

Skull trophies of the Pacific War: transgressive objects of remembrance

SIMON HARRISON *University of Ulster, Coleraine*

This article discusses the use of enemy body parts as war trophies, focusing on the collection of Japanese skulls as trophies by Allied servicemen in the Second World War, and on the treatment of these objects after the war. I argue that such human trophy-taking tends to occur in societies, including modern states, in which two conditions hold: the hunting of animals is an important component of male identity; and the human status of enemies is denied.

When their enemies fall [the Gauls] cut off their heads ... and these first-fruits of battle they fasten by nails upon their houses, just as men do, in certain kinds of hunting, with the heads of wild beasts they have mastered.

Diodorus of Sicily, Book V (1939: 173-5)

A small subfield of forensic anthropology concerns the identification and analysis of human skulls collected by military personnel as war souvenirs and trophies. Most of these relics originate in two twentieth-century conflicts: the Pacific War and the Vietnam War.¹ Many have come to light quite accidentally. In June 2003, for instance, detectives in the city of Pueblo, Colorado, searching a house for drugs, discovered a small trunk inscribed with the word 'Guadalcanal' and the date 'November 11 1942'. Finding a human skull inside, they seized it. Photographs taken by the coroner's office, and published in a local newspaper, showed that the skull bore many inscriptions. Across the frontal bone were the neatly lettered words:

**THIS IS A GOOD JAP
GUADALCANAL S.I.
11-NOV.-42
OSCAR
M.G. J.PAPAS U.S.M.C.**

The skull also bore autographs of two or three dozen servicemen up to the rank of lieutenant colonel, and had been lacquered. The householder told the police that it was

a family heirloom, and demanded its return. It was the skull, he said, of a Japanese soldier killed in the battle of Guadalcanal by his great-grandfather, Julius Papas. Papas and other members of his unit had signed their names and ranks on it and given it the nickname 'Oscar'. Forensic analysis by anthropologists at the US Army Central Identification Laboratory confirmed the probability of wartime Japanese origins, and in May 2004 the skull was handed over to the Japanese authorities for interment (Malone 2003*a*; 2003*b*; 2003*c*; 2004*a*; 2004*b*).²

In a newspaper interview after the discovery of the skull, a spokesman for the Marine Corps expressed shock at such reprehensible and unlawful treatment of the dead:

As a God-fearing person, it violates all moral laws of everything I've been raised to know ... I don't need to look in the Uniform Code (of Military Justice) to tell you that you can't walk off the battlefield with the remains of the enemy. Has it ever happened? It has, but it's just wrong (Malone 2003*a*).

But the relatives of Papas, who died in 1960 after a long career in the Corps, spoke of their sense of loss. For them, the passage of time had transformed the skull into a cherished possession redolent with family sentiment and affection. The niece of Papas, for instance,

has fond memories of the skull as a family heirloom. She said she was saddened that the artifact has been taken from her family and returned to the Japanese government.

'Anybody that knew the family or went in (Papas') house saw it ... Whenever you walked in that house, it was right there in the middle of the shelf ... It was just somebody that was dead, and this was the way my uncle felt about it. Yes, nowadays people would be outraged about it. But then, we didn't know any better, it was no big deal. It was war. Uncle Julius just thought he was doing what he was supposed to do over there' (Malone 2004*b*).

The collection of skulls and other remains of Japanese soldiers for souvenirs by Allied servicemen is an aspect of the Pacific War that seems largely forgotten.³ Yet several historians have shown that it occurred on a large enough scale to concern the Allied military authorities throughout the conflict, and was widely reported and commented on in the American and Japanese wartime press (Aldrich 2005: 14-15; Dower 1986; Fussell 1988; 1989; Hoyt 1986: 277, 357-9; Shillony 1981; Weingartner 1992; 1996). One problem these practices therefore pose is why they occurred to such a significant extent throughout the course of this war, and why they seem to have disappeared from public memory afterwards. They also raise a deeper problem in the understanding of warfare: namely to explain the treatment of enemy body parts as trophies.

I suggest that these questions may be usefully approached in the light of ethnographic accounts of some indigenous Amazonian, Southeast Asian, and Melanesian societies in which trophy-taking was normal and accepted. I show that cultural attitudes among Allied servicemen in the Pacific War closely paralleled those of these indigenous peoples in certain respects: especially in the importance of hunting as a key icon of masculine identity. My comparison suggests, then, that the use of enemy body parts as war trophies is connected with symbolic associations between war and hunting, and between enemies and game animals, and may therefore occur in any conflicts in which such imagery of predation is employed.

There is evidence of a long if submerged history of such practices in the European and American militaries, at least among servicemen from social backgrounds in which hunting is conceptualized in a way that makes it readily usable as a model of a violent

power relationship between people. In southern and eastern Africa in the nineteenth century, British and German military personnel sometimes took African people's skulls and heads as war trophies (Baer & Schröter 2001; Morris 1996). At the time, sports trophy-hunting was a popular leisure pursuit among colonial officials – indeed, an important symbolic claim of dominion over land and people (MacKenzie 1988; Ritvo 1987). But it tended to be an elite, highly class-bound activity in the nineteenth-century colonial German and British militaries, and so correspondingly was human trophy-taking. Partly for this reason such uses of enemy dead seem to have occurred on a smaller scale than in the twentieth-century United States armed forces, where they were relatively unrestrained by barriers of class and status.

Clearly, not all hunting societies have engaged in taking human war trophies, and the problem is therefore to identify the conditions under which such societies may employ metaphors of hunting, or rather live these metaphors, in warfare. In the case of the Euro-American armed forces, the answer has much to do with racism. Trophy-taking in these organizations seems to have become progressively racialized during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, tending increasingly to be limited to wars which mapped strongly onto social divisions of race. The Pacific War is a paradigm case of such a conflict.

After that war, some families possessing trophy skulls may have grown attached to them, as the family of Papas apparently did. But the passage of time seems to have had a very different effect on most veterans, or veterans' families, turning these mementoes into increasingly unwanted burdens, particularly as their perceptions of the Japanese changed in the post-war years. As we will see, many veterans, or their heirs, eventually sought to rid themselves of their relics – in some cases repatriating them, or trying to repatriate them, to Japan, often despite considerable official obstacles.

In short, I argue that powerful and compelling cultural schemata associating masculinity and hunting motivated some Allied servicemen in the Pacific War to treat enemy remains as trophies. But unlike some indigenous societies with comparable patterns of trophy-taking, and similar conceptions linking hunting with male identity, there were no generally accepted schemata for integrating objects of this sort into the family or community. Instead, this class of war mementoes appeared to transgress the boundaries between persons and things, or persons and property, in such a way as to resist assimilation into the social relations of their collectors and, ultimately, into collective memory.

Race, war, and expeditionary trophy-hunting

Some indigenous societies practise in their warfare a pattern of trophy-hunting which might be called expeditionary. Its basic feature is a strongly marked distinction between close and distant enemies, in which only close enemies are viewed as fully human. They may be killed, but heads or other body parts are taken only from enemies in the second category, victims socially (and perhaps also geographically) remote and classified as semi-human or subhuman (see McKinley 1976). This pattern occurs, for example, among the Iban of Borneo, who practised headhunting against distant strangers whom they called by a term translatable as 'not-people' (McKinley 1976: 108). Similarly, the Mundurucu in Brazil carried out headhunting raids of up to a thousand miles against outsiders whom they looked upon as game animals to be hunted for sport (Murphy 1957: 1026). In New Guinea, similarly, the Marind-Anim, who called themselves 'real'

humans, took heads only from non-Marind, strangers whom the Marind seem to have regarded as subhuman, existing only to serve as victims for their annual headhunting expeditions (Van Baal 1966: 676-96).

This, then, is a pattern in which trophies are taken only among strangers, on territory away from home. Often, the trophy-taking expedition is conceptualized as a sacred, ritualized journey or quest, and in this respect it has analogies with pilgrimage and also tourism (cf. Graburn 1989; 2000; Pannell 1992). As a personal mission to bring enemy relics home to family and kin as symbols of success, the expedition often has the character of a rite of passage into manhood.⁴ It is also often equated with a hunt, though metaphors of fishing or harvesting are sometimes employed as well, perhaps together with tropes of hunting (Davison & Sutlive 1991; Harner 1972: 186, 189; Hoskins 1996: 23). In these societies, men, or most men, also hunt, and hunting is understood as an iconically male pursuit. In effect, ideas of predation or, more broadly, of consumption, provide models on which a relationship with a category of remote enemies is defined.

There is evidence in the Pacific War of analogous dichotomies between near and distant enemies, coded similarly in terms of the permissibility or impermissibility of trophy-taking. Historians have described the deep mutual racial animosities which gave the Pacific War its particular brutality (Dower 1986; Johnston 2000: 85-9; Weingartner 1996). In the eyes of many Allied servicemen and civilians in the Second World War, their enemies were ranked by degrees of humanness, with Germans and Italians acknowledged as human, as 'men just like us' (Spector 1984: 410), Italians at times slightly more so than Germans (Fussell 1989: 116-17). Attitudes to Germany, moreover, tended to define the enemy in political terms – as 'Hitler' or 'the Nazis', rather than the German people. But attitudes to the humanness of the Japanese tended to be at best ambivalent. In the words of an American war correspondent:

'In Europe we felt that our enemies, horrible and deadly as they were, were still people', he explained in one of his first reports from the Pacific. 'But out here I soon gathered that the Japanese were looked upon as something subhuman and repulsive; the way some people feel about cockroaches or mice' (Dower 1986: 78).

Conspicuous in wartime representations of the Japanese was the pervasive use of animal terms: monkeys, rats, cockroaches, lice, vermin, reptiles, and so forth (Dower 1986: 77-180; Fussell 1989: 116-17). Japanese soldiers were portrayed as brutish, simian, often rabid, with an affinity for jungles and jungle warfare unfathomable to civilized combatants. In short, for many Americans in particular, the conflict in the Pacific was a war (for some, a war to the death) between peoples or races – almost between species – in a way that the war in Europe was not (Dower 1986: 77; Weingartner 1996).

A particularly significant aspect of these attributions of animality and ferality to the Japanese was a recurrent imagery of hunting in American depictions of the war in the Pacific.

The evocation of the hunt appears everywhere in American writing about combat in the Pacific, sometimes with an almost lyric quality, evoking images of the Old West and physical pleasures that have always been part of the picture of the good life in the more rural American consciousness ... An advertisement by a cartridge company carried a headline reading 'Now Your Ammunition Is Getting Bigger Game,' and juxtaposed a painting of a hunter sighting in on a mountain sheep with a scene of ammunition stores on Guadalcanal. An ad for telescopic sights showed a Japanese soldier crouched on

his hands and knees, with the cross hairs fixed behind his shoulder. 'Rack up another one,' the heading read. Cards for display in automobile windows proclaimed 'Open Season for Japs' (Dower 1986: 89-90).

Similarly, humorous recruiting posters for the Marine Corps offered 'Jap hunting licenses', with the added bonus of free weapons and ammunition (Weingartner 1992: 55). To grasp the full force of such tropes, one must understand the place of hunting in the symbolism of American national identity. Herman (2001) has described how sports hunting became a mass pursuit among American men during industrialization in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. For many Americans, urban and rural, and to some extent irrespective of social class, hunting came to symbolize masculine qualities of self-reliance and hardihood associated with pioneer times (Herman 2001: 270). In the hunting season a wide range of men could reaffirm and relive powerful national myths of the frontier and the conquest of wilderness. Among the reasons that Herman suggests for this were the nineteenth-century stereotypes of native Americans as hunters. The European settlers imagined they could succeed the indigenous peoples as legitimate owners of the land by taking over what they understood to be the autochthonous mode of relating to the environment and its resources. So hunting came to express a type of white American nationalism that rested on a symbolically appropriated indigeneity (Herman 2001: xiii, 7, 171-2; Slotkin 1973). To some of the sport's most passionate advocates, such as Theodore Roosevelt, the figure of the hunter had an almost mystical significance as the quintessential expression of American male character (Herman 2001: 223). In 1945, a quarter of American men were sports hunters (Herman 2001: 271), and many of these must have had personal experience of preparing animal trophy heads and skulls.

In short, at the time of the Pacific War, hunting was not simply a mass leisure pursuit, but an important symbolic affirmation of American white male identity, and to some extent it still is, more perhaps among rural and working-class men. In particular, it can have some of the qualities of a rite of passage for adolescent boys (Cartmill 1993: 232-3; Fine 2000; Marks 1991). Many servicemen, whether hunters themselves or not, must have shared this image of hunting, rich with associations of male camaraderie, coming-of-age, patriotism, and white racial identity, and brought it with them into combat with an enemy which many of them viewed as subhuman. Hence in their accounts of fighting in the Pacific, servicemen often drew on familiar experiences – familiar also to much of their audience – of shooting rabbits, quails, ducks, deer, mountain sheep, and other game back home (Dower 1986: 89-90). It was perhaps inevitable that some would pursue the implications of such metaphors to the point of treating Japanese remains as hunting trophies. Even the setting of the fighting – remote islands and jungles in New Guinea and elsewhere, evocative of headhunting and cannibalism in the public imagination – may have tended to reinforce this image of a war being waged at the frontier between culture and nature, civilization and the wild.

Body parts as tokens of love and respect

In 1944, the American poet Winfield Townley Scott worked as book editor of *The Providence Journal*, a Rhode Island newspaper. His diary records the excitement of his colleagues one day in January when word spread through the building that a sailor, recently home from the Pacific, was in the office displaying the skull of a Japanese

soldier killed at Guadalcanal. All the staff stopped work and gathered round eagerly to view the souvenir (Goldstein 2002: 61). This event became the basis of his poem 'The U.S. sailor with the Japanese skull' (Scott 1962), a work which a critic has called 'one of the most revelatory and widely-reprinted poems about the savagery of World War II' (Goldstein 2002: 68). In the poem, a sailor decapitates an enemy corpse on a Guadalcanal beach. He skins the head and, on the voyage home, cleans and polishes the skull by towing it behind his ship in a net, and finally scrubs it with caustic soda. The description of the process by which the skull is curated takes up four of the poem's eight stanzas, and in its graphic detail seems unlikely to have sprung purely from Scott's imagination.

At the time, other newspapers had reported servicemen coming home from the Pacific with similar objects. On 1 October 1943, a communiqué from the Army Chief of Staff to General MacArthur (Supreme Allied Commander of the Southwest Pacific theatre) expressed alarm over some recent items in the US press. He referred to a newspaper story which told:

how a soldier had 'made himself a string of beads from the teeth of Japanese soldiers.' Another report he cited concerned a soldier who had recently returned from the southwest Pacific theater with photos showing various steps 'in the cooking and scraping of the heads of Japanese to prepare the skulls for souvenirs' (Spector 1984: 411; see also Weingartner 1992: 57).

A photograph of this sort appears in an essay by Fussell (1988: 47), himself a veteran of the Second World War. Taken on a beach on Guadalcanal during the war, the photograph was revealed to Fussell in the 1980s by a friend who had served there as a marine. It shows the friend and another marine tending a small metal vat in which they are boiling a clearly visible human head. Fussell makes the point that snapshots such as these 'were taken (and preserved for a lifetime) because the marines were proud of their success' (1988: 48)

Charles Lindbergh, the pioneer aviator, went to the Pacific war area in April 1944 to serve as a civilian adviser to the US Army and Navy, and refers to several of these sorts of acts in his wartime diary. On 14 August 1944 in the Marshall Islands, he records a marine officer telling him that some of his men:

had a little sack in which they collected teeth with gold fillings. The officer said he had seen a number of Japanese bodies from which an ear or a nose had been cut off. 'Our boys cut them off to show their friends in fun, or to dry and take back to the States when they go. We found one Marine with a Japanese head. He was trying to get the ants to clean the flesh off the skull, but the odor got so bad we had to take it away from him.' It is the same story everywhere I go (Lindbergh 1970: 919).

