Russia in the Construction of Japan's Identity: Implications

for International Relations

Alexander Bukh

Thesis submitted in requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in International Relations, London School of Economics and Political Science

89000 words

UMI Number: U220264

UMI®

Dissertation Publishing

ProQuest®

THESES
F
8612

Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is two folded. One is to explore the discourse on Russia and the role it has played in constructing contemporary Japan's national identity. The other is to explore the relationship between the identity discourse and Japan's foreign policy towards post-communist Russia.

In this thesis, national identity is conceptualized as a discursive narrative that engages in the construction of the national "self" vis-à-vis multiple "others." The thesis focuses on Russia as the "other" in Japan's identity discourse. Russia has always occupied a special place in Japan's identity construction, and has never been part of "Asia" or the "West", which have been the main paradigms in Japan's identity discourse.

The analysis focuses on works of leading Japanese scholars and public figures to examine the contemporary identity discourse, which has emerged in 1970s and continues to dominate the debates on Russia till the present day. The thesis also explores the construction of "Japan" and "Russia" in the writings of one of the most popular Japanese historical fiction writer, Shiba Ryotaro. It argues that the construction of hierarchical difference between Japan and Russia has served two purposes: one was to establish Japan's belonging to the universal realm of modern civilization, the second was to establish Japan's superior uniqueness not only vis-à-vis Russia, but also vis-à-vis the West.

The last chapter examines the economic, political and military dimensions of the Japanese foreign policy vis-à-vis Russia, since the collapse of the Soviet Union. This chapter examines the discourse of foreign policy along three dimensions: economic, military and the territorial dispute, arguing that identity functions differently in all three cases. Identity does not matter for the economic sphere, where the search for profits overrides concerns related to territory and history. Identity is, however, visible in the security discourse as seen in the lack of long-term trust of Russia's intentions among the members of the security community. In the context of the territorial dispute, identity shapes and, at the same time, is shaped by the policy related to this dispute.

The thesis argues that, the policies Japan has implemented to enhance the return of the disputed islands are located within the same cognitive framework that has created Japan's cultural and civilizational superiority vis-à-vis Russia. It argues that it is not the security discourse but the conception of the territorial dispute and related polices which engage in creation of boundaries and hierarchical difference between the "self" and the "other."

Table of Contents

Russia in the Construction of Japan's Identity: Implications for International Relations

Introduction

This thesis is a case study in national identity construction. Its main purpose is to inquire into one of the discourses that constitute "national identity" debates in today's Japan. Most of the empirical work is devoted to examining Japan's national identity discourse which emerged in debates on Russian national character. The last part of the thesis explores the relationship between the perceptions of Japan's and Russian national character and the formulation of Japan's state interests and foreign policy vis-à-vis Russia. The conceptual framework used in this thesis draws on the recent developments in the studies of nationalism and international relations. Furthermore it approaches both national identity and the conception of State's

interests as well as desirable policies as discursive formations, which are produced and reproduced in relations with multiple "others."

This thesis aims to contribute to the understanding of the multi-layered and complex construction of contemporary Japan's national identity by examining the structure of Japan's discourse on Russia. So far, the English language and Japanese scholarship on Japan's relations with Russia has treated the negative perceptions as a historical given, either tracing them to Japan's "traditional" fear of Russia or approaching it as the direct result of the Soviet behavior in the last days of the war in the Pacific, mainly the occupation of four islands that came to be known as the "Northern Territories" and the internment and forced labor of Japanese POWs (the "Siberian internment.")

This thesis takes a different approach. It explores the construction of Japan's national superiority vis-à-vis Russia which has emerged in a particular economic and political environment of the late 1970s through early 1990s but has remained the dominant identity discourse on Japan and Russia till the present day. It argues that, while the Soviet conduct and the Cold War rivalry induced the emergence of the discourse, its main target was to rescue Japan from the negative qualities attributed to its national character and to construct her as a "normal nation" that is part of the universal realm of civilization. This was achieved through internalization of the Western discourse of difference and projection on Russia of the negative national characteristics originally attributed to Japan by the Western and domestic debates, and resulted in a construction of hierarchical difference between the superior Japan and the inferior Russia. At the same time, Russian and Japanese "otherness" has been used to create Japan's uniqueness. Both Japan and Russia are located outside of the West, with Japan occupying a superior place to the West in the realm of difference, and Russia located in the realm of inferiority.

In its last chapter, this thesis examines Japan's foreign policy discourse on Russia in the post-Cold War era. It argues that there are certain commonalities and influences between the cognitive lens of the identity discourse and foreign policy formulation, but they cannot be reduced to one discursive body or to a simple cause-effect relationship. It argues that the cost/benefit calculations and strategic interests in diversifying sources of oil have shaped economic policy vis-à-vis Russia. Hence,

it has not been formulated within a cognitive framework constructed by the identity discourse. However, it also argues that the notion of danger from Russia, while highly diluted compared to the Cold War era, still resides in the background of the security discourse. Furthermore, it argues that the conception of the territorial issue and policies aimed at facilitating the return of the four islands captured by the Soviet Union in the last days of the war in the Pacific (Northern Territories), have been shaped by the same cognitive lens that is constructed in the identity discourse.

The following section will outline the theoretical background of this thesis and the analytical tools used to examine national identity and foreign policy. The last part of this chapter will outline the implications of the end of the Cold War for Japan's foreign policy, in general, and her relations with Russia.

1. IR Theory and Japan's Identity

On the whole, post-World War II international relations theory paid little attention to domestic non-material factors such as national identity and culture. Theory became increasingly structuralist, and has drifted toward largely unvarying systemic properties to deduce what were assumed to be uniform national interests. Kenneth Waltz's seminal work *Theory of International Politics* written in 1979 became the symbol of this neo-realist tradition, which assumes states to be rational unitary actors, pursuing the accumulation of power. The focus of attention is the anarchical nature of the international system, which is perceived to be the main factor explaining states' behavior. Neoliberalism, which ascribes major importance to international institutions and emphasizes the possibility of cooperation among the states in the anarchical system, has taken most of the neorealist assumptions for granted and did having maintained the "economic mode of analysis" which views states and unified and rational actors (Katzenstein 1996, 15.)

Starting from the late 1980's, Waltz's model of international relations was refined and modified by numerous scholars trying to address the growing demise in the explanatory power of the neo-realist theory. Notwithstanding the attempts to incorporate nationalism and other "non-realist" factors into the new theoretical models, most of the variations of Waltz's model still have anarchy as the underlying

feature of the international system and focus on the military and economic power distribution among the states. States are still perceived as being rational actors and the possibility of variation or changes in interests resulting from domestic politics, different cultures and collective identities is rarely envisaged.

This said, national identity is not a new phenomenon in the broadly defined study of international relations. This concept as well as other non- "rational choice" factors have been present in the scholarship in the 1940s and 1960s, and were used by highly regarded academics such as Hedley Bull, Karl Deutsch and Ernst Haas (Clunan 2000, 91.) Also, contestations, or rather, modifications of the realist perception of foreign policy existed long before the contestations of the basic paradigms of the utilitarian framework.

Focusing on the domestic instead of the systemic, works of scholars like Kalevi Holsti (1970) and Naomi Wish (1980) have identified a set of national role conceptions as perceived by the leaders and attributed variations in foreign policy to differences in role perceptions. Margaret Hermann (1977), a political psychologist, has emphasized in her work the impact of individual perceptions, values and attitudes of the decision makers upon foreign policy formation. The analysis of cultural implications on foreign policy formation had also begun long before the end of the Cold War, but has modestly focused on studies of particular cultures (for example, Watanabe 1978), refraining from presenting a conceptual challenge to the hegemony of the rational structuralism.

Of course, it can also be argued that every basic notions of neo-realism, such as security and power rely on the notion of identity, since their meaning depends on the particular understanding of the "self", survival and rationality (Lapid and Kratochwil 1996, 105-126.) However, the identity which resides in the neo-realist framework is homogenous and shared by all the actors (states) in the international system, as the framework envisages a single universal meaning of survival, rationality and utilitarianism.

Theory, particularly problem solving theory, which aims to provide a general framework for solving puzzles in relations among the nations, cannot exist in a vacuum detached from the actual dynamics of the world as its validity depends on its utility and technical applicability (Devetak 1996, 150.) The end of the Cold War,

which meant the end of ideological confrontation between communism and capitalism, as well as the dramatic developments in the international arena (for example, the war in former Yugoslavia) that followed, resulted in a drastic revision of the theoretical framework as this events could not be explained by the established analytical approaches (Katzenstein ed 1996, 3-17.)

The failure of the mainstream IR theory to provide correct predictions (most importantly, the collapse of the Soviet Union) resulted in many scholars and policy makers sensing the need to re-engage with the national, i.e., with the domestic and the non-material sources of foreign policy. As Yosef Lapid (1996) writes, "the global eruption of separatist nationalism set in motion by the abrupt ending of the Cold War has directly and inescapably forced the IR scholarly community to rethink the theoretical status of culture and identity in world affairs." Lapid goes further and argues that the "comeback" of identity and culture is, on a larger scale, a response to the globalization process, part of which is cultural transformation of the global order and is part of a "recent burst of critical scrutiny in the IR discipline" (Lapid 1996, 4.)

1.1 Emergence of Constructivism

An important part of the revising process was to reconsider the relevance of national characteristics to states' foreign policy. The scholars' attention has been drawn by the fact that different responses to questions related to European and Asian identities have been frequently appearing in political speeches and programs (for example, the notion of "Asian values" advocated by Malaysia's Prime Minister Mahathir and Singapore's Lee Kuan Yew) and were presented as at least one of the factors that determine the preferred foreign policy.

Furthermore, the concepts of identity and culture, which were perceived as singular, self-evident and non-problematic, have also undergone a revision, and the motifs of multiplicity and social construction came to dominate the debate of identity and culture in social theory in general. The conception of identities has become "emergent and constructed, contested and polymorphic, and interactive and process-like" (Lapid and Kratochwil, 1996, 6-8.)

Identity has become a trendy term and has been used in a variety of ways in the

5

constructivist scholarship leading to a certain lack of clarity regarding the actual meaning of the concept and an "uncomfortable fuzziness" in the scholarly discussions (Anno 2000, 117.) However, what the various approaches share in common is that human behavior, including state actions, is being shaped by a "socially shared understanding of the world" (Berger 2003, 390) of which national identity is an integral part.

Another important unifying thread of the new body of constructivist scholarship has been the continuous belief in a "scientific approach to social inquiry" (Wendt 1999, 1.) Hence, regardless of the definitions of identity or usage of other non-material factors and the emphasis on the social construction of reality that relies heavily on sociological scholarship (Clunan 2000), the empirical constructivist scholarship has remained faithful to the positivist framework, aiming to explore the causality between the non-material factors such as identities, culture and norms, and states' foreign and domestic policies. In the words of Peter Katzenstein, the general task is of the constructivist scholarship is to explore how identities and norms influence the actors' definitions of interests (1996, 30.)

1.2 Japan's Identity and Constructivism

Japan has proved to be a popular case study in testing and verifying the usefulness of the constructivist frameworks in explaining state domestic. and foreign policies. Works of Peter Katzenstein and Thomas Berger, which have become the cornerstones of empirical constructivists scholarship, explore the norms and political culture of post-war Japan and attempt to establish causality between those non-material factors and Japan's foreign and domestic policies during the same period.

The next chapter engages in a critical examination of these works. The main argument of this chapter is that the positivist framework, formed around the "why question" (why Japan has not used military force in the post-WWII era) combined with the focus on general norms and political culture (which include certain perceptions reminiscent of Orientalism) have determined the outcome of the inquiry. In spite of the conceptual novelty of these works within the Japan related IR scholarship, they can be placed within a broader body of works on Japan, both within

it and outside it, that have attempted to answer the question of what are the national characteristics of Japan. While reflecting the *zeitgeist* of IR discipline, constructivist works can be located in, what John Dower has called the "third stage" of postwar Western (Anglo-Saxon) discourse on Japan which was pre-occupied with the divergence of Japan from the Western models and paying attention to "culture" (Dower 1994.) As Dower notes in the same essay, the "third stage" has been in many ways a reflection on Japan's post-war achievements and usually have offered a positive, or even admiring, evaluation of Japan's "deviation" from the Western norms.

We must agree with Dower that these works offer a more complex and nuanced depiction of Japan and hence are different from the negative Western scholarship of the 1940s and 1950s. However, as it is argued in the following chapter, the focus on the distinct normative or cultural traits of Japan's identity and the meta-structure that pre-supposes the existence of a monolithic culture or body of norms, which defines the State and shapes its behavior leads to a similar essentialism of both norms/culture and foreign policy. This will be illustrated not through a theoretical "monologue of instructions" (Kratochwill 2000, 75) regarding the correct way of approaching Japan's national identity, but by an empirical demonstration of the analytical shortcomings present in the discussed works.

1.3 Defining Identity

The conception of national identity used in this thesis is similar to the one provided by the social constructivist framework, as it seems to provide the tools necessary for a more narrowly focused inquiry into identity construction. National identity is viewed as a social cognitive lens, which provides the holders of identity to make sense of the "self" and the outside environment of the society (Prizel 1998, 14.) National identity is seen as a socio-historical temporal space with its own dominant meanings and interpretations (Hopf 2002, 4-6.) This definition also resembles the one developed by Habermas in which identity is perceived as a tool used by individuals and communities to locate themselves in their "profane and cosmic environments" (Habermas in Bloom 1990, 47.)

7

However, while sharing this conception of national identity, this thesis seeks to depart from a search for one coherent identity structure and perceives national identity as a multiplicity of discourses. Maja Zehfuss (2001) has shown the dangers of the monolithic conception of identity in her work on Germany's national identity. She has shown empirically how the anthropomorphic and holistic conceptualization of identity prevents us from a meaningful inquiry into the discursive and multidimensional nature of national identity.

This thesis proposes to "break down Japan" (Dower 1994) by exploring one particular discourse on the nature of Japan's national character that has emerged in the context of debates on Russia. National identity is seen not as a coherent and monolithic structure but as a multiplicity of discourses which emerge in relations with multiple others (Neumann 1996,1.) It seems that there are a number of basic epistemological issues that support the departure from the anthropomorphic and monolithic conception of identity.

Unlike with individuals, in case of the nation a multiplicity of agents are involved in the process of the identity construction. The agents can be identical, but can vary for different "others." Furthermore, unlike with the individual, where the process of identity construction occurs in one's head, in case of the nation the locales of construction are multiple and vary for different discourses. After all, while exploring a vague "national identity", the actual empirical work involves examination of texts produced by individuals or groups, be they scholars, reporters, politicians, or think tanks and governmental agencies. Assuming all of these to belong to a certain structure involves too much predetermination about the nature of national identity and its operation. Hence, this thesis focuses on one identity discourse that has created the self-understanding of Japan as a nation in relation to Russia.

1.4 Identity and Foreign Policy

The relationship between identity and policy has been conceptualized in a number of ways. Drawing on a critical reading of the foundations of the contemporary international system, David Campbell conceptualizes foreign policy as a general political practice of "othering", as a "specific sort of boundary-producing political

performance" (1992, 69.) As such, the conventional foreign policy is just one of these practices that produce an identity by "framing man in the spatial and temporal organization of the inside and outside, self and other" (*Ibid.*)

This thesis relies heavily on Campbell's depiction of the practice of "othering" in the analysis of Japan's identity discourse on Russia outlined in Chapters V and VI. However, the conception of foreign policy of the states only in terms of creation of difference and the focus on the notion of "danger" central to Campbell's discussion of foreign policy seems to be too narrow to encompass the variety of policies and perceptions that shape it.

In his study of national identity and foreign policy in Central and Eastern European nation, Ilya Prizel (1998) defines their relationship as being of a dialectical nature, with both identity and policy shaping and influencing each other. National identity, by constructing the meaning of the "self" defines state's interests and foreign policy, is perceived as one of the tools of affirming the nationalist myths and through this providing legitimacy to the ruling elite. However, since national identity is not constant or immutable, it undergoes a continuous process of redefinition through interaction with the outside world, i.e. through foreign policy (1998, 13-37.) The empirical case study conducted in this thesis argues for a more nuanced and complex relationship between identity discourse and foreign policy.

One of the most empirically interesting and cautious about pre-theorization works within the constructivist framework has been Ted Hopf's *Social Construction of International Politics* (1999.) Hopf engages in an extensive discussion regarding the relationship between foreign policy and identity. Interests are perceived as derivable from identity, as the variety of domestic identities constitute a social cognitive structure within which threats and opportunities, enemies and allies are classified as such and for the first time become intelligible (Hopf 2002, 16.) Identities constitute the social cognitive structure within which the decision makers understand another state (2002, 22.) In general, it assumes that identity (or other non-material factors, such as culture and norms) defines the interests and the policy through the provision of a cognitive framework within which interests and policy are shaped and defined.

In his work, Hopf examines the Soviet and Russian identity discourses in 1955 and 1999. For the purpose of this thesis, the former case study will be briefly examined.

Hopf identifies four main identities for the USSR in 1955 (class, modernity, nation and the New Soviet Man) that combined, have shaped the cognitive structure within which the foreign policy making has taken place. The depiction of identities is followed by a number of foreign policy case studies aimed at explaining the relationship between identities and foreign policy. One of the main conclusions of Hopf's empirical work is that identities imply interests and make certain foreign policy acts more probable than others (2002, 39-151.) Hopf provides an interesting analysis and is continuously cautious about oversimplification of foreign policy and its reduction to identity factors. However, this thesis chooses not to take this conclusion for granted, but to explore its relevance through empirical investigation.

The case study developed in this thesis is more modest in scope and more cautious about the assumption that both identities and foreign policy making are shaped within the same cognitive structure. From the multiplicity of identity discourses, this research focuses only on the one that seems to be the most relevant to bilateral relations, i.e., one that constructs the "self" through the "other." Furthermore, the analytical framework used here assumes that the understanding of the self through the other and the discourse about actual action to be taken vis-à-vis the "other" do not necessarily belong to the same discursive formations.

Following Tzvetan Todorov's (1984) typology of relations between the self and the other, this thesis locates identity and policy formation on different axes of interaction with the other. The identity discourse belongs to the levels of knowledge, where through certain frameworks of knowledge, the value judgment regarding the "self" and the "other" occurs. However, definition of interests and foreign policy occurs on the level of actual action, when it is decided and executed. As Todorov demonstrates, different perception of the "other" can lead to same action, like Las Casas and Cortes. The former loves the Indians, while the latter looks down on them, but they both chose the same policy of engagement (1984, 185.)

However, the opposite can also be true, as similar perceptions of different "others" can result in different action. To clarify this point, the "axis of evil" in US President G.W. Bush's State of the Union Address on 29.1.2002 can be seen as an identity narrative which constitutes the "peaceful world" of "us" and the "dangerous" and threatening "them." Campbell's framework that focuses on the broad notion of

danger, would attribute the foreign policies vis-à-vis all the three "others" as belonging to the same practice of difference. However, the actual policies taken vis-à-vis the three "evil others" are contrastingly different- Iraq was invaded, the multilateral negotiations with North Korea aimed at finding a peaceful solution for the crisis carry on and, as of January 2006, the policy regarding Iran's nuclear program is still in the process of formation, while the referral of the issue to UN Security Council seems like the most probable policy preference at this stage.

Hence, deriving both policy and identity from the same discourse can be a dangerous enterprise that will need to account for differences in policy. In order to explore the relationship between identity discourse and foreign policy, carrying as little as possible theoretical baggage regarding the relationship between the two, in this thesis each discourse is examined separately, without providing a pre-determined framework for a particular relationship between the two.

Thus Chapters V and VI examine the identity discourse and Chapter VII examines the policy discourse aiming to determine the cognitive framework that has shaped the Japanese economic, security and Northern Territories related policy in the post Cold War years.

Based on the case study conducted in this thesis, the author believes that neither of the established theoretical frameworks examined is able to explain the relationship between all the realms of State's foreign policy and national identity. The relationship that emerges from this thesis is diffuse-in certain realms, like the economic policy it seems to be non-present, and in the security discourse it is rather weak and vague.

However, this thesis finds the relationship between identity and foreign policy in Japan's policy related to the territorial dispute. It argues that identity discourse and Northern Territories related policies do not constitute a cause/effect relationship but combined engage in perpetuation and re-production of hierarchical boundaries between the Japanese "self" and the Russian "other." Hence, it argues, that the post-structuralist framework outlined in Campbell's work provides the most effective tool for approaching the identity/foreign policy nexus.

2. Japan's Socio-Cultural Identity

Before engaging the identity discourse on Russia, this thesis examines the existing scholarship on Japan's national identity. Chapter II examines the broad discussions of Japan's identity in the historical, sociological and cultural studies. In general, the focus is on the body of literature defined as *nihonjinron*.

The term *nihonjinron* (theory of the Japanese) or *nihonron* (theory of Japan), or *nihonbunkaron* (theory of Japanese culture) refers to a body of academic and semi-academic inquiry into social, cultural and historical traits of the Japanese society and tends to emphasize its superior uniqueness. Chapter II focuses mainly on the critical analysis of the conservative *nihonjinron* literature. It explores the contributions as well as the pitfalls of the various works and their analytical frameworks. The critical scholarship on the conservative *nihonjiron* literature examined in this chapter usually agrees that while *nihonjiron* aims to uncover the uniquely positive national characteristics of Japan, it is structured by using Western paradigms and constructed vis-à-vis what is or perceived to be the West. This chapter argues that the critical scholarship on *nihonjinron* has contributed greatly to the understanding of the general paradigms that have shaped the construction of the discourse.

However, it was not only the West that has played an important role of the "other" in the discourses on Japan's identity. Stephan Tanaka (1993) examines the creation of Japanese Oriental historiography (mainly focusing on China as the subject of historic inquiry) around the turn of the 19th century as a discourse that has created a special place for Japan as a "bridge" between Asia and the West. Oguma Eiji (2002) examines the discursive formation of the debate on the national homogeneity, which has been one of the master discourses on Japanese identity. The genealogy of the discourse reveals the dynamics of its construction vis-à-vis Okinawan, Ainu, Korean and Taiwanese "others" and how it is made to reflect the political ideology of the various periods in Japanese history. Hence, this chapter argues that an inquiry into a particular identity discourse provides a more nuanced picture of the paradigms that shape the discourse and its dynamics.

12

3. Russia as Japan's Other

As can be easily derived from the official documents on Japan's foreign policy[1], the most significant political "others" for post-Cold War Japan are United States, China, South Korea and North Korea, with Russia occupying the fifth place. However, the importance of Russia in both Japan's foreign policy and national identity construction should not be ignored. Writing in 1992, Gilbert Rozman has pointed out the following reasons for Russia's (and the Soviet Union's) significance to, what he calls, "the Japanese worldview." First, Russia epitomizes the same problems that Japan has been facing in its own modern history, i.e., national identity being located between the East and the West, social order founded on communalism, and "emergent forms of individualism" and culture that are a mix of native traditions and heavy borrowing from the West. Second, the collapse of the Soviet Empire represents what might have happened to Imperial Japan had it not lost the war. Third, explains Rozman, Japan was unable to exercise fully its political potential because of the Cold War structure and only by Moscow "popping the cork of the Cold War" could Japan emerge as a political superpower. Fourth, the long-time rivalry between Moscow and Tokyo, and the way this rivalry is perceived is helping to define Japan's evolving international role (Rozman 1992, 4-5 also see Togawa 1990 for similarities between the two nations). The conceptual and analytical framework used is this thesis differs from the one used by Rozman, but the above mentioned points are important to explain the uniqueness of Russia/USSR/Russia not only in Japan's identity construction but also for Japan's foreign policy.

In the context of national identity discourse, it is most important to note that Russia has always occupied a special place within an array of Japan's "others." It has been never been part of the "West" which has bee the most important "other" for modern Japan's self definition, but it has also never became part of Japan's Orient or the cultural place from which Japan has departed towards modernity (this will be discussed in more detail below.) The discourse on Russia has also included numerous and, at times, contradictory traits, and was probably the most dynamic among all the

---

[1] See for example the annual *Gaiko seisho* (Diplomatic Blue Book) published by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the *Boei hakusho* (Defense White Book) published by the Defense Agency for the ranking of important bi-lateral relations and for threat perceptions.

other identity discourses. In a sense, the history of modern Japan's relations with Russia shares numerous similarities with the two other important "others"-China and Korea. In both cases, the last hundred years of interaction were dominated by mutual suspicion, wars and territorial problems. The present debates on Japan's identity vis-à-vis China and Korea evolve mainly around the discourse on Japan as an "assailant,"[2] as a perpetrator of various crimes and atrocities in the historical narrative on its imperial and colonial past (see Saaler 2005 for in-depth analysis.) On the other hand, Japan's fear of and victimhood vis-à-vis Russia are presented as "traditional" nature of Japan's relations with her northern neighbor. However, the Japanese discourse on Russia has been more complex than that and experienced numerous changes.

The "threat from the North", which is considered to be the traditional Japanese perception of Russia (for example, Shimizu 1992), has it origins in the second half of 18th century. However, the original perception of threat, based mainly on Dutch documents, was perceived not as a military threat to Edo Japan per se, but as a possible expansion of Russian influence leading to the loss of Japanese influence over Ainu lands (Northern parts of today's Hokkaido and some of the Kurile islands) which, at that time, were not fully incorporated into territories under the control of the Edo shogunate (*bakufu*.) More important, however, is that the potential Russian expansion of influence was seen as expansion through enlightenment and amicable policies which could result in the Ainus themselves desiring to come under the control of the Russian empire (Akatsuki 1987.) Hence, Russia was perceived as an enlightened Western power which could endanger Edo Japan's control over the northern territories through the introduction of its superior civilization.

At roughly the same time two other discourses on Russia emerged. One, emphasizing the military threat, was reinforced by the false warning about Russian expansionist plans, brought to Japan by a Hungarian adventurer in 1771 (Shimizu 1992, 76-84 and Togawa 1990, 34), and gained further legitimacy as the result of violent clashes between Russian explorers and the Japanese. At the same time, the

---

[2] Unlike the numerous sensationalist articles in the English language press suggest, the narrative in the most widely used textbooks engages in descriptions of Japan's atrocities and oppressive colonial policies. The depth of narrative varies from one textbook to another but none attempt to justify Japan's colonial past or to paint it in bright colors.

amicable and cooperative relations established between the Russian navy officers and Japanese merchants that facilitated the solution of the crisis gave birth to the discourse on Russia as a neighbor, with whom relations based on trust are possible and desirable (Wada 1999, 4-6.)

During the first years of Meiji (1868-1912), Russia again was classified by Meiji thinkers and policy makers as an "enlightened nation" and a "teacher", more advanced than Japan (sharing this category with Italy, Spain, Portugal and Latin-American nations). However, the respect and also the fear of Russia declined after first-hand exposure to Enlightenment thought combined with the incorporation of Western views of Russia greatly influenced the Japanese intellectuals' perceptions of Russia (Togawa 1990, 34 and Wada 1999, 7.)

From here onwards, identity discourse on Japan and Russia was influenced greatly not only by the bilateral state of relations, but also by the continuous need of Japan to establish herself as an equal among Western powers. Before and during the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-1905, in the domestic discourse, Japan came to represent the civilized world which embarked on the historical mission of fighting the barbarian Russia, fighting in the name of civilization, peace and humanity. The construction of Russia has relied heavily on Anglo-Saxon modes of knowledge of Russia and ironically Russia came to be depicted as oriental and "half-yellow." On the other side, Japan, which aspired for an equal status with the European powers, was depicted as a Western nation having a "white heart" under the yellow skin, or at times as even belonging to the white race (Shimazu 2005, 365-369 also Oguma 2002, 143-155.)

In the years after the war, the discourse changed again and the perception of the war as a war of races came to dominate the Japanese discourse. This resulted from the impact it had on the colonized nations from India to Egypt (Marks 2005) and from the growing tensions in Japan's relations with Europe and the United States (Shimazu 2005, 370.)

The Bolshevik revolution combined with growing exposure of the Japanese intellectuals to Russian literature and art lead to further change and fragmentation in the discourse. Among the progressive intellectuals the image of Russia as a teacher was revived and became a symbol of progressive revolution (Shimizu 1992, 163-172 Wada 1999, 8-9.) At the same time, the "threat" discourse of the ruling elite was

reinforced by the threat of communism.

During the years of Japan's militarism, the Japanese propaganda machine used Soviet Russia to justify the need to enhance Japan's military capability and its military involvement on the continent. In government related publications, the jingoistic and militant Russian national character was contrasted with the peaceful and somehow gullible Japanese one. The Japanese people were called to fully comprehend the seriousness of the Soviet threat and to enhance their national defense capability (for example, Ouchi 1937.)

After Japan's defeat in the Pacific War, the discourse on USSR/Russia evolved mainly around the events that followed the Soviet opening of the front against Japan in August 1945. While parts of the leftist intellectuals continued to sympathize with the ideals of socialism and communism, the mainstream discourse focused on the Soviet violation of the neutrality treaty, the occupation of the Japanese islands that came to be known as the Northern Territories, and the internment and forced labor of Japanese POWs, tenth of whom had died in the camps ((Rozman 1992, Kimura 1999, Hasegawa 2000b, Glaubitz 1995.)

At the same time, as it will be shown in Chapter III, the discourse (like the creation of the Northern Territories problem) was not a result of direct experience but emerged in 1950s. It can be traced to the Cold War politics and the American interest in preventing Japan's normalization of relations with the Soviet Union which coincided with the interests of the ruling conservative elite to prevent the spread of pro Soviet sentiments and to consolidate the nation around fear and contempt of the Soviet "other" (Togawa 1990, Hasegawa 2000b, Wada 1999.)

While the official discourse on Japan's victimhood remained intact, there was little public or academic debate on the Soviet Union or Russian national character mainly due to lack of interest, a lack of contact and a lack of information about the Soviet Union. However, as the Cold War entered a new phase, there was a resurge of interest in the Soviet Union in the late 1970s that gave birth to a voluminous body of literature on the Russian national character (Kimura 1980, 3.) In spite of the changes that occurred in Russia and in bilateral relations since the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, this discourse continues to be the dominant one that constructs Russia and Japan's national characters. Analysis of this discourse is the main aim of this

thesis. As it will be shown in Chapters V and VI, this discourse is not unrelated to the discourse on the Soviet Union/Russia in pre-1945 Japan and in the immediate postwar years. A number of important structural similarities exist in the construction of hierarchical difference between "Japan" and "Russia" and in the perceived sources of national character that link the discourse examined here to the broader Japanese discourse on Russia and national identity in general. However, an in depth analysis of the role of "Russia" in modern Japan's identity is beyond the scope of this thesis and limited to the brief outline provided above. This is due to the fact that the main interest of this thesis is the contemporary construction of "Japan" vis-à-vis "Russia" and its role in Japan's policy in the post Cold War years. Furthermore, as it will be argued in Chapter V, the contemporary discourse is not a simple replication (or resurrection) of the pre 1945 discourse. Its structure, roles and normative implications can be (at least partially) attributed to the particular domestic and international environment of the 1970s and early 1980s and hence the analytical chapters focus almost exclusively on the contemporary discourse. However, its relationship to the broader Japanese discourse on "Russia" and its role in the construction of Japan's identity will be outlined in the Conclusion.

4. Locales of Identity Construction

4.1 Contemporary Debates on Japan's nationalism

In the last two decades, what is regarded as contemporary Japanese nationalism has been receiving a growing amount of both scholarly and media attention (for example, Dirlik 1993, McCormack in Hein and Selden eds. 2000, Nelson 2002, Rozman 2002, Jacques 2005, Brooke 2005, Saaler 2005 and Takahashi 2005.) The theme that unifies all these works is Japan's reconstruction of its imperial and colonial history through revisionist history textbooks, nationalistic comic books, Prime-Minister's visits to Yasukuni shrine and other issues related to the imperial past. A large part of the media, the pundits and the Korean and Chinese politicians perceive (at least on the rhetorical level) the reconstruction of the past as a process of constructing the present identity of Japan, nationalistic and oblivious of its

responsibilities for the past misdeeds (for example, Chinese FM Li Zhaoxing in *Asahi* 16.11.2005.)

The current problem of Japan's "historical consciousness" is far more complex than usually presented in the "critical" literature which often tends to devote excessive attention to the revisionist textbooks ignoring the narrative in the most widely used textbooks and the general perceptions among the Japanese public. Furthermore, the issue should be put in the context of Korean and Chinese domestic politics and state-led construction of historical narratives, as well as the broader regional relations that involve disputes over natural resources and growing competition between China and Japan for regional leadership. This said, historical narrative plays a vital role in the construction of national identity (Prizel 1998, 14.) Historical narrative has a broader meaning than "history"- it is a particular understanding of the national past, present and future, the events and their interpretations, which are subjectively linked to national identity. A particular construction of the past provides a link to the present and the future (Barnett 2002, 6 also Sugiura 1995, 43.) A nation's identity is first of all about "remembering" (Ozkirmili 2005, 185.)

The importance of historical narrative for national identity is exemplified in the already mentioned work of Stefan Tanaka (1993.) It examines the creation of the "Orient" (mainly China) and the studies of the Orient as a discipline (*toyoshi*) in Japanese historiography in the late 19th and early 20th centuries as means to create a sense of the national "self" and its relations with the outside world. The "Orient" has become Japan's own past and provided a historical basis by which Japan could compare itself against the West. As Tanaka notes, the West and Asia were used as the others to construct the Japanese sense of a nation as both modern and oriental (1993, 18.)

Tanaka focuses mainly on texts produced by scholars affiliated with Tokyo University, which, before Japan's defeat in the Pacific War, has maintained close relationship with the Imperial government. The contemporary debates on Japan's historical memory and national identity also focus mainly on government supervised historical education, shifting their inquiry to school textbooks.

However, this thesis argues that the historical narrative is not produced and re-

produced exclusively through the formal institutions of education. On the contrary, in case of the narrative on Russia, the school textbooks are, at best, providers of historical facts but do not cognitive lens that can provide guidance in interpreting the facts.

Historical narrative (or historical consciousness) engages in processing "experiences of time into orientations for everyday life" and through this provides temporal orientation in life (Jörn Rüsen in Saaler 2005,125.) As this thesis demonstrates in Chapter IV, compared with the narrative on the former colonies, the historical narrative on Russia in Japanese textbooks offers little material for identity construction. The history textbooks depiction of USSR/ Russia and Japan's relations with Russia is mainly factual, lacking normative interpretations that can serve as a tool to process the historical experience of the Japanese "self" with Russian "other", and lacking the capacity to discern from it tools that can provide guidance for evaluating the present bilateral relationship. Hence, the construction of interpretative lens related to Russia and her relations with Japan is constructed elsewhere.

4.2 Identifying the Texts I

The identification of texts that are representative of the discourse is of vital importance for the validity of the conclusions reached during the research and needs to be addressed properly. Scholarly works, which circulate solely in the esoteric realms of academia, can prove to be a fascinating object of inquiry into intellectual history of particular nation or particular period, but here this thesis is interested in the broader narratives that are diffused into larger parts of the society and which provide a collective image of the "other" and the "self", serving as an interpretative tool to evaluate the events of the past, present and the possible future developments.

In this sense, Iver Neumann's (1999) otherwise fascinating inquiry into the role of the "East" in European identity formation suffers from a lack of explanation regarding the choice of the texts. The work is lacking a clear definition of the actors involved in the process of identity formation and in his work quotes from a broad social and political spectrum are used. These include legal scholars, philosophers and historians, monarchs and politicians, diplomats and travelers. Also, the nationalities

of authors who are treated as representatives of European discourse range from British to Danish to Russian. As such, otherwise innovative and thought provoking research becomes prone to criticism on the grounds of the representativeness of the texts.

Hopf (2002) identifies the need to address this issue and explains that his choice of texts that represent Soviet/Russian identity discourse was done based on two criteria-variety and representativeness. For an inquiry into Soviet identity construction, he has chosen literary and journalistic texts that were not subjected to harsh party/government censorship, but also official publications, texts that were designed purposefully to shape the identity discourse, such as memoirs of public figures and popular novels. He also provides a detailed explanation of why a particular book, journal or newspaper, was chosen as representative of the genre (2002, 33-37.)

In this thesis, the selection of texts has been conducted based on criteria of authoritativeness and their engagement in identity discourse by providing value-laden depictions of Russia and Japan, their comparative histories and national characteristics. The authors of the works examined in Chapter V are authoritative specialists on Russia and have been an integral part of the public and academic discourse on Russia. Most of them belong to the conservative mainstream and have maintained close relationship with the government. As this thesis seeks to depart from the positivist analysis, it does not attempt to establish a cause/effect relationship between the discourse/authors examined in Chapters V and VI and the policy makers. However, in informal conversations with MoFA officials that are involved in Russia related policymaking, the authors whose discourse is examined here (mainly Hakamada and Kimura) have been portrayed as authoritative specialists with "correct" knowledge of Soviet Union/Russia and her history of relations with Japan (unattributable interviews Nov 1st, 2004, Moscow and June 18th, 2005 and March 28th, 2006, Tokyo.) Furthermore, important similarities can be observed in the discourse produced by Kimura, Hakamada and other authors examined in Chapter V and the perceptions of Russia/Soviet Union in the autobiographic writings of Sato Masaru (2005 and 2005a), ex-diplomat and one of the core members of the so-called

"Suzuki Trio" that have been in the forefront of Japan's foreign policy vis-à-vis Russia until the explosion of the scandal in 2001.

In their capacity as authoritative specialists on the Soviet Union and Russia, both Kimura and Hakamada have testified on a number of occasions in front of various Diet committees, including the Budget Committee of the House of Representatives (12.2.1985 discussing the defense budget), Foreign Affairs Committee, House of Representatives (16.05.1990) and the Committee on Okinawa and Northern Territories, House of Representatives (08.02.2005.) In 2004, both have represented Japan at the Fourth Japan-Russia Forum-a bilateral governmental initiative aimed at improving the domestic public opinion in both nations as part of the measures facilitating the conclusion of peace treaty.

Kimura has appeared on a number of occasions in front of LDP Commission on Foreign Affairs giving briefings regarding Russia (for example on 24.7.2002 giving a talk on Russia's foreign policy after Sept 11th http://www.jimin.jp/jimin/daily/02_07/24/140724i.shtml) Hakamada has also appeared as an authority on Russia and Russo-Japanese relations in the monthly magazine of LDP (*Gekkan Jiyuminshu* July 2005) and both Kimura and Hakamada appear often in the mainstream monthly *Gaiko foramu* (Diplomatic Forum) as authorities on Russia and her relations with Japan.

Hence, the author believes that the discourse examined here is not only one that is shaping public opinion but also has a close relationship with the policymaking elites. In addition to the manuscripts produced by Kimura, Hakamada and other authoritative scholars, relevant material from newspapers and general interest journals (mainly conservative) is also used.

The works analyzed here are the ones that, by the way of providing a general framework of national and cultural characteristics, have engaged in the construction of the Japanese "self" through the Russian "other." It can be argued that the knowledge constituted by the discourse is not shared by all of the Japanese, who, especially in recent years, have lost interest in Russia. It must be noted that the conceptual framework used here does not imply that the identity of every Japanese is an anti-thesis of the Western, Russian or other "others" (Nandy 1988, 73.) However, the discourse examined here is the only one that engages in construction of Russian

national identity. Furthermore, as Chapter VI shows, the narrative on Russia and Japan in the writings of Shiba Ryotaro, one of the most popular writers in post-war Japan, is similar in its construction of hierarchical difference between the two national characters.

As can be easily understood from the above this thesis engages in textual analysis and does not examine other locales where the images of Russia are constructed. No doubt that the visual media plays and important role in shaping the perceptions of Russia among the general population. In 2000, *Nanohana no Oki* (The Open Sea of Rape Blossoms), one of Shiba's most popular novels related to the history of Japan's relations with the Russian Empire during the Edo period, was turned into a popular NHK drama. Hence the analysis of Shiba's discourse on Russia conducted in Chapter VI hopes to (at least partially) compensate for the exclusion of visual media from the analysis.

However, "Russia/Soviet Union" has been present in other visual media. Russo-Japanese War has been the subject of a number of films, among them *Meiji Tenno to Nichiro Daisenso* (The Emperor Meiji and The Great Japan-Russia War released in 1957) and *303 Kochi* (The 303 Hill released in 1980) which engage in a patriotic depiction of Japan's victorious war. In 2004, NHK released a TV film titled *Bokyo* (Nostalgia or Longing for Home) depicting a story of brave friendship between a Japanese officer and a Romanian one in post-WW II Soviet labor camp. In this film, the author of the present thesis had the honor of playing a minor role of a Soviet labor camp guard sending the Japanese POWs to their daily woodcutting labor in the freezing Siberia and bullying the main hero.

The harsh labor and living conditions of the Japanese POWs and the hardships of the Japanese deportees from Manchuria (*hikiagesha*) can also be experienced visually through paintings, pictures and other artifacts at the small museum named *Heiwa Kinen Shiryokan* ("Praying for Peace" Resource Center) supervised by the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications. Without doubt it can be argued that these visual images contribute to the construction of the negative image of Russia in Japan. However, these images only strengthen the more sophisticated construction of Russia (and Japan) conducted in the textual discourse. Hence, the

author believes that the omission of the visual media does not lead to any grave analytical shortcomings in the depiction of the discourse.

In the context of the "Siberian imprisonment" it is also important to mention the existence of a number of organizations of the survivors of Soviet labor camps. The two main organizations are *Zenkoku kyoseiyokuryusha kyokai* (All Japan Association of Forced Detainees) and *Zenkoku yokuryusha hosho kyokai* (All Japan Detainees Compensation Association.) Neither of the associations has been very vocal in the public discourse on Soviet Union and their participation in the discourse seems to be most visible in contribution of exhibits to permanent and special exhibitions organized by the above mentioned *Heiwa Kinen Shiryokan*. Furthermore, the main agenda of the ex-detainees is to obtain monetary compensation for the years of labor in the Soviet Union from the *Japanese* government (for example, http://www.mmjp.or.jp/jcp-ozawa/new_page_206.htm and http://www.mainichi-msn.co.jp/seiji/iwami/sunday/news/p20060620org00m010022000c.html.) For these reasons, the discourse produced by the associations and their members is not examined in this thesis.

Furthermore, public opinion polls regarding Japanese perceptions of the Soviet Union are only briefly mentioned in Chapters III and VII. The questions offered by the polls are usually quite basic. In the annual public opinion polls regarding diplomatic relations (conducted by the PM Office), the respondents are given five options to evaluate their feelings towards a particular country. They can choose from "having positive feelings", "having slightly positive feelings", "having slightly negative feelings", "having negative feelings" and "don't know." In general, the two negative choices have continuously accounted for over 80% of the respondents. There have been a number of more detailed opinion polls regarding bilateral relations, the most recent conducted by MoFA in 2001. In general, the results show that the majority of the Japanese people do not have particularly positive feelings towards Russia, do not believe in a possibility of a positive change in bilateral relations and believe that Russia is either a present military threat or will become one in the future (http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/area/russia/chosa01/index.html.) As with the visual media, these public views do not provide enough material for examination of identity construction. However, these results do not present a counter-discourse to the

identity construction outlined in Chapters V and VI and are compatible with the general hierarchical construction of "Japan" and "Russia." It could also be argued that the identity construction examined here is (at least partially) responsible for the overwhelmingly negative perceptions of Russia among the population, as the actual exposure of the Japanese to Russia or Russians remains very limited.

Chapter V and VI argue that the main task of the discourse on Russian national identity has been to "rescue" Japan from the negative qualities attributed to her national character by the Western and domestic discourse. By using Western dichotomies of civilized/barbarian, peaceful/jingoistic, normal/abnormal and others, the Japanese "abnormality" was projected on Russia, and Japan located within the realm of universal "normalcy." Chapter V also briefly examines the parallel discourse that has engaged in positivist historical and political analysis, without engaging the national character debate or avoiding comparisons with Japan. There is little doubt these works have contributed greatly to the academic knowledge of Russia in Japan. However, this discourse has not presented a formidable counterargument to the "national identity" lens. As Harutoonian notes in the context of the Japanese discourse on the emperor, the left in general was incapable "to take seriously the discourse on culture" (Harootunian 2000, 625-626.) As part of this general tendency, the leftist intellectuals (with a notable exception of Maruyama Masao whose critical work will be introduced in Chapter V), have continuously ignored the importance of providing an alternative framework of conceptualizing national characteristics and culture, preoccupied with proper scientific analysis.

Hence, similarly to *nihonjinron*, for lack of competitors, the discourse examined here is, if not the only, then the major discourse available (Kowner 2002) that constructs Japan and Russia's national identities.

4.3 Identifying the Texts II-Literature and IR

Chapter VI examines the perceptions of both Japan and Russia's history in the works of one of the most popular writers in the last three decades, Shiba Ryotaro. The role of poets, writers and artists in the construction of national identity as producers of narratives that are likely to evoke nostalgic feelings has been an integral

part of the general discussion of nationalism (Kaiser 2001 quoted in Ozkirimli 2005, 180.) As Edward Said has demonstrated in his celebrated *Orientalism* (1979) and *Culture and Imperialism* (1994), literature plays an important role in the formation and reproduction of the identity discourse. "Literature" has always been related to other kinds of discourse, some of which were used to define national identity and engaged in the process of writing the "nation" against other nations and forms of imagined communities. (Hadfield 1994, 1)

In a discussion of modern nationalism, Brennan also notes that "literary myth" has played an important role in the creation of modern European nations (Brennan 1990, 49.) Literature can shape knowledge, perceptions and identities (Pollack 1992, 1.) However, as Chapter VI, which analyses works of the writer Shiba Ryotaro, will demonstrate, literary texts can by themselves constitute knowledge.

The genre of historical fiction occupies an important place in the constitution of historical narrative. By providing different interpretations and perceptions of historical figures and events, it allows the people to "imagine the nation" (Brennan 1990, 49) and constitutes the knowledge on the nation and its interactions with its others.

Shiba's works have little to offer to those looking for the exquisite aesthetics of the well known Japanese writers such as Mishima Yukio, Kawabata Yasunari or Oe Kenzaburo. At the same time, Shiba, the "people's writer" (Keen 2004, 87 and Matsumoto 1996, 14), has been undoubtedly the most widely-read author and, what is more important, one of the dominant figures in the discourse on Japanese identity. His works, including historical novels and essays on a variety of subjects that are unified by their belonging to the meta-narrative called "Japan", are still widely read and have sold over 180 million copies (*Asahi*, 12.2.2005.) Shiba's works have been quoted as a source of inspiration by two Prime Ministers and by a large number of politicians in their statements regarding Japan's past, present or future[3]. As already mentioned, this thesis does not seek to establish a positivist linkage between the

---

[3] Shiba was quoted by the present PM Koizumi in his conclusion of General Policy Speech to the Diet (Asahi Shimbun 26.09.2003) and by the late former PM Obuchi in his Policy Speech. (Asahi Shimbun 28.01.2000) For citations of Shiba by Diet members see the Diet Library database of Diet extrapolations-my search have resulted in 145 hits between 1992 and 2004. The names included MPs, political commentators and scholars that have testified in front of various parliamentary committees.

identity discourse examined here and the policymaking elites. However, Shiba's tremendous popularity not only among the general population but also among the political elites serve as a proof to his relevance as an important producer of identity discourse shared by a large portion of the establishment.

Along with his tremendous popularity, another important aspect of Shiba's work, for the purposes of this research, is that his works have been largely perceived as proper history, i.e., as factually and analytically sound depictions of Japan's past and her interactions with the outside world. The reasons for this are numerous and complex. No doubt that his extensive reading on the period that resulted in detailed narrative developed around well-known historical figures has played an important role. Furthermore, his works written during the high-level growth period on 1970s and 1980s have responded to the "demand for a collective image" (McSweeney 1999, 78) that, like the conservative *nihonjinron* literature, would explain Japan's economic success through the depiction of a glorious past and unique national identity. Shiba's consistent critique of ideology and explicit and often stated rejection of such subjective and value laden terms as "justice" in favour of objective "realism" (Sekikawa 2003, 14-15) has also contributed to his image as a proper historian. This image has been so dominant that even one of the leading Japanese specialists on Russia has described Shiba's approach to history in general and to Russia in particular as being characterized by "politically realistic" search for the truth without any ideological or emotional biases (Numano in Shiba 1999, 8-9.) This understanding of Shiba's work has been widely shared by the readers. All the readers' reviews of the book examined here, on the main book selling websites of Amazon Japan and Yahoo Books, portray it as a depiction of history of Russia and Russo-Japanese relations.

In spite of the obvious influence of Shiba's writings on Japanese society, his works were so far only briefly engaged in the domestic scholarship but completely denied international scholarly attention. Chapter VI examines the identity discourse in Shiba's writings on Russia, drawing mainly on the collection of essays titled "On Russia-The Original Form of the North", first published in 1986, the book received the 38th Yomiuri Literature Prize. This book is, as Shiba himself has stated, the crystallisation of his perception of Russia that has developed while writing the ever

popular *Saka no ue no kumo* (The Cloud on Top of the Hill) and *Nanohana no Oki* (The Open Sea of Rape Blossoms) novels.

This thesis argues that in spite Shiba's dislike of ideology and his devotion to what he described as realism on one side and attempts to discover a unique Japan through providing a uniquely Japanese perception of Russia, his narrative replicates the Western discourse on the Russian difference. Furthermore, Shiba's narrative forms an integral part with the academic discourse on Russian national character and through creation of difference, constructs hierarchical relationship between Japan and Russia.

5. The End of the Cold War and Japan

Chapter VII will examine the foreign policy and the policy related discourse vis-à-vis post-communist Russia. It pays special attention to the security discourse and governmental debates on desirable policies to enhance the return of the islands (Northern Territories) captured by the Soviet Union in the last days of the Pacific War and which were the main obstacle in the conclusion of the peace treaty and the final and complete normalization of the relations. It argues that the economic policy pursued by the Japanese state and by private business has been driven mainly by cost/benefit calculations and formulated outside of the cognitive lens of the identity discourse. Furthermore, the acute need to secure alternative sources of oil and to end the dependence on Middle Eastern oil resulted in Russia being perceived as a potential contributor to Japan's security. This perception constitutes an opposite to the dangerous and irrational Russia of the identity discourse. At the same time, this chapter argues that the perception of military threat from Russia has not completely disappeared from the security discourse and that it can be partially attributed to the interpretative lens of Russian identity discourse. It also argues that the conception of the territorial problem and the related policies are located within the cognitive framework constructed by the national identity lens.

In order to clarify the importance of the period examined, the following section will outline the changes which have occurred in Japan's international environment as the result of the end of the Cold War and explain why this period is of particular

interest for Japan's relations with Russia.

The changes that Japan experienced as the result of the defeat in the Pacific War and the American occupation are generally referred to as the "San Francisco system."[4] This concept refers to the system of relations in which Japan has found itself as the result of signing the peace treaty, which officially ended the Pacific War in San Francisco on the 8th of September, 1951. In general, it can be described as Japan's military, economic and diplomatic dependence on the United States (Vogel 2002, 1). A more detailed analysis of Japan's post-war foreign policy will show that Japan has not always been the faithful servant of American interests and quite often embarked on independent initiatives (for example, see Yahuda 2004, 197-203.) However, these deviations were rare and did not contradict the main policies pursued by the US government.

The foundations of the "San-Francisco system" can be seen as constructed of three major legal documents: the Peace Treaty itself, the Security Treaty with the US and the new constitution of Japan that was designed chiefly by the Occupation Administration headed by General McArthur and which came into force on the 3rd of November 1947. The general direction for Japan's post war foreign policy based on economic performance rather than on military might, and almost complete reliance on the US for the latter, has become known as the Yoshida doctrine which can be seen as both the result of the San Francisco system and as an integral part of it. In general, this can be summarized as Japan's reliance on the US for the provision of security guarantees and Japan's focus on economic development, resulting in the emergence of Japan as an economic superpower in 1970s.

The Gulf War of 1991, which can be seen as the first product of the end of the Cold War, had an enormous impact on both the Japanese elites' as well as the general public's perception of international affairs and Japan's role in it. Funabashi Yoichi, one of Japan's leading journalists and "opinion leaders" summarizes the feelings of the Japanese establishment when he writes, "In the moment of truth, an economic superpower found itself merely an automatic teller machine...The Gulf

---

[4] At times, the reference is made to the "1955 system" which refers more to Japan's domestic politics, named after the year that in which the LDP was born and became the ruling party, but also can be seen as the year when the Cold War structure has taken its final shape (Ishii1992)

Crisis was the manifestation of the failure of Japan's leadership...In sum, the Gulf Crisis demonstrated the enormous gap between Japan's economic might and its immature political prowess and still-low a level of real internationalization."(Funabashi 1994, 2) The crisis resulted in a passage of the International Peace Cooperation Law in June 1992, which allowed Japan's Self Defense Forces to participate in non-combatant peacekeeping missions overseas and can be regarded as a revolutionary change in Japan's foreign policy.

However, in general, the impact of the end of the Cold War on Japan and North East Asia has been much more subtle than in Europe. Unlike many had hoped (or feared) at the dusk of the Cold War, not only the vision of *Pax Nipponica* (Vogel 1986) became even further from realization, but Japan had not yet even climbed to the position of a balancing power *vis-à-vis* the United States, neither in economic or political terms. Also, many of the domestic and international changes, such as the loss of power by the LDP in favor of the Socialists in the early 1990s and the US "strategic partnership" with China during the Clinton administration, proved to be of a temporary and short-lived nature. In 1994, the LDP regained its control and so far the political spectrum has not seen any potential rivals, with the Socialist Party almost disappearing as the result of a number of scandals[5] and in 2005, the Democratic Party struggling to find points of contestation between itself and the LDP.

The US-Japan alliance seems to be stronger than ever in light of the Japanese cooperation in the "War on Terror" (Yahuda 2004, 321) and the growing perception of the China threat in the US, which is shared by many of the key Japanese policy makers. Also, unlike the end of the Cold War in Europe, Asia has not experienced the collapse of regimes and states and the emergence of new nations. Inoguchi Takashi wrote in 1993, "for the Japanese, Europe 1992 does not require any direct or immediate responses unlike those demands from the United States which do require immediate and concrete responses to demonstrate Japan's openness and fairness."(Inoguchi 1993.)

---

[5] Most significant were probably the admission of the kidnappings of Japanese citizens by DRPK, which the Socialist Party has consistently denied, and revelations about Soviet funds channeling during the Cold War.

However, besides the fact that the US demands have changed in light of the new realities of the international system, the end of the ideological confrontation, the collapse of the so-called "San-Francisco system", as well as the emergence of a different of international relations, have had a considerable impact on Japan. Quite paradoxically, the strengthening of the partnership with the United States has been paralleled by Japan's redefinition of its role in the world and in the region, responding to the complexities and dynamics of international politics. The process of the search for the "normal role" (Inoguchi 1992, 67 Ozawa 1994) has not reached its final conclusion, mainly because of the absence of general paradigms that would direct Japan's foreign policy and the US-Japan alliance. The dominant post war paradigms of economic development and containment of communism have disappeared and others, like the need for a US-Japan alliance, are gradually loosing their relevance, but the new broad guiding principles are yet to emerge (Nitta in Vogel ed. 2002, 64-81.) Furthermore, in spite of the emergence of the US as the sole superpower, so far it has failed to provide either "hegemonic stability" or clear and consistent leadership (Yahuda 2004, 211.) This is particularly relevant to Japan's policy vis-à-vis Russia which was dominated by the grand American strategy of containment of communism.

The US-Japan Security Treaty, which has been the cornerstone of the alliance, had envisaged the Soviet Union as the potential enemy. In light of the enemy's disappearance, the legitimacy of the security treaty has come into question as the alliance has lost its "potential enemy" (Kawaraji et al 1998, 254.) At the same time, Japan has been released from the grand and clear strategy of containing the Soviet Union, which resulted in Japan's relations with Russia becoming more complex and diversified.

The search for the new legitimacy of the alliance had started not long after the disappearance of the Soviet Union. Academics close to the policy making process have suggested various perspectives to justify the existence of the alliance (for example, Tanaka 1994, 45.) The US-Japan Declaration on Security Cooperation in 1996 presented the new role of the Alliance as the regional "tranquilizer" that provides stability to the Asia-Pacific region and contributes to the regional peace and prosperity (Kawaraji et al 1998, 256.) However, the most significant document was

the revised Guidelines for US-Japan Defense Cooperation that were published in 1997 and ratified by the Diet in1999.

The new guidelines provided new objectives for the alliance and redefined its missions in the sense that activities such as cooperation in UN peacekeeping activities, international humanitarian relief, and, most importantly, envisage for Japan's active involvement in conflict situations in areas surrounding Japan. For the latter, the government provided six possible scenarios to the Diet when introducing the guideline bill; two of which relate to internal conflict in certain countries. The guidelines also envisage a new role for SDF in situations surrounding Japan such as intelligence gathering, surveillance and minesweeping, to protect lives and property, and to ensure navigational safety (Article 5.)

Further justification to the US-Japan Alliance was provided by a declaration in February 2005, made at the "2+2" Security Cooperation Committee meeting in which the "peaceful resolution of the Taiwan Straits problem" was listed as one of the strategic goals of the alliance. This statement has been interpreted by many as addressing the need for the new potential enemy and part of the US containment policy vis-à-vis China (for example, Jing-dong Yuan 2005), but also as epitomizing the growing perception of China's threat. While a stable relationship with China is perceived to be of vital importance to Japan by a large part of the political establishment (for example, (Tanaka 2000, 104), there is little doubt that the perceptions of China's threat have been rising parallel to the growth of China's economy, military and political might.

As early as 1993, PM Hosokawa and Foreign Minister Hata publicly called for greater transparency in China's military affairs. After China ignored Japan's warnings and continued to conduct nuclear tests in 1995, Japan suspended $75 million in development assistance. In this context Russian rapprochement with China, and particularly the sales of weapons to China, has become an important factor in Japan's regional security assessment.

While the Chinese threat is viewed as a long-term problem, North Korean nuclear capability has become the most acute short-term problem in Japan's security debate since 1994. In 2003, six party talks that include US, Russia, China, Japan and the two Koreas were established as a new framework for resolving the nuclear impasse.

Hence, in the context of the North Korean problem, Russia, as a member of the six party talk (and also a partner in a war on terror) has become an ally of Japan in a combined effort to solve these problem.

To conclude, the overall post-Cold War situation in East Asia has been fluid and lacking clarity. This perception of the situation has been shared both by the politicians and scholars alike (Mochizuki 1995, 125.) There is little doubt that Japan's relations with the US and the US-Japan security alliance has continued to be the cornerstone of Japan's foreign policy. To a certain degree, the same statement can be made in regards of most of the members of the international community as long as US continues to maintain its hegemonic position. However, the nature of the alliance has changed from a simple Cold-War structure to a more complex and fluid one where the relations with Russia have evolved to become multidimensional, going beyond the simple ally/foe dichotomy. Russia's integration in the world economy, the rapprochement with China, which has made the Japanese elites rather nervous (Hasegawa 1998) and, more active participation in the region have changed the regional order and have made it far more complex than the ideological confrontation of the Cold War era.

6. Summary

This chapter has outlined the analytical framework used in this thesis and its main conclusions. In general, the definition of national identity applied here relies heavily on the social cognitive model of identity applied to the studies of international relations by scholars such as Iver Neumann, Ted Hopf and others. National identity is perceived here as a definition of the national "self" vis-à-vis "other" nations. The main target of this thesis is to explore the construction of the Japanese "self" through a critical examination of the discourse on the Russian national character. Critical scholarship on *nihonjinron* and Stephan Tanaka's perceptive work on Japanese scholarship on China have served as major points of reference in the analysis of identity construction in Japanese perceptions of Russia.

However, this thesis is more cautious about the nature of the relationship between national identity and state policy than are a large part of national identity related IR

scholarship. The author believes that the assumption that state interests (and hence, foreign policy) are derivable from identity (for example, Hopf 2002), or that foreign policy is just one of the tools in the construction if national identity through creation of difference (for example, Campbell 1992) carries excessive theoretical baggage. When applied to an actual case study of identity and policy, these kind of analytical framework/s may result in a simplified understanding of both identity and policy. Hence, this thesis examines separately the Japanese identity discourse on Russia and her foreign policy vis-à-vis Russia. It argues that the relationship is far more complex than the one provided by the constructivist and poststructuralist definitions. At times the traces of identity construction in State's are either non-existent or extremely vague and diffuse, like in the economic and security policy discourses. At the same time, this thesis argues that identity construction and State's foreign policy can function as border creating practices and here the analysis utilizes Campbell's framework as the most suitable analytical tool. However, the thesis discovers the creation of hierarchical difference between the "self" and the "other" not in the conception of "danger/threat" and security policy as argued by Campbell but in the conception of the territorial dispute and related policies.

The last section of this chapter outlined the main developments in Japan's international environment in order to clarify the importance of the post-Cold War for Japan's relations with Russia. The arguments presented here do not contain anything particularly new and can be found in a much more detailed form in the numerous scholarly works on Japan's foreign policy. In general, this part of the chapter argued that in spite of the collapse of the Cold War structure, Japan's relations with the US continue to play a vital role in Japan's relations with the rest of the world. However, the (relative) integration of Russia in the realm of "democracy and market economy" on one side, and the emergence of new (real or perceived) threats such as North Korea and China on the other side, has altered the nature of Japan's relations with Russia from a relatively simple participation in the American strategy of containment to a more complex one. The main aspects of these relations will be examined in the last chapter.

Chapter I: Limitations of Constructivism

Orientalist ideas could enter into alliance with general philosophical theories and diffuse world hypotheses, as philosophers sometimes call them; and in many ways the professional contributors to Oriental knowledge were anxious to couch their formulation and ideas in language and terminology whose cultural validity derived from other sciences and systems of thought.
Edward Said "Orientalism"

1. Introduction

Since the emergence of the San-Francisco system firmly placing Japan in the Western camp through the Peace Treaty and the US-Japan Security Alliance, Japan's "special relationship" with the US has been considered to be at the core of Japan's interaction with the outside world (for example Ambassador Okazaki in *Japan Times* 16.9.20002.) Not surprisingly, there is a vast amount of academic literature on both sides of the Pacific devoted to descriptive and prescriptive analyses of the bilateral relations (for post Cold War period see for example Mochizuki 1997, Inoguchi et al 1997, Green 1999, Hosoya and Nobuta eds 1998, Nishihara 2000, Vogel 2002.)

There are also numerous excellent general works on Japan's international relations in the post WWII international system some of which also include analysis or predictions about Japan's place in the post-Cold War international system (for example, Inoguchi 1991, Hook et al 2005, Drifte 1998, Hughes 2004.)

The English language IR scholarship has also seen a number of works on Soviet/Russo-Japanese relations (for example, Rozman 1992, Hasegawa 1993, Hasegawa 1998, Hara 1998, Rozman 2000, Ivanov and Smith 1999.) These works provide a detailed description of the bilateral relations and analyze them from the perspectives of domestic and international politics. Combined, they probably cover all the major events that have occurred in the bilateral high politics in the last two five decades. The majority of the research is devoted to historical and political analysis, explaining the origins of the Soviet/Russo-Japanese conflict paying a special attention to the territorial dispute. Among these works, Kimie Hara's *Japanese-Soviet/Russian Relations since 1945* (1998) is probably the most informed and concise account of the bilateral efforts to resolve the territorial dispute and to conclude a peace treaty since the end of WWII until 1993. Rozman's *Japan's response to the Gorbachev era* (1992) and a number of chapters in his edited book (2000) are the only scholarly works that engage in a detailed analysis of the non-material factors in the bilateral relations. These works will be reviewed in the following chapter.

In general, it is the constructivist works examined in this chapter, which have provided the most theoretically sound account of Japan's foreign policy, using as variables non-material factors such as culture and norms. It must be mentioned that Japan related International Relations scholarship has seen a number of attempts to use the concepts of culture and identity in explanations or predictions of Japan's behavior in the international arena (for example, see Tamamoto 1993.)

However, there are two works that, while departing from the traditional "rational actor" approach, have provided the most theoretically sound and detailed explanation of Japan's security policy in the post Pacific War era, using non-material factors as independent variables. The works discussed here are Peter J. Katzenstein's *Cultural Norms and National Security-Police and Military in Postwar Japan* (1996) and Thomas U. Berger's *Cultures of Antimilitarism-National Security in Germany and*

Japan (1998). The arguments advanced in these works have been repeated by the authors elsewhere (Katzenstein and Okawara 1993, Katzenstein 1996a, Berger 1996), and citations from these works will be used occasionally to clarify the points made. [6]

The main purpose of this chapter is to expose the limitations of these analyses. It does not seek to question the validity of the constructivist theory in general, but limits itself to outlining the pitfalls of the empirical works that have explored the normative/cultural and foreign policy nexus in the context of post-war Japan. However, since the author believes that one of the main sources of the shortcomings discussed below is the need to establish a direct causal relationship between the ideational and State's policy, this analysis probably has certain ramifications for the constructivist framework in general. The aim of this chapter is not to provide an argument supportive of the neo-realist (or neo-liberal) analytical framework that focuses solely on the systemic and perceives states to be rational actors. Chapter VII argues that domestic cultural discourses can be an important element in conception and formation of particular foreign policy. However, in this chapter the author argues that the focus on monolithic and comprehensive "culture" or normative structure combined with the positivist approach as applied by Berger and Katzenstein results in simplification and essentialization of both foreign policy and the non-material social structures. In other words, the author does not seek to refute the importance and the validity of non-material aspects in analyzing international relations but criticizes the constructivist positivism and its conception of national identity. Furthermore, the author seeks to criticize the dichotomous conception of both identity and foreign policy that defines both of the discourses as either "militarist" or "pacifist." As this chapter will show, the dichotomous approach also leads to essentialization of both foreign policy and identity.

The following part will introduce the conceptual frameworks and the conclusions of the two authors. This will be followed by an examination that implements a suggestion made by Peter Katzenstein himself to question what is "natural" and

---

[6] It should be mentioned that not only Japan but also Germany is the object of analysis of both of the works discussed. However, since the author lacks in-depth knowledge of Germany's politics and ideas in general, the discussion here is limited to the analysis and conclusions only as applied to Japan.

"normal" (Katzenstein and Sil 2004) but also to go beyond the militarism/pacifism dichotomy, which dominates the works discussed here and a decade later, still continues to be the main paradigm in Katzenstein's newly developed "eclectic analysis" of Japan's security (Katzenstein and Okawara 2004.) Through a brief introduction of alternative approaches to Japan's pacifism on one side and its foreign/defense policy on the other, it will try to show that the perceptions of both the cultural/normative structure and the policy as pacifist are too essentialized and simplified to be regarded as a meaningful inquiry into either aspects of "Japan."

2. Constructivist Framework and Japan

Both Berger (1998) and Katzenstein (1996) are answering the same "big" question- why Japan has been reluctant to use military force since the end of the Pacific War. As Katzenstein formulates it, "over the last few decades the Japanese police and military have been, by international standard, very reluctant to use violence"(1996,1.) Katzenstein argues that, the contrast between Japan and the US is self-evident regarding the use of military force since the end of the Pacific War. Berger's work is very much dominated by the same *problematique* or what he calls the puzzle of "the dog that did not bark," with Japan representing the dog and the use of military force the barking (Berger 1998, 193.)

Both of the authors criticize the two dominant theoretical approaches to IR-what Berger calls, "system determinism and material rationalism" (1998, 199) for their lack of explanatory power. Emphasizing the importance of the domestic as a factor in shaping States' policies, Berger criticizes the realist and liberal approaches for their focus on the systemic. He explains that States' perceptions on the systemic signals and the tools of response that are available to them, are influenced heavily by domestic forces. Non-material factors play an important role since actors understanding of the environment is conditioned by cognitive perceptions. These perceptions are in many ways a result of socially negotiated understanding of past events (Ibid.)

Hence, an understanding of the cultural context within which the cognitive perceptions are located, allows for a more comprehensive and detailed understanding

of State's policy choices (1998, 18.) Culture is seen as supplying the fundamental goals and norms of political actors, determines the perception of domestic and international political environment and conditions the ability to mobilize the national resources for military purposes (Berger 1998, 16.) Methodologically, Berger proposes that culture should be disaggregated from behavior in order to avoid the tautology of deriving culture from behavior, and can be discerned from public opinion polls, parliamentary debates, books and articles by opinion leaders, newspaper editorials, etc (1998,20.)

Katzenstein's analytical framework also emphasizes the importance of the domestic factors. He explains that the realist approach is indeterminate in its understanding of Japan's security policy and is "too restrictive" as it treats Japan as a "unified and rational actor" (1996, 23.) While sympathetic with the liberal approach, which focuses on the role of norms in regulating states' behavior, Katzenstein criticizes it for overlooking the "thick" constitutive norms that "define the identities of the actors" (1996, 27) and, in case of security policy, shape the interests that inform the policy (1996, 28.) Norms are defined as "collective expectations for the proper behavior of actors with a given identity" (Katzenstein 1996a, 5.)

In general, this conception of the non-material factors and their relationship with policy is located within the broadly defined constructivist framework, outlined by Alexander Wendt. Culture is defined as a "socially shared knowledge" (Wendt 1999,141), which is inscribed in the collective memory (1999, 163) and constitutes the identities and interests of the actors involved (1999, 177.)

Both authors propose solutions, which are rooted in domestic non-material factors. According to Berger, the solution to the puzzle of why Japan, in spite of her "economic and technological prowess" and formidable military potential (1998, 193) did not use military force as a tool of foreign policy "lies in the strong antimilitarist sentiments" that emerged domestically in the wake of the WW II defeat (1998, x.) These sentiments have played a vital role in the post-war national identity construction and were institutionalized to become constitutive components of post-war political culture. According to Berger, the Japanese have "stood the prewar cult of Bushido and the Japanese warrior spirit on its head," (1998, 199) fundamentally changing their perceptions of state's interests and the international environment.

Berger concedes that other factors may have played a role as well (1998, 194) but the cultural factors have had a "profound influence" (1998, 193) on Japan's approach to national defense and security related issues.

Katzenstein, whose work focuses on institutionalized norms as shared knowledge that has shaped the decision making process, notes that in post-war period, the Japanese have embraced an identity of a "merchant nation" or "economic identity" (1996, 20.) Japan's external security is largely shaped by the normative context, which is defined by the interaction between the institutionalized social norms that are expressed by public opinion (1996, 39) and the legal norms (1996, 18), which "condition the definition of interests that inform Japan's security policy"(1993, 129.) These norms have become institutionalized in the media, in the judicial system and in the bureaucracy and they shape the interests and policy choices of the government (1996, 19.) Besides the emphasis on economic strength and the public support for Article 9 of the Constitution, Katzenstein's analysis emphasizes the norms of peaceful diplomacy, low-key consensus approach, the lack of popular respect for the Self Defense Forces (SDF) and the lack of willingness by the public to resort to armed defense. These are seen as proof of Japan's stable anti-militarist social norm (1996, 116.) The legal norms are those embedded in Article 9 of the Constitution, which outlaws war and prohibits the state the right of belligerency (1996, 118.) Japan's security policy is portrayed as being determined by the interaction of the social and legal norms, which condition the definition of interests that inform the policy (1993, 129.)

3. New Concepts, Old Ideas

No doubt that both of the works belong to a more sophisticated body of Western scholarship, which has been preoccupied with what Dower (1994) calls "sizing up" Japan. However, there are two critical ontological and methodological issues, which undermine the validity of the empirical findings proposed by the works discussed.

Ontologically, the formulation of the puzzle involves a number of assumptions shared by a large part of Japan related scholarship that's preoccupied with Japan's uniqueness. Like numerous other studies of Japanese society, these works evolve

around the same master narrative of Japan as different (Clammer 2001, 2) and as the "other" for the (Anglo-Saxon *my addition*) West (2001,21) either in positive or negative terms. This body of scholarship is dominated by the need to essentialize and simplify the various aspects of Japanese society (or, what Clammer calls "categorical mode" limitations.) As the result, Japan "One of the culturally richest, sociologically most complex and conceptually most challenging of the societies, becomes dull"(Clammer 2001, 27.)

First, the postwar cultural/normative anti-militarism presupposes a drastic change and a break from a culture of militarism. It assumes an existence of militant and inherently jingoistic totalizing normative/cultural structure in pre-1945 Japan, which shaped Imperial Japan's policy. This perception of Japanese as being inherently bloodthirsty has dominated the Western imagery since long ago, especially after the attack on Pearl Harbor (Littlewood 1996, 167.)

This assumption is most visible in Berger's work. One of the most vivid proofs for this conception of prewar Japan is the emphasis on the lack of the concept of "civilian" in prewar Japan, which was introduced to Japan for the first time by the American occupation (Berger1998, 50.)

A more careful analysis will reveal that "civilian" has existed in pre-war Japan and was translated as *futsumin* or *heimin,* while "civil" was translated as *minkan no* or *shimin no* (*Sanseido English-Japanese dictionary* 1928, and Creswell et al 1942.) A detailed inquiry into the creation of the concept *bunmin* reveals that it is related to the drafting of the new constitution under the guidance for the SCAP in 1946. Among other demands, the Far East Commission insisted on inserting "civilian" as one of the qualifications for the Prime Minister and other members of Cabinet. When the Japanese government proposed, "Prime Minister and other Ministers of the Cabinet should not have a military background" which, in Japanese corresponds perfectly to the "civilian control" demand, the Occupation authorities (commonly known as the GHQ) expressed its dissatisfaction and insisted on inserting "civilian" in Article 16. (Ootsuka 1992, 165-166) As Yoshida Shigeru states in his memoirs, since there was no explicit *legal* term (italics added by author) in Japanese corresponding to "civilian", eventually the Chinese characters compound *bunmin* was created (quoted in Ootsuka 1992, 166.)

Furthermore, in order to illustrate the militaristic nature of prewar Japan, Berger gives an example of Fukuzawa Yukichi's "Rich Country, Strong Nation" motto that "reflected the country's peculiar blend of militarism and with aggressive notions of national destiny" (Berger 1998, 8.) Besides that this is an over-simplified reading of the rich philosophy of Fukuzawa the leading Enlightenment thinker of Japan, Berger completely forgets that his liberal ideas were not in favor during the years of militarism and could hardly be considered as part of that ideology. Ironically, Maruyama Masao, one of the most prominent critical intellectuals of post-war Japan has used Fukuzawa's ideas to criticize Japan's militarism (Maruyama 1963, 18 and Hiraishi 2003.) Also the rationale behind the "strong nation" part of the motto as the need to preserve Japan's independence from the greed of European imperialism seems to be considered irrelevant. Similarly, the aggressive and bloody nature of European imperialism that has provided the Meiji rulers with enough reasons to worry about the future of Japan is also ignored in the quest for the militaristic Japan.

The nature of the pre 1945 Japanese normative or cultural structure is a rather complex issue. The simplistic understanding of Bushido as to "die happily for the sake of one's lord" (in Bellah 2003, 21) was probably shared by the military, but it also must not be forgotten that the ideology of Imperial Japan was more complex than a simple jingoism and also emphasized the peaceful and civilized nature of the Japanese (for example Ouchi 1937 and Umemori 2006.) It also should not be forgotten, that the broader notion of Bushido, popularized by Nitobe Inazo in his famous *Bushido, The Soul of Japan* (1899) originally written in English as a depiction of Japanese moral code does not deviate from the Western norms and includes the pursuit of justice, courage, benevolence, politeness, sincerity and loyalty. In 1932 after Japan's invasion of Manchuria and the growing criticism of Japan in the West, Nitobe himself has toured the United States with a series of lectures trying to promote understanding and peace between Japan and the United States.

How deep was the penetration of militarism into people's minds is another important question, providing an answer to which, lies beyond the scope of this thesis. However, it must be noted that even the highly orienalistic account of Japanese national character provided by Ruth Benedict, written during the Pacific War, notes that Bushido has been a "modern official term which has no deep folk-

feeling behind it" (Benedict 1946, 175.) Reflecting this complexity of the Japanese self-image, after the defeat in the Pacific War, the newly "peaceful" Japan, was seen by many intellectuals not as a departure but as a return to the traditional values (Wada 2002.) As such, it seems to be a grave oversimplification to claim that the cultural/normative framework of "militarist" or "jingoistic" national character can provide a plausible explanation for the pre-1945 behavior of Japan.

Needless to say, post war Japan has not been unique in its "not barking policy." There are probably more nations in the world that did not deploy their military overseas over the last five decades than did so over the same period of time. Japan (and Germany) stand out as leading economic powers and therefore the conception of the puzzle, i.e. the question of why Japan has not resulted to military force also implies that economically powerful states are naturally bound to resort to a use of force. This conception conceals two major problems. One is that this assumption can be traced to the realist understanding of states' interests, which the authors are actually trying to deviate from. After all, it is the realist framework of Morgenthau and Waltz that assumes that states' interests are unified under a universal rationality of power accumulation and the pursuit of self preservation through means of violence.

Second, and more important, is that this formulation of the puzzle presupposes an existence of situations where Japan would "rationally" need to resort to military action. No doubt that the case of postwar Japan is unique compared to other economically powerful states. However, her security environment has also been unique, as Japan's security policy has been firmly located within the framework of US-Japan Alliance, where the US has taken on itself a leading role. Furthermore, during the Cold War years, Japan has never faced an immediate objective or subjective security threat, that would force her to make drastic decisions regarding the use of force. Hence, it can be argued that the case of Japan provides positivist evidence to support both the realist and constructivist theories (Otte and Grimes 1998, 11) since it never faced the need to consider a military option.

Methodologically, the constructivist framework seeks to establish a positivist causal relationship between the policy and the non-material structure. As such both the dependent and the independent variables are simplified and treated as relatively

stable and consistent in order to fit into the cause-effect framework. As already mentioned, Katzenstein focuses on institutionalized norms, which by definition become an integral and consistent part of the social structure. Berger notes that culture will experience only incremental changes in response to ordinary historical events such as shifts in the balance of power or the formation of international institutions. (1998,20.)

Japan's policy during the postwar years is also portrayed as consistently static. Katzenstein accounts for the various changes that occurred in Japan's security policies over the four decades since the end of the Pacific War but concludes that no "sharp changes" have occurred in the security policy (1993, 139-199.) Berger engages in a very brief discussion on the changes in the international environment like the détente, its end, and the end of the Cold War, and describes the responses of the political establishment to these challenges. While admitting that various changes have occurred in Japan's defense policies and interpreting them as a "rational learning process"(1998,147) responding to domestic and international challenges, Berger asserts that these changes were minor and the basic norms and values of different subgroups have displayed continuity (1998,148). Even such major shocks as the end of the Cold War and the Gulf War forced Japan only to modify its views and to adopt "less parochial" approaches to national security but these changes served only to confirm the antimilitaristic core values (1998,167.) The yardstick for measuring change is unclear but it seems that nothing short of full-scale invasion of a neighboring country conducted by the SDF would account for a change in policy.

The essentialization implied in the focus on the general norms and culture dangerously treads on the thin line between inquiry into Japan's cultural setting and the Orienalistic framework of analysis. The comparison of the accounts of Japan with the Western Orientalism is too tempting to be avoided here. According to Said, present day Orientalism, can be seen not as a "sudden access of objective knowledge" but as a modified set of structures that previously dominated the discourse and were modified by new trends in the social sciences (1979, 122.) There is a certain epistemological similarity between Orientalism and constructivist framework that focuses on the non-material factors, as both are providing accounts of collective behavior based on essentialized images of culture and normative structures

of the society. However, stripped of the scientific language of political science, the findings of the works discussed here seem to repeat numerous clichés that have been present in other, less theoretically sound explorations into Japan's culture and norms

Hence, the Japanese Left "appeared almost hopelessly naïve" regarding the Soviet propaganda and realities (Berger 1998, 37) and while it had been "idealizing" the communist nations, the Right was "glorifying" the past of imperial Japan with the political Center "idealizing" the US (1998, 62.) It is interesting how this depiction of the Japanese resonates with the one provided by General MacArthur, a well-known "admirer" of the Japanese, who noted that "measured by the standards of modern civilization, they [the Japanese] would be like a boy of twelve as compared with our development of forty-five years" (cited in Littlewood 1996, 94.) More importantly, though, the Japanese Communist Party, which had been the second major political party of the left but has also been strongly nationalistic and pursued a course independent from both the Soviet and Chinese Communist parties since the 1960s, is left out of this account of Japan's political spectrum.

There is nothing revealing about the notion of Japanese pacifism, as the "uniquely Japanese pacifism" has been an integral part of *nihojinron* (Ishida 1989, 12-13.) There, pacifism is seen as part of Japan's traditional values and perceives the postwar, to be basically a return to the normal. Japan's political culture as defined by the norms of consensus has also been depicted in the *nihonjinron* literature (for example, Nakagawa 1977) and its origins have been traced to the social and economic circumstances of the pre-modern *mura* (village) society (1977, 117-127.)

Interestingly, the *nihonjinron* literature of the 1970s and 1980s, which will be discussed in detail in the next chapter, shares certain ontological and epistemological premises with the constructivist works as its main goal was to provide and explanation for Japan's postwar success through culture, norms and tradition.

On the policy level, we can agree with Hirano Kenichiro (1985, 345) that, *heiwa* (peace) has become one of the foundations of post-Pacific War Japan diplomatic ideology. At the same time, its purely rhetorical nature, the hollowness of meaning and contradictions with other "pillars" of Japan's foreign relations, such as the US-Japan military alliance, have also been pointed out and criticized (Kurino 1982.)

The last part of this chapter aims at showing the complexity and the dynamism of the norms and culture, and providing some different interpretations of Japan's security policy, divorced from the causal framework of analysis.

4. Beyond the Pacifism/Militarism Dichotomy

4.1 The General Interpretation of Post-War Pacifism

It is far beyond the scope of this chapter and of this thesis to provide a detailed analysis of Japan's post-war political culture and norms. Furthermore, the analytical framework outlined in the previous chapter and used in the empirical chapters, questions the usefulness of exploration into general and totalizing social structures. However, by examining separately the societal environment and the policy, this section hopes to expose the simplifications of the dichotomous approach used by Berger and Katzenstein. This section will illustrate that if we depart from the pacifist/militarist dichotomy in analyzing the society and the foreign policy, Japan's "postwar" can be seen in a completely different light.

There is little doubt that the general perception among the Japanese public that Japan is a "peaceful nation" has become part of the postwar mainstream discourse and discussed by numerous Japanese intellectuals from various perspectives (for conservative critique see Fukuda Tsuneari 1966, for liberal critique see Nakamura et al. in Sakamoto 1982.) However, the actual meaning of this pacifism is highly debatable. In general, the whole attempt to find a consistent normative/cultural structure in the context of pacifism for postwar Japan is problematic. Numerous authors have emphasized the different stages in Japan's postwar era (*sengo*), with different ideologies and different master paradigms that have dominated the intellectual debates and the general public (for example Yoshida 1994, Oguma 2002 and Yasumaru 2004.)

First, I propose to examine the meaning of the Peace Constitution. Katzenstein and Berger ascribe an important role to the Peace Constitution in the institutionalization of the pacifist norm and the emergence of the anti-militarist culture respectively. A

"dovish public climate" is seen as being "reinforced by the legal provisions" (Kazenstein 1996, 20) and the antimilitary and pacifist clauses in the constitution have acted as important constraints on Japanese military policy (Berger 1998, 30.)

Obviously, in the immediate postwar years, the understanding that, "peace" is to be the common basis for the new Japanese state has been shared by all the groups in the society, including even the nationalistic rightist wing groups (Wada 2002 and Umemori 2006.) This seems to be common sensical as opposition to peace would mean the advancement of jingoism or militarism and there is no modern state that had these ideas as the basis of its Constitution (Maruyama 1965, 257-258.)

Furthermore, propagating militarism would have been unthinkable in Japan that had been defeated military and economically. Interestingly, the economic factor (and not the pacifist mood or the constitution) was perceived as the main reason for the general public reluctance to rearm, was pointed out by the American Japan watchers in their analysis of Japanese public opinion in the late 1940s and early 1950s (Thayer 1951, 85.) Hence, it can be plausibly argued that initially Article 9 has been treated as a self-evident expression of Japan's postwar reality. It also can be said to reflect the realities of the international society of 1945-47, tired of war and hoping for long lasting international peace (Oguma 2002, 153-174 and 448-449.)

However, the interpretation of the Peace Constitution and its meaning has varied greatly. Maruyama, the most celebrated post-war scholar of Japanese political thought and the most prominent progressive intellectual, has examined the normative meaning of the abolition of armed forces and the renouncement of war. He divides the interpretations in two groups-those that see this as a manifest of an ideal which is separated from the real politics (dualism) and those that see the declaration as imposing certain limitations of the politics, serving as a king of a "limiting fence" for the actual policies to be pursued by the government. However, in opposition to those static interpretations, Maruyama proposes a more "progressive" one-the Constitution serving as a broad and *dynamic* set of guidelines, a kind of a compass for the politics (1965, 259-261 italics added.) Departing from this understanding of the new Constitution, Maruyama interprets the passages in the preface of the Constitution that refer to the Japanese people trusting in the justice and faith of the peace-loving peoples of the world" and the desire of "Japanese people to occupy an honored place

in the community of the peace loving peoples." He perceives this not as an expression of desire to rely on other nations but actually as extending a positive obligation on the government to engage in actions necessary to achieve a peaceful resolution of international conflicts (1965, 267-268.) In other words, Maruyama perceives the Peace Constitution as progressive and internationalist, committing Japan to active participation in the process of peaceful change of the international society. (1965, 269)

Few would argue that Japan has fulfilled this mission of active promotion of international peace or that this interpretation of the constitution has found support among the Japanese people. One of the leaders of the peace movement, Kuno Osamu, has written in 1953, that, unfortunately both the pacifist idea and the realistic idealism are yet to be embraced by the political power and so far have remained on the "civilian" level (Kuno 1972, 70-71.) However, even on the societal level, the notion of pacifism has evolved from being a negative concept in pre 1945 Japan, to a positive symbol, but *failed* to become part of the (national) consciousness (Ishida 1968, 143-144 italics added.)

Hence, the "popular pacifism" or "defending the constitution" movement of the 1950s and 1960s can be interpreted more as an expression of Japan's nationalism than as an expression of popular belief in international peace. The "people" did not want war, but the main consideration was to avoid war on Japan's land. The greatest fear of the Japanese was the reoccurrence of the attacks on the Japanese homeland which were still vividly remembered by the majority of the population (Jorden in Borton et al 1957, 284.) These memories were also part of the sentiment behind the mass anti US-Japan alliance demonstrations of 1960. As one of the participants recalls, "defending the Peace Constitution" cause was mainly justified by the "never again war on *our* land!" slogan (in *Asahi Shimbun* 23.11.2005 italics added.)

As it is visible from public opinion polls conducted in the early 1950s, the majority of the Japanese did not oppose recreation of the military per se, but opposed it in the context of it becoming part of the American forces. The same reason was behind the opposition to overseas deployment of the newly created Self Defense Forces, namely it was not much of a pacifist belief but more an expression of

nationalism, a lack of desire to get involved in a war, conducted by the former enemy (Oguma 2002, 454-461.)

Interestingly, Oguma traces certain parallels between the various anti-colonial movements and the Japanese "defending the constitution" movement (*goken undo.)* The situation which "small and weak" Japan found itself in the early 1950s in the context of her relations with the US has resembled the colonial setting, and hence the opposition to constitutional revision was more an expression of nationalism directed towards both the US and the USSR, than pacifism (Oguma 2002, 465-473.)

The mass anti-US-Japan Alliance movement (*anpo*) of 1960 had been an expression of anger towards the "undemocratic" way PM Kishi concluded the treaty and was dominated by the slogans of "patriotism" and "nation." As such it was also much more an expression of anti-American nationalism than pacifism. Emerging from the war memories of the intellectuals, Kishi, the pardoned war criminal, symbolized all the bad of the imperial past and their anger was very much a product of their own guilty consciousness regarding their passive stance during the years of militarism. On the other side, the "citizens" that participated in the demonstration were not interested in the ideological rivalries of the Marxist, Trotskyte and other student groups but were instead motivated by the feeling of struggle against corrupt politicians (Oguma 2002, 499-548.)

While it can be argued that initially there was a certain synergy between the progressive intellectuals and the masses, since the failure to prevent the renewal of the US-Japan Security Treaty in 1960, the progressive intellectuals became further and further alienated from the general public (Kersten 2005.) While the intellectuals continued their critique of the alliance with the US, a general "optimism regarding the further continuity of peace in Japan" and growing lack of interest in foreign affairs spread among the Japanese public. However it can be explained by a simplistic (or, overly optimistic) view of the state of international affairs and Japan's place in it. This view is not based on pacifism but founded on the self-centered belief that Japan is unlikely to get involved in a conventional war, at least in the near future nuclear war will not occur and that the international economic activities of Japan are peaceful and cannot present a threat to peace (Nakamura et al in Sakamoto 1982, 157.)

4.2 Public Opinion Polls

The public opinion polls cited by both Katzestein and Berger as a proof of a widely spread pacifism, reveal a rather different picture if examined detached from the comparison with the imaginary jingoistic "spirit of Bushido" and beyond the related pacifist/militarist dichotomy.

Asahi Shimbunsha publishing house has continuously conducted public opinion polls regarding the general population's views on constitution and military and defense policy. In the overall summary of the Japanese public attitudes during the "postwar" years, written in the last days of the Cold War, the general trend of the Japanese attitudes is seen as not favoring Japan becoming a military superpower but as having consistently agreed to the need of military. The public has also affirmed that over the years, since its creation, the SDF has played an important role in protecting Japan's peace. Only 15% in 1970 and 21% in 1988 of those polled stated that there was no need to rely on military power and there is no need for either the SDF or the American military to protect Japan (Asahi Shimbunsha 1988, 173-186.)

The public opinion polls conducted annually by the Prime Minister's Office confirm these findings as they reveal a gradually increasing favorable impression regarding the SDF among the public during the Cold War years (66% in 1967 and 74.3% in 1984) and the need to maintain or increase the present level of defense capability (44.4% and 22% respectively in 1969 and 61.4% and 12.6% in 1984) and only a minority supporting a reduction in defense capabilities (10.8% in 1969 and 11.8% in 1984)[7] (PM Office homepage.)

"Unarmed neutrality", which has been one of the main slogans of the intellectuals of the left, found little support among the general public in the years after the 1960 protests. In a poll conducted in 1967, only 17% supported unarmed neutrality as the optimal way to guarantee Japan's security (PM Office 1967, 67.) In a similar poll conducted in 1975, fifteen years after the mass protests against the US-Japan security alliance, only 9% showed support for the abolition of the US-Japan Security treaty and the abolition or reduction of SDF forces. In 1984 the numbers of supporters of

---

[7] The figures are for Ground SDF but the ratio is similar for Marine SDF and Air SDF as well.

the abolition of the US-Japan Security Treaty and the reduction or abolition of the SDF further decreased to 6.8%. Furthermore, 57% answered that, while diplomacy should be the most important way to prevent acts of aggression against Japan, a necessary minimum of defense capabilities should be maintained. 44% in 1976 and 60% in 1981 have replied positively when asked whether there was a possibility of Japan being involved in some kind of military conflict. In 1981, out of the 34% that negated this possibility, only 29% have stated the reason to be the war abolition norm under the present constitution, while 28% stated the UN efforts to achieve international peace, reflecting the "naïve optimism" criticized by Nakamura (PM Office website, PM Office 1976, 14-17 and 1982, 18-27.)

Regarding the "fighting spirit" of the Japanese, the large majority has always shown a willingness to defend their country. True, to the direct question regarding a will to protect the country, the percentage of polled that have expressed a strong or quite strong willingness has been relatively low (around 50%) followed by " I cannot say" or "I don't know" (around 40%.) However, it must be noted that those polled were asked to express the strength of their will as "compared to others." Dangerously treading on the line of Orientalism myself, the author would attribute the low level of expressions of strong willingness to defend Japan and a high percentage of "don't know" to the Japanese modesty and humility when asked to compare themselves with others. Furthermore, it must be also remembered that the numbers of those that have explicitly expressed a weak willingness to defend their country has consistently been very low (around 7%.)

The author believes that the below figures that show the patterns of response to the question regarding their action in case of invasion confirms the above speculation and also the existence of "healthy" patriotism among the Japanese population. In 1969, only 6.5% replied that they would not resist invasion, 12.5% said they will resist in a non-violent way, 42% would support a violent resistance and 36.9% said, that they don't know (PM Office homepage.) In 1982, when asked the same question, 43% replied that they would either participate or support violent resistance, 16% replied that they would resist in a non-violent way and only 12% replied that they would not engage in any act of resistance (PM Office 1982, 18-27.)

Furthermore, after the end of the Cold War, the numbers of "realists" and "patriots" have continued to climb. In 1991, 62.4% replied that Japan's security should be achieved through the US-Japan Security Treaty and SDF, 7.3% have shown support for self-reliance thorough the abolishment of the Security Treaty and the enhancement of the SDF and only 10% have shown support to the "unarmed neutrality", to be achieved through abolishment of the Security Treaty and either reduction of the SDF capabilities or its complete abolishment (PM Office1991, 35-42.)

In 2003, this after the beginning of the War on Terror and Japan's participation in it, to a question regarding their actions in case of invasion by a foreign force, 48.9% said they would support the SDF in one way or another and 18.3% said they would resist in a non-violent way and only 7.7% (from the highest of 12.4% in 1981) replied that they would not resist in any way. As the same time, an equal number of respondents have replied that they will fight the invaders by joining the SDF or engaging in a guerilla resistance. (PM Office HP)

Furthermore the collective memory of the Pacific War, which is generally perceived as the central driving force in the opposition to Japan's remilitarization, has undergone an important transformation with the change of generations. In an opinion poll regarding Japanese perceptions of its pre-1945 history, almost half of those polled (44.8%) replied that Japan's military interventions were unavoidable acts of survival and the largest number (36.9.%) of the polled has replied that the people were the victims of militarist propaganda and hence bear no responsibility (In Yoshida 1994, 27.)

Possibly it can be argued that, reflecting the non-existence of an actual or perceived threat to national security and lack of patriotic education, the Japanese "fighting spirit" has been lower and the perceptions of international affairs much more optimistic than those of Americans or Europeans. However, the results of the above analysis reveal a population neither pacifist or militarist, but one, that firmly supports its military and the military alliance with the US, with a large majority willing to actively contribute to the protection of the country in one way or another, in case of invasion. It seems that we can confidently conclude that this population can hardly be called pacifist or even anti-militarist in the sense of opposing the

legitimacy of the military or military solutions or believing in Gandi like non-violent resistance.

In light of these findings, the popular reluctance to actively participate in the first Gulf War, which is used by Berger as evidence of Japanese pacifism, can be more correctly interpreted not as pacifism but as a manifestation of a lack of interest in affairs which are not perceived as directly related to Japan. As Oguma has noted, Japan has been suffering from isolationism, meaning "rejection of any troublesome event outside Japan in an attempt to maintain domestic peace and stability" (Oguma 2002a, 322.)

4.3 Views of Japan's Security Policy

As already mentioned, during the Cold War years Japan has not faced an actual or perceived danger that would demand a result to military means. During the two main wars (Korea and Vietnam) that have taken place in Asia during those years, Japan's establishment has been preoccupied with achieving more immediate national interests and perceived the wars more as opportunity than as a threat.

During the Korean War, from which Japanese economy has benefited greatly, the perception of immediate danger to Japan's security did not exist among the Japanese elite (Jorden in Borton et al 1957, 279) and PM Yoshida's policy had generally been oriented towards regaining of independence from the US led occupation (Watanabe 1985, 29-30.) Furthermore, it seems that the general public also did not feel threatened even when the North Korean army was rapidly advancing southward and, in general, did not show much interest in the war (Thayer 1951.)

The same lack of threat perception continued to prevail across political fractions and social classes after the San-Francisco Peace treaty was signed, and Japan again became an independent nation. In an opinion poll conducted among business leaders, high government officials, labor union leaders and scholars in May 1954, just over a year from the end of the Korean War, only 3% of the respondents indicated a fear of communism or Communist aggression (Wilbur in Borton et al 1957, 312.) At the time, the reluctance to re-arm in response to American demands during the Korean

War, has been rooted not in the fear of war but in the need to focus on the economic recovery, PM Yoshida's personal suspicion of the military, the harsh economic situation and the alarmist view of Japan's rearmament by Australia and other neighboring countries. (Watanabe 1985, 29.)

The Vietnam War, the other major war in Asia, was perceived by a large number of the population as a war of American aggression but not directly related to Japan. The anti-American feelings among the Japanese public were on the rise, and the government, trying to facilitate the return of Okinawa, was preoccupied with maintaining the stability in the relationship with the US (Iokibe 1999, 122-125.)

As for the Soviet threat, the Japanese have never felt it to be as menacing as in Western Europe. A surprise attack by the Soviet Union on Japan was never a conceivable possibility for the Japanese policy establishment (Hasegawa 2000b, 300.)

Needless to say, Japan's general postwar policy has rarely been perceived as pacifist by the Asian nations, especially China and Korea. As already mentioned in the *Introduction*, the issue of Japan's frictions with these two nations is complex and should not be treated as a simple reflection of Japan's policies. However, the fact that Japan has never managed to project the pacifist nation image into the regional debates and her intentions continued to be viewed with suspicion should not be forgotten. In other words, the argument regarding Japan as a peaceful nation, contrastingly different from the Imperial Japan, has certain validity in the domestic and Western discourse, but has been continuously rejected in the regional discourse on Japan.

Furthermore, Japan's policy has rarely been perceived as pacifist by the domestic intellectuals, who have continuously criticized the government for not living up to the standards set by the Peace Constitution. Ishida Takeshi, one of the main ideologues of pacifism in postwar Japan, reviewed the place of Japan in the postwar international system, and observed that, in spite of the fact that Japan has not been directly involved in any military conflict since the end of the Pacific War, it has become an important contributor to the "structural violence" through its economic activities overseas and indirect support of militarization of numerous Asian states (1989, 122-123.) He warns that the concepts "peace" and national security have

become identical, both on the policy level and as part of the broad public *Weltanschanung* (Ishida 1989, 124-125.)

Writing during the final stages of the Cold War, Prof Sakamoto Yoshikazu of Tokyo University, one of the leading public intellectuals of that time, stated that in light of the recent developments such as new emergency legislation, the controversial official visits to Yasukuni shrine, *kigensetsu* (Anniversary of the Empire Foundation) and textbooks related problems as well the increase in defense expenditures, it seemed that the Japanese government had embarked on the road of militarization. Hence he classified Japan as a medium military power (Sakamoto 1982, 237-270.)

In the same book edited by Sakamoto, the Japanese people are warned that today "even the small territory of Japan is densely covered with modern weapons" and that the process of "snatching away the peace from the Japanese society and bringing militarization to the Japanese society" is rapidly advancing (Nakamura et al. in Sakamoto 1982, 156.) The authors see the process of militarization as being fueled by the rise of "military technocrats", the weakening of the democratic idea in Japan that is reflected in domestic and international policies and the friendly and, from an economic perspective, mutually beneficial relations Japan has established with military dictatorships in numerous developing countries (Ibid, 186-193.)

It also has been pointed out that the Japanese military might has become few times larger that that of the Imperial Japanese Army and that starting from 1970s Japanese defense budget has become the 6th largest in the world, larger than the budgets of the four Scandinavian countries, Switzerland and Austria combined (in Ishida 1989, 123 and Nakamura et al in Sakamoto 1982, 162-163.)

These perceptions of Japan's security policy were not limited to domestic intellectuals and were shared by numerous foreign Japan experts. Like Sakamoto, Glenn Hook also views the changes that occurred in Japan during the 1970s-1980s as of major importance and sees it also as the process of the militarization of Japan (Hook 1996). Hook notes that Article 9 of the Constitution, which is supposed to be the basic document of the anti-militaristic norm, has been subject to various interpretations, ranging from the admission of wars of self-defense to the comprehensive prohibition of all kind of wars, including wars of self-defense. He asserts, quoting the head of the US Defense Information Center in support of his

claim, that already by 1984 Japan was well on a way to becoming a military power and in 1985, after the appreciation of the yen resulting from the Plaza Accord, its military budget became the third in the world, base on dollar calculations (1996, 50-56.)

In spite of no experience in actual warfare, the JSDF has come to be considered as one of the most potent armies in the region. As Ian Gow has noted, the JSDF is the "most technologically sophisticated non-nuclear force in the Asia-Pacific"(Gow 1993, 57-58.) As of 2001, only China surpassed Japan's military budget and both of the countries' budgets combined account for more than 60% of East Asia and Australasia's defense expenditures (The Military Balance, October 2002.) In short, the perception of Japan as a pacifist state has not been shared by the progressive domestic intellectuals and even by some Western Japan specialists.

Even the so-called "nuclear allergy," or the three anti-nuclear principles that were established in 1967 by the Sato cabinet, i.e., the political decision not to possess, produce or introduce nuclear weapons, which, along with the Constitution, can be seen as the second pillar of Japan's pacifism, were far from being as solid as claimed by Katzenstein (1996, 128.) The evidence that in spite of the anti-nuclear stance, Japan's actual policy has been much more pragmatic than advertised officially has been plentiful. Ohta (2004), Kyodo news agency reporter in the US, provides a detailed account based mainly on American documents, of Japan's nuclear policy since the end of the Pacific War. In general, it argues that Japan has continuously maintained the possibility of developing an independent nuclear arsenal and on various occasions has secretly agreed to American nuclear weapons being brought to Japan. The purely rhetorical nature on the "three no's" is obvious from the fact, that one of the governmental studies into the possibility of developing nuclear weapons, was conducted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1968, less than a year after its declaration by PM Sato (Ohta 2004, 303.) *Asahi Shimbun* has also revealed that in 1970, Yasuhiro Nakasone at that time Director-General of the Defense Agency, agreed to US nuclear weapons being brought into Japan at a meeting with US officials (*Asahi* 20.12. 2000.) Kei Wakaizumi, (2002) who served as Prime Minister Sato's secret envoy to negotiations on the return of Okinawa, mentioned a secret memorandum in which Japan agreed to US deployment of nuclear weapons on

Okinawa in case of emergency. Furthermore, there is also plenty of evidence that Japan has looked into the possibility of building nuclear armament at least on three occasions and the option was rejected on purely strategic grounds. (*Asahi* June 19, 2004.)

4.4 Post-Cold War Developments

How should we interpret the recent developments in Japan's domestic and international stance? An analysis of the developments, conducted within the "pacifist/militarist" dichotomy would conclude, like Masaru Tamamoto (in Agawa et al 2004) that Japan's participation in the War on Terror in Afghanistan and in the Second Gulf War, the swift adoption of various national security related bills[8] as well as the growth of constitutional revision momentum should be interpreted as a revolutionary change in the normative structure and in the foreign policy strategy. It concludes that Japan is losing its identity of a "civilian power" (Maull 1990/91) and transforming into a "militaristic" nation.

However, a less categorical look at the public opinion trends reveals that there has not been any change in the public opinion regarding militarism or forceful solutions of international conflicts. Since 1993, constitutional revision has been gradually gaining support among the broad population. The overwhelming majority of the supporters of the revision (around 50%) have stated the need for Japan to engage actively in contributing to the international society as the main reason (Yomuri Shimbun Publication 2002, 53.) The public has also shown support to the SDF dispatch to Iraq as part of the humanitarian effort (TV Asahi poll 21.2.2004, 49% and 55% in January.) In the most recent poll conducted by the PM Office in 2005, the majority of the polled (49.3%) have voted for an active participation in humanitarian aid and peaceful resolution of regional conflicts as the most important international role for Japan (PM Office HP.)

However the debates regarding the revision of the constitution and overseas dispatch of the SDF are conducted within the framework of international peace building and peace keeping and do not indicate in anyway "Americanization" or

---

[8] This was done in spite of the strong resistance from the opposition, by this dealing a blow the myth of "consultative norms" that is emphasized by Katzenstein.

Japan's involvement in overseas conflicts. After all the same public has shown a strong opposition to the war in Iraq war per se (TV Asahi 22.2. 2003, 79% against) and only 14% have expressed support of the American invasion (www.tv-asahi.co.jp.) Furthermore, the support for SDF presence in Iraq has decreased sharply, following the revelations regarding non-existence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq and the growing Iraqi resistance to the occupation (for example, NHK polls regarding the Iraq War 2003, NHK homepage.) There is little evidence that the "active participation in peaceful resolutions" means becoming an active partner in US wars for the Japanese.

It seems that there is a stronger will among the public for Japan's more active participation in international affairs, including peace keeping and humanitarian missions. This is paralleled by the rise of patriotic feelings and the decrease in guilt regarding the misdeeds of Imperial Japan. However, this should not be viewed as an abandonment of pacifism in favor of militarism, but as a complex and dynamic social change.

5. Conclusion

The purpose of this brief analysis is not to argue that, contrary to Katzenstein and Berger's propositions, Japan has never ceased being a militaristic nation, like claimed by some alarmists (for example, Axelbank 1972 or Halliday and McCormack 1973.) Furthermore, this chapter does not aim to provide supportive evidence to the rational actor approach by arguing that non-material elements do not matter in international relations.

Obviously, the structure of the Japanese politics, the role of the military, the definitions of national interest, and the social and legal normative context of post-war Japan are fundamentally different from that of pre-1945 Japan. It is beyond doubt that the war experience, the constitution and the popular mood have established certain parameters (Pyle 1992, 20 and Maruyama 1965) within which political leadership has operated. However, this chapter argues against a positivist and dichotomous approach to identity and foreign policy. It argues that the perception of

Japan (her social structures and foreign policy) in terms of either pacifist or militarist is simplistic and essentialist. The adoption of the "Peace Constitution" and the rhetoric about "peaceful Japan", as well as the fact that Japan has not engaged in military operations overseas since the end of the Pacific War[9] till the beginning of the War on Terror, do not necessarily mean societal and political pacifism. Detached from the "pacifist/militarist" dichotomy different periods of postwar Japan's policy and public opinion can be interpreted in a number of ways such as political realism, isolationism and even nationalism.

The main conclusion for the purposes of this thesis is, that the focus on broad and consistent general norms and culture as positivist factors determining foreign policy results in a simplified and essentialized analysis of both. In order to provide a more nuanced analysis of national identity and its relationship with foreign policy, the analytical framework used in this thesis has two main differences from the one used by Berger and Katzenstein. First, in order to avoid the dichotomous understanding of identity it focuses on particular identity discourse in which the Japanese "self" is constructed vis-à-vis the Russian "other." Second, it abandons the positivist approach in favor of a post-structuralist analysis. The case study conducted here does not seek to establish a cause-effect relationship between identity discourse and foreign policy. It examines them separately and argues that the relationship is not always visible and thick. In case of Japan's security policy vis-à-vis Russia, the relationship between identity and policy seems to be vague and weak and in economic policy it is non-existent. It can be observed in the territorial dispute and related policies. However, the relationship is not one of cause/effect but one in which identity construction and foreign policy combined, engage in a political practice of "othering." The last chapter argues that in this particular case study Northern Territories related foreign policy and identity are part of what Campbell defines as Foreign Policy-political practice of creation of borders between the "self" and the "other" through construction of hierarchical difference.

A large part of this thesis is devoted to analysis of particular identity discourse and hence it is important to review the dominant debates on Japan's national identity.

---

[9] Actually this is not completely correct as Japan has sent mine sweeping vessels during the Korean War and even suffered one casualty.

The following chapter will review the broad debate on contemporary Japan's national identity, which has emerged from the broadly defined Japan studies and has not been restricted by the need to establish empirically the influence of the identity discourse on foreign policy.

Chapter II: A Literature Review-Japan's Identity

The previous chapter outlined the shortcomings of the constructivist approach to Japan's social structures and their relationship with Japan's foreign policy. However, the inquiry into the nature of Japan's national identity has not been limited to the IR scholarship. This chapter aims to provide a cross disciplinary review of the main debates regarding the construction of Japan's identity. Its main purpose is to outline the structures and the roles of the "other" in Japan's identity debates. The following part will examine the main arguments regarding the origins, roles and structure of the broad socio-cultural national identity discourse (*nihonjinron*.) The second part of this chapter will examine two case studies of particular identity discourses whose analytical approach and conclusions are of particular interest to this thesis.

1. *Nihonjiron* as the Main Identity Discourse

In Japan's context, the notion of "national identity" has been defined and perceived in a number of ways, often identifying it with the state's definition of national interest. However, even this political definition of national interest presumes to reflect deeper traditional and cultural values of Japanese society. For example, Kitaoka Shin'ichi, a leading political scientist, conceives national identity as a purely political enterprise. He conflates the nation and the state and defines national identity as an intentional choice of self-definition (or of a role) as a state, conducted by the

ruling elites, and belongs to the realm of international politics. Kitaoka defines the core of Japan's identity not only as a success of independent economic development, but also as the ability to reconcile traditional culture and values with westernization. (Kitaoka in Ito 1999, 236-243) However, what is the nature of "traditional culture and values?" The question of what constitutes Japan's socio-cultural national characteristics has been the focus of numerous academic and popular explorations since the beginning of the process of modern state creation in the second half of the 19th century. In general, the whole body of literature that focuses on the unique characteristics of the Japanese nation is usually referred to as *nihonjinron*.

Nihonron (theory of Japan), *nihonjinron* (theory of the Japanese) or *nihonbunkaron* (theory of Japanese culture) signifies a voluminous body of academic and semi-academic inquiry into the unique social, cultural and historical traits of the Japanese society and nation. According to Nomura Research Institute survey there were approximately 700 titles published on the issue of Japanese identity just between 1946 and 1978, when the genre reached the peak of its popularity (in Dale 1999, 15 and Befu 2001, 7.) Due to this outstanding number of the publications, this chapter will focus mainly on the genealogies of the genre and outline the origins of the genre, its dynamics and the structure of the discourse.

1.1 Origins of Japan's national identity debates

In general, the origins of the discourse are traced to Japan's entry into the modern international system and constitutes a response to westernization, modernization and the "internationalization" of Japan (Befu 1987, 103.) Hence, the "West" has continuously played a central role in the formation of the *nihonjinron* discourse and its structure. For example, Ookubo's *Genealogy of Nihonbunkaron* (2003) provides a concise (but purely descriptive) introduction of major works that represent the various approaches to the issue of Japanese uniqueness starting with the Meiji era thinkers like Shige Shigetaka, Nitobe Inazo and Okakura Tenshin. All of these ideologues of *nihonjinron* have provided theories regarding the origins of Japan's uniquely positive national characteristics in the context of the process of formation of

Japan as a modern nation state during the second half of the 19th and early 20th centuries.

Another relevant author, Clammer (2001) argues that Japan's identity is a combination of the domestically produced worldview with the Western impact. He traces the origins of *nihonjinron* to the encounter between Japan's modernity and her pre-modern worldview. This worldview is characterized by such distinct aspects like the unity of the natural and the social, the Buddhist worldview, and the perception of causality as a function of the mutual interdependence of all the elements in the universe.

This combination of modernity with nativism, Clammer believes, is a direct cause of uniquely Japanese social science and the proliferation of *nihonjinron,* which attempts to create the uniquely Japanese "self" (2001, 58-59.) Clammer describes it as a new form of post-colonial Orientalism, i.e., a discourse on difference that originates inside the Orient and aims to deprive the West of the privilege to define the "other." In this construction, the Japanese "self" defines itself as an exceptional "other" but, by being merely a response to Western Orientalism, draws on dichotomies and paradigms that have originated in the West (2001, 48-49.)

Dale (1986) is more critical of *nihonjinron,* but his definition of the genre also traces its origins and structure to the Western impact. He defines *nihonjinron* as a "defensive combative endeavor to overcome a diffuse sense of inferiority to the West" which is a "symbolic entity, as the image of a hostile diversity, the Oedipal, the social, the presence of the father within the self" (1986, 176) and constitutes a response to the "irruption of an alien mode of cognition and social organization" (1986, 211) on the path to modernization.

However, the structure of *nihnojinron* has not been static and has experienced a number of modifications, which are usually traced to domestic and international factors. For example, Minami's *Nihonjiron* (1994) traces the changes in the discourse and sees them as the reflection of domestic changes, such as the Meiji Restoration, the rise of fascism and the various interactions with the outside world like the process of Westernization and the defeat in the Pacific War. Minami's own conclusion about the nature of Japan's identity is that it is a product of a historical

process during which Japan's self-cognition developed, in which the West (and its cultural aspects) has played a central role.

To summarize, the Japanese identity discourse is seen as a response to modernization and an attempt to construct a unique place for Japan as a nation, in a world dominated by Western paradigms of knowledge. At the same time, the construction of uniqueness is conducted through the usage of epistemological and ontological tools provided by the Western science.

1.2 The Roles of *Nihonjinron*

The critical approach that emphasizes the normative nature of *nihonjinron* literature tends to perceive it as an ideological tool, created or appropriated by the elites as means of social control. Befu, one of the leading critics of *nihnonjinron*, sees the contemporary discourse on Japan's uniqueness as an ideological tool of the conservative mainstream and a continuation of wartime propaganda of Japanese greatness by other means. For Befu, any theory of culture is value laden and normative and is seen as a means to mark a line between a certain group and "other" groups, which have some kind of interests (*rigai kankei*) involved with the "self" community (1987, 60.) The culture (*bunka*) is described as consisting of behavior patterns, customs and values (1987, 47) and hence it prescribes to the Japanese the correct behavior that is consistent with the general pattern (1987,49.) Since there is no other normative discourse on what it means to be Japanese, which is general in nature and receives a high degree of domestic support, Befu classifies *nihonjinron* as a kind of Japanese "civil religion" (2001,105-122.) In a similar fashion, Kowner (2002) points out that while not all of consumers of *nihonjinron* publications actually adhere to the embedded ideas, the vast body of literature does provide certain guidance regarding identity and, for lack of competitors, it is the hegemonic ideology in contemporary Japan.

Dale also defines the *nihonjinron* literature as an instrument of ideological coercion and a "self-fulfilling prophecy" since it not only reflects, but also conditions the categories and modes of expression regarding the ontology of "Japaneseness."

For Dale it as a tool of social control, potentially more powerful than the pre-war "thought policing."(1986, 17.)

Igarashi interprets the postwar *nihonjinron* as part of a process of distancing Japan from its past and a reconstruction of Japan's nationhood "through ahistorical, transparent images" (2000,200.) Like Befu and Dale, Igarashi sees the cultural discourse as being a product of the ruling elites and asserts that the focus on the cultural and the tradition in the post-war national identity discourse is part of an attempt to mask the "historical disjuncture" of Japan-US relations, when Japan almost overnight became an ally of its former enemy. He argues that culture has become a convenient tool to project a continuity of Japan with its past and to avoid the historical issues of the Imperial Japan (2000, 75.)

The role of the ruling elite in the reproduction and enhancement of the positive perceptions of Japanese national characteristics is beyond doubt. After all, as Befu pointed out, one of the major works in the genre titled *"Bunka no jidai"* (The Age of Culture), published in 1980, was a product of a policy study group, created by PM Oohira (1987, 5.) However, the understanding of *nihonjiron* purely as an ideological creation of the elites provides only part of the broader picture. This approach tends to focus only on the positive identity discourse of the 1970s and 1980s and tends to ignore the other, critical and negative part of *nihonjinron*, which had emerged in the aftermath of the defeat in the Pacific War. However, in spite of the almost opposite normative prescriptions, both the positive and the negative literature on Japanese uniqueness belongs to the same discursive formation as it emphasizes the uniqueness of Japanese national character, its continuity and the centrality of its role in determining the social, economic and political conditions of the Japanese society.

In this sense, Aoki (1999) and Anno (2000) provide a more comprehensive review of the social functions of *nihonjinron*. They are more careful about perceiving the discourse as purely a tool of propaganda and examine not only the positive identity discourse that emerged in 1960s, but also the postwar critical debates regarding the negative uniqueness of the Japanese that brought the miseries of militarism, war and defeat. They also conclude that the positive *nihonjinron* eventually became the ideology of the conservative elites but locate its sources not as a purely instrumental

ideological creation, but as a discourse that has emerged within a broader socio-economic and political context.

Anno identifies two cycles in the politics of post Pacific War national identity. The first cycle of 1945 to 1991, which emerged from the intellectual response to Japan's wartime ideology and defeat started as a discourse of the progressives like Maruyama Masao. They criticized Japanese traditional culture on the basis that it gave birth to militarism and to the conservatives efforts to reverse some of the radical reforms imposed by the American occupation. This resulted in a compromise of "moderate conservativism" that became dominant during the three decades following the *Anpo* (anti US-Japan Security Treaty mass movement) crisis of the sixties. Anno argues that originally non-ideological *nihonjinron* emerged as an academic or pseudo-academic explanation to the rapid economic growth of post-war Japan. Furthermore, it constituted a response to a search for values in an economically prosperous nation. However, as notes Anno, once emerged, it was picked by the conservatives to support their position (2000, 347-348.) According to Anno, the second cycle began in 1991 with the collapse of Japan's bubble economy. Anno perceives the new cycle as being led not by political elites but by liberal business leaders and technical specialists that are united by the need for liberalization of Japan (1999, 352.)

Aoki (1999) provides a more detailed periodization of the discourse. He divides the postwar discourse into four periods. He traces the dynamics of the discourse not only to the domestic economic and sociological changes, but also to impacts from outside such as the loss of the Pacific War and the A-bomb experience. The first period, from the defeat in 1945 till 1954, is dominated by reflections on Japanese militarism, characterized by "negative uniqueness", which is ascribed to the Japanese society by progressive sociologists driven by the mission to democratize Japan (1999, 56-67.)

From 1955 until 1963, when the general public's life in Japan began to stabilize and recover from the post-war chaos, the discourse is dominated by historical relativism, which attempted to be objective by simply comparing the Japanese culture and identity with those of the West. In spite of the attempt of objectivity and non-prescriptive nature, the theories tended to include Japan and the West in the

same category, implying the belonging of Japan to the Western camp (1999, 68-84.) This period also served as a transitional period, preparing the ground for a change from a "negative uniqueness" to a "positive uniqueness" period that extended for over 20 years from 1964 till 1983, resulting in mass production of *nihonbunkaron* towards the end.

According to Aoki, *nihonbunkaron* has not been simply a tool of propaganda in the hands of the conservative elites. It also responded to the need to fill the ideological vacuum left as the result of the retreat of leftist ideology which dominated the public debates in the beginning of the 1960s. "Postwar" was over and public discourse became dominated by conservatism. Japan had become a world power again, but this time in economic terms. The economic prosperity and the political stability, argues Aoki, resulted in a new need for "culture and identity" in the Japanese society. The *nihonbunkaron* responded to these demands by not only providing affirmation of Japanese uniqueness and the superiority of the Japanese model, but also by providing emotional and moral support to the Japanese businessmen being placed overseas in unfamiliar environments and to the Japanese masses that were devoting their lives to work (Aoki 1999, 86-122.)

The last period, which is defined by universality or internationalization, started in 1984 and, according to Aoki, is continuing to the present. The discussion of *kokusaika* ("internationalization") of Japan has been a response to foreign criticism of the Japanese social, political and economic systems, but has been divided into two opposing streams. While both of the groups were preaching internationalization, one was focusing on the positively unique features of the Japanese society and promoting limited and gradual internationalization. The members of the other group, not completely negative in their view of Japanese uniqueness, were promoting the view that Japan's unique features are anachronistic in the new "international" age and calling for swift reform and adaptation (1999, 134-164.)

To summarize, the broader perspective of the postwar Japan's national identity discourse shows that it has not been a simple tool of the political elites. It has emerged in a dialectical relationship with the societal, political and economic environments, attempting simultaneously to provide explanations for the current conditions of the society and normative guidance regarding what it means to be

Japanese. The positive *nihonjinron* became the only discourse that explicitly provided general framework for Japan's identity, since there was little debate in the sense of discursive competition among competing models, "save some discussion on multiculturalism..." (Befu 2001, 118-119.) However, as Anno and Aoki argue, it was appropriated by the conservative elites to provide an ideological support for the agenda and provide it with a cultural context.

1.3 Frameworks of Knowledge

Peter Dale's *The Myth of Japanese Uniqueness* (1986) was probably the most thorough critique of the contemporary positive *nihonjinron*, mainly focusing on the works published between the mid 1960s and early 1980s. As can be easily derived from the title, the author adopts a very critical position towards what he calls "a pervasive academic approach" and classifies the genre as "cultural nationalism" that is embedded with a "queer" ideological code (1986, *Introduction.*) Dale's aggressive deconstruction aims to provide a critique of "conscious nationalists working in an intellectual framework out of touch with both reality and the most elementary principles of logic and method" (1999, 9.) Dale traces the sources of the contemporary *nihonjinron* to the pre-war conservative ideologies of Nishida Kitaro, Watsuji Tetsuro and others. He sees it as a major problem that the contemporary works draw "openly and consistently" on these ideological works as if the "conceptualization of culture were wholly divorced from politics, something which the modern history of Japan thoroughly discredits" (1999, 218-219.)

According to Dale, there are three major assumptions which are common to all of the works: 1) the social and cultural homogeneity of the Japanese racial entity and its historical continuity, 2) the radical difference of the Japanese from other peoples and 3) the nationalistic hostility to any mode of analysis that might be seen as derived from non-Japanese sources (1999, *Introduction.*) Like other critiques, Dale points out that *nihonjinron* is a construction of the Japanese "self" vis-à-vis the "other", mainly China and the West (1999, 39-40.) He sees it as a projection of the "mandarinate's alter ego" onto a part of the outside world, or as one of those latent facets and emerging trends within modern Japanese society in which the nationalists

are determined to repudiate or dissemble as the result of their nostalgia and romantic longing for the idyllic past (1999, 40.)

Dale notes that the geo-ecological differences are considered to play a very important role in the cultural formation. The "violent forms" of Western culture is in many ways a function of it being a "continent", dominated by desert or pasture, where the nature is poor and dominated by man and the climate is "temperate" and "regular". On the other hand, the "peaceful and harmonious" Japan is an "island" that is covered by "forest" and "paddy", the nature is "rich" and "prevails over man" (1986, 41-42.) In racial terms, the West is assumed to be "a miscegenation of races", while in Japan "blood purity" of "one race" prevails. All these factors are perceived as determining the economic mode, where the West is "nomadic-pastoral", has an animal flesh based diet and slave based economy. Contrasted with the "West", "Japan" is a "settled agricultural" society, has a vegetarian diet and labor is not based on exploitation of others but on communal cooperation (1999, 42.)

The Western social structure is usually characterized in terms of society, individualism, horizontal structure of relations among individuals, and egalitarianism, urban-cosmopolitan, contract-based, and is dominated by notions of "private", "guilt", rights and independence. Dale identifies the Western socio-cultural mode depicted in *nihonjinron* as usually masculine, bellicose, monotheistic, unstable, intolerant and materialistic. In contrast, the Japanese society is communal, vertical and hierarchical, rural-exclusive and dominated by notions like groupism, contextualism, "kintract", "public", "shame", "duties" and "dependence." The socio-cultural mode of the Japanese society is feminine, peaceful, polytheistic, stable, tolerant and spiritual. While the intellectual basis of the Western culture is logical, rational, objective, rigid principle and "talkative", in Japan it is characterized by ambivalence, emotions, subjectiveness, situational logic and silence (1999, 44-46.) Another unique character of the Japanese society is its unique way of absorbing foreign influences that rather than disturb, actually catalyses the growth of the domestic culture and tradition. (1999, 50)

Dale refutes the claims to uniqueness by tracing the origins of many of the "uniquely" Japanese ideas to Western classics like de Tocqueville, Hegel, Heidegger and Maine. He argues that like earlier attempts to "Japanize" certain Buddhist ideas,

the contemporary ideologues borrow their ideas from Western philosophers and present them in modified form as originally Japanese (1999, 222.) Dale claims that Western conceptual models are dismissed by the *nihnojinron* writers because they "tend to expose by analogy with earlier Western life, aspects of tenacious medievalism operant in the Japanese version of capitalism" and are sympathetic to feudal values while hostile to the "logic and institutions of bourgeois culture"(1986, 44.)

Since the linguistic uniqueness is one of the basic threads of the *nihonjinron*, Dale aims to "demystify" the various socio-linguistic aspects attributed to the Japanese language. He traces the ideas of various Japanese writers to their Western experience or Western linguistic theories developed by Wittgenstein, Fichte and others, as well as the nationalistic, political or social origins implications of such ideas. In a similar fashion, the critique of unique linguistics is followed by the critique of uniquely Japanese psychoanalysis. Aspects of uniquely Japanese psyche are traced to Freud and common psychoanalysis, "originally Japanese" approaches to anthropology and primatology are traced to Darwin and Carpenter respectively.

Dale focuses on exposing the ideological aspects of these concepts as well as their erroneous nature. (1986, 211-244) Unfortunately, like Befu, Igarashi and other critiques, Dale focuses only on the literature that emphasizes the positive aspects of the Japanese nation. He does not attempt to explore the broader discourse, part of which as noted by Aoki and Anno, explores the negative uniqueness of Japan. In spite of them belonging to the same discursive formation which emphasizes Japanese national uniqueness, Dale's analytical framework probably locates them within the "serious empirical research on Japanese society" (1986, *Introduction.*) Furthermore, Dale tends to ignore the symbiotic relationship between Japanese proponents of *nihnojinron* and Western critics of Japan. This uses the same points of reference regarding cultural difference to endorse the view of Japan as inferior in case of the latter and as superior in case of the former (Ben Ami 1997, 16.)

This narrow conception of the debate on Japan's identity leads to reductionism, and the discourse again is seen as a mere tool of social control by the elites. Ironically, the narrow focus causes Dale to engage in *nihonjinron* himself as he implies that the contemporary preoccupation with unique characteristics of a nation

is exclusive to Japan. He ignores the existence of similar genres outside Japan such as the idea of the Russian or American messianic mission, Anglo-Saxon values and other ideas that emphasize the historically unique nature of a certain nation. He fails to locate the *nihonjinron* within a broader context of modern national identity discourse.

In spite of these shortcomings Dale provides an important insight into the construction of the discourse. Japan's identity is constructed mainly in opposition to the "West" and conducted through appropriation of Western tools of analysis and their modification to provide uniquely Japanese national features. He also shows empirically that the discussion of culture is very much a part of the political discourse and the conceptualization of culture cannot be divorced from politics.

1.4 Recent Trends in *Nihonjinron* Discourse

While Dale and others engage the literature published mainly during the 1970s and 1980s, the recent additions to the literature on Japan's identity do not differ much in structure, contents or ideological implications. An ambitious project titled "Japan's Identity-Neither the West Nor the East", which brought together mainly conservative scholars and policy makers, was initiated in 1998 by Japan's Forum on International Exchange, a non-profit organization affiliated with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. As it can be easily derived from the title, the purpose of the project was to explore Japan's unique identity, focusing on the West and East (meaning China) as the "others."

Nishio Kanji, the most famous and vocal participant, who gained his fame domestically and internationally as one of the founding fathers of the revisionist New History Textbooks Association (*tsukurukai*), engages in a critique of the prevailing perception of world history in Japan. According to Nishio, world history has been portrayed in Japan not from the Japanese point of view, but from that of China or the West (Nishio in Ito 1999,18.) Both the Sino-centric and Western-centric approaches to Japanese history are wrong for Japan as they fail to establish the proper position for Japan in it. Nishio complains that the Japanese have lost the vision of "themselves" (*jibun toyuno o miushinatta*) since Meiji. The origin of this problem is

traced to the foreigners that came to teach history and brought with them the Western-centric perception during Meiji. One the other side, explains Nishio, the Oriental history school in Japan has concentrated only on China and did not look at the whole of Asia. He goes further to criticize the perception that Chinese civilization was more advanced than Japanese and attacks Meiji Japanese intellectuals for their slave mentality vis-à-vis the China and the West. In the best tradition of *nihonjinron*, Nishio reaffirms the vision that Japan as a unique and independent civilization, and demonstrates the uniqueness by showing the social, political and linguistic differences between Japan and China, while implying the positive, virtuous and advanced nature of the Japanese civilization has some parallels in development with Western civilization. Emphasizing the importance of geographical aspects, Nishio notes that Japan has been at the uniquely favorable position of the "last stop" of various civilizational expansions and therefore absorbed only their positive aspects (in Ito 1999, 19-46.) As such, it can be argued, that the framework of debating Japan's unique identity did not experience major changes since the peak popularity of the *nihonjinron* literature in 1980s. Furthermore, in recent years, *nihonjinron* has spread beyond the Japanese domestic discourse or the Western discourse on Japan. As with the Western and Japanese usages of Japanese uniqueness, it has been a reflection of the political and economical, and used to construct a unique self-identity through the "other", using the concepts provided by *nihnojinron*.

The comparison of the Chinese and Japanese national "psychologies" conducted by Cui Shiguang of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (in Wan 2004, pp. 196-211) provides an interesting illustration on the way *nihonjinron* has been used to construct a unique (Chinese) "self." The approach taken and the conclusions are obvious reflections of the present state of bilateral relations and the rise of Chinese economic and political power. To the usual juxtaposition of Japan with the West, Cui simply adds China and presents a psychological explanation to the rise of China and its bright future. Cui divides human's psyche into three parts: knowledge, emotion and will. The comparison of the Japanese and the Chinese national psyches and their sources relies on the notions of the nature (geography, climate, topography) history and culture, which are the main paradigms of the *nihonjinron*.

The Chinese psyche is described as being governed by the will, while the Japanese one as governed by the emotion. While briefly referring to some positive aspects of this national psyche, Cui criticizes the Japanese as lacking integrity and persistence, and lacking in the strength to engage in prolonged self-development. According to Cui, Japanese society does not have a moral basis, being closed to the outside, emphasizing internal harmony and competition with the outside, and lastly, warm to the insiders and cold to the outsiders. Cui concludes that while the Japanese society has experienced various changes, the emotional and the aesthetic element have been, and still are, very strong. The ideological framework of Cui's analysis becomes even clearer in the concluding part, in which he discusses the future of world culture. Cui describes the Western culture as being governed by knowledge and reason, and therefore it is logical that modernization started from the West. However, continues Cui, Japan's unique form of modernization has proven that modernization does not necessary mean Westernization. Furthermore, there are limits to the Western model as the side effects, such as the destruction of the environment, the collapse of the family unit and abuses of individualism, show that the Western model does not provide the ideal model for humanity's sustainable development.

Therefore, Cui believes that the future of humanity's culture lies in the fusion of the three elements of knowledge, emotion and will, which in turn will lead to the unity of truth, virtue and aesthetics. Cui, whose approach almost duplicates the Neo-Kantian Japanese culturalists of the 1920s (in Harootunian and Najita 1988, 734-735) concludes that in this regard, the Japanese and Chinese cultures have an important role and responsibility to play in the construction of humanity's culture. Reading between the lines, one could easily find behind this conclusion, the notion of the peaceful rise of China, propagated by the Chinese government and affiliated public figures to disperse the fears about the growing China's economic and military prowess.

2. The "Others" in Japan's Identity Construction

As the critics of *nihonjinron* have pointed out, the broad modern discourse on Japan's national identity has been constructed mainly vis-à-vis the West. The images of China as the "other" during the Tokugawa period have been replaced by the monolithic West, which has become a mirror image against which Japanese exceptional distinctiveness could be measured (Harootunian and Najita 1988, 711.) A number of empirical case studies into particular manifestations of this identity discourse have explored the construction of the Japanese self vis-à-vis the West as the "other." Julia Thomas (1995) has analyzed the visual representations of Japan at the "Photography in the 1940s" exhibition in the Yokohama Museum of Art. She sees the exhibition as creating a story of Western aggression and Japanese innocence, Western shame and Japanese recovery intertwined with beautiful landscapes from the West and from Japan. (1995, 1485) As the exhibition is ambiguous, Thomas's conclusion also lacks clarity. She observes that it can be interpreted as propagating three different kinds of Japanese national identity: 1) Japan as a nation formed through history of innocence and resistance, 2) Japan as an inviolable nation in its ahistorical sense and 3) Japan that is engaged in traumatic self-discovery through engagement with the "other", with the West serving as a mirror of Japan. (1995, 1491)

Xavier Guillaume (2002) used Bakhtin's dialogical approach to show the construction of national identity through the instrumentalization of the West as the "other." His article provides an innovative and detailed development of a theoretical framework to examine the process of identity Japan's identity construction and links between the national and the international. Unfortunately, the actual empirical work examining the discourse of *kokutai* (national polity) and *tenko* (conversion) in Imperial Japan is brief and based mainly on secondary sources. As a result, the analysis suffers from oversimplification and, while theoretically innovative, provides little material regarding the actual construction of the identity discourses. The two works discussed below are the most detailed exploration of particular identity discourses that provide important insights into the construction of modern Japan's national identity.

Stefan Tanaka's *Japan's Orient* (1993) and Oguma Eiji's *A Geneaology of 'Japanese" Self-images* (2002), originally published in Japanese in 1995 as *The Origins of the Myth of "Homogenous Nation"* (*tan'itsu minzoku shinwa no kikgen*), both explore the discourse on the origins of Japan as a nation during the formative years of Japan as a modern nation. While Oguma focuses on the homogeneous/pure nation myth, Tanaka explores the creation of the Japanese identity through a Japanese discourse on Asia (particularly, China.) His work traces the development of Oriental historiography (*toyoshi*) around the turn of the 20th century, as an identity discourse that created a unified past for the new Japan and placed it within a modern perspective.

Tanaka's work explores the creation of the "Orient" as a project aimed at establishing the place of Japan vis-à-vis two "others"-the West and Asia, mainly focusing on China. As Tanaka notes, a simple adoption of the Western Enlightenment model would have meant a denial of Japan's past and would have deemed Japan for a "perpetual state of inferiority" as a developing nation (1993, 266-267.) Hence, the creation of Oriental (Chinese) history as a discipline, which evolved from a dialogue of Japanese historians with the Western discourse on the Orient (1993, 70), was part of the project to find an alternative conception of the universal. It was part of Japan's struggle for independence, which would save Japan from the category of the backward Orient and create a unique place for it in the universal history of humanity.

Hence, in Japanese historiography, the Orient has become the Origin, the cultural past of Japan from which it has developed and grown. Japan has emerged from the Orient, inheriting all the positive aspects of the Asian culture, but has developed to gain its autonomy, comparable to that of the West. This creation of Japan's own Orient in turn has enabled the creation of Japan's own history of development into a modern nation and as such has provided a world vision, a new totality, an alteration of the Western model of the universal history, through which Japan could compare itself with Asia and the West. Ironically, as Tanaka notes, while the new view of history has altered the Western model, it has been conducted with tools and methods of modern (Western) positivist science, professing objectivity and universality (1993, 103-104.)

As a result of the new universality created by Oriental historiography, Japan has become spatially unified with Asia but, at the same time, it has been temporally unified with the West as they both have achieved modernity. The rest of Asia's regions have become "incomplete variations of Japan" and their options were either to follow "historical development" as defined by Japan, or resist. (1993, 104.) This creation of the Orient and refutation of the East/West dichotomy have provided legitimacy for Japan's claims for equality with the West. However, Tanaka notes, the need for the consolidation of Japan as a nation, resulting from the sense of societal disintegration attributed to Western cultural influence during Taisho Period, and the continuity of the international hierarchy of the West over Japan, gave birth to the discourse on Japan's cultural uniqueness (1993, 181.) This was achieved through the creation of Japan's unique history of assimilation and transformation of many pasts, Asian and Western alike (1993, 268-274.) Japan came to epitomize all that the West was not. As opposed to the individualism, self-interest, greed, conflict, competition and imperialism of the West, Japan's essence was characterized by cohesion, cooperation and loyalty as was found in the antiquity of the Orient (1993, 184.)

Oguma Eiji's *A Geneaology of 'Japanese" Self-images* (2002) provides an excellent analysis of the dynamics of the homogeneity discourse in Japan from the Imperial times through the postwar years. His detailed work aims to deconstruct the contemporary dominating self-perception that the Japanese nation has always consisted of members who share "a single, pure origin and a common culture and heritage" (Oguma 2002, xxx.) Oguma analyzes the works of historians, anthropologists, folklore scholars and journal articles to expose the changes in the dominant discourse from the prewar mixed nation theory., which advocated the heterogeneous nature of the Japanese nation, to the postwar homogenous theory. Oguma provides an interesting insight into the various theories of "Japan" as a homogenous/heterogeneous nation, and is probably the most comprehensive critical analysis of one of the major national identity discourses. For the purposes of the present research, the role of the "other" in the construction of the discourse and its relationship with the political are of particular interest.

The homogeneity discourse has evolved vis-à-vis numerous others, that were included or excluded in the Japanese nation and responded to the political realities of

that period in Japan's modern history. In general, Oguma's work shows that the homogeneity discourse has constructed the "Japanese" vis-à-vis the Ainus, Okinawans, Taiwanese and Koreans, incorporating them within the "mixed Japanese nation" theory or excluding them through the "pure Japanese" one. However, the "West" has also played an important role of the "other." In this particular discourse, the West was not the "other" vis-à-vis whom the nation has been constructed, but the sole provider of scientific knowledge regarding the origins of the nation.

According to Oguma, the homogenous theory originated in the 1870s as a nationalistic "revolt" against the originally Western perception of the Japanese as a mixed nation consisting of conquering people, aboriginals and other minorities, and as an attempt to end the Western monopoly on defining the Japanese and their roots driven by a strong inferiority complex vis-à-vis the West, which has occupied superior position not only in terms of knowledge, but also military and economic power (2002, 3-15.) At the same time, both of the currents of the "nation" discourse have developed using Western scientific methodologies of anthropology, ancient history and eugenics in constructing modern nationalism and were influenced by the European conceptions of a nation, universalism, European Romanticism and the American "melting pot."

Oguma's work traces the development of both currents as responding to the political realities of Japan, with the political mainstream appropriating and promoting either of the theories as an ideological backing for its policies. Oguma depicts the numerous changes in both of the theories and the variations within them, but in general it can be said that, the "mixed nation" theory becoming dominant after the annexation of Korea as responding to the realities of the multi racial empire and was used to justify aggression, assimilation policies and conscription of Koreans and Taiwanese into the Imperial Army (2002, 291.) However, it gave way to the homogenous theory after Japan's defeat in the Pacific War and the subsequent loss of the colonies and their residents as subjects of the Japanese state. In the postwar revolt against the past, "mixed nation" theory was seen as symbolizing the Empire, and, like other ideological discourses, was turned upside down. As the existence of Korean, Taiwanese and other minorities left on mainland Japan was seen as the result of the imperial expansion, the general tendency was to help them to go back and not

to reformulate Japan as a multi-ethnic nation. In this environment, Oguma argues, the "peace-loving homogeneous state" discourse has emerged as a dichotomous opposition to the "militaristic multi-national empire" and came to dominate public and academic debates both on the left and right (2002, 298-31.)

Oguma concludes that while both of the branches of the discourse are different in form, their function has been similar as they both exclude and discriminate against the "other" by turning the "other" into a "defective Japanese" in case of the mixed nation theory and excluding the minorities from the nation in case of the pure nation theory (2002, 323-325.) Oguma's analysis shows that the "homogenous nation" thread of the *nihonjinron* literature, is not a simple continuation of the prewar discourse, but constitutes an opposition to the imperial discourse of mixed nation and, paradoxically, can be seen as part of the revolt against the militarist and colonial past.

Importantly, both of the authors note that the discourse of uniqueness and superiority produced by the historians has been appropriated by the state and used as part of state ideology. The historical discourse on China with its methodologies has been incorporated into the research division of the government affiliated South Manchurian Railway Company which became an important part of Japan's aggressive expansion (1993, 2240-245.) Most importantly, the government-produced school textbooks provided the students with scientifically objective knowledge and emphasized that Japan was indebted to ancient China. At the same time, contemporary China was presented as helpless and in need of guidance from Japan, which had the duty of bringing peace to East Asia and advancing its civilization (1993, 200-201.)

Unfortunately for the purposes of this thesis, both authors' focus on the intellectual history approaches the policy as a historical given and precludes them from looking into the effect of identity discourse on the policy and the possibility of a dialectical relationship between State's policy and identity discourse. However, the focus on particular identity discourses provides a more contextualized inquiry into identity constructions. Furthermore, both of the works provide an in depth analysis of the dynamics and the discourse and the roles of the various "others" in the construction of the Japanese self.

3. Conclusion

This chapter aimed to provide the contextual and the analytical background for the empirical inquiry into Japan's national identity construction vis-à-vis Russia conducted further in the thesis. By reviewing mainly the critical scholarship it outlined the main arguments regarding the origins, the structures and the roles of the general national identity discourse and two particular identity constructions. The "West" has continuously played the most important role in the construction of modern Japan's identity by providing the tools and serving as the mirror image vis-à-vis which Japan has defined herself. However, the general discourse as well as particular identity constructions were never static and tended to reflect the domestic social, political and economic conditions but also responded to outside impacts. Certain parts of the discourse were adopted by the ruling elites and utilized in order to provide a normative guidance, consistent with their interests.

The last part of this chapter reviewed works on two particular identity discourses, namely the discourse on China and the discourse regarding the homogeneity of the Japanese nation. While not inconsistent the general arguments of the *nihonjinron* related critical scholarship, these two works provided a more nuanced inquiry into the structure of a particular identity discourse and its role. Importantly these works also argued that, the "West" was not the sole "other" and constructions of China and the former colonies played an important role in the construction of the Japanese "self."

The works examined here are located mainly in the cultural studies of Japan or critical history of Japan's political thought and hence they devote very little space to examining the relationship between the identity discourses and Japan's foreign policy. However, if we conceive Japan's embracement of the West dominated international system as an act of foreign policy, we can argue that *nihonjinron* has been to a large extent a product of foreign policy. Furthermore, both Tanaka and Oguma outline the changes in identity discourses that resulted from the policies pursued by the government and their utilization in providing ideological background for State's policies vis-à-vis China and other Asian nations.

The empirical analysis of the construction of Japan's identity vis-à-vis Russia will be conducted in Chapters IV, V and VI. In Chapter VII, the author provides a different interpretation of the relationship between identity and policy. It argues that certain aspects of foreign policy together with identity construction belong to one particular practice of boundary creation between the Japanese "self" and the Russian "other." Hence it perceives both discourses as forming one particular whole and does not see identity discourse as a mere function of State's policies.

Before conducting the actual empirical analysis, the next chapter briefly examines the historical background of post-WW II Japan's relations with the Soviet Union/Russia and reviews the scarce scholarship on Japan's perceptions of Russia.

Chapter III: Russia as Japan's "Other"

In spite of the long history of relations and the special place Russia has occupied in Japan's worldview, a comprehensive and critical inquiry into the origins of the Japanese discourse on Russia, its formation and dynamics, has yet to appear. This chapter provides a review of the limited scholarship that does pay attention to contemporary Japanese perceptions of Russia. However, in order to set up the contextual background not only for the discussion of perceptions, but also for the identity discourse and policy analyses conducted in the next chapters, the first part of this chapter starts with a brief review of Japan's relations with Russia, focusing mainly on the post-Cold War period. The main arguments of the perceptions related scholarship are introduced in the second part of the chapter.

1. Major Developments in the post Cold War Bilateral Relations

1.1 Pre 1992 Background

Before examining the recent developments, it is important to outline briefly the state of bilateral affairs during the Cold War. In general, the major issue in bilateral relations since the end of WWII has been the rivalry over the four islands, known as the Northern Territories (referred to as NTs below.) The problem has been very much the product of the Cold War rivalry between the US and the USSR. At Yalta conference between Stalin, Churchill and Roosevelt conducted on February 11, 1945, the transfer of the Kurile Islands to the Soviet Union was used as a bargaining chip to

bring the Soviet Union into joining the war in the Pacific (Hara 1998, 45.) However, as it is well known, the wartime friendship and cooperation between the Allies did not last long after the victorious conclusion of the war both in Europe and in Asia. Resulting to a large extent from the American desire to keep a seed of rivalry between Japan and the Soviet Union, in the San Francisco Peace Treaty of 1951, the reference to the territories that were occupied by the Soviet Union was vague and open to a variety of interpretations as it neither defined the scope of Kuriles nor stated explicitly to which country Japan renounce her rights to islands to (Wada in Rozman 2000 and Hara 1998, 33.) In article 2 of the San Francisco Peace Treaty, which the Soviet Union has refused to sign, Japan renounced "all right, title and claim to the Kurile Islands, and to that portion of Sakhalin and the islands adjacent to it over which Japan acquired sovereignty as a consequence of the Treaty of Portsmouth of 5 September 1905." Since then, Japan's official interpretation has been that, it did not renounce the rights to the four islands of Habomai (actually, an archipelago), Shikotan, Kunashiri and Etorofu, which, according to Japan's interpretation, do not belong to the Kurile group.

After a decade of silence on both sides and the formal continuation of the war status between Japan and the Soviet Union, the peace negotiations started in 1955, leading to restoration of diplomatic relations in 1956. However, because of the territorial issue, negotiations did not result in a conclusion of a peace treaty, but in a Joint Declaration, in which a transfer of two islands of Shikotan and Habomai was promised by the Soviet Union as a sign of good will after the conclusion of peace treaty. There is actual evidence suggesting that the return of the two islands was taken seriously by the Soviet Union and preparations for evacuation of Soviet citizens and coastguard units were taking place after the signing of the Joint Declaration (Hara Ibid, 106-107.) However, four years later, as a protest against what was seen in the Soviet Union as Japan's military alliance with the US against the USSR and China, the promise was revoked and never materialized. As of today, no treaty has been signed and no islands have been transferred.

Since the restoration of relations in 1956, the bilateral relations between Japan and the Soviet Union can be characterized as very low profile. In this time Japan has been continuously calling for the return of all of the NTs as a prerequisite for further

normalization and the Soviet Union, first demanded the abolishment of the US-Japan military alliance as a prerequisite for the transfer of two islands and later denied the existence of any territorial dispute between the two nations.

It must be noted that there was a brief attempt to normalize the Soviet-Japanese relations in the early 1970s, initiated by the Soviet Union and taken on by Prime Minister (PM) Tanaka. However, after the oil shock of 1973, and Tanaka's resignation resulting from a corruption scandal (the infamous Lockheed incident) in the following year, the momentum was lost. The MiG-25 defection incident of September 1976, during which the Japanese Defense Agency invited the Americans in joint examination of the secret aircraft and allowed the pilot to leave for the US, angered the Soviets. Japan's joining with the US in the sanctions against USSR after the invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 caused further deterioration of bilateral relations and regular foreign ministerial contact between the two states was suspended.

Political relations remained basically non-existent till the advent of Gorbachev's *perestroika* in spite of the continual, economic involvement of Japanese private businesses, mainly in projects related to development of natural resources in Siberia and export of industrial machinery. Change was slow to come and the Soviet President paid a visit to Tokyo only in 1991, 18 years after PM Tanaka's visit to Moscow and just a few months before the collapse of the Soviet Union. In spite of the broad public optimism that this visit would bring a resolution of the territorial issue, the achieved results were quite disappointing. Gorbachev did bring a list of the names and burial locations of the 60,000 Japanese war prisoners who died during the internment and announced troop reduction on the disputed islands as well as continuing the permission for relatives to visit the graves of their ancestors located on the islands (Nimmo 1994, 95-96.) However, no progress was achieved in the territorial dispute, with Gorbachev refusing to discuss the return of the islands or to admit Japan's residual sovereignty over the islands. The territorial issue was mentioned in the joint communiqué as a vaguely defined "problem of territorial demarcation", but the Soviet side refused to include the Japanese interpretation of the 1956 communiqué as a promise to return two islands of Shikotan and Habomai. In addition, Gorbachev's persistent calls for economic aid remained unanswered, reflecting the continuous importance of politics for the economy policy (Nimmo Ibid,

98-101) under the "expanded equilibrium" approach announced in 1989 which served as a replacement for the rigid Cold War approach of "inseparability of economics and politics."

However, the Japanese position did begin to change gradually after the failed coup in August 1991, when the Japanese government announced a program of economic aid to the Soviet Union. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs changed their rigid position of "simultaneous return" of all the NTs to what has been perceived as a more flexible position of the demand for recognition of Japanese sovereignty (Hasegawa in Rozman 2000, 169.) However, in December 1991, the Soviet Union ceased to exist and Japan found herself facing a new country under a new leadership.

1.2 Post 1992 Major Developments

The Japanese political elite and the media were hoping for considerable achievements from Russian President Yeltsin's visit to Tokyo planned for September 1992. However, in early September, virtually in the last moment, Yeltsin suddenly cancelled the visit, explaining the cancellation to his domestic audience was due to "Japan's intransigence on the territorial issue"(Nimmo 1994, 149.) Yeltsin did make the promised visit to Tokyo the following year, in October 1993, but, nevertheless, the sudden cancellation caused great disappointment in Japan. In the summit with Japan's Prime Minister Hosokawa, Yeltsin stressed that Russia desires to develop her relations with Japan on the basis of "law and justice" (Hasegawa in Rozman 2000, 184.) Since then these two concepts have been adopted by the Japanese policy discourse and become the main keywords in discussions of bilateral relations, especially in regards to the solution of the NTs dispute. Furthermore, Yeltsin publicly apologized for the Soviet internment of the Japanese POWs in the aftermath of WWII. This apology was welcomed by the Japanese establishment as a sign of change in the Russian perceptions of her relations with Japan. In the bilateral Tokyo declaration, Yeltsin committed himself to the resolution of the territorial issue and pledged to honor all bilateral agreements concluded by the Soviet Union, however he refused to make a specific reference to the Joint Declaration of 1956 (Hasegawa Ibid, 184-186.)

Between Yeltsin's visit in 1993 and 1996, there was little progress in the bilateral relations, mainly resulting from the political instability in both countries. In Russia, the nationalistic mood was on the rise and Yeltsin's popularity and his political power were significantly undercut, with the majority of the parliament seats occupied by the communists and nationalists after the 1995 elections. In Japan, in 1994, a coalition government of the two rivals, the Socialist Party and the LDP, were formed, headed by the Socialist Murayama Tomiichi. Lacking in unity and ideas, little progress in foreign policy was achieved during the two years of Murayama cabinet and he resigned in January 1996, giving way to the LDP new Secretary General, Hashimoto Ryutaro.

However, during these years, the Japanese foreign policy towards Russia, led by MoFA, was gradually changed from exclusive focus on the territorial issue, to the addition of another aspect to its policy: an active support of the Russian transition to market economy to be achieved through economic aid and provision of training for Russian specialists in Russia and in Japan (Hasegawa Ibid 187.)

In 1996 the bilateral relations gained momentum. An unprecedented number of visits to Japan by high-ranking Russian officials gave a new boost to the bilateral relations and culminated in the Krasnoyarsk summit between Yeltsin and Hashimoto in November 1997. The most significant of those were the visits of Foreign Minister Primakov and the Defense Minister Rodionov. During his visit to Tokyo in November 1996, Primakov engaged in a number of symbolic gestures to assure Japan that the bilateral relations occupy a place of importance on the Russian agenda. In May of the following year, Russian Defense Minister Rodionov paid the first visit ever by a top Moscow defense official to Tokyo after his Japanese counterpart, Head of Japan's Defense Agency (JDA), Usui visited Moscow in 1996. Rodionov conveyed to the Japanese government that Russia does not regard either Japan or the US-Japan Alliance as a military threat and does not oppose the new security guidelines enhancing Japan's defense capability in case of emergency (Sarkisov in Rozman 1999, 219-221.) The two visits paved the way for a still limited but significant security dialogue between the two states. They resulted in an agreement on actual trust building measures such as mutual notifications in cases of large military exercises, exchange visits by naval vessels, exchange of information, joint

communications drills and an extensive variety of defense exchanges (Valliant in Ivanov and Smith ed 1999, 158-161.)

A month after the G-8 summit in June 1997, during which Hashimoto and Yeltsin talked and made a positive impression on each other, Hashimoto made an unprecedented policy speech at the Japan Association of Corporate Executives (*Keizai doyukai*), bringing a significant change in Japan's conception of her relations with Russia (Sato 2005, 253.) In his speech, Hashimoto affirmed the concept of "multilayered approach", announced earlier, by stating that Japan was going to build her relations with Russia based on the three principles of trust, mutual benefit and long-term perspective. Stressing that the return of the four islands remains the national goal, Hashimoto announced the need to create an appropriate atmosphere through bilateral cooperation and announced that Japan will pay special attention to economic cooperation, particularly energy resources in the Far East.

At the Krasnoyarsk summit, the two leaders agreed to make all efforts needed in order to conclude a peace treaty by the year 2000, based on Tokyo declaration of 1993 and agreed on, what has become known as "Yeltsin-Hashimoto Plan". This plan envisaged an extensive bilateral cooperation including promotion of Japanese investment into Russia, Japan's assistance in conversion of Russian military resources to civil sector, and Japan's extensive assistance to further implementation of Russian economic reforms.

In 1998 Yeltsin paid another visit to Japan, where he conducted a two day meeting with Hashimoto in Kawana and in November met with PM Obuchi Keizo, who had meanwhile replaced Hashimoto as Japan's top executive. Neither of the meetings between top leaders brought any significant progress on the territorial issue and only confirmed the mutual will to conclude the peace treaty by the year 2000 (Ozawa in Yokote 2004, 142.) On the New Year's Eve of 2000, Yeltsin suddenly resigned from the post of the President of Russia, and following the March elections, Vladimir Putin became the newly elected President.

Since his election, Putin conducted a number of meetings with his Japanese counterparts, Mori Yoshiro and his successor Koizumi Junichiro. However, no significant progress in the resolution of the territorial dispute and peace treaty negotiations has been achieved. The most significant outcome has been the

confirmation of the mutual desire to continue the negotiations, based on all the previous joint declarations between Japan and USSR/Russia, including the 1956 Declaration in which the USSR promised the return of Shikotan and Habomai islands.

It must also be noted that the "Suzuki Muneo affair", which was in the center of public attention in 2001 and 2002, impeded significantly the potential of progress in the bilateral relations (Iwashita 2005a, 15.) Suzuki, (an LDP MP from Nemuro, the closest city to the Northern Territories, where many of the ex-residents of the islands deported by the Soviet Union live and the center of the movement for the return of the NTs) served as the Head of the Hokkaido and Okinawa Development Agency during the second Hashimoto cabinet and as a Vice Chief Cabinet Secretary during Obuchi cabinet. Suzuki exercised a tremendous influence on MoFA, particularly in the context of Japan's policy towards Russia. Suzuki's rivalry for control of MoFA, with the newly appointed Foreign Minister Tanaka Makiko as part of the first Koizumi cabinet in 2001, led to a number of MoFA related scandals. After a series of revelations in the press presumably leaked by his rivals in MoFA (Honda 2005, 217), Suzuki was forced into resigning from LDP and was arrested in 2002 on corruption charges on a construction project which was part of Japan's humanitarian assistance program to the Russian residents of the disputed islands. In the process of intensive media scrutiny, it was revealed that the actual Japanese policy vis-à-vis Russia had been conducted by the trio of Suzuki and two other high level MoFA bureaucrats: Sato Masaru (nicknamed the Japanese Rasputin), at that time Senior Analyst of International Information Bureau and Togo Katsuhiko, former Head of Eurasia Bureau and Japan's Ambassador to Holland.

In general, the trio pushed for a "two islands" as a first solution for the territorial dispute that would involve the transfer of the islands of Habomai and Shikotan to Japan along with continuation of negotiations regarding the other two islands. The exact details of the trio's negotiations with Russian officials still remain unclear, but the scandal resulted in an extensive personnel shifting, numerous dismissals of MoFA bureaucrats affiliated with Suzuki, and attempts to reform MoFA's structure and the way MoFA bureaucrats' relations with politicians are conducted (for example, *Asahi* 24.9.2003, 13.)

There is no doubt that this "confusion in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs" (*East*

Asia Strategic Review NIDS 2003, 245) had a highly negative impact on the state of bilateral affairs. As one of the members of the trio Sato Masaru noted, after the scandal the process of NTs and peace treaty related negotiations has entered a "dormant season" (Sato 2003, 263.)

In the latest development, during a press conference conducted on the 31.1.2006, Russian President Putin referred to the Yalta Agreement (1945), Potsdam Declaration (1945) and the San Francisco Peace Treaty (1952) as the main legal documents that decide the status of the disputed territories and should be respected by both parties in their search for the solution. The reference to Yalta Agreement, the validity of which Japan denies, and the lack of reference to the 1956 Joint Declaration, have been interpreted in Japan as a justification of Russian possession of the islands and as Russian retreat to a much more rigid position than earlier (*Asahi Shimbun* 1.2.2006.) As such, the achievement of the final resolution in the territorial dispute and the conclusion of a peace treaty seem to be further than ever from realization.

2. Japanese Perceptions of Russia

The most detailed scholarly inquiry into the dynamics and variety of Japanese perceptions of Russia has been conducted by Princeton sociologist Gilbert Rozman in his book *Japan's Response to the Gorbachev Era, 1985-1991*, published in 1992. Since this is probably the only extensive scholarly work in English and in Japanese that is devoted solely to Japanese perceptions of USSR/Russia, the work will be introduced in detail below.

Rozman's detailed descriptions and his extensive knowledge of the individuals involved in the policy making and public and academic debates regarding the Soviet Union deserves nothing short of admiration. The book could also be used as an introduction to contemporary studies of Japan in general, as well as a concise depiction of the political spectrum in Japan. Rozman also includes in his research the main organs of the media and their respective ideological backgrounds, the foreign policy establishment and the patterns of policy making, and the nature of USSR/Russia related academia. Unfortunately, as a result of this broad coverage, many of the issues that are of major interest to the present research are engaged only

in a brief and shallow way. For example, "The Japanese Worldview" is described in a mere seventeen pages and is an array of clichés regarding Confucianism, geographical isolation, catch-up mentality and Japan's sense of victimhood related to the Pacific War.

These broad frameworks are followed by a depiction of political perceptions of "the correlation of forces" in the global arena and the notion of "internationalization" that had become a popular catchword in 1980s (1992, 3-19.) Rozman does not elaborate on the relationship among these discourses, and narratives related to Japan's national identity are conflated with the political ones, without a clear explanation of the relationship among them.

Similarly, the relationship between the broad worldview and the "blocks of perceptions" through which Russia is perceived is not completely clear. Rozman argues that the Japanese preoccupation with Russian national character has its origins in the similar tendency in Japanese self-perceptions, which often focuses on Japanese national character (1992, 173-208.) However, the examination of the Japanese views of Soviet society (1992, 209-223) and the chapter on the Japanese views of Soviet politics (1992, 224-242 contributed by Mayumi Itoh) do not seem to be connected to the general world view. They leave the reader to wonder regarding Rozman's view about their origins and relationship to the broad "worldview" discourse. In his analysis of the debate regarding the Soviet Union and bilateral relations, Rozman chooses to divide the various groups along their political affiliations and identifies five main groups in the Japanese political spectrum: the far right, the right of center, center, left of center and far left.

As the result, the perceptions and political views are conflated and become part of the general view. According to Rozman, the far right, which has been a very powerful element in the public and political debate vis-à-vis the Soviet Union during the Cold War years but has been on the demise in the last decade, has been very much in favor of increasing military expenses, fervently anti-communist and very suspicious of every Soviet initiative. At least up to 1989, the far right could be identified as the supporter of state policies (1992,45.)

The right of center difference from the far right became more visible towards the end of 1988 when more evidence was coming in support of Soviet flexibility and

expectations for a breakthrough in Soviet-Japanese relations were on the rise. The right of center was (and still is) in support of a more prominent role for Japan in international affairs and, as Rozman notes, sides with the West for reasons of morality and power politics. They are more patient and cautious than the far right and believe that in regards to the Soviet-Japanese conflict, time is on Japan's side. However, Rozman notes that the views of the right of the center a shifting from a status quo orientation to a more active approach in light of the changes in the international system (1992, 46.)

In the center, Rozman identifies experts in Soviet affairs from the various branches of academia, government and media who were open to new developments in Gorbachev's USSR, sympathetic but often critical in their outlook on Soviet history and contemporary life. Importantly, Rozman notes their impotency in terms of social influence because of "their obvious concern for objectivity without a consistently formulated conclusion"(1992, 47.)

According to Rozman, the left of center, which is comprised mainly of academics, along with the right wing, is the most vocal group in the debates over the Soviet Union. They "embrace the cause of transforming Japanese policy, scholarship and opinions on the Soviet Union."(1992,48) Many entered Soviet studies as idealistic socialists, and, while becoming more pragmatic by the end of 1980s, they are still idealistic about achieving a new world order, finding an alternative to LDP rule and detaching Japan from the US dependence. The far-left, which is comprised mainly of "emeritus professors" and is relatively small, can be classified as true believers in socialism. They continue to emphasize the achievements of the Russian revolution as opposed to the serious problems that plague the capitalist societies. (1992, 49)

Rozman's clear cut division of the discourse into five groups probably can be contested in the context of certain issues and certain individual actors. Furthermore, it seems that the amount of publications produced by a certain group, and not their societal reach, is the main determinant in deciding whether the group is "vocal" or not. There is no doubt that the "left of center" has been leading, in both qualitative and quantitative terms, in the production of USSR/Russia related scholarship. However, probably as a result of producing mainly scholarly works, its participation

in the public debate has been very limited and, with few exceptions, restricted to academic locus, a fact that Rozman himself mentions briefly (1992, 190-191.)

Furthermore, the break down of Japanese views into political affiliations seems to be a legitimate way to approach the variety of opinions. However, Rozman does not attempt to provide a clear linkage between political ideologies and the above mentioned blocks of perceptions. Also, the break down of the Japanese views is mixed with general statements about what "the Japanese believe" or "the Japanese often think." This leads to a confusion regarding whether Rozman actually believes in a unified view and if yes, what its relationship to the variety of perceptions conducted within certain political ideologies might be.

In terms of the interests of this thesis, the most important result of the vocal groups evaluation is Rozman's observation that since late 1980s, the importance of both of the extreme sides of the spectrum have declined, if not completely disappeared, and the right of center has become dominant and will probably remain so (1992, 50.) Furthermore, Rozman's chronology of Japanese post-war perceptions of the Soviet Union is of major interest for the purpose of this thesis. Rozman divides the post-war years into three stages of changes in perceptions. Here the perceptions are examined along the line of elites, progressive intