

RITUALS OF SILENCE

The Shaping of Memorial Services in Wartime and Postwar Japan

AWAZU Kenta 粟津賢太

Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture

Paying “silent” tribute to the war dead is a modern invention with many forms. Historically its roots reach from Teddy Roosevelt’s funeral to the aftermath of the Great War in England. The word “mokutō” 黙禱 is itself Chinese in origin, but its usage in modern Japan spread after memorial services for victims of the Great Kanto Earthquake of 1923. Japanese today use the ritual of silent prayer for everything from major accidents to natural disasters to the funerals of pop stars. This paper investigates how memorial services to the war dead were formed and transformed during the war and the years immediately following, when debates linked to separation of religion and state, and then demonstrates their shape in contemporary Japan.

ON 23 JUNE of each year, in the Peace Memorial Park near Mabuni Hill (摩文仁の丘) in Okinawa, a memorial service is conducted by Okinawa Prefecture and attended by local and national politicians, including the prime minister and speakers of both of the Lower House and the Upper House of Parliament, the governor of the prefecture, and bereaved families. Participants gather in front of the National Peace Mausoleum for the War Dead, where they are surrounded by the Cornerstones of Peace (平和の礎, Heiwa no Ishiji) on which have been inscribed the names of more than 200,000 of the fallen. At noon, a minute of silence is observed in remembrance.

This type of national ritual is common in Japan, with silent prayers held on 6 August in Hiroshima, 9 August in Nagasaki, and 15 August in Tokyo and elsewhere around the country. The prayers are intended not only for the war dead but for victims of major accidents and natural disasters as well.

On 11 March 2012, the First Anniversary of the Tōhoku Earthquake was commemorated under the sponsorship of the Japanese government at the National Theater in Tokyo. In addition to the emperor and empress, the prime minister and representatives of bereaved families from the Tōhoku region gathered for the occasion, 1,200 people in all. The event began with a singing of

the national anthem, after which, at 2:49 p.m., participants stood up, uncovered their heads, and bowed to the wooden pole on which was written “To the souls of all the victims of the Tōhoku Earthquake” (東日本大震災犠牲者之霊). This was followed by a minute of silence. At that same hour, people across the islands observed a minute of silence. The annual high school baseball tournament at Kōshien stadium in Osaka was interrupted for the observance. At the bustling western gate of Shinjuku, in front of the Shinjuku Alta Building, people stopped to remember, in silence, what had happened.

Although the ritual of silent prayer is of very recent history, it has become so natural and so commonplace across the country to express grief, regret, or condolence that people believe it originated centuries ago. Japan is not alone in this regard. Examples can be found around the world. To mention only a few: Remembrance Sunday in England, *Yom HaShoah* (Holocaust Remembrance Day) in Israel, frequent moments of silence observed in schools in the United States, and the ritual of 默哀 held in China on 19 May 2008 at 14:28.

Except for the religious practices of the Quakers, rites of silence became popular in Great Britain in the aftermath of the Great War. On 5 November 1919, the War Cabinet discussed the commemoration of the first anniversary of Armistice Day. The proposal was contained in a memorandum submitted by Sir Percy Fitzpatrick, high commissioner in the South Africa during the war:

During the War, we in South Africa observed what we called the “Three minutes’ pause.” At noon each day, all work, all talk and all movement were suspended for three minutes that we might concentrate as one in thinking of those—the living and the dead—who had pledged and given themselves for all that we believe in...¹

The proposal was approved and “enthusiastically” supported by the prime minister, after which it became the model for the two minutes of silence observed on Remembrance Day. The War Cabinet decided that “a pause of three minutes would be too long and that a pause of one minute, as adopted in the United States of America on the occasion of President Roosevelt’s funeral, would be ‘more impressive.’”²

At the personal request of King George V, an announcement was made in the newspapers:

No elaborate organization appears to be required. At a given signal, which can be easily arranged to suit the circumstances of each locality, I believe that we shall all gladly interrupt our business and pleasure,

1. Adrian Gregory, *The Silence of Memory: Armistice Day 1919-1946* (Oxford: Berg, 1994), 9.

2. *Ibid.* 10.

whatever it may be and unite in this simple service of Silence and Remembrance.³

Discussions were held on setting aside a Remembrance Day for World War II, but in the end, the date and practice remained.⁴ It was felt that silence avoids expression of any particular religious faith or political affiliation. It was simple, available to all, and open to observance at both the national and local levels. After the San Francisco Peace Treaty, a Commonwealth cemetery for the war dead was established in Japan, where each year on Remembrance Sunday, as in over 2,500 gravesites across the world, two minutes of silence is observed. In so doing, the British Commonwealth, with its a wide range of nationalities, has sought to preserve local diversity in a common practice.