But skulls seem rarely to have been obtained from bodies of the newly killed (though I will mention later a case of a Japanese prisoner apparently being murdered for his skull). Most were taken from remains partially or fully skeletonized.⁵ Weinstein (2000), for instance, regretfully recalls what he terms his 'primitive behavior' when he and a companion found some decaying Japanese bodies in the New Britain jungle in 1943. Deciding that the skulls were too precious to leave, they wove makeshift baskets out of vines and twigs, and carried the skulls back to camp, where they boiled them in old fuel drums. Weinstein's own souvenir was stolen shortly afterwards, but his companion managed to ship his home. Later, a directive was issued forbidding the ownership of

skulls and teeth, practices which in Weinstein's experience were widespread (for similar cases, see Aldrich 2005: 475-6; Kahn 1993: 82-5; Larson 2003: 112-13).

Forensic analysis of the skull confiscated from the descendants of Julius Papas indicated that it had probably been collected in a similar way. Papas apparently told his family that he had obtained the skull by killing a Japanese soldier who had killed his best friend. But the tests carried out on the skull revealed signs of decomposition and of gnawing by rats and indicated that skull was old when Papas collected it (Malone 2004*b*). Many of the relics that servicemen brought home seem to have been collected a considerable time after the end of fighting, in an activity perhaps better described as trophy-scavenging than trophy-hunting, though these objects might be misrepresented back home as proof of fighting prowess, taken in combat. Bass (1983: 801-2) mentions the origins of one of the two Japanese trophy skulls he analyses: a serviceman, securing some Pacific island, came across a crashed Japanese fighter plane and took the pilot's skull.

On 26 June 1945, a Navy lieutenant from New Orleans wrote to his wife from Corregidor in the Philippines:

We looked all over the island and in the hospital cave where the last fighting took place. There were dead Japs all over the place and I thought of sending Pack his Jap skull, but most were still being used slightly. We got some pens and stuff out of the pockets and one of the fellows got 2 bayonets. I got a rifle and other papers. There were a lot of helmets, canteens etc. lying around. The Japs were pretty ripe and one of the boys got sick (King 1945).

Such souvenir-seekers were not necessarily combat troops. An ambulance-driver wrote home from India on 23 September 1944:

Yesterday we hiked four miles into the hills to the ex-Jap headquarters ... There were no souvenirs whatsoever. However, we did take some good pictures of bomb craters and bombed out buildings. Do you want a Jap skull? Now that I'm better acquainted with mailing ways I'll try to ship home something better than I have already. A Jap canteen, insignia, flag, sword, medals, etc. Enclosed are some Jap invasion notes, a sleeve division insignia, a sketch and an Irish money order. Also a Jap instruction sheet for mosquito preventive (Anonymous 1944).

Notable in these letters are the casual references to skulls as souvenirs along with other popular mementoes of the Japanese such as sabres, pistols, and battleflags. Such items were collected for much the same reasons that tourists collect souvenirs: as proof of 'having been there' (Graburn 1989: 33-4; Hitchcock 2000: 2; Jones 1963: 331).

Like other Japanese souvenir items, skulls and other remains were sometimes traded among military personnel. In January 1944 an Allied intelligence report referred to members of the Naval Construction Battalions stationed on Guadalcanal selling Japanese skulls to merchant seamen (Weingartner 1992: 57). Teeth were sometimes similarly commoditized. Weinstein (2000) recalls almost falling ill the first time he saw his sergeant wearing a necklace of teeth, an investment which the sergeant planned to sell on his return home. He had set the more valuable gold ones between every five or so of the more common natural ones. He polished them constantly, and often concocted tales of personal heroism to explain how he had acquired them, though most of them had actually been bought or bartered from other personnel. Half a century later, Weinstein still sometimes wondered whether his sergeant's 'unsold collection decorates some bar he frequented where he traded them for beer, while recounting his tales of bravery'.⁶

One factor which veterans themselves, as well as other writers on the Pacific War, often cite in explaining such behaviour was the notoriously harsh and brutal conditions of the campaign. Sledge, in his classic first-hand account of fighting on Peleliu and Okinawa as a marine infantryman, concludes that the 'fierce struggle for survival ... eroded the veneer of civilization and made savages of us all' (1981: 121). Weinstein (2000), similarly, describes himself and his companions undergoing a 'decline of enlightened, civilized discipline' in the jungles of New Britain. Such factors may indeed explain mutilation and ill-treatment of enemy dead, though some servicemen had expressed intentions to obtain Japanese body parts even before embarking for overseas: that is, before any experience of combat or exposure to its stresses (Dower 1986: 65; Tregaskis 2000 [1943]: 14; Weingartner 1996: 56).⁷

More basically, the battlefield conditions cannot explain why servicemen in many cases collected such trophies not for themselves but – as is often the case with souvenirs and holiday mementoes purchased by tourists (Graburn 2000: xiv-xv; Mars & Mars 2000) – as gifts for relatives and others back home. Some collected such objects at the specific request of family members. Here, for example, a sailor describes in his diary a kamikaze attack on his ship in November 1944:

Parts of destroyed suicide planes were scattered all over the ship. During a little lull in the action the men would look around for Jap souvenirs and what souvenirs they were. I got part of the plane ... One of the Marines cut the ring off the finger of one of the dead pilots ... One of the fellows had a Jap scalp, it looked just like you skinned an animal ... One of the men on our [gun] mount got a Jap rib and cleaned it up, he said his sister wants part of a Jap body. One fellow from Texas had a knee bone and he was going to preserve it in alcohol from the sick bay (Fahey 1963: 231; see also Fussell 1989: 117; Hynes 1998: 170-1).

A perceived demand for Japanese remains among their civilian relatives seems to have been driving the behaviour of some servicemen. In April 1943, a Baltimore newspaper wrote of a local mother seeking permission from the authorities for her son to send her a Japanese ear which she wanted to nail to her front door; and a Detroit newspaper in the same month ran a story 'of an underage youth who had enlisted and "bribed" his chaplain not to disclose his age by promising him the third pair of ears he collected' (Dower 1986: 65). In other words, some servicemen set out for the Pacific with an express intention, indeed a promise, of obtaining such tokens for friends and family.

One case of a departing serviceman pledging enemy remains in this way received international publicity on 22 May 1944, when *Life Magazine* published a 'Picture of the Week', with the caption: 'Arizona war worker writes her Navy boyfriend a thank-you note for the Jap skull he sent her'. In this full-page photograph a modishly dressed young woman composes a letter, and gazes, pen in hand, at a skull on her writing desk, a love token from a Navy officer in the Pacific. The following commentary accompanies the photograph:

PICTURE OF THE WEEK

When he said goodbye [*sic*] two years ago to Natalie Nickerson, 20, a war worker of Phoenix, Ariz., a big, handsome Navy lieutenant promised her a Jap. Last week Natalie received a human skull, autographed by her lieutenant and 13 friends, and inscribed: 'This is a good Jap – a dead one picked up on the New Guinea beach.' Natalie, surprised at the gift, named it 'Tojo'.⁸ The armed forces disapprove strongly of this sort of thing.

Some of the autographs and part of the motto are visible in the photograph. The idea that enemy remains were fitting gifts for departing soldiers to pledge to their loved ones

seems to have transcended the racial and class divisions of the time. In Arkansas in 1942, the folklorist and musicologist Alan Lomax recorded a blues song in which a black soldier bids farewell to his wife and infant son, saying he has to 'fight for you, America and my boy'. He promises to send his son a 'Jap's skull' as a Christmas present and, in a later verse, a 'Jap's tooth' to ease the child's teething pains (O'Neal 2002).⁹

At the extreme far end of the social scale similar attitudes sometimes revealed themselves. On 13 June 1944, the *New York Times* reported a Congressman Walter presenting to President Roosevelt a letter-opener made from a Japanese soldier's arm bone, and apologizing ironically to the President for being unable to offer him more of the Japanese anatomy (Hoyt 1986: 357-8; Weingartner 1992: 60-1). Some weeks later, the same newspaper reported that Roosevelt had given the letter-opener back, declaring himself unwilling to possess such an object and suggesting that it be given burial (Weingartner 1992: 65). At the time, the military authorities and some of the civilian population, including church groups, had condemned such desecrations of Japanese dead, especially following the publication of the photograph in *Life Magazine* (the lieutenant who sent his girlfriend a skull was traced and given an official reprimand), and Roosevelt appears to have been sensitive to this public feeling (Dower 1986: 330).

My point is that there is no evidence that those servicemen who collected trophies were typically suffering from what was at the time called combat fatigue, or were other than normal men who understood such souvenirs to be tangible expressions of their loyalties to family and nation, and perceived a demand for these objects back home. Certainly, some seem to have had commercial motives, like Weinstein's entrepreneurial sergeant with his plans to sell his collection of teeth on his return. But for many other men, skulls, teeth, and other body parts were proper and fitting items to collect because they were understood to be symbols of attachment and moral relatedness to people in their own country. Some of the collectors were non-combatants such as ambulance-drivers, happening upon a skull on some old battlefield and taking it as a curio for their relatives, never pretending they acquired it in combat. Others, *soi disant* headhunters such as Papas, passed off such objects as personal kills after the war. A very few, as we shall see, do appear to have killed to acquire body parts as trophies. But a common attribute many shared was that once in the combat areas they valued such items, and sought them, often as expressions of love and esteem for parents, siblings, fiancées, children, for their political leaders or other figures of authority, to whom they may have promised such tokens of duty and affection even before leaving for overseas.

War as a continuation of tourism by other means

The collection of Japanese trophy skulls and other body parts seems to have represented the far end of a continuum, at the other end of which was a common and generally accepted military practice: namely the taking of possessions from prisoners and enemy dead. Such pilfering or robbery is widely reported in twentieth-century wars (see, e.g., Hynes 1998: 156; Johnston 2000: 18). Sledge describes the way in which not only equipment – such as helmets, swords, pistols, and so forth – but all personal effects – letters, photographs, pens, watches, eyeglasses, and so forth – were routinely taken as souvenirs from all Japanese corpses encountered (1981: 118-20). He calls this practice 'fieldstripping', as if an enemy body with its accoutrements were an object to be disassembled like a piece of captured ordnance. Jones, who fought at Guadalcanal and wrote a novel, *The Thin Red Line*, based on his experiences, describes in the novel daily barter markets in which front-line infantry troops traded such souvenirs to other

military personnel in return for whiskey, beer, and similar luxuries (see also Sledge 1981: 118-20). But fieldstripping was not just motivated by the economic value of enemy belongings. Sledge calls it a 'ritual' to degrade the defeated enemy and, very interestingly, compares it in this respect to scalping.

The collection of skulls, teeth, and other body parts seems on the whole to have been carried out as an extension of this 'normal' and widely practised looting of corpses. According to Hynes (a marine veteran of the Pacific War), the mutilation of enemy dead has been 'part of military behavior from the beginning of wars. If you kill your enemy, his body belongs to you, it's part of the loot' (1998: 191-2). On the other hand, Hynes also tells us that he never heard of an American serviceman mutilating German or Italian dead for souvenirs.

In fact, none of the Second World War trophy skulls occurring in the forensic record derive from the European theatre; all have been identified as Japanese. The reasons for this are not far to seek. As Dower remarks: 'It is virtually inconceivable ... that teeth, ears, and skulls could have been collected from German or Italian war dead and publicized in the Anglo-American countries without provoking an uproar; and in this we have yet another inkling of the racial dimensions of the [Pacific] war' (1986: 65-6; see also Fussell 1989: 117). Personal effects certainly might be taken from German and Italian dead as souvenirs, but the killers, it seems, felt no sense of ownership of their bodies.¹⁰ I suggest that the special fetishizing of Japanese remains as desirable acquisitions was permitted or encouraged by the way in which the different enemy peoples were classified racially by degrees of humanness. One consequence, among the armed forces and civilians in the United States at least, was an implicit conception of the war in the Pacific as a sort of nation-wide, collective hunting expedition, allowing the moral boundaries of normal military fieldstripping and souvenir-seeking to be widened, in the case of the Japanese, to the collection of body parts.

Lindbergh, in his wartime diary entry for 14 August 1944 reports Fighter Control personnel at the air base on Noemfoor Island in New Guinea carrying out patrols to hunt the last remaining Japanese as a sort of hobby, often taking leg bones from those they killed and carving objects such as letter-openers and pen-holders from them (1970: 906, 997; see also Weingartner 1992: 61). Military personnel have often been known to manufacture in their spare time trinkets and souvenirs of a genre usually called trench art, primarily in the context of the First World War (Saunders 2003), and Lindbergh seems to have been describing an extension of this long-established pastime. In the same way that odds and ends such as old shell casings, or pieces of aircraft wreckage, might be fashioned into cigarette cases, decorative mugs, watchbands, and so forth (see, e.g., Lince 1997: 96), so, it seems, enemy bones were fashioned into desk equipment or other artefacts. Johnston (2000: 82) mentions an Australian soldier in the Aitape area of New Guinea who made a tobacco jar from a Japanese skull, probably in 1944.

What we see with the treatment of the Japanese dead is a drive to push the normal practices of military souvenir-taking to an extreme, not merely by appropriating body parts, but often then by extending this appropriation further still and modifying these objects so as to impress some mark of ownership on them: writing signatures on them, giving them pet names, fashioning them into commemorative artefacts, or in some other way making bodies memorialize their own defeat and destruction.

In the same way that enemy aircraft parts, and enemy pilots' body parts, were alike categorized as souvenirs as they rained down together on Fahey's ship, so the Japanese dead seem sometimes to have been viewed as one type of surplus Japanese war *matériel*,

raw matter on which the winners were free to stamp their will. For instance, as noted above, parts of bodies might be made to circulate as objects alongside goods such as whiskey in the informal barter which flourished among military personnel (Jones 1963: 309-11). Bodies can become commoditized in many contexts (see Scheper-Hughes & Wacquant 2002); here, the commoditization occurred as a ritual of retribution, degradation, and power akin, as Sledge sensed, to scalping.

How far these extensions were taken seem to have depended largely on self-regulation, and thus varied considerably between military units (cf. Young 1995: 127-8). In Sledge's experience, the taking of teeth seems to have been largely accepted or tolerated, by both officers and enlisted men, but not of other parts of the body. During the fighting on Peleliu, a member of his unit announced he had a 'unique souvenir' and produced from his pack, carefully wrapped in waxed paper, a partially dried hand. His companions were disgusted and told him to throw it away before it started to smell: it gave them 'the creeps', they told him, and the commanding officer would 'raise hell' if he saw it (Sledge 1981: 152-3).

To Sledge and his companions, taking body parts other than teeth was reprehensible, indeed inconceivable. Undoubtedly, only a minority of men extended souvenir-taking to body parts, and of those, fewer still went so far as to collect trophy skulls or carve bones into desk ornaments. But their behaviour reflected attitudes which were very widely shared, and such practices were a source of constant disquiet to the military authorities. Weingartner describes in detail the efforts of the authorities to curtail them throughout the course of the war. So, for example, in January 1944 a directive from the Joint Chiefs of Staff to all theatre commanders 'called upon them to adopt measures to prevent the preparation of skulls and "similar items" as war trophies, and to prevent members of the armed forces and others from removing from the theater skulls and other objects which might be represented as Japanese body parts' (Weingartner 1992: 57; see also Aldrich 2005: 475). Such mistreatment of the dead not only violated the Geneva Conventions but, perhaps more importantly, was a propaganda gift to the Japanese and might have provoked reprisals against American prisoners and detainees (Weingartner 1992: 64).¹¹

Interestingly, the Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet had ordered 'stern disciplinary action' against the use of enemy body parts as souvenirs as early as September 1942 (Fussell 1989: 117), only a few weeks into the battle of Guadalcanal, the first land offensive against the Japanese. Clearly, the collection of body parts on a scale large enough to concern the military authorities had started as soon as the first living or dead Japanese bodies were encountered.

The official directives may have been effective in some areas of the campaign, but they seem to have been implemented only partially and unevenly by local commanders in the field (cf. Winslow 1998). Weinstein (2000) recalls that his officers never encouraged the collection of skulls and teeth, but never tried to prevent it either, even when orders came forbidding the ownership of skulls and directing them to be handed over to Graves Registration. The officers did not want to discourage expressions of animosity toward the enemy. Skulls, as well as the sergeant's collection of teeth, were often still displayed openly. Lindbergh (1970: 897) saw a skull hung as a decoration on the blackboard in the pilots' alert tent at the airbase on Biak on 6 August 1944, and there are other accounts of the use of skulls to decorate military boats at Saipan and elsewhere, and in various other sorts of display (Aldrich 2005: plate following 468; Daws 1994: 278; Fussell 1988: 12, 47).

Trophy skulls in the post-war years

Sledzik and Ousley (1991: 521) report that skulls were missing from about 60 per cent of the remains of Japanese war dead repatriated from the Mariana Islands in 1984. A Japanese priest who visited Iwo Jima regularly since 1952 to conduct ceremonies for the dead reported similarly in 1985 that skulls had been taken from many of the remains, presumably for souvenirs (Ross 1986: 357-9; see also Fussell 1988: 51). Such evidence suggests that a substantial quantity of human remains may have been imported into the United States during the war, and perhaps also in the immediate post-war years, though US customs took measures to prevent it. On 14 September 1944, Lindbergh left the Pacific theatre and passed through customs at Hawaii:

The customs officer asked me if I had any bones in my baggage. He said that he had to ask everyone that question because they had found a large number of men taking Japanese bones home for souvenirs. He said he had found one man with two 'green' Jap skulls in his baggage (1970: 923).

Evidence of the post-war fate of remains brought back to the United States is meagre but suggests that, unlike animal hunting trophies, they did not usually become objects of display, with a few exceptions such as the skull kept by Papas. Some, as we will see, were eventually returned to Japan. Many others seem simply to have been discarded, because abandoned trophy skulls are sometimes discovered and brought to the attention of the authorities. Some, like the skull kept by Papas, have been found by chance during police raids. Most have come to public light only when their keepers tried to rid themselves of them (see, e.g., Maples & Browning 1995: 26-9).

A skull recovered from a lake in Illinois had been thrown there after becoming an object of avoidance and fear to its own keeper. It had been brought home from the Pacific by a navy medic who became a high school science teacher after the war and used it in his biology classes. Years after his death, it was discovered in a trunk in the attic by his teenage grandson, who spraypainted it gold, tied a bandana around it, and used it as a bedroom decoration until he became frightened of it and in January 2000 threw it into nearby Lake Springfield. A spell of dry weather exposed the skull on the lake bed a month later, and a passer-by reported it to the police. After examination by an Illinois State Police anthropologist, the local police working with American military officials sent the skull to the US Naval Hospital in Okinawa, to be handed over to the Japanese government at the Group of Eight economic summit on Okinawa later that year. In the event, the transfer was delayed for three years because the American authorities deemed there was insufficient evidence that the skull was that of a Japanese soldier. On the verge of being disposed of as hospital waste, the skull was finally handed over to the Okinawan authorities in a small ceremony in 2003 (Allen 2004; Antonacci 2000a; 2000b; 2000c; 2003; Oliva 2002; 2003).

Some trophy skulls seem to have become a source of family conflict in the post-war years. One, analysed by the forensic anthropologist Harrell Gill-King and his colleagues, had originally been presented as a gift to one of the senior marine officers involved in planning the invasion of Saipan, and was apparently the skull of a member of the Japanese garrison there. After the war, the skull circulated in the officer's family for many years, with some wanting to return it to Japan, while others – referred to by Gill-King as the 'John Wayne' faction of the family – wanted to keep it. Eventually, the skull came into the possession of the officer's great-nephew, a young lawyer, who offered it to the Japanese Consulate in Houston. He was told that it could not be

accepted without supporting evidence, which Gill-King's laboratory successfully provided (Gill-King 1992; pers. comm. 1 April 2005).

Especially interesting are attempts by veterans themselves to repatriate their trophies. In April 1993, a Cincinnati newspaper columnist wrote of having recently been contacted by a 76-year-old man whom I will call G., who had served as an artillery gunner on Guadalcanal, where he lived for twenty-two months in a tent with eight other marines. One of the men went looking for souvenirs one day, and brought back a number of items, including the head of a Japanese soldier. The men boiled the head, breaking the bones behind the eyes to remove the brain, and kept the skull in their tent as a trophy. Later, the souvenir collector was sent to hospital in New Caledonia with malaria. When G. developed malaria a month later, and was also shipped to New Caledonia, his friends packed the skull in his seabag for him to return to its collector. In the event, the two never caught up with each other, and G. ended up with the skull at the end of the war:

'I put it in my basement on a shelf. My wife knew about it. Every so often, she says, "What are you going to do with that thing?"'

'But time passed. After a while, I didn't give it a thought.'

A couple of years ago, [G.] starts seeing all these 50-year anniversary stories in magazines he gets from the Disabled American Veterans and the American Legion about Pearl Harbor, the U.S. Marine landing on Guadalcanal, the first raid on the Japanese mainland. This gets him thinking. He sounds like a man who's taking account of his life: 'Don't get me wrong – it's not like I'm remorseful. War is war. After the devastation the Japanese warlords ordered against our country in 1941, I can never forgive or forget Pearl Harbor.'

'On the other hand, if we're having celebrations here, maybe they're having celebrations in Japan. I'm thinking, this skull oughta go back to Japan. Anyhow, I'm at a point where I'd really like to get rid of it' (Wecker 1993*a*).

G. handed the skull in a shopping bag to the columnist, who contacted various Japanese organizations, including the Japanese Consulate in Detroit, all of which declined the skull because of the lack of proof that it belonged to a Japanese soldier. A team of filmmakers preparing to fly to the Solomons told the columnist of a group of Japanese priests who return there each year to recover remains of their war dead, and the columnist gave the skull to the filmmakers to take with them and hand it over to them (Wecker 1993*a*; 1993*b*).

Do-it-yourself repatriation of war dead often turns out to be harder than veterans, and those who seek to help them, initially realize because the Japanese and American authorities are clearly unwilling to receive these remains without strong evidence of their origins. Such difficulties were encountered by a middle-aged Dallas man, M., who contacted a local newspaper columnist in 1993 for help with an unusual problem. During the Second World War, a relative of M. had served at Guadalcanal as a member of a platoon which captured a Japanese sniper. The platoon did not want the prisoner, had nowhere to keep him, and shot him during the night:

'They cut his head off – the corpsman [medical personnel] cut it off,' [M.] said. 'I don't know, I guess they boiled it. Then the squad signed their names on it, and they put the head on a pole.' ...

[M.]'s relative eventually got the skull. 'He decided he wanted it for a souvenir, and so he sent it home.'

With that introduction, [M.] took me to a back bedroom and removed from a plastic bag the skull of 'Sam,' as the squad had named him.

'Shot at Guadalcanal,' said the hand-lettered inscription across Sam's forehead. All over the skull were signatures, nicknames and hometowns.

And just above the eyes, in letters almost faded from view: 'One Dead Jap' ...

[M.] said his relative, who wishes to remain anonymous, is now filled with remorse. 'He's a different person now – religious and a family man.'

Several years ago he asked [M.] to help him return Sam to Japan. [M.] made a few phone calls at the time and got nowhere. So Sam remained in a closet until recently, when [M.] decided to try again and called the newspaper.

'I think he's a soldier that rates a ticket back home,' [M.] said. 'He defended his country just as we defended ours. I think he deserves to be buried with Japanese honors' (Blow 1993a).

The columnist posted the skull to the Japanese Consulate in Houston, which returned it a few weeks later with a courteous but firm note of refusal. Later, on the advice of a well-informed reader, he shipped it to the Tokyo address of the priest I mentioned earlier in connection with Iwo Jima, who had publicly undertaken to receive such relics if they were offered to him (Blow 1993a; 1993b).¹²

Perhaps for some veterans, returning from the Pacific with a trophy skull and putting it on show in their home had at first seemed no more aberrant than displaying a souvenir of some foreign holiday. But as the years passed, and the Japanese ceased to be viewed as semi-human, divisions grew within some veterans' families (or between some veterans' own older and younger selves) over whether these memorabilia belonged in the realm of things or persons. To some veterans in old age, or to their surviving relatives, their trophy eventually came to seem 'a soldier who rates a ticket back home' – the 'last prisoner of World War II', as M. expressed it to the Dallas columnist (Blow 1993a) – an actual person wrongfully prevented for fifty years from returning to his own people. The skull was no longer an object which could be 'owned' as an article of display, like a sports trophy or commemorative dinner-set. It had assumed the form of a reproachful human presence in the family, someone whose remains had been misappropriated for half a century, and to whom restitution was owed.

In this respect, there is a marked contrast between trophy-taking in the Pacific War and in the indigenous societies I mentioned earlier, one that may help explain the post-war erasure of trophy-taking from public memory. Societies in which headhunting was publicly accepted usually had elaborate rituals in which enemy heads were incorporated into the world of kinship and family, and into the processes of social reproduction, as if they were persons or parts of persons. In other words, taking heads was understood as a male contribution – in some societies, an essential one – to reproduction and fertility (Harner 1972: 147, 193; Hoskins 1996: 18-23; McKinley 1976). Hence, in the celebrations following a successful raid, women might dance with the head to welcome it, offer it food as if it were an honoured guest, or treat it as an infant to nurse and coddle (Fausto 1999; McKinley 1976: 114-15).

In the case of the Pacific War, on the other hand, it was as if the society had the means to generate such objects but not assimilate them. The ambivalence and distaste which servicemen's wives often express towards trophy skulls is notable, and contrasts markedly with the unreservedly enthusiastic reception accorded such trophies by women among the Dayaks or Jivaro (Geddes 1954: 21; Harner 1972; McKinley 1976: 114). One of the skulls analysed by Bass was handed in to his museum by a veteran's widow who told Bass she had never liked it and wanted to be rid of it now that her husband had died

(1983: 803). Willey and Leach (2003) report a case of a Vietnam War veteran whose attachment to his trophy skull appears to have contributed to the breakdown of his marriage.

After their trophies were sent home, or brought home, it seems that many veterans and their families did not know what to do with them, because there were no accepted cultural schemata for the use of such objects. It was not so much that their existence was deliberately suppressed or denied after the war. Certainly they were distasteful, even potentially incriminating, but worse wartime atrocities are remembered and openly acknowledged. More basically, the skull trophies of the Pacific War, a class of artefacts whose origins seem so radically to confound the distinction between persons and things, proved too aberrant and anomalous to be readily assimilated into social memory. After the war, their existence was in large part lost to public historical consciousness, ultimately because this consciousness lacked categories to accommodate such transgressive objects, embodying as they did incongruous ideas of the inalienable alienated, and the inappropriable appropriated.

Conclusion

Clearly, trophy-taking is not an ethnological curiosity of tribal or 'primitive' warfare, alien to the supposedly impersonal, instrumentally rational, and disenchanted warfare waged by advanced state societies. It seems that any society in which hunting is an important component of male identity, and a will exists to define some enemies as less than human, can give rise to the military cosmology, or pattern of enchanted war-making, that I call expeditionary trophy-hunting. And though modern states certainly make such trophy-taking illegal, the history of the Pacific War suggests that a state at war may to some degree tacitly tolerate its covert occurrence in the interests of motivating and mobilizing its population or armed forces.

I have argued that expeditionary trophy-hunting is related to social classifications in which distant foreigners appear as subhuman or animal-like. The evidence from the Pacific War suggests that trophy-hunting is not simply a reflection of these classifications, but a social practice by which such classifications may be sustained and reproduced. When combatants take trophies, they do not do so because they classify their enemies literally as animals, any more than peoples who metaphorize trophy-hunting as fishing or harvesting think their enemies are fish or vegetables. Trophy-hunting is, at one level, a device, distinctive to some kinds of societies in which men hunt animals, to mask or deny the humanness of some chosen category of people. In some indigenous societies which practised expeditionary trophy-hunting, such as the Melanesian community of Avatip, heads were taken not because the victims were distant strangers, but to make them distant, to generate estrangement, and 'produce' a category of people as enemies with whom to fight (see Harrison 1989; 1993; 2005). It was by such practices that social actors created and negotiated group boundaries and thus, in a sense, the groups themselves. The attempt metaphorically to reduce others to a less than human status required effort to sustain and was predicated on underlying categorizations of them as human. It was a device, then, not so much of social classification, as of reclassification or counter-classification.

Trophy-taking during the Pacific War needs to be interpreted in a similar way: not merely as an effect of the powerfully racialized wartime imagery of the Japanese as subhuman, but as one of the symbolic practices by which these conceptualizations were

reproduced and sustained – in opposition to a contrasting default recognition of the Japanese as human. That these attributions of animality were counter-representations (meant to transgress, negate, and deny others perhaps more resilient and enduring) is shown by the way they were contested even during the war, and by the rapidity with which they fell apart afterwards. They disintegrated as the Japanese lapsed back into humanness in the collective imagination of the Allies, while their souvenired remains appeared to revert from the realm of things to their proper place in the realm of persons.

Although trophy-taking seemed to vanish from public memory after the Pacific War, the same schemata of predation suddenly re-emerged intact a generation later in Vietnam, and the same transgressive practices resurfaced, in relation to another people. The idea of racialized trophy-hunting seems to have proved enduring, though different peoples might be made to enter and exit the role of victims as political circumstances changed.

NOTES

For helpful comments on earlier versions of this article, I thank Geoffrey White, four anonymous referees for *JRAI*, and members of the School of Anthropological Studies at Queen's University, Belfast, to whom this was presented as a seminar in October 2005.

¹ For the Pacific War, see Bass (1983); Gill-King (1992); Maples & Browning (1995: 27–9); Valentin & Miller (2004). For the Vietnam War, see Sledzik & Ousley (1991); Taylor, Roh & Goldman (1984); Willey & Leach (2003).

² The battle of Guadalcanal, in the Solomon Islands, was fought from August 1942 to March 1943. A photograph of Papas in a sergeant's uniform appeared in the *Pueblo Chieftain* in 1943 (see Malone 2004b), and the letters before his name may stand for Master Gunnery (Sergeant). The significance of the name 'Oscar' is unclear, though the Allies called a certain type of Japanese fighter aircraft an Oscar (Francillon 1979: 206–14).

³ Australian, as well as American, servicemen sometimes collected Japanese skulls. See Clarke & McKinley (2004: 68–9); Johnston (2000: 82); Stanley (1997: 140).

⁴ McKinley (1976) provides the classic account of what I call expeditionary trophy-hunting, though he does not employ this term.

⁵ Similarly, in some 'headhunting' societies of Borneo: 'Just how heads were obtained was of secondary importance. I was told that Kayan and Kenyah folk even broke into Berawan mausoleums to steal skulls' (Metcalf 1996: 273).

⁶ See Lindstrom & White (1990: 142) for a photograph, taken on Guadalcanal in November 1943, of an enterprising corporal's makeshift market stall or souvenir shop displaying for sale skulls, helmets, canteens, and other mementoes of the Japanese. Local Melanesian communities with their own indigenous practices of headhunting often had long-standing experience of supplying trophy heads and skulls as ethnographic curios to Westerners, and sometimes traded these as 'native souvenirs' to Allied servicemen (see Lindstrom & White 1990: 143). One such skull, over-modelled with clay as a 'traditional' headhunting trophy and acquired in the Solomons by an American serviceman, was that of a Japanese soldier (G. White pers. comm., 21 September 2005). Such cases suggest there may have been some complex synergies between indigenous and Allied practices of trophy-taking in the Pacific theatre.

⁷ In her memoirs of her time on bases in the United States as a member of the Women's Army Corps during 1944–5, Henderson recalls some friends playing a joke on her in which a 'Jap skull from Guadalcanal' was made to rise up before her in a darkroom (2001: 109). Some servicemen may have learned the practice of taking Japanese trophy skulls during their training in the United States, particularly if such skulls were in evidence on military bases.

⁸ General Hideki Tojo was the Japanese Prime Minister. For other discussions of this image, see Dower (1986: 65, 249); Fussell (1988); Lucaites & McDaniel (2004); Weingartner (1992: 57–8).

⁹ 'Jap's skull' was until recently mistranscribed as 'Jap's girl' (O'Neal 2002). A gift of a skull to a child is puzzling, but a clue is provided by the two skulls, found in Tennessee, discussed by Bass (1983). With both, the foramen magnum had been enlarged, and one was known to have been used as a lantern at Halloween,

the enlargement being made to accommodate a lightbulb. Japanese wartime press reports of American children playing with the skulls of Japanese soldiers brought home by their fathers (Weingartner 1992: 61) may also have referred to the use of skulls as Halloween decorations. The Vietnamese trophy skull analysed by Willey and Leach (2003) had been used as a Halloween lantern by the family of the serviceman who collected it.

¹⁰ Johnston mentions an Australian soldier taking a gold tooth from a German soldier's body in the North Africa campaign, and states that similar behaviour occurred sometimes in the First World War (2000: 82, 166). But such behaviour seems to have been comparatively rare in the European theatre of the Second World War.

¹¹ Soon after the publication of the *Life Magazine* photograph, and the news of Roosevelt's receipt of the letter-opener, both were widely publicized in Japan (Hoyt 1986: 357-9) to portray Americans as deranged, primitive, racist, and inhuman. The Japanese press also reported, in August 1944, the Japanese government requesting Spain to investigate American desecrations of Japanese dead (Weingartner 1992: 63). Weingartner points out the strong element of hypocrisy in these reactions, given the Japanese army's own atrocities (1992: 62). Hoyt (1986: 391) argues that what he calls the 'unthinking' practice of taking home bones as souvenirs was exploited so effectively by Japanese government propaganda that it contributed to a preference for death over surrender and occupation, shown, for example, in the mass civilian suicides on Saipan and Okinawa after the Allied landings.

¹² For a trophy photograph of a Japanese skull displayed on a pole at Guadalcanal, see Fussell (1988: 47).

REFERENCES

- ALDRICH, R.J. 2005. *The faraway war: personal diaries of the Second World War in Asia and the Pacific*. London: Doubleday.
- ALLEN, D. 2004. Skull from WWII casualty to be buried in grave for Japanese unknown soldiers. *Stars and Stripes* (Pacific Edition), 13 May (available on-line: <http://www.stripes.com/article.asp?section=104&article=21322&archive=true>).
- Anonymous 1944. American Field Service Letters (available on-line: <http://www.ku.edu/carrie/specoll/AFS/library/4-ww2/AFSletters/31.html>).
- ANTONACCI, S. 2000a. Skull found at lake from World War II passed down in family until discarded by teen. *The (Springfield, IL) State Journal-Register*, 16 Feb., 1.
- 2000b. Officials trying to return WWII skull. *The (Springfield, IL) State Journal-Register*, 10 June, 7.
- 2000c. WWII-era skull to be buried in Hiroshima. *The (Springfield, IL) State Journal-Register*, 24 June, 1.
- 2003. Japanese skull unburied three years after discovery. *The (Springfield, IL) State Journal-Register*, 27 May, 1.
- BAER, M. & O. SCHRÖTER 2001. *Eine Kopffjagd: Deutsche in Ostafrika*. Berlin: Ch. Links Verlag.
- BASS, W.M. 1983. The occurrence of Japanese trophy skulls in the United States. *Journal of Forensic Sciences* **28**, 800-3.
- BLOW, S. 1993a. War atrocity proves tough to put to rest. *The Dallas Morning News*, 14 Mar., 35A.
- 1993b. Can't this episode just be buried? *The Dallas Morning News*, 4 Apr., 37A.
- CARTMILL, M. 1993. *A view to a death in the morning: hunting and nature through history*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- CLARKE, P. & M. MCKINNEY 2004. *The equal heart and mind: letters between Judith Wright and Jack McKinney*. St Lucia: University of Queensland Press.
- DAVISON, J. & V.H. SUTLIVE, Jr 1991. The children of Nising: images of headhunting and male sexuality in Iban ritual and oral literature. In *Female and male in Borneo: contributions and challenges to gender studies* (ed.) V. Sutlive, 153-230. Williamsburg: Borneo Research Council.
- DAWS, G. 1994. *Prisoners of the Japanese: POWs of World War II in the Pacific*. New York: Morrow.
- Diodorus of Sicily 1939. *Diodorus of Sicily*, with an English trans. by C.H. Oldfather, Vol. 3. London: William Heinemann.
- DOWER, J.W. 1986. *War without mercy: race and power in the Pacific War*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- FAHEY, J.J. 1963. *Pacific War diary, 1942-1945*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- FAUSTO, C. 1999. Of enemies and pets: warfare and shamanism in Amazonia. *American Ethnologist* **26**, 933-56.
- FINE, L.M. 2000. Rights of men, rites of passage: hunting and masculinity at Reo Motors of Lansing, Michigan, 1945-1975. *Journal of Social History* **33**, 805-82.

- FRANCILLON, R.J. 1979. *Japanese aircraft of the Pacific War*. New York: Putnam.
- FUSSELL, P. 1988. *Thank God for the atom bomb*. New York: Summitt.
- 1989. *Wartime: understanding and behavior in the Second World War*. Oxford: University Press.
- GEDDES, W.R. 1954. *The Land Dayaks of Sarawak*. London: HMSO.
- GILL-KING, H. 1992. A Japanese 'trophy skull' from the Battle of Saipan. In *Program and abstracts of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences annual meeting, February 1992, New Orleans*. Colorado Springs, CO: American Academy of Forensic Sciences, 162.
- GOLDSTEIN, L. 2002. 'The imagination problem': Winfield Townley Scott and the American Wars. *War, Literature and the Arts* 14, 59-77.
- GRABURN, N.H. 1989. Tourism: the sacred journey. In *Hosts and guests: the anthropology of tourism* (ed.) V.L. Smith, 21-36. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- 2000. Foreword. In *Souvenirs: the material culture of tourism* (eds) M. Hitchcock & K. Teague, i-xvii. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- HARNER, M.J. 1972. *Jivaro: people of the sacred waterfalls*. London: Robert Hale.
- HARRISON, S. 1989. The symbolic construction of aggression and war in a Sepik River society. *Man* (n.s.). 24, 583-99.
- 1993. *The mask of war: violence, ritual and the self in Melanesia*. Manchester: University Press.
- 2005. *Fracturing resemblances: identity and mimetic conflict*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- HENDERSON, A.K. 2001. *Stateside soldier: life in the Women's Army Corps, 1944-45*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- HERMAN, D.J. 2001. *Hunting and the American imagination*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- HITCHCOCK, M. 2000. Introduction. In *Souvenirs: the material culture of tourism* (eds) M. Hitchcock & K. Teague, 1-17. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- HOSKINS, J. 1996. Introduction: headhunting as practice and as trope. In *Headhunting and the social imagination in Southeast Asia* (ed.) J. Hoskins, 1-49. Stanford: University Press.
- HOYT, E.P. 1986. *Japan's war: the great Pacific conflict*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- HYNES, S. 1998. *The soldiers' tale: bearing witness to modern war*. London: Pimlico.
- JOHNSTON, M. 2000. *Fighting the enemy: Australian soldiers and their adversaries in World War II*. Cambridge: University Press.
- JONES, J. 1963. *The thin red line*. London: Collins.
- KAHN, S.M. 1993. *Between tedium and terror: a soldier's World War II diary*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- KING, E.L. 1945. The Edward Lacy King Collection (available on-line: <http://www.war-experience.org/collections/sea/alliedusa/king/pagetwo.htm>).
- LARSON, T.J. 2003. *Hell's kitchen Tulagi 1942-1943*. New York: iUniverse.
- LINCE, G. 1997. *Too young the heroes: a World War II marine's account of facing a veteran enemy at Guadalcanal, the Solomons and Okinawa*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland.
- LINDBERGH, C.A. 1970. *The wartime journals of Charles A. Lindbergh*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- LINDSTROM, L. & G. WHITE. 1990. *Island encounters: black and white memories of the Pacific War*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- LUCAITES, J.L. & J.P. MCDANIEL 2004. Telescopic mourning/warring in the global village: decomposing (Japanese) authority figures. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 1, 1-28.
- MACKENZIE, J.M. 1988. *The empire of nature: hunting, conservation and British imperialism*. Manchester: University Press.
- McKINLEY, R. 1976. Human and proud of it! A structural treatment of headhunting rites and the social definition of enemies. In *Studies in Borneo societies: social process and anthropological explanation* (ed.) G.N. Appel, 92-126. (Special Report 12). De Kalb: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Northern Illinois University.
- MALONE, P. 2003a. Macabre mystery: coroner tries to find origin of skull found during raid by deputies. *Pueblo Chieftain*, 25 Aug., A5.
- 2003b. Pueblo soldier a product of his times. *Pueblo Chieftain*, 2 Nov., B1.
- 2003c. Skull likely is WWII trophy. *Pueblo Chieftain*, 3 Nov., B1.
- 2004a. Skull found in Pueblo to be returned to Japan. *Pueblo Chieftain*, 5 Feb., B3.
- 2004b. Unknown soldier's remains home at last. *Pueblo Chieftain*, 17 May, A10.
- MAPLES, W.R. & M. BROWNING. 1995. *Dead men do tell tales: the strange and fascinating cases of a forensic anthropologist*. London: Random House.

- MARKS, S.A. 1991. *Southern hunting in black and white: nature, history, and ritual in a Carolina community*. Princeton: University Press.
- MARS, G. & V. MARS. 2000. 'Souvenir-gifts' as tokens of filial esteem: the meanings of Blackpool souvenirs. In *Souvenirs: the material culture of tourism* (eds) M. Hitchcock & K. Teague, 91-111. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- METCALF, P. 1996. Images of headhunting. In *Headhunting and the social imagination in Southeast Asia* (ed.) J. Hoskins, 249-92. Stanford: University Press.
- MORRIS, A.G. 1996. Trophy skulls, museums and the San. In *Miscast: negotiating the presence of the Bushmen* (ed.) P. Skotnes, 67-79. Cape Town: University Press.
- MURPHY, R.F. 1957. Intergroup hostility and social cohesion. *American Anthropologist* **59**, 1018-35.
- OLIVA, M. 2002. Forensic efforts fail to shed light on mystery of skull. *Stars and Stripes (Pacific Edition)*, 31 July (available on-line: <http://www.stripes.com/article.asp?section=104&article=9239&archive=true>).
- 2003. WWII 'souvenir' turned over to Okinawa officials. *Stars and Stripes (Pacific Edition)*, 17 June (available on-line: <http://www.stripes.com/article.asp?section=104&article=15460&archive=true>).
- O'NEAL, J. 2002. Bluesoterica Research Forum (available on-line: <http://bluesoterica.com/jimoneal/p3.html>).
- PANNELL, S. 1992. Travelling to other worlds: narratives of headhunting, appropriation and the Other in the 'Eastern Archipelago'. *Oceania* **62**: 3, 162-78.
- RITVO, H. 1987. *The animal estate: the English and other creatures in the Victorian age*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- ROSS, B.D. 1986. *Iwo Jima: legacy of valor*. New York: Vintage Books.
- SAUNDERS, N.J. 2003. *Trench art: materialities and memories of war*. Oxford: Berg.
- SCHEPER-HUGHES, N. & L. WACQUANT. 2002. *Commodifying bodies*. London: Sage.
- SCOTT, W.T. 1962. *Collected poems, 1937-1962*. New York: Macmillan.
- SHILLONY, B-A. 1981. *Politics and culture in wartime Japan*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- SLEDGE, E.B. 1981. *With the old breed: at Peleliu and Okinawa*. New York: Presidio Press.
- SLEDZIK, P.S. & S. OUSLEY. 1991. Analysis of 6 Vietnamese trophy skulls. *Journal of Forensic Sciences* **36**, 520-30.
- SLOTKIN, R. 1973. *Regeneration through violence: the mythology of the American frontier, 1600-1860*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- SPECTOR, R.H. 1984. *Eagle against the sun: the American war with Japan*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- STANLEY, P. 1997. *Tarakan: an Australian tragedy*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- TAYLOR, J.V., L. ROH & A.D. GOLDMAN 1984. Metropolitan Forensic Anthropology Team (MFAT) Case Studies in Identification 2: Identification of a Vietnamese trophy skull. *Journal of Forensic Sciences* **29**, 1253-9.
- TREGASKIS, R. 2000 [1943]. *Guadalcanal diary*. New York: Random House.
- VALENTIN, S. & E. MILLER 2004. Analysis of four contemporary trophy skulls in Los Angeles County, California. Presentation, American Association of Physical Anthropologists 73rd Annual Meeting, Tampa, Florida, 14-17 April.
- VAN BAAL, J. 1966. *Dema: description and analysis of Marind-Anim culture (South New Guinea)*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- WECKER, D. 1993a. What would you do with a skull? *The Cincinnati Post*, 13 Apr., 1B.
- 1993b. Skull goes home 50 years later. *The Cincinnati Post*, 22 Apr., 1C.
- WEINGARTNER, J.J. 1992. Trophies of war: U.S. troops and the mutilation of Japanese war dead, 1941-1945. *Pacific Historical Review* **61**, 53-67.
- 1996. War against subhumans: comparisons between the German War against the Soviet Union and the American War against Japan, 1941-1945. *The Historian* **58**, 555-73.
- WEINSTEIN, S. 2000. Tanka: lost thoughts of war return (available on-line: <http://haiku.cc.ehime-u.ac.jp/~shiki/shiki-tanka.archive/html/0012/0004.html>).
- WILLEY, P. & P. LEACH 2003. The skull on the lawn: trophies, taphonomy, and forensic anthropology. In *Hard evidence: case studies in forensic anthropology* (ed.) D.W. Steadman, 176-88. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- WINSLOW, D. 1998. Misplaced loyalties: the role of military culture in the breakdown of discipline in peace operations. *Canadian Review of Anthropology and Sociology* **35**, 345-67.
- YOUNG, A. 1995. *The harmony of illusions: inventing post-traumatic stress disorder*. Princeton: University Press.

Les trophées de la guerre du Pacifique : des crânes comme souvenirs transgressifs

Résumé

L'auteur étudie l'emploi des dépouilles d'ennemis comme trophées de guerre, et notamment la collecte de crânes de Japonais par les militaires alliés pendant la deuxième Guerre Mondiale et le devenir de ces trophées après la guerre. Il affirme que cette prise de trophées humains se produit souvent dans les sociétés, y compris modernes, dans lesquelles deux conditions sont réunies : d'une part, la chasse est une composante importante de l'identité masculine, et d'autre part, le statut humain est dénié à l'ennemi.

Simon Harrison is Reader in Social Anthropology at the University of Ulster, and has carried out ethnographic fieldwork among the people of Avatip in Papua New Guinea. He has published on cultural identity, and on Melanesian warfare, ethnopsychology, and indigenous forms of intellectual property.

School of Psychology, University of Ulster, Coleraine BT52 1SA, UK. sj.harrison@ulster.ac.uk