RYOTA NISHINO

From Memory Making to Money Making?

Japanese Travel Writers' Impressions of Cross-Cultural Interaction in the Southwestern Pacific Islands Battle Sites, 1962–2007

ABSTRACT Of the numerous commercially published Japanese travelogues about the southwestern Pacific Islands, five stand out for their detailed accounts of interactions between the travel writers and the Pacific Islanders. This article explores the common narrative threads in these works. Drawing on the literature on travel writing and dark tourism, it analyzes how the relationship between travelers and the Islanders has evolved over time. The early writers report disturbing encounters with Islanders for whom memories of World War II's Pacific battles were still vivid. The later writers exhibit greater expectations as patrons of battlefield tourism. Their writing displays less interest in a meaningful cultural exchange with the Islanders. This trend may parallel the asymmetry of political and economic power between Japan and the Pacific Islands. KEYWORDS Travel writing, dark tourism, Japan, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, World War II

Travel writing is a popular literary genre in Japan. Within this genre, travelogues featuring Pacific War battle sites make up a lesser-known niche market, one in which conflicting memories of war emerge from travel writers' interactions with Pacific Islanders. This essay explores how writers' and Islanders' memories of war are narrated in five commercially published travelogues about southwestern Pacific Islands such as Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands between 1962 and 2007.[1] The five writers discussed here were selected because they devote greater space to their interactions with the Islanders at Pacific War battle sites than their contemporaries do. The analysis reveals how the writers' interactions with the Islanders affected both their views of the Islanders and of the war.

1. Throughout this article, I will refer to these two nations by the names adopted since independence, Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands. I use Islands and Islander, with the capital I, as collective terms for the islands and the people of the two nations.

Pacific Historical Review, Vol. 86, Number 3, pps. 443–471. ISSN 0030-8684, electronic ISSN 1533-8584 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1525/phr.2017.86.3.443.

This article traces two main historical trajectories present in travel writing. The first maps how the travel writers speak to or against prevailing understandings of the war in Japan at the time of travel. We can see how the travelers' interactions with the Islanders affected their understanding of the war. The second trajectory teases out the shifting characteristics of the cross-cultural interactions that bear upon the contemporary relationship between Japan and the Pacific Islands. By exercising their economic power, tourists have shaped local residents into hosts who are willing to serve their nostalgic needs. The earliest of the five works examined in this essay documents cross-cultural interactions in which Islanders tell tales of Japanese occupation. These accounts humble the travelers. The more recent works, on the other hand, show interactions with a stronger commercial tone. These accounts reveal that Japanese travelers expect Islanders to prepare their islands so that the travelers can consume wartime history on their own terms.

Travel writing on the southwestern Pacific War battle sites conveys important messages about how travelers grapple with the fading memories of campaigns that took place so far from Japan. A few of the potential causes of the relative obscurity of the southwestern Pacific theater are the distance from Japan, the numerous defeats in battles, and the great number of deaths in proportion to the total number of soldiers deployed. Moreover, the vast majority of Japanese deaths resulted from illness induced by starvation rather than from direct combat.[2] Japan's rapid advance across the Asia-Pacific region meant that Japanese involvement in the southwestern Pacific was short but intense and often brutal. Nonetheless, the region still holds significant connections for the Japanese. Japanese travelers visit the region's battle sites to observe, remember, and reflect upon this violent legacy. Commemorative ceremonies conducted by Japanese pilgrims to former battle sites have generated a number of scholarly contributions.[3]

2. Fujiwara Akira, *Uejinishita eirei tachi (The Starvation of the Japanese Army in World War II)* (Tokyo: Aoki Shoten, 2011). When introducing Japanese-language works by Japanese-born authors, I follow the East Asian convention of last name first. Exceptions apply to the authors whose original works are published in English.

3. Scholars who have studied various aspects of contemporary Japanese pilgrimages across the Pacific Islands include Greg Dvorak, "Who Closed the Sea? Archipelagoes of Amnesia between the United States and Japan," *Pacific Historical Review* 83, no. 2 (2014): 350–72; Shingo Iitaka, "Remembering Nan'yō from Okinawa: Deconstructing the Former Empire of Japan through Memorial Practices," *History and Memory* 27, no. 2 (2015): 126–51; Nakayama Kaoru, "Senbotsusha irei jumpai oboegaki: Chibaken Tochigiken gokokujinja shusai senbotsusha irei jumpai no jireikara" [Notes from a Commemorative Tour of the War Dead: From a Tour Organized by a Shrine in Chiba and Tochigi Prefectures], *Kokugakiin daigaku kenkyū kaihatsu suishinsentā: Rekishi kiyō* 2,

This article takes a different approach by situating itself in the scholarly fields of travel writing and dark tourism (also known as thanatourism). These fields draw on distinct yet allied interdisciplinary approaches. The former is the more developed of the two, having gained critical recognition since the 1990s. Postcolonialism has driven travel writing scholars to reveal the relations of power that operate between travelers and travelees. Mary Louise Pratt has coined the term "travelee" to refer to the people whom travelers meet and describe. The hierarchical relationship that exists between travelers and travelees is never stable but is tempered by travelers' anxiety, by tension with travelees, and by travelees' resistance.[4] Treating travel writing as a useful source for historical inquiry, this essay hopes to use Pratt's concept to reveal how the asymmetry of power behind the traveler-travelee interaction evolves in and is conditioned by history. This article maps the trajectory of the traveler-travelee relationship so as to better appreciate how travel writers have represented their interactions with Islanders during different time periods. This approach allows an uncovering of the voices of the travelees embedded in the travel writers' accounts and may serve as a model for future research on postwar and post-empire Japanese travel writing.

Analyses of how travelers interpret and reflect on their journeys can provide rich substance for dark tourism scholarship. The scholars John Lennon and Malcolm Foley consider dark tourism as divorced from fun-filled leisure and "connected in some way to death."[5] Subsequent scholars see the appeal in this notion but find that it needs further theoretical development to better respond to tourists' diverse motivations and behavior. Frank Baldwin and Richard Sharpley consider battlefield tourism as one category of dark tourism. They also propose a number of subcategories based on tourists' differing motives and expectations. For instance, participants in battlefield pilgrimage tours seek spiritual connection.[6] This differentiation is but one development that bodes well for the eventual theoretical maturation of the field. An exciting recent development in our understanding of dark tourism

(March 2008): 170–215; Shinji Yamashita, "The Japanese Encounter with the South: Japanese Tourists in Palau," in *Japanese Tourism and Travel Culture*, ed. Sylvie Guichard-Anguis and Okpyo Moon (New York: Routledge, 2009), 172–93.

4. Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2008), 7.

5. John Lennon and Malcolm Foley, *Dark Tourism: The Attraction of Death and Disaster* (London: Continuum, 2000), 4.

6. Frank Baldwin and Richard Sharpley, "Battlefield Tourism: Bringing Organised Violence Back to Life," in *The Darker Side of Travel: The Theory and Practice of Dark Tourism,* ed. Richard Sharpley and Philip R. Stone (Bristol, U.K.: Channel View Publications, 2009), 194.

has come from postcolonial scholarship. Robert Clarke, Jacqueline Dutton, Anna Johnston, and Anthony Carrigan have pointed out that dark tourism scholars tend to focus on the supply side, that is, on the creation and maintenance of the dark tourism experience. They propose that engagement with travelers' own meditations and reflections on disturbing moments might further enrich the field.[7] Carrigan agrees this exploration can tease out "points of tension and reinforcement between capitalist industry demands, competing nationalist ideologies and the reassertion of marginalized or suppressed histories—all of which hold strong resonances for postcolonial research."[8] This new orientation purports to salvage the agency of the travelee buried in the words of travel writers. It raises the utility of travel writing as a historical medium to inform us about the assumptions travel writers make about travelees and their responses to them in writing.[9] Reading Japanese travel writing through the lens of dark tourism and traveler-travelee relations allows us to treat Japan as a postcolonial nation with deeply ambivalent attitudes toward its colonial and wartime past in the Asia-Pacific region.[10] Such an awareness can stimulate further research into Japanese responses to unsettling knowledge about the war.

