, leads “the video message project bridging Philippines and Japan” exchanging video messages between the Japanese war veterans and the Filipino victims of Japanese occupation. The single organizer of this conscientious project recalls it was her own experience of being emotionally confronted (or haunted, Calosa would say) in February 2000 by the victims who lost their loved ones by the hands of Japanese that motivated her to engage in this project.45 I think it says that haunting nice people pays off. I hope more “living personalities,” dead or alive, will haunt nice people of Japan, the United States, and the Philippines, to keep the venue for history as endless mourning alive and well.
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