The Introduction of the Ritual into a Japanese Context

It would appear that the imperial family, political leaders, and the bureaucrats learned of this ritual of silent prayer directly from England during the prewar period. On 3 March 1921, Crown Prince Hirohito (posthumously referred to as Emperor Shōwa, 1901–1989) departed the port of Yokohama with an entourage to pay a courtesy call on to the British Royal family. They travelled by way of Hong Kong, Singapore, Ceylon, and Egypt before finally arriving in England on the 9 May. Three days later Prince Hirohito visited the Cenotaph at Whitehall and stopped at Westminster Abbey to place a wreath at the monument to the Unknown Soldier. We may suppose that when the Cenotaph was explained to him, the Prince was also informed of the practice of observing two minutes of silence on the Armistice Day and the meaning behind it.⁵ The custom of silent prayer was later to be taken over by the Imperial family in Japan.

On Saturday, 1 September 1923, at 11:58:44 a.m., the Great Kanto Earthquake (関東大震災) struck the Kanto plain on the Japanese main island. It was the most powerful earthquake ever recorded in Japan, with a magnitude of 7.9. (The Tōhoku Earthquake of 2011 would later surpass that record with a magnitude

3. *Ibid.* 11

4. *Ibid.* 218. “The Home Office began to consider viable alternatives. A memorandum drawn up indicates the remarkable breadth of the possibilities considered. Dates included, 8 May (VE Day), 6 June (D Day), 15 June (signing of the Magna Carta), 4 July (us independence! Perhaps a unique example of a government seriously contemplating celebration of a national defeat), 14 August (signing of the Atlantic Charter), 15 August (VJ Day), 2 September (capitulation of Japan), 3 September (outbreak of War, 1939), 15 September (Battle of Britain Day), 2 November (All Souls Day), and 11 November. Serious objections were raised to every single date. The Japanese war was considered insufficiently emotive to the British, the European war dates were considered offensive to Australian national sentiment in what was intended as a Commonwealth wide commemoration, the trans-Atlantic and historical dates were too abstract and All Souls was too religious. November 11 was drifting back on to the agenda by default.”

5. 外務省記録「皇太子裕仁親王殿下御渡欧一件」。

of 9.0.) The earthquake devastated Tokyo, the port city of Yokohama, and the surrounding prefectures of Chiba, Kanagawa, and Shizuoka, in addition to causing widespread damage throughout the Kanto region. Casualties were estimated at around 142,800, including some 40,000 missing and presumed dead. Nothing in prewar Japan compared with it, and in 1960 the government declared the anniversary of the quake, 1 September, “Disaster Prevention (Drill) Day.”

The first anniversary of the Great Kantō earthquake was commemorated in 1924. During the previous summer, the Tokyo Metropolitan Government, the Tokyo Chamber Of Commerce and Industry, and the Tokyo Business Association set up a preparatory committee that met several times to plan the event. Announcements went out to the media that at 11:58 on the first day of September, at the very time the earthquake struck, temples and shrines were requested to ring the bells and beat their drums, ships to blow their horns, and public transportation halted so that the entire city might offer up a moment of silent prayer for the souls of the victims.

On the occasion the emperor, empress, and others of the Imperial family placed wreaths for victims, and the emperor visited Tōgu-gosho, the palace of the crown prince in Akasaka (currently Geihinkan, a guesthouse), where he requested a two-minute silence for those who had lost their lives in the disaster.

Normally, official funerals were accompanied with certain religious rites—generally Buddhist for a private ceremony, if that was the wish of the family of the departed, and Shinto for a more public ceremony. This “non-religious” style of tribute was something quite new in prewar Japan.

Contrary to the wide distribution of totalitarian images, the prewar government of Japan shunned the use of religious rites for a national event so as to avoid the impression of showing administrative favors to any particular religion. Inadequate as it was, religious freedom had been assured in the Constitution of the Empire of Japan (大日本国憲法, 1889). Indeed, already on 24 January 1882, Ordinance No. 1 of a notice issued by the Ministry of the Interior (明治15年1月24日内務省丁1号達 *chō 1 gō*) had regulated the separation of church and state,⁶ which also upheld the distinction between the Jinja (Shinto shrines) and religion, prohibiting Shinto priests (of shrines belonging to organizations at the prefectural or national level) from engaging in funeral rites. In terms of war memorials, a notice in 1906 made the ministry’s policy clear regarding monuments: they should not be religious in nature, and there should be only one monument in each city, town, or village.

6. They guaranteed freedom of religion “within limits not prejudicial to peace and order and not antagonistic to their duties as subjects.” In practice, this meant that religious groups required government approval, their doctrines and rituals coming under government scrutiny.

Two styles of silent prayer were introduced in modern Japan: *yōhai* (遥拝) and *mokutō* (黙禱). The former denotes homage paid from a distance to the emperor, the imperial palace, or shrines. The word itself comes from the *Engishiki* (延喜式), a collection of ancient Japanese governmental regulations drawn up in 967 and preserved in the old aristocracy. Its use ceased early in the premodern period. The term *mokutō* is Chinese in origin. We find it in a poem of seven-character verses written in the Tang Dynasty (唐, 618–690, 705–907) by Han Yu (韓愈, 768–824). The ninth line reads: 潜心黙禱若有応 (“Even praying deeply to deities in silence, one’s prayer is heard”).⁷ There is no indication of any particular religion (though it is probably Buddhist) and there are no examples of such silent prayers being used in Japan prior to the modern era. On the contrary, *yōhai* and *mokutō* were incorporated as “invented tradition” in the modern context and subsequently became an indispensable part of national commemorations.

Types of silent prayers gradually spread with the support of the army and state-run schools. The observance of *mokutō* not for disaster victims but for those fallen in war began at the behest of the army. On 3 March 1938, on the occasion of the thirty-third anniversary of Armed Forces Day, the Army Ministry announced in the newspapers that, at noon of that day, the public was to observe silence in remembrance of the war dead. Saitō Yoshihisa has gone through the archives of the *Asahi Shinbun* and points out that from 1926 (Shōwa 1) to 1945 (Shōwa 20), 222 newspaper articles contain the word *mokutō* and 444 *yōhai*.⁸

During the war years, most notably after the Manchurian Incident, civilians began to disappear from the decision-making process. On 27 February 1939, the army issued an official notice declaring that “monuments to the war dead should not be merely memorials; they are to be objects of worship.” And on 7 July the Greater Japan Foundation for Commemorating Loyal Souls (大日本忠霊顕彰会) was established. The purpose of the foundation was to raise money to construct monuments, both at home and abroad in neighboring Asian countries.⁹

Within this context, other debates focused on state funerals. One of them was centered on nationalistic right-wing groups, the so-called *uyoku dantai* (右翼団体). Among them, the Daitō Juku (大東塾) began a campaign in the 1940s to promote what they called the Movement to Promote Shintō Funerals for

7. 深澤一幸『鑑賞 中国の古典 唐詩三百首』角川書店、1989年。

8. 斎藤吉久「黙禱 死者に捧げる無宗教儀礼の一考察:戦前も戦後も宗教を理解できない日本の知識人たち」『正論』平成18年2月号。This paper is also available on the internet. See, <http://www.sankei.co.jp/seiron/koukoku/2006/0602/ronbun1-1.html> (accessed 21 October 2012).

9. Kenta Awazu “War Memorials in the modern Japanese context: The transformation of nationalistic representation,” in Klaus Antoni, Hioshi Kubota, Johann Nawrocki and Michael Wachutka, eds., *Religion and National Identity in the Japanese Context* (Lit Verlag: Munster, 2002), 37–49.

Loyal Souls (忠霊公葬運動).¹⁰ Another debate had to do with the Imperial Aid Association (大政翼賛会), a para-fascist organization championing the aims of a movement for a New Order (新体制). These movements repudiated western culture and sought to eliminate it from all state ceremonies and culture. Jingi-in (神祇院 1940–1946), the Institute of Divinities established as a branch of the Ministry of Interior, criticized silent prayer, *mokutō*, for its western influence. In the end, however, the Imperial Aid Association, the Ministry of Education, and the Institute of Divinities all concluded that *mokutō* is deeply rooted in the life of the people and has become a custom suitable for expressing patriotic sentiments.

The Debate During the Postwar Period

Throughout World War II, the government used State Shinto to stimulate patriotism and support the efforts at militarization. With the surrender of Japan, State Shinto officially came to an end. The Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers issued a Shinto Directive ordering the removal of the government from religious affairs during the time of the occupation. In 1947, Japan incorporated a principle of the separation of church and state into its constitution.

On 1 January 1946, Emperor Shōwa issued a statement, sometimes referred to as the *Ningen-sengen* (人間宣言),¹¹ in which he quoted the Five-Charter Oath of Emperor Meiji and announced that he was not an *akitsumikami* (incarnation of a god). The emperor was not put on trial, but he was forced to reject *explicitly* the State Shinto claim that the Emperor of Japan was an *arahitogami*, an incarnate divinity. The claim was grounded in the Japanese constitution of 1889 which stated that the emperor had a divine power over his country, as expressed in the Shinto belief that the Japanese Imperial family were the offspring of the sun goddess Amaterasu.

After its defeat in World War II, Japan was occupied by the Allied Powers under the direction of the United States and with the collaboration of the British Commonwealth. Their foreign presence marked the first time in its history that the island nation had been occupied by a foreign power. The result was the transformation of Japan into a democracy modeled somewhat after the New Deal of the United States.

10. 粟津賢太「戦没者慰霊と集合的記憶—忠魂・忠霊をめぐる言説と忠霊公葬問題を中心に」『日本史研究』501 (2004): 176–206.

11. “Imperial Rescript,” 1 January 1946. “They are not predicated on the false conception that the emperor is divine, and that the Japanese people are superior to other races and fated to rule the world” (天皇ヲ以テ現御神トシ、且日本国民ヲ以テ他ノ民族ニ優越セル民族ニシテ、延テ世界ヲ支配スベキ運命ヲ有ストノ架空ナル觀念ニ基クモノニモ非ズ。)

The San Francisco Peace Treaty, signed on 8 September 1951, marked the end of the Allied occupation, and when it went into effect on 28 April of the following year, Japan was once again an independent state (with the exceptions of Okinawa, which remained under the control of the United States until 1972, and Iwo Jima, which remained under US control until 1968). The San Francisco Peace Treaty is also important because, following it, bereaved families again began to build or restore war memorials in their towns or villages.

On 2 May 1952, at Shinjuku Imperial Garden, with the emperor and empress, the prime minister, and representatives of bereaved families in attendance, the first national memorial service for the war dead was held. Now that Japan had regained its independence, this kind of ceremony once again became possible, but when it was approved by the cabinet decision of 8 April, five provisions were stipulated, among them (quoted here 2 of them):

3. This ceremony will not to be accompanied by any religious rites.
(3本式典は、宗教的儀式を伴わないものとする。)
4. At a certain point during the ceremony, the whole nation will be encouraged to participate in silent prayer.
(4本式典中の一定の時刻において、全国民が一斉に黙祷するよう勧奨する。)

From 1963 onwards, the cabinet decreed that the ceremony be held every year, and in 1983 the date was set at 15 August and it was officially referred to as the Anniversary of the End of the Pacific War (終戦記念日), or more formally, Day of Prayers for Peace in Commemoration of the War Dead (戦没者を追悼し平和を祈念する日).

Just three months before the signing of the San Francisco Treaty on 12 June 1951, the cabinet issued a directive ordering that public expressions of condolence be made on 22 June, the day on which the death of the Empress Dowager is commemorated:

It is our desire that your offices and the schools under your jurisdiction will express condolence in a way similar to that in which the central Government offices will express condolence.

You are asked to direct your attention to the following points:

1. The emperor will pay tribute at 10:20 a.m. on 22 June.
2. It is our wish that on the occasion of the commemoration, primary schools and junior high schools see to it that teachers, students, and pupils gather to pay silent tribute, and that the student body be addressed. Schools are not to include religious rites in the services. They are to see that teachers do not take the students and pupils to shrines or temples....

On 23 June 1951, the *Nippon Times* carried a letter in the “Readers’ Council” written by a female missionary in Gifu prefecture and bearing the title “Freedom of Religion.” *Nippon Times* was the most famous English-language newspaper in Japan, and General Douglas MacArthur is said to have been in the habit of reading it every morning. Aside from his morning habit, the paper, which had been published continuously since 1897 and was an arena for debate in the years immediately following the war, had been obliged to change its name during the war years from its original title, *The Japan Times*, to which it later reverted.

To the Editor:

A deplorable return to prewar state religion took place today in a school of Japan. At 10:15 the students were ordered to “offer silent prayer” to the spirit of the Empress Dowager.

True Christian children, who refused to disobey the true and living God by bowing their heads and praying to the spirit of the deceased, again became a spectacle before the other school children.

In view of the fact that the Mino Mission suffered much persecution in prewar days because our Christians refused to participate in shrine worship, then compulsory for all schools, we are much concerned about this situation. We trust the Ministry of Education will take steps at once to “nip in the bud” any compulsory religious services in the schools.

Elizabeth A. Whewell
Superintendent of The Mino Mission

ps: One of our Christian girls has just returned from Tomida High School and reports that before worshiping in “silent prayer” as above mentioned, the entire school (standing in the school yard) faced toward Tokyo and at a given command, bowed deeply. Upon hearing this, I said, “kyujo Yohai,” and the girl replied, “Yes, just the same as before the war.” This girl and three other Christians stayed in their classrooms during the period of worship. Even if these children do not receive persecution from now on, they will no doubt be considered “hikokumin” by the rest of the school children. I am sorry indeed that this has happened in postwar Japan.

E. A. W.

On 1 July, four other letters appeared under the same title, one of them in support and the other three critical. The former article was submitted by the Japan Bible Christian Council of Tokyo and read in part:

Thus, regardless of the intention of the Ministry’s statement to the schools, it resulted in schools calling upon students to perform acts

which Christians definitely feel are of a religious character and a violation of the Second Commandment, and thereby infringing upon the principles of separation of Church and State, and freedom of religion, which are inherent principles of a true democracy...

Although the Minister of Education declared that it was not his intention to call upon anyone to perform a religious rite, the above deplorable situation has arisen because the word used in the statement released by the Ministry called upon the students not just to pay silent tribute, but to pay tribute by the religious act of offering silent prayer (*mokutō*).

The Japan Bible Christian Council (日本聖書主義キリスト者協議会, 1951–1967) was an evangelical protestant association active in postwar Japan. From their religious perspective, the observance of *mokutō* in the schoolyard constituted a religious practice and stood in violation of the principle of the separation of church and state.

Among the critical letters is one submitted by a Japanese reader in Nagoya who accused the initial letter of a “narrow-minded view.” The text is reproduced here in its original form:

Indeed, it was a deplorable thing to see the biased and obstinate opinion written by Miss Elizabeth A. Whewell on June 26. My admiration towards Christian missionaries in Japan has chiefly been for their broadminded and understanding attitude towards things Japanese, which was minimized a great deal by this article.

To offer silent prayer, even to a given command, towards the spirit of the Empress Dowager is, indeed, a desirable and beautiful virtue of old Japan. I prayed myself, “Goodbye my beloved Empress Dowager, my God bless your spirit!”

Interestingly, despite the short history of *mokutō*, the observance of silent prayer is held up as “a desirable and beautiful virtue of old Japan.” The second critical letter was submitted by a member of the Anglican church and carried the title “Christianity and Good Manners.”

Every year in England a remembrance is made of those who died in the wars, many of them not Christian. Silence is kept and heads are bowed. Members of the various sects do not as a general rule pray for the dead, but all Catholics, Romans, Orthodox, and Anglicans pray for the souls of the faithful departed, for few if any are perfect at death and fit for eternal bliss....

In the event of a non-Christian friend dying, there is no reason why we should not attend the funeral. Buddhist worship will not be expected of us, but neither will bad manners. We can sit quietly or kneel reverently and pray according to our faith. It would be well to remember in this connection that neither Buddhists nor Shintoists pray to the spirits of the dead...

It does not matter how we offer "silent prayer" to God, Buddha, or Allah to honor her memory. So we may say "to offer silent prayer for the late Empress Dowager," instead of "to offer silent prayer to the late Empress Dowager."

Several other contributions to the debate (July 1, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 12; September 14 and 24; and October 12) were included with headings such as "Hopes for Tolerance," "What's Wrong?," "One American's View," "One Japanese View," "Favors Tolerance," "Reason for Hate," and so on. These entries were mostly critical of the original letter.

On 24 September, an editor's note was published to close the debate:

The time has come to close these columns to further letters on "Silent Prayer"... In *mokutō* no ritualistic form of prayers are offered. It is Japan's encounter of the minute of silence that is observed in Western countries for the Unknown Soldier, or on such special occasions as the opening of a peace conference.

Thus, we can see no threat to the freedom of Christians in this country in the *mokutō*. But if Miss Whewell or anyone else can present us with a case now or in the future where some child has been penalized in any manner for refusal to participate in *mokutō* or a religious ceremony of any kind, we will fight with every weapon we have to defend his right....

On 12 October a lengthy letter signed by officers of the Japan Bible Christian Council and 296 evangelical missionaries in Japan appeared, objecting to the editor's concluding note on 24 September.

William Parsons Woodard (1896–1973), a scholar of Japanese religion, served as an advisor on religion and cultural resources to the Civil Information and Educational Section (民間情報教育局) under allied command after World War II. He returned to the United States in 1952 but was back in Japan in 1953, at which time he founded the International Institute for the Study of Religions, which he directed until his permanent return in 1966. In an essay published in the institute's journal, he summarized and commented on the *Japan Times* debate over this "Freedom of Religion." Christian Missionaries, he claimed, had misunderstood the Shinto Directive (神道指令), and remarked that on the matter of the separation

of religion and state, the term “religion” does not mean “religion in general” but the separation of religious organization and the state. He also noted apparent similarities here to the situation in the United States.¹²

Conclusion: Rituals of a Modern State

When we think of it, silent prayer is a most peculiar custom. At any given moment, people suddenly stop, keep silent in a fixed position with their eyes closed, and bow their heads in an indistinct direction. Clearly this qualifies as a modern ritual.

Even rituals of recent origin are often thought to have been around for a long while. Like the rules of football, chess, and other games, ritual is bound to what Searle calls “constitutive rule,”¹³ which defines the game and makes it possible to play. For this reason, rituals are just as unquestionable as the rules of football for those who actually play it. People don’t ask its origin; they just play it.

What is clear is that from the prewar through to the postwar years, silent prayer has stayed the same. Nevertheless, according to circumstances it has been differently evaluated. During the years before the war it was accused of religious neutrality; during the war it was accused of western influences, and after the war, for its religious overtones. Even to this day, the Japanese Communist Party regards the observance of silent prayer at national memorial services for the war dead as a religious act because the word “souls” is inscribed on memorial tablets.

Silence is well-suited to pluralistic societies and multicultural policies if for no other reason than that it glosses over diversity. As D. I. Kertzer has pointed out, “ritual can promote social solidarity without implying that people share the same values, or even the same interpretation of the ritual.”¹⁴

If we take seriously the opinions of evangelical Christians in the years immediately after the war, and if we further take into consideration Woodard’s remarks, we have to say that the modern state has maintained in some measure a religious character, albeit in a neutral and law-regulated form. This means that it has had to create rituals of its own. Modern industrialized warfare has enabled killing on a massive scale, and modern states need to figure out how

12. William P. Woodard, “Reflections on the Religious Affairs during the Occupation,” *Bulletin* (International Institute for the Study of Religions in Japan) 2 (1955): 78–95.

13. John Searle, *Speech Acts: an Essay in the Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969). See also Mary Douglas’s comment on ritual: “Social rituals create a reality which would be nothing without them. For it is very possible to know something and then find words for it. But it is impossible to have social relations without symbolic acts.” *Purity and Danger* (New York: Praeger, 1966), 62.

14. David I. Kertzer, *Ritual, Politics, and Power* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), 69. See also Carolyn Marvin and David W. Ingle, *Blood Sacrifice and the Nation: Totem Rituals and the American Flag* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

to interpret and memorialize the results. The benefit of new forms of rituals like silent prayers is that there is no attempt to control the way people imagine their country, but instead they give themselves over to the ambiguities of quietly bowing their heads.