THE WAR THAT NEVER LEAVES US

The earliest travelogue analyzed here is *Sekai no tabi* [The world around us] (1962) by the television travel journalist Kanetaka Kaoru (1928–). This book

7. Robert Clarke, Jacqueline Dutton, and Anna Johnston, "Shadow Zones: Dark Travel and Postcolonial Cultures," *Postcolonial Studies* 17, no. 3 (2014): 221–35; Anthony Carrigan, "Dark Tourism and Postcolonial Studies: Critical Intersections," *Postcolonial Studies* 17, no. 3 (2014): 236–50. Recent scholars have provided reviews to delineate the intellectual evolution and contours: four initial chapters in Sharpley and Stone, eds., *The Darker Side of Travel*; Jonathan Skinner, ed., *Writing the Dark Side of Travel* (New York and Oxford: Berghahn, 2012); Philip Stone, "Dark Tourism Scholarship: A Critical Review," *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research* 7, no. 3 (2013): 307–18; and Avital Biran and Kenneth F. Hyde, "New Perspectives on Dark Tourism," *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research* 7, no. 3 (2013): 191–98.

8. Carrigan, "Dark Tourism and Postcolonial Studies," 240.

9. Ibid.; Clark, Dutton, and Johnston, "Shadow Zones," 228. Preceding the work by Lennon and Foley, David Lloyd and Anthony Seaton traced the evolution of a war-related tourism industry in Western Europe. David W. Lloyd, *Battlefield Tourism: Pilgrimage and the Commemoration of the Great War in Britain, Australia and Canada, 1919–1939* (Oxford: Berg, 1998). Anthony Seaton, "War and Thanatourism: Waterloo 1815–1914," *Annals of Tourism Research* 26, no. 1 (1999): 130–58.

10. The work of Naoto Sudo on Japanese textual representations of Micronesia confirms that Japanese writers employed a common mechanism of Orientalism. Sudo's work does not directly address travel writing and the topic of war. Sudo, *Nanyo-Orientalism: Japanese Representations of the Pacific* (Amherst: Cambria Press, 2010).

derived from a filming trip Kanetaka and her two-person crew took to Australia and a number of southern Pacific Islands in 1961 to make a series of weekly travel documentary programs. Kanetaka's book deserves scrutiny not only because the program enjoyed sustained popularity until its end in 1991, but also because it tells us how her interaction with the people of Papua New Guinea, then still an Australian territory, propelled her to reflect on the Japanese military occupation and the war. During her visit to the town of Lae, Kanetaka and her crew hired a local driver, who remained anonymous throughout. The driver had been twelve years old when the Japanese occupied Lae and established a base in January 1942—making him Kanetaka's near contemporary—and he also claimed to have attended a Japanese school for two years. His Japanese, initially rusty, began to flow a little more easily after awhile. He sang Japanese children's songs well enough to make Kanetaka feel impressed and awkward in equal measure. The driver asked a crewmember if he knew a military officer, Mr. Hamazaki, who spoke good Pidgin English, adding, "Was he a good man or a bad man? No comment." He then moved to less personal topics of how much he enjoyed Japanese food. He even offered to pay Kanetaka to buy some of the corned beef that his Japanese supervisor used to give him and to have a watch that he had received from Mr. Hamazaki repaired. Certainly, Kanetaka was troubled by his request for her to do errands.[11]

The interaction shows how the driver's wartime memories added a moral undertone that changed the balance of power, making Kanetaka uneasy and placing the onus of dealing with wartime memory on her. Kanetaka did not speculate or elaborate on these incidents. However, it is possible that the driver might have spared the details to avoid shocking a female traveler, that Kanetaka chose to edit them out, or that she was instructed to do so by her publishers.[12] Her recording of the driver's "no comment" remains as a subtle and ominous reminder of those who live with memories of wartime. Travelees may recall the physical discipline meted out by military officers abroad and by the military police at home. The driver saw Kanetaka as a citizen and as a representative of Japan, and he expected her to act as a conduit between him and Mr. Hamazaki. Equally, the driver's request for errands and his anecdotes about receiving food from the Japanese showed he had achieved

11. Kanetaka Kaoru, *Sekai no tabi: Oseania* [Travel around the world: Oceania] (Tokyo: Jitsugyō no Nihonsha, 1962), 224–26.

12. Kanetaka did not provide a backstory to the editorial process, nor did the four other travel writers offer such stories about their writing.

sufficient credit in wartime and maintained emotional ties with the Japanese after the war. Although Kanetaka did not pass judgment on his wartime experience, her unease registered a humbling discovery of the wartime Japanese military presence in a far-flung war zone.

Kanetaka's reaction exemplifies a number of qualities of dark tourism. The driver stimulated the simmering discomfort within her and reminded her of how little she was prepared for it. Kanetaka's personal background may help explain her reaction. Her autobiography, published in 2010, relates that she grew up in a comfortable middle-class household and attended an Anglican mission school that insulated her from wartime patriotism. Even during her two-year study at the University of California, Los Angeles in the early 1950s, she experienced little animosity or discrimination for being a Japanese citizen—which perhaps shows America's own triumphalism. Back in Japan, she put her bilingual skills to good use and launched a career in journalism. She became an iconic figure among her contemporaries, especially women. Her energy represented the buoyant collective mood that came with the postwar economic recovery. She embodied the new ethos under the new constitution and represented what postwar Japan could be.[13] The encounter with the driver showed how unprepared she was to deal with the wartime past that still mattered to him.

Following the exchange, the driver took Kanetaka and her crew to a beach. The travelers saw the wreckage of a Japanese transportation vessel sunk by the allied forces.[14] Standing before the shipwreck, one of the film crew suddenly recalled his friend who had died in the war, and he wept. Kanetaka watched him and wrote:

> I felt intense anger at those who put the boat crew to death. They [Japanese military officers] keep calm composure and teach harmony and manners, but then they demand hatred and victory. I felt we were weak to have been dragged along by those people.[15]

Kanetaka's expression of anger is both candid and coded, an emotion she could not likely express on television. She was not angry with the Allied soldiers.

13. Kanetaka, *Watakushi ga tabikara mananda koto: 80 sugitemo 'sekai no tabi' wa keizoku chū desu no yo!* [What I learned from travel: my world travel continues even though I am past the age of 80] (Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 2010), 22–34.

14. The Japanese landed in Lae in March 1942 and established a base there. The Allies isolated the Japanese by attacking their reinforcements and supply vessels. A prominent instance was the Allied attack on Japanese vessels in Dampier Strait, en route to Lae from Rabaul, on New Britain Island to the east of New Guinea, in March 1943. Fujiwara, *Uejini*, 54.

15. Kanetaka, *Oseania*, 227.

Instead, she accused the Japanese military strategists and officers of stoking jingoism and animosity that led the Japanese public into war, and she pointed to the hypocrisy of later embracing peace and harmony in the postwar era. Her comment reflects an interpretation of the Japanese defeat that is held by liberals and progressives in Japan. They regard the Japanese soldiers as having been misled by military strategists. These strategists, not the Allied counter-attacks, were to blame for the loss of lives and eventual defeat. This position contrasts with the central premise of the conservative interpretation that the loss of Japanese soldiers was a meaningful sacrifice that lay the foundation for postwar Japan's peace and prosperity.[16] Though brief, Kantaka's description points to the intersection between dark tourism and historical memory. On one hand, the sight of her colleague's tears reminded Kanetaka how readily the raw grief of wartime could still be elicited. On the other hand, her admission of the timidity of the Japanese toward the state indicates a different position from the victim-hero binary, and raises the awkward question of the complicity of the Japanese public.

Readers older than Kanetaka, who were adults during the war, might find her criticism naïve for failing to recognize the severe control and repression of wartime. Yet she articulated the position of the younger generation and of those with liberal and progressive political views. Her colleague's reaction to the shipwreck gave her the authority of an eyewitness to the legacy of war and compelled her to develop a perspective on the disturbing questions raised by this relic. Remarkably, Kanetaka's observation anticipated the subsequent rise of pacifism in Japan. Peace campaigners and the intelligentsia voiced their opposition to the ratification of the U.S.-Japan Peace Treaty of 1960, which confirmed Japan's support for the U.S. military. The ethos of pacifism galvanized anti–Vietnam War campaigns later in the decade. A case in point is the essayist and prominent anti–Vietnam War campaigner Oda Makoto (1932–2007), who urged the public to question their complicit role in supporting the U.S. during the Vietnam War and thus challenged the widespread assumption that the Japanese were not responsible for it. These questions influenced many to think of the Japanese as the perpetrators during the Second World War.[17]

16. Philip A. Seaton, *Japan's Contested War Memories: The 'Memory Rifts' in Historical Consciousness of World War II* (Abingdon, U.K.: Routledge, 2007), 19–21.

17. James Orr, *The Victim as Hero: Ideologies of Peace and National Identity in Postwar Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2001), 3–4.

Meanwhile, Kanetaka described a lighthearted gesture her driver made. He suddenly picked up a stone from the beach and started slowly writing *Dainippon* [Great Japan], shorthand for the Japanese Empire, in big *kanji* script on the hull. Then he turned to Kanetaka and smiled at the travelers.[18] Kanetaka ended her interaction with the driver without any further comment, leaving readers to draw their own conclusions. She did not relate the driver's thoughts and reasons for this action, thereby reducing him to the role of an inscrutable and impudent other. Thus, one could dismiss the driver as insensitive; his gesture could easily rub salt in the war-wounds of many Japanese. However, the driver's gesture demonstrated his ability to use Japanese writing to remind travelers of the depth of the Japanese military occupation that subjugated the hapless Islanders. The driver's apparent pride in his past association with the Japanese might induce irony and even guilt in the reader's mind. It was a disturbing reminder of the Japanese imperial ambitions that snuffed out so many lives, including those of Islanders and allied soldiers, and brought the nation to a humiliating defeat. Kanetaka reminds us that the memory of the war does not lie in the tangible objects such as the wreckage, but in the memories of the people who lived through the Japanese occupation.

Later, Kanetaka also visited Goroka, which had been the site of a Japanese military base in Papua, New Guinea. There she met a New Guinean coffee plantation owner. She found his attire proper—identical to that of European plantation owners—and his English fluent—not Pidgin English. Kanetaka was immediately impressed and judged that he had received a western education. After the initial pleasantries, the plantation owner broke into Japanese: "While I was in Rabaul, I was used by the navy for four years."[19] His command of Japanese shocked Kanetaka. She thought it was far better than the driver's. The plantation owner claimed to have learned Japanese while working as an interpreter under the Japanese for four years. When Kanetaka heard him say, "Come here!" in the commanding tone of a military officer while he was showing her his plantation, she got "an eerie feeling."[20] To Kanetaka, the man represented a paradox. If his western dress and proper English signaled his status as a member of the indigenous elite, then his military Japanese added

18. Kanetaka, *Oseania*, 227.

19. Ibid., 228. Rabaul was initially an Australian garrison, until the Japanese attacked and occupied it on January 20, 1942. It then became one of the principal Japanese bases in the southern Pacific. James F. Dunnigan and Albert A. Nofi, *The Pacific War Encyclopedia, Volume 2: M–Z* (New York: Checkmark, 1998), 522.

20. Kanetaka, *Oseania*, 251.

another cultural layer. It was presumably the only variety he had learned, and his unwitting display fifteen years after defeat reminded Kanetaka of the deep imprint that wartime discipline—and the hierarchical relationships between seniors and juniors maintained within the Japanese military—had left on him.

Taken together, Kanetaka's reactions exemplify some of the qualities of dark tourism before the advent of commercially run battlefield tourism. Her interactions with travelees began as a filming trip but evolved into a trip replete with unexpected and unsettling reminders of the Japanese military officers' presence in Papua. The driver's tastes and his requests for various favors, as well as the plantation owner's use of Japanese, hinted at the manner in which the Japanese had interacted with and treated these men. Considering Kanetaka held the power of film and pen, these reminders suggest the possibility of seeing these Papuan men not as savage or native others, but as informants to a wartime experience the Japanese would find embarrassing and would rather forget. The surprise and the eerie feeling Kanetaka experienced made her realize that her journey and her presence were implicated by history. This realization compelled her to take a political stand, which spoke to contemporaneous intellectual currents in Japan.

DISCLAIMING PREJUDICE, ASSERTING POWER

Five years after Kanetaka's first trip in 1961, the male novelist Agawa Hiroyuki (1920–2015) visited Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands for three weeks. Agawa, who was eight years older than Kanetaka, had served in the navy and went to China during the war but did not go to the Pacific Islands. After the war he turned to writing novels. His biography of Admiral Yamamoto Isoroku (1965) achieved commercial success and earned him critical acclaim as a non-fiction writer.[21] Agawa preferred to keep his journey private. But once his plan got leaked to the media, readers inundated Agawa with letters relating their wartime anecdotes. One letter by a former army paymaster, Mr. S, suggested Agawa seek out a witness, a chief called Bobake, in the village of Buin in Bougainville. During wartime, Bobake worked under Mr. S to supply laborers to a Japanese-run plantation. Mr. S was confident

21. Takahashi Saburō, *Senki mono o yomu: sensō taiken to sengo nihon shakai* [Reading War Memoirs: Wartime experience and postwar Japanese society] (Kyoto: Academia Shuppankai, 1988), 71.

that Bobake would help Agawa identify the site of Yamamoto's fatal plane crash if Agawa mentioned Mr. S's name.[22]

While Agawa's search for the crash site and the wreckage forms his account, one of the subplots is how his interactions with Islanders affected his view of them. Even before leaving Japan, Agawa assumed the prerogative to judge the Islanders, and he slotted them into an imagined hierarchy. Both before and during his journey, Agawa repeatedly expressed his feelings of anxiety about the risks of tropical disease and cannibalism, based on anecdotes from his readers and from veterans.[23] He made frequent references to the American filmmaker Osa Johnson's memoir, *Bride in the Solomon Islands* (1944). Johnson had accentuated the putative barbarity of the Solomon Islanders' customs and cultures during her visit in 1917 and portrayed herself as the bearer of civilization.[24] Her descriptions made Agawa concerned about the Solomon Islanders. However, he remained ambivalent about Johnson's claims. While he dismissed her book as outdated and "full of mostly trite stories," he credited it for teaching him that the Islanders "are not as stupid as people of the civilized world think."[25] Agawa's ambivalence helped him present himself as an anti-heroic traveler without traditional masculine macho bravado. Still, his stance preserved his prerogative to judge the travelees along or against his reading of Johnson's observations while he witnessed and even lamented racism in Bougainville.

Soon after arriving in Bougainville, Agawa hired a driver and went to a village near Buin without prior arrangement. He found Bobake with reasonable ease, but communicating with him proved much more difficult. Agawa was not fluent in English, and Bobake's Japanese was not strong enough to hold a conversation. Agawa was prudent enough to acknowledge that Bobake's responses reflected Agawa's command of English. Therefore, Agawa took a sideways approach. To jog Bobake's memory, Agawa asked

22. Agawa Hiroyuki, *Watakushi no soromon kikō* [My Solomon Islands journey] (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1967), 32–33. Mr. S. was the anonymous name Agawa used.

23. Ibid., 6.

24. Osa Johnson, *Bride in the Solomon Islands* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1944). Her book derived from a filming trip she made with her husband Martin in 1917 at the age of twenty-three. The Japanese translation was published in 1958.

25. Agawa, *Soromon*, 6, 103. William Robert Bell, District Officer of Malaita Island, who knew the Solomon Islanders' customs well, accompanied the Johnsons. Agawa did not specify who stated that not all the Solomon Islanders were "uncivilized." However, Johnson noted Bell had spoken of the potential for the youth to attain western civilization if adequate opportunities were given. Johnson, *Bride*, 12.

Bobake if he remembered any songs in Japanese. Bobake sang a song in accurate Japanese—to the end of the second verse. Agawa admitted that he was not a great fan of military songs and remembered only the first few lines of the song. The following afternoon, Bobake recited the Japanese national anthem, *Kimigayo*. Just like Kanetaka, Agawa was impressed but felt awkward.[26] His ambivalence might have been greater than Kanetaka's, for the military songs were closer to his heart despite his indifference to them. This anecdote suggests the possibility that the travelee could present the traveler with an unsettling historical memory.

Agawa's subsequent experiences challenged his prejudices. The following afternoon, Agawa hired a young male Australian patrol officer or *kiap*, as they are commonly known in Pidgin. The kiap was to assist Agawa in communicating with Bobake in English. Agawa soon became disturbed by the commanding tone and demeanor the young bureaucrat adopted with Bobake. Agawa's suspicion grew when he caught the kiap referring to Agawa as "master," which, despite his limited English, he knew to be "the idiom of slavery." Bobake lost his composure. He began looking around and mumbled his responses to the Australian's questions. Bobake denied ever having been to or seen the site of the plane crash and pointed at his ears as he repeated "Truly, truly." Agawa interpreted this gesture as Bobake's emphasizing that all he knew was hearsay. This misdirection was intended to conceal his past association with the Japanese, for fear of potential retribution from the Australian.[27] Agawa perceived the Australian's interrogation as one-sided. He did not criticize the Japanese, at least in his book, for co-opting Bougainvilleans for the war effort. The Australian's lack of outward hostility to the Japanese—the former belligerents in the war, at least on the surface—testifies to his deference to the moneyed traveler from Japan. Instead, Bobake got the blame for making, in the Australian's eyes, the wrong choice of collaborating with the Japanese and selling Bougainvillean laborers to them. Awaga's reaction reveals surprise and dismay as the whole interaction turned into a kangaroo court that incriminated Bobake's collaboration with the Japanese to procure local laborers.[28]

26. Agawa, *Soromon*, 104, 134.

27. Ibid., 128–29.

28. After the war, Papua New Guinea returned to Australian rule. The Australian civil administration put Papua New Guineans on trial for collaborating with the Japanese and feeding and accommodating their soldiers. Hiromitsu Iwamoto, "Japanese Perceptions on the Pacific War in Papua New Guinea: Views in Publications," in *The Pacific War in Papua New Guinea: Memories and*

Bobake's plea signaled the unresolved anguish and real-life implications of wartime, despite the passage of time. The incident turned Agawa's attention to the contemporary racial hierarchy in the Bougainville of the 1960s, but he did not go so far as to criticize the kiap's behavior. Despite his concern, he maintained his distance from the scene. His stance was akin to the interdisciplinary scholar Marita Sturken's description of the tourist as "a figure who embodies a detached and seemingly innocent pose."[29] Agawa could afford to travel and to purchase the services of not only of Bobake but also the Australian, expenditures that would have been unthinkable prior to Japan's economic recovery in the 1960s. While Agawa developed sympathy for Bobake and doubts about the kiap, he concluded that Bobake was not a useful informant after all. He then decided to visit other villages to look for informants. His description projects distance and impunity, but it masks his central role in the whole scene, as he was the one who hired and fired Bobake as part of his search for the plane wreck.

Agawa had no luck even at the third village he visited. Just when he decided to give up, however, a boy called Joseph approached him speaking English. Joseph offered to take Agawa to the crash site and to get him back to the village before sunset. Agawa accepted his offer on the spot. Initially, he still saw Joseph as a descendant of cannibals. However, a cross on Joseph's chest made Agawa feel at ease with Joseph. Agawa "thank[ed] Christianity" because to him the cross symbolized Christian faith and progress out of savagery and reduced his anxiety about being prey to cannibalism.[30] Agawa now ranked Joseph as more trustworthy than Bobake. Joseph was not a "savage native" of Johnson's era, and his youth made him less likely to surprise Agawa with wartime memories. Accompanied by Joseph and his seven friends, Agawa walked into thick, dim, and humid jungle. Joseph even carried his belongings, which made him "so happy that [I] gave Joseph my bag with all my money." Only in hindsight did Agawa realize he had exposed himself to the risk of robbery and murder.[31] These insights underline the fact that Agawa remained in a privileged position in receiving assistance from both Bobake and Joseph. Bobake's wartime memory had been disturbing to

Realities, ed. Yukio Toyoda and Hank Nelson (Tokyo: Rikkyo University Centre for Asian Area Studies, 2006), 53.

29. Marita Sturken, *Tourists of History: Memory, Kitsch, and Consumerism from Oklahoma City to Ground Zero* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2007), 9.

30. Agawa, *Soromon*, 138–39.

31. Ibid., 143.

Agawa, and he maintained his distance. Agawa felt less inhibition with Joseph in his search for Yamamoto's wreckage. In Agawa's mind, Joseph's lack of wartime memory and his Christianity posed less risk to Agawa than Bobake did. Agawa's passing of judgment marks the forming of a power structure from which a traveler stands to gain.

Agawa and the men eventually arrived at the crash site. Agawa examined the wreckage and concluded the plane was likely to be Yamamoto's. He was so impressed with Joseph that he decided to give him a shirt or a towel as a bonus in addition to the wage he had already paid. He invited Joseph to his room at his guesthouse to pay the bonus. Agawa was unable to give Joseph the reward. When the wife of the guesthouse owner found Joseph on the premises, she shouted, "Go away. No place for natives. Who said you could come in? Get out!" Through a window in the guesthouse, Agawa saw the barefoot Joseph leaving in the rain and reflected on his part in Joseph's departure. Unlike in the Bobake episode, Agawa felt a guilty conscience. When the owner told Joseph to leave, Agawa wanted to intervene but chose silence and inaction for fear of retribution.[32]

Agawa's interaction with Joseph shows the semblance between the traveler-travelee dynamic and the patron-client relationship. In such a relationship, as theorized by anthropologists and sociologists, the patron and the client establish a relationship based on reciprocity in order to attain mutually satisfactory outcomes. The relationship reflects the asymmetry in wealth, power, and status between the two parties. Although clients may be subordinate to the patron, they do exercise agency and employ subtle measures to resist the patron's objectives.[33] Agawa painted himself as a gentleman whose charitable intent met the resistance of the guesthouse owner's wife. Notwithstanding the rueful tone of Agawa's description, his inaction underlines his complicity in the racial hierarchy of the local society. It is important to note

32. Ibid., 160. In the same era, hoteliers in Solomon Islands tended to exhibit a hostile attitude toward indigenous Islanders. Charlie Panakera, "World War II and Tourism Development in Solomon Islands," in *Battlefield Tourism: History, Place and Interpretation*, ed. Chris Ryan (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2007), 130.

33. Some of the seminal contributions to the literature on patron-client relationships are: Michael Kenny, "Patterns of Patronage in Spain," *Anthropological Quarterly* 33, no. 1 (1960), 14–23; Robert R. Kaufman, "The Patron–Client Concept and Macro-politics: Prospects and Problems," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 16, no. 3 (1974): 284–308; John Duncan Powell, "Peasant Society and Clientelist Politics," *The American Political Science Review*, 64, no. 2 (1970): 411–25; James C. Scott, "Patron-Client Politics and Political Change in Southeast Asia," *The American Political Science Review* 66, no. 1 (1972): 91–113.

that the owners of the guesthouse were a Chinese couple—presumably second-generation descendants of Chinese laborers brought to Bougainville. Over the decades, the Chinese came to occupy the middle-tier in the local socio-economic and racial hierarchy.[34] In this contex, Agawa acquiesced to racial discrimination when he remained a bystander to the woman's gesture. Meanwhile, the woman's behavior drove Agawa to conclude Joseph was more culturally sophisticated than the guesthouse owner.[35] While Agawa's judgment shows his softening attitude towards the Islanders, his latent racism and sexism speak to his sense of superiority. Both Kanetaka and Agawa confronted unsettling moments of dark tourism, but each dealt with them differently. Reminders of the Japanese military presence and of the war prompted Kanetaka to draw politically charged conclusions. Five years later, Agawa found himself troubled by local racism, but his economic position shielded him from meaningful meditation on the dilemma of his own role in aiding and abetting racism in Bougainville.

BETWEEN THE PERSONAL AND THE POLITICAL

Nearly two decades after Agawa's journey, the female travel writer Miyakawa Masako (1942–) wrote *Papua nyūginia rekuiemu* (Papua New Guinea Requiem, hereafter *Rekuiemu*) which derived from her two visits to Papua New Guinea in the 1980s. Miyakawa represented a new generation of nonfiction writers of the war who emerged in the mid-1970s. This shift resulted from the maturation of the publishing industry and the expansion of opportunities for younger authors, including women. These new authors typically felt uninhibited in addressing issues that previous generations, such as veterans and the wartime generation, considered awkward.[36]

In *Rekuiemu,* Miyakawa adopted two alternating roles: that of an investigator of war history and of a participant-observer in Japanese pilgrimage. Though targeting a popular readership, she used written and oral sources on Japanese and New Guinean wartime history to provide historical context to her journeys. Miyakawa's encounter with Japanese pilgrims in Papua New Guinea began with a coincidence. On her first visit in September 1983, Miyakawa came to Wewak on an assignment to cover the anniversary of

34. David Wu, *Chinese in Papua New Guinea 1880–1980* (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1982), 1.

35. Agawa, *Soromon*, 153.

36. Takahashi, *Senki mono*, 138–40.

Papua New Guinea's independence. She happened to stay in the same hotel as a group of Japanese pilgrims who were there to commemorate the deaths of their comrades and loved ones. This incidental contact with the pilgrims aroused her interest. Ten months later, she formally joined a Japanese pilgrimage tour and returned to Wewak to report on Japanese pilgrimages.

Her visit had another purpose. She wanted to investigate a massacre committed by the Japanese military in July 1944.[37] In May 1944, a unit led by Captain Hama Seiichi occupied Timbunke, a settlement to the south of Wewak. At that time, the Japanese had begun exploiting the existing antagonism between Timbunke and another village, Korogo—upstream on the Sepik River—and had inveigled the Korogo men into collaborating with them. Hama became suspicious that the Timbunke villagers were acting as spies for Australia, and he ordered a massacre that ended in the killing of ninety-nine men and one woman from Timbunke. Men from Korogo raped women in Timbunke and then took them as hostages back to Korogo. This little-known massacre was a result of Japan's divide-and-conquer strategy and of the heightened aggression displayed by Japanese forces at a time when the impending defeat was becoming a reality.[38]

One morning, Miyakawa announced to the tour coordinator her intention to visit Timbunke on her own while the group visited another site. The coordinator was surprised but did not stop her. Instead, he urged her to write and leave her will before departure. She thought to herself, "Even 40 years after [the massacre], I am going to the village where the Japanese, my compatriots, killed so many people. I'm a woman and I'm going solo."[39] While Agawa's fear of the so-called savage Islanders had little to do with the Bougainvilleans' wartime memory, Miyakawa's anxiety showed an awareness of the risk she was taking. She was venturing into an area seeped in violence by the Japanese; the local residents might give her a hostile reception on account of her nationality, traveling solo, and gender. Upon arrival at Timbunke, Miyakawa asked the villagers for a bed for the night—a bold gesture since Miyakawa seemed to have made no prior arrangement with the villagers or

37. Miyakawa Masayo, *Papua nyūginia rekuiemu* [Papua New Guinea Requiem] (Tokyo: Ushio Shuppansha, 1985), 160.

38. Hata Ikuhiko, "Timbunke jiken (New Guinea)," in *Sekai sensō hanzai jiten* [An encyclopedia of war crimes around the world], ed. Hata Ikuhiko, Sase Hiromori, and Tsuneishi Keiichi (Tokyo: Bungei Shunjū, 2002), 181–82; Alan Powell, *The Third Force: ANGAU's New Guinea War* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 2003), 210–11 and n. 64, 274. Korogo is also spelled as Korogu.

39. Miyakawa, *Rekuiemu*, 177.

the Japanese coordinator to visit there or stay overnight. Nonchalant responses made her suspect that she might have made a mistake by coming. She wondered if the villagers' collective response reflected the cruelty of the massacre as well as her nationality.[40] Her anxiety subsided when she met Francesca, a nurse at the village clinic. Francesca's polished manners and impeccable English led Miyakawa to judge her as a well-educated woman in her mid-twenties—too young to have had first-hand experience of the war. Francesca let Miyakawa stay in the clinic's staff house and promised to introduce her to Annamarie, a colleague whose grandfather had witnessed the massacre.

The next day, Annamarie took Miyakawa to her grandfather. In the presence of other villagers, he talked about his work under a Japanese unit. When Captain Hama's unit arrived and announced the end of the war, he had felt compelled to flee Timbunke. Suddenly, his facial expression grew serious. He said very slowly in English "Fighting no good. War no good." A middle-aged woman nearby suddenly began to speak about witnessing the massacre as a child. Japanese troops rounded her up into a hut with many others. She peered through the cracks of the wall and watched the Japanese troops strip the men naked, tie their hands, and finally shoot them. Miyakawa asked Annamarie for her opinion. "Just scary," was her short-but-firm response. Then she added, "If you were at the scene, you would not feel hatred. You would only feel scared." Her face suddenly turned solemn for the first time; Miyakawa sensed the weight of Annamarie's comment. The woman continued to talk about her mother, who remarried after her husband was shot dead in the massacre. Miyakawa listened with her face downcast: "I felt as if everyone was expecting me to say something. I could not lift my face."[41] Miyakawa found the woman's testimony to be confrontational, and it made her powerless. Miyakawa's experience made her recognize the gravity of history and exposed the memory gap between the Islanders and the Japanese.

Miyakawa's investigation resulted in herself being subjected to an investigation by the villagers. This reversal of the traveler-travelee power relationship further fuelled her desire to learn about and report on the war. Born in 1942, she grew up without first-hand memory of the war. Her family never discussed the war, even though her father was a veteran who later joined the Japanese Self-Defense Forces. Miyakawa reached adulthood without any

40. Ibid., 184.
41. Ibid., 192–93.

interest in wartime issues and claimed that her indifference was typical of her generation. It was not until her first visit to Papua New Guinea in 1983 that she began to realize her own ignorance.[42] Moreover, her journey took place after Japanese wartime atrocities had become a topic of public discussion. *Rekuiemu* followed the ethos of journalist Honda Katsuichi (1932–). In 1971, he traveled to China for forty days and documented the raw testimonies of survivors of the Nanjing Massacre of 1937. His reportage sent shockwaves in Japan and triggered debates about Japanese aggression.[43] A decade later, the question of wartime atrocity ignited a regional political dispute. In 1982, the Japanese Ministry of Education screened school history textbooks and recommended one publisher revise its original description of the Japanese "invasion" of China to the more euphemistic "advance." The Chinese and Korean governments, as well as domestic critics, protested. This incident demonstrated, *inter alia*, the apparent official reluctance to recognize conflicting interpretations of Japan's imperial period.[44] Considering these developments, Miyakawa's journey is a significant example of dark tourism that informed her readers that the New Guinea campaign involved more than the mass starvation of Japanese soldiers.

The villagers and Miyakawa grew silent. Then Annamarie broke the silence: "We are Christians. We have to forgive everything." Only then, Miyakawa admits, was she able to lift her face.[45] Miyakawa perceived the traveler-travelee dynamic at a site of dark tourism. Annamarie's words made Miyakawa aware that the absence of open hostility belied the profound resentment felt by the villagers. Relief from their tense cordiality prompted Miyakawa to conjecture that the niceties directed toward her were the result of the passage of time and of Christian teachings.[46] Just as Agawa felt rescued by a Christian adolescent, the visibly distressed Miyakawa found that Annamarie represented the Christian tenet of forgiveness. Annamarie's graceful manner asserted the villagers' collective moral high ground and turned Miyakawa into a redeemable and hence "good" Japanese female civilian as opposed to the bad male Japanese troops. More explicitly than in Kanetaka's episode, Annamarie played the

42. Ibid., 32. Miyakawa did not say where her father fought.

43. Honda's reportage appeared as a serial in *Asahi Shinbun* from August to December, 1971. The whole series was published as a book in 1972. Seaton, *Japan's Contested War Memories*, 44.

44. Mutsumi Hirano, *History Education and International Relations: A Case Study of Diplomatic Disputes over Japanese Textbooks* (Folkestone, U.K.: Global Oriental, 2009), 118–30.

45. Miyakawa, *Rekuiemu*, 193–94.

46. Ibid., 199.

strong hand: she humbled Miyakawa with the memory of a massacre that remained vivid for the villagers but of which few Japanese were even aware. As Miyakawa later discovered, Timbunke was on the circuit of Australian cruise ship tourists who visited the villagers' monument to the massacre.[47] The villagers turned Timbunke into a site of dark tourism and empowered themselves to tell their wartime history. Her observation revealed the depths of the villagers' unresolved resentment toward the Japanese that helped forge a common bond with Australian tourists—some of whom might have harbored similar resentment toward the Japanese. While the textbook controversy of 1982 was still fresh in the Japanese public consciousness, Miyakawa's accidental encounter on her first journey in the Wewak hotel triggered personal transformation. On her second journey she pursued the stories of the Timbunke Massacre victims. Her book was the result of the impact on her affect and intellect that drove her commitment to raising awareness of Japanese wartime aggression.

Rekuiemu complements the author's accounts of travel with the impressions of another visitor to Timbunke. After the journeys, she interviewed a Japanese ex-soldier. He had been one of the perpetrators of the massacre and had paid a visit to Timbunke after the war. There a man confronted him. He claimed to have been shot in the shoulder by the Japanese during the massacre. The man smirked at the veteran and demanded compensation. The veteran sensed menace and pleaded that he had nothing to give; he had already given gifts to the villagers in a memorial ceremony conducted earlier by his group. In desperation, he handed over two pairs of shorts and hurried back to his tour bus. Back on the tour bus was Father Cherubim Dambui, who acted as a guide and an intermediary with the villagers. He reassured the veteran and the entire group that "the war is a thing of the past."[48] Miyakawa, however, suspected that Annamarie and Dambui's words "do not necessarily represent the opinion of the whole village. I sensed this with my own skin."[49] Miyakawa's episode suggests a schism within the travelee community when dark tourism became more formalized in Timbunke. On the one hand were

47. Ibid., 196.

48. Ibid., 198. The register of bishops held by the Catholic Church recorded his name as Cherubim Dambui. Born in 1948 in Timbunke, he was ordained as a priest of Wewak in 1974 and then bishop of Port Moresby in 2000. He died in 2010. David M. Cheney, "Bishop Cherubim Dambui." *The Hierarchy of the Catholic Church Current and Historical Information about Its Bishops and Dioceses*, http://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/bishop/bdambui.html (accessed March 26, 2016).

49. Miyakawa, *Rekuiemu*, 200.

a small future-oriented elite and, on the other, the majority of ordinary residents who harbored historical grievances. Like Miyakawa's experience, the incident with the veteran shows the potential of the travelee to induce guilt and shame (and, in this case, even to extract goods from the Japanese). Miyakawa pointed to a complex ledger of morality between the villager and the veteran. Just as the villager felt justified in extracting gifts from the veteran, the veteran tried to absolve his wartime responsibility for the price of two pairs of shorts. Yet, the veteran fled from awkward and even life-threatening consequences, returning to the safe confines of the tour bus. Miyakawa's descriptions—the whole interaction between the two men and the comments by Dambui and Annamarie—showed varying attitudes to the past event. The traveler-travelee relationship resulting from the Japanese visit seemed to promise little meaningful engagement with multiple views and memories and with the villagers' unresolved grievances.

Miyakawa further witnessed the role gift giving played in the traveler-travelee hierarchy during pilgrimages. The villagers and the pilgrims, some of whom were repeat pilgrims, had grown accustomed to each other's presence and their interactions had become routine. Still, Miyakawa did not gloss over anecdotes of tension between the Japanese and the villagers. One male villager opposed the Japanese request for erecting a monument because the memory of Japanese aggression caused him distress. He agreed to the monument only after the Japanese convinced him that it was dedicated to all those who died in the war, irrespective of nationality. On other occasions, some Japanese created memorials without seeking villagers' permission.[50] Miyakawa did not elaborate on these episodes but acknowledged the effects of pilgrimage on traveler-travelee relationships. The more Japanese pilgrims came and established their presence, the more they became detached from the local residents. The locals accepted the Japanese not as welcome guests but out of necessity to secure their livelihood. This paradoxical tension documented in *Rekuiemu* highlights the undercurrent of dark tourism.

Miyakawa also observed the traveler-travelee tension percolating through the village social structure. On her second journey in 1984, Miyakawa attended a memorial service in a remote village in the Wewak region. She noticed the villagers silently looking on while a Buddhist monk recited a sutra to finish the ceremony. After the ceremony the Japanese pilgrims distributed goods to the villagers such as towels, rugs, cigarette lighters, snacks, basic stationery,

50. Ibid., 136, 146.

sticking plaster, and shaving blades.[51] Such gift giving appears to date back to an earlier period of contact. Miyakawa traced the activity by Kamei Fumiko, a sixty-three-year-old widow of a deceased combat medic. After her first pilgrimage in 1970, Kamei established a charity to raise funds to build a monument in Papua New Guinea, to donate goods and medicine to the villagers in exchange for the use of their land, and to maintain the monument. In 1984, Miyakawa saw Kamei receive a warm reception from the villagers, but she noticed that it was not unanimous. She reported one villager complaining about a resident priest from the Netherlands who held onto all the gifts and refused to hand them out. Miyakawa acted as an interpreter between Kamei and the priest. He justified monopolizing the gifts because no one in the village helped him clear the overgrown grass around the memorial in time for the pilgrims' visits. The priest used the gifts to reward children for their labor and to exclude the spectators. The villager remained unconvinced by the priest's explanation, but Kamei seconded the priest's decision.[52]

The gifts connected two agents of cultural change: Japanese pilgrims and a western priest. Miyakawa knew Kamei was not immune from criticism for "buying" patronage from villagers. Miyakawa quoted Kamei insisting: "I don't feel bad . . . This [gift giving] is heart-to-heart communication. I don't care what people say. . . . Japan caused much trouble to this country. They should be happy to get presents from us."[53] Kamei explained the gifts as in-kind compensation for the past trouble, the villagers' care for Japanese soldiers until their eventual repatriation, and also as rent for the commemoration ceremonies. Miyakawa collected similar opinions from other pilgrims. Together with Kamei's understanding of the gifts, her confidence in the priest underlined her status as a neo-colonial overlord: she delegated the unpleasant task of maintaining the site and dealing with the Islanders to the missionary. The priest seemed content with his part of the bargain. The gifts functioned as a catalyst for a virtuous cycle to make the young receptive to his proselytizing as well as a way to assert his authority. On the other hand, a Japanese hotel owner in Wewak expressed his concern that Japanese pilgrims' gift giving was causing trouble in the villages.[54] Although Miyakawa did not explain these concerns in detail, the hotelier's concern suggests that

51. Ibid., 149.
52. Ibid., 151.
53. Ibid., 151–52.
54. Ibid., 152.

the traveler-travelee relationship and dark tourism, of which pilgrimage is part, impacted the local communities more than it impacted the pilgrims.

Miyakawa gradually developed a more critical stance toward the assumptions and behavior of the Japanese pilgrims. The villagers greeted the pilgrims by saying "Hello, Hello, Japan, Japan." Then, the pilgrims readily handed out cigarette lighters and packets of tissue paper. This exchange amplified the Japanese reticence to engage in a conversation with the villagers, hoping instead that cheap and inconspicuous gifts would push them out of sight. Thus, Miyakawa effectively exposed the hubris of the Japanese as they reduced the villagers into professional beggars of sorts. "Even then, no one dared throwing chocolate at them," she quipped.[55] Her aside evokes the popular experience of Japanese children during the occupation years (1945–52). At that time, American GIs riding in Jeeps went around towns and distributed chocolate and chewing gum to children. "Give me chewing gum" and "Give me chocolate" were among the few English phrases many Japanese children learned and repeated to the occupiers. This interaction cemented an unequal relationship in the minds of the occupiers and of the Japanese, especially children.[56] Miyakawa perceived a parallel between these two kinds of interaction, four decades apart, and she did not apologize for the Japanese pilgrims' behavior. In Papua New Guinea she witnessed a Japanese veteran telling a tour coordinator that he wanted to strip village girls topless and record them on the camcorder, presumably to document what he perceived as primitive natives. The coordinator, a Japanese male, grew stern and forbade the veteran from doing it.[57] This anecdote, nonetheless, demonstrates the sexist and racist attitude of the veteran, which would have reinforced the traveler-travelee hierarchy and engendered deleterious consequences without the coordinator's intervention.

Crucially, Miyakawa's observations anticipated the Islanders' changing perception of the tourists. In the late 1980s, the anthropologist Charles de Burlo observed that battlefield tourism accelerated local residents' reception of the visitors. In the early years of foreign visitors to battle sites, Islanders regarded visitors as former combatants. By the late 1980s, Islanders had come to regard the visitors as tourists who brought revenue to the communities. Public memory of the war shifted from that of lived experience to an asset for

55. Ibid.

56. John W. Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Aftermath of World War Two* (New York: W W. Norton, 1999), 72 (photo caption), 207.

57. Miyakawa, *Rekuiemu*, 152.

community development—a tendency more common among the younger generation, whose knowledge of the war came from their parents and grandparents.[58] Miyakawa alerts us to the polarization of the traveler and the travelee: while the attitudes and behavior of the tourists changed, the new generations of travelees also held new expectations of the tourists.

COMMERCIAL IMPERATIVES AND HISTORICAL MEMORY

Thus far, this article has traced two undercurrents of dark tourism informing the travel writers' interactions with the Islanders in the context of wartime history. First, the traveler-travelee interaction was always hierarchical, but the balance of power shifted over time. Second, the Islanders' wartime memories presented unsettling yet critical questions about Japanese military occupation and campaigns. The travel writers responded differently to unsettling reminders about the war, especially to the Islanders' wartime memories. On such occasions, the Islanders' roles and wartime accounts became subordinate to serving the needs of the travelers by showing travelers the history that they wanted to see. Two travelogues published in the 2000s, one by self-proclaimed war writer Nishimura Makoto (1952–) and the other by journalist Sasa Yukie (1974–), show more commercialized traveler-travelee interactions that have marginalized the Islanders. By the 2000s, the public discourse turned new corners. The death of Emperor Hirohito in 1989 and the fiftieth anniversary of Japan's defeat in 1995 recast the extant questions and raised new ones. The ensuing debate exposed deep rifts in public opinion as to why, in whose name, and how the fallen soldiers should be commemorated.[59]

58. Charles De Burlo, "Islanders, Soldiers, and Tourists: The War and the Shaping of Tourism in Melanesia," in *The Pacific Theater: Island Representations of World War II*, ed. Geoffrey M. White and Lamont Lindstrom (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1989), 318. Inquiry into the complex connection between public memory and war tourism is gathering much scholarly attention. See for instance: Malcolm Cooper, "Post-Colonial Representations of Japanese Military Heritage: Political and Social Aspects of Battlefield Tourism in the Pacific and East Asia," in *Battlefield Tourism*, ed. Ryan, 73–86; Panakera, "Solomon Islands," in ibid, 125–41; and Gilly Carr and Keir Reeves, eds., *Heritage and Memory of War: Responses from Small Islands* (New York and Abingdon: Routledge, 2015).

59. The descriptions of Japanese imperialism and wars in school history textbooks and the function and symbolic role of Yasukuni Shrine make a few of the most heated public and scholarly topics of debate inside and outside Japan. See John Dower, "Aptitude for Being Unloved," in *Ways of Forgetting, Ways of Remembering: Japan in the Modern World* (New York: The New Press, 2012), 157–89.

Given these new intellectual currents, what makes Nishimura and Sasa remarkable? Nishimura's publication record warrants his self-identification as a war writer. He traveled to a number of Pacific War battle sites in the mid-1990s with a photographer and published four illustrated books on the sites about a decade later. Ostensibly aimed at war buffs, the books detail the battles and strategies using numerous photographs and maps. Pilgrimage or commemoration of the war dead was not his purpose. He wanted to see the battlefields to gain a vicarious appreciation of the war.[60] His personal interactions with the Islanders remain subplots at most, but they do provide insight into the changing patterns of interaction. Nishimura visited Lae in Papua New Guinea, which Kanetaka had visited in 1961. Nishimura was aware that Lae had grown in the postwar era and that most of its residents were too young to remember the war and came from outlying areas. He learned that island residents thought of the Japanese as pilgrims and battlefield tourists, but he also discovered that they knew very little about the war itself. Later, Nishimura visited the capital of Solomon Islands, Honiara, on Guadalcanal, and saw the communities cashing in on Japanese visitors. Guiding Japanese tourists and charging entry fees to show relics of the war on their homesteads provided lucrative income for the local men but not for the women.[61] His descriptions confirmed de Burlo's observation of the role of battlefield tourism in making communities receptive to tourism. As Nishimura showed, the Islanders exercised agency in an informal battlefield tourism economy.

A case in point was Nishimura's encounter in a village near Red Beach, in the central north of Guadalcanal. When he pointed his camera at a disused U.S. military vehicle, Ben, the local driver Nishimura had hired, immediately told him not to take photographs because the local residents treated wreckages as private property. Ben further explained that visitors had to pay the owners an admission fee before taking photographs. The owner related that before the U.S. withdrawal from Guadalcanal, American soldiers had asked his father for permission to abandon the vehicle on his land. In return,

60. Nishimura Makoto, *Gadarukanaru: taiheiyō sensō kikō* [Guadalcanal: Pacific War journey] (Tokyo: Kōjinsha, 2006), 133. The catalogue at the National Diet Library of Japan, Japan's legal depository, shows Nishimura has authored ten books since 1995, eight of which pertain to the Pacific War. National Diet Library (Japan), 2016, NDL Search, http://iss.ndl.go.jp/books?rft.au=%E8%A5%BF%E6%9D%91%2C+%E8%AA%A0%2C+1952-&search_mode=advance (accessed March 26, 2016).

61. Nishimura, *Gadarukanaru*, 118; Nishimura, *Nyūginia: taiheiyō senseki kikō* [Travel to the Pacific War Battlefields: New Guinea] (Tokyo: Kōjinsha, 2006), 8, 15, 135–36.

the soldiers promised he could use it in any way he liked. Nishimura complimented the owner's decision to turn it into a tourist attraction and, indeed, a durable source of income when he could have sold it for scrap metal.[62] Nishimura was clearly delighted to see the relics of the war. But also, at least in his writing, he was oblivious to big picture questions, such as whether individual entrepreneurship in this apparently informal sector could really contribute to the economy of Solomon Islands as a whole and whether Nishimura's own journey was perpetuating or alleviating global inequality.

In Guadalcanal, Nishimura encountered another example of local residents taking initiative to make the most out of informal battlefield tourism. Nishimura and his photographer visited the former site of a U.S. airfield at Koni, to the east of Honiara. While they walked among disused U.S. military installations, they suddenly heard a man shouting, who popped out of a house nearby. He edged toward the visitors, aiming a rifle at them. Nishimura was startled, but Ben kept his composure, which led Nishimura to suspect the two men were acquaintances, if not in outright collusion. Ben instructed Nishimura to pay the elderly man five dollars. The moment he received the payment, he posed for the photographer. Nishimura took a close look at the rifle and ascertained that it was Japanese but was too rusty to fire. The elderly man claimed to have vivid memories of the war, but what Nishimura remembered most was his frequent repetition of the phrase "the Japanese strong." Nishimura heard other villagers repeating the same phrase after they found out his nationality. Nishimura knew that the Japanese were not as "strong" as these villagers were claiming. By then he realized that the man's flattery was a performance to pander to patriotic Japanese nostalgia. He asked Ben for the true meaning of this phrase. Ben responded, "The Japanese give tips. That's why."[63] His dismissive comment reveals how financial incentives affect the traveler-travelee interaction at sites of dark tourism. The man's performance for the tourist dollar denied him the opportunity to communicate his historical memory to the tourists.

An alternative historically informed reading of the scene can give a new nuance to the villagers' set phrase. It can be understood as a covert expression of resentment of the cruelty the Japanese inflicted on the Solomon Islanders in wartime when the Islanders worked under the Japanese. The experience of Sergeant Major Jacob Vouza (ca. 1900–1984), one of the best-known

62. Nishimura, *Gadarukanaru*, 149.
63. Ibid., 151.

Solomon Islander war heroes, adds more to the infamy of the Japanese. In the Battle of Tenaru in August 1942, the Japanese captured and tortured him. He managed to escape and provided vital intelligence to the U.S. military, leading to a U.S. victory.[64] Tourists without sufficient historical knowledge could enjoy the man's entertainment for small money while remaining blissfully ignorant of the flipside of the flattery.

While these encounters showed Nishimura's status as a paying consumer of war history, his growing annoyance exhibited his attitude and his expectation projected a traveler-travelee power dynamic. Early in his journey, Nishimura asked Ben to take him to Taivu Point, on the northeast coast of Guadalcanal, where the Ichiki and Kawaguchi Detachments landed on August 18 and September 1, 1942, respectively. Ben warned Nishimura that he would be denied entry because he did not belong to the landowner's tribe. He added that the restriction helped to maintain the island's social order. Nishimura saw the futility of persuading Ben to drive him to Taivu Point.[65] Similar setbacks occurred. Nishimura asked Ben to take him to the entry point of the Maruyama Trail, which follows the route by which General Maruyama Masao led his troops in October 1942 in an attempt to recapture Henderson Airfield.[66] Ben stated the same reason and declined Nishimura's request. Nishimura persisted but could not get a clear answer. Nishimura then asked Ben a hypothetical question: could Nishimura gain entry if the whole party were foreigners and contained no Solomon Islanders? Ben replied, "It's dangerous if it's only foreigners. So you must never go there [on your own]." Nishimura's annoyance at Ben grew after he learned that other travelers had visited the Maruyama Trail. "Does the itinerary for the Japanese tourist vary according to the tribe to which the guide belongs?," he asked. "At any rate, we could not travel as we wished because Ben stopped us. We don't understand the situation among the tribes at all." Nishimura knew about the political sensitivity around territorial access but still vented his frustration, writing that "even when I had a visa to visit Solomon Islands, there were so many areas we

64. The unveiling of Vouza's statue in Honiara in 1992 is said to have revived his legacy among the Solomon Islanders. Lamont Lindstrom, "Images of Islanders in Pacific War Photographs," in *Perilous Memories: The Asia-Pacific War(s)*, ed. Takashi Fujitani, Geoffrey M. White, and Lisa Yoneyama (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001), 126.

65. Nishimura, *Gadarukanaru*, 147.

66. Maruyama's troops carried heavy artillery through dense bush and precipitous terrain. The Japanese were exhausted and weakened by the time they reached Bloody Ridge, to the south of the airfield. The U.S. troops comprehensively defeated Maruyama's regiments. Herbert Christian Merillat, *Guadalcanal Remembered* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2003), 195–207.

could not readily visit."[67] His attitude conforms to Sturken's label of a "detached and innocent" tourist who believes that politics and tourism should not mix and who resents these disruptions to his journey.[68]

What Nishimura overlooked was the rich socio-cultural fabric of the contemporary Solomon Islands with nearly eighty distinct linguistic groups. Individual groups maintain inter-group cohesion through reciprocal ties. Thus, in cases where inter-group animosity develops, the diversity belies the facile assumption of a singular national identity.[69] Nishimura further failed to notice that Ben's intervention could have saved Nishimura and his companion from personal risks at a time of deepening political tension. Later, this exact tension flared into drawn-out conflict in 1998 and ended in 2003. The conflict involved two groups: the Guale, who were the original (and land-owning) inhabitants of Guadalcanal, and the Malaitans, who had relocated from neighboring Malaita Island. The ensuing violence displaced nearly thirty-thousand Malaitans and plunged Guadalcanal into domestic disorder.[70] The origins of the conflict, however, go back to the Pacific War. Malaitans moved to Guadalcanal in search of employment from the U.S. military when the Americans occupied Guadalcanal to defend the island from the Japanese. The migration continued after the war, when socio-economic inequality between the Guale and the Malaitans gave rise to political tension.[71] Nishimura's annoyance showed that he regarded Guadalcanal to be open to paying visitors. Even as a war writer himself, he failed to notice the irony: a new local conflict impeded his desire to visit Pacific War battle sites, but the war had sown the seed of the ethnic tension in Solomon Islands. Nishimura's interaction with Ben is a later manifestation of the patron-client relationship described by previous travelers. Moreover, like previous Islander travelees, Ben's role typified the relationship between Japan and Guadalcanal. The island was becoming a war theme park where Japan, the rich nation,

67. Nishimura, *Gadarukanaru*, 109, 153 158.

68. Sturken, *Tourists of History*, 9.

69. The term *wantok*, derived from "one talk", refers to distinct linguistic groups with its own in-group cohesion. Gordon Leua Nanau, "The *Wantok* System as a Socio-economic and Political Network in Melanesia," *OMNES: The Journal of Multicultural Society* 2 (2011): 35.

70. In July 2003, Solomon Islands came under the Australian and Pacific Islands police intervention to restore stability for the Solomon Islanders. During the unrest the number of annual tourists decreased from seventeen thousand in 1999 to six thousand in 2004. Panakera, "Solomon Islands," 140.

71. Clive Moore, *Happy Isles in Crisis: The Historical Causes for a Failing State in Solomon Islands, 1998–2004* (Canberra: Asia Pacific Press, 2004), 52–61.

expected the Solomon Islanders to serve the tourists. Ben was in an awkward position as a local guide in the dark tourism trade. He had to satisfy the tourist's demand even at the time of seething political instability. Even if he acted out of his concern for Nishimura's safety, Ben's refusal to accede to every demand from Nishimura represents an inadvertent form of resistance to the frequent and gratuitous intrusions of tourists. Otherwise, Ben's servitude to Nishimura would have been complete.

The fifth and final travelogue in this analysis is by Sasa Yukie, who traveled to Pacific Island battle sites in 2005 and 2006. Her account integrates, among other things, reports of Japanese commemoration ceremonies she attended, interviews with veterans and pilgrims, and her opinions of the war and of the commemorations based on her journeys and observations. As a result, her book is replete with Japanese perspectives that practically marginalize the Islanders. The descriptions of her interaction with the Islanders are far more limited than those of other travel writers.[72] Thus, the little she did write on this topic stands out and reveals her attitude toward the Islanders more clearly. In Guadalcanal, Sasa noticed children who appeared suddenly and followed the Japanese pilgrims with whom she traveled. The children aided the visitors in negotiating the terrain and paths at times and asked for photographs in return. She saw other travelers handing out balloons and inconspicuous toys as charitable gestures that made good impressions on the children.[73] Sasa suggested giving candies to children and gave practical advice on how to do so:

> Candies in cans are no use: they get stuck in the heat. It is best to buy a packet of individually wrapped candies. You can find them in supermarkets and 100-yen shops. They are cheap and do not take up much space in your luggage. One packet will be enough for one village. Say "Line, line" with gestures, and get the children to line up, and give them a candy each.[74]

Her advice encapsulates the essence of the traveler-travelee relationship. Sasa perceived the children as an inevitable irritation to be managed with the least possible hassle. Although she agreed that the balloons and toys were suitable

72. Sasa Yukie, *Onna hitori gyokusai no shima o yuku (Toward the Islands of Graves)* (Tokyo: Bungei Shunjū, 2007), see her final chapter on the state of Japanese memorials, esp., 267–68. For a detailed analysis of Sasa's travelogue, see Ryota Nishino, "The Awakening of a Journalist's Historical Consciousness: Sasa Yukie's Pacific Island Journeys of 2005–2006," *Japanese Studies* 37, no. 1 (2017): 71–88.

73. Sasa, *Onna hitori*, 38.

74. Ibid.

instruments of grassroots diplomacy, building rapport with the children was not part of Sasa's mission. She believed that individually wrapped candies were both a cost-effective and time-efficient means of crowd dispersal. The candies created an impression of charitable tourists while keeping her journey exclusive to pilgrims and circumventing the potential tension that could sabotage pilgrimages. Earlier, we saw Miyakawa comparing the Japanese tourists' gift giving to the chocolates distributed by U.S. GIs during the Occupation Era. The gestures by Sasa and Kamei, whom Miyakawa described, seem similar but also reveal how the forces of dark tourism permeate the traveler-travelee interaction. We recall Kamei's admission that a desire to repay past debts motivated her charitable intentions, whereas Sasa's writing gave no such reason or impression. Her candies left the children with a bitter aftertaste that reinforced the power dynamics between Solomon Islands and Japan.

CONCLUSIONS

This analysis of five travelogues offers a new perspective on travel writing and dark tourism scholarship by charting the changing contours of the hierarchical traveler-travelee relationship at the site of dark tourism. Tracing this evolution requires a focus on the travelers' reflections on their interactions with the Islanders. This approach entails interpreting each writer's account against the historiographical trends and historical contexts of the time. Travel writings published between the 1960s and the 2000s show that reducing the relationship to the simple formula of the dominant traveler and subordinate travelee is inadequate. While the unequal power relations between the parties were always present, the wage of shame and guilt made the travel writers realize that wartime history still mattered in the present era. This historical consciousness could well have tipped the balance of power. Nonetheless, beneath these accounts lies the travelers' assumption of the right to make judgments—be they implicit or explicit. Their judgments extended from the supposed degree of civilization and savagery of the Islanders, to the Islanders' attitudes to the war, to the Japanese occupiers, and even to tourists. However, the Islanders' historical memories challenged the travelers' assumptions of immunity from wartime history and their latent posture of innocence and superiority.

How did the travel writers respond when confronted by the disturbing histories of the places they visited? Kanetaka and Miyakawa faced up to their

ignorance and engaged with questions of the atrocities inflicted by the Japanese upon the Islanders. Kanetaka's 1962 travelogue reminded readers of the unequal relationship between Japanese military officers and their Islander subordinates, when such memories were disappearing during Japan's economic recovery. Over twenty years later, Miyakawa's humbling experience in Timbunke reminded her that victims and their descendants maintained strong memories of Japanese atrocities. Her account then related the effects that the unresolved resentment manifested on the traveler-travelee interactions at a time when Japanese pilgrimages affected travelee communities. In an emerging trend found in the travelogues by Agawa, Miyakawa, and Nishimura, each writer engaged in and observed commercial transactions, and each related how the Islanders grew more enterprising as the years went by. This underlines how wartime memory turned into a commodity that travelers could pay for and receive—an ironic consequence of demographic shifts in the Islands, and of new perceptions of the tourists as sources of livelihood. Yet, marginalizing or even erasing the Islanders completed a vision of the Islands as war theme parks where the Islanders serve the visitors. Nishimura's frustration at Ben suggests the Islanders can control travelers' access to historical information and resist their subordinate status. If the travel writings analyzed here are representative of the changing nature of the traveler-travelee relationship, then Japanese travelers will likely continue to use their position to create their own zones of remembrance, without necessarily listening to the sentiments and sensibilities of the Islanders. ■

RYOTA NISHINO is a lecturer (assistant professor) in history at the University of the South Pacific, Suva, Fiji.

NOTE

I acknowledge the University of the South Pacific for the award of a sabbatical leave that enabled me to conduct research and write this article. During the leave I received institutional support from the Research School of Asia and the Pacific, the Australian National University, Melbourne Law School, the University of Melbourne, and the Graduate School of Law, Hitotsubashi University, Japan. I thank the anonymous readers of this article for their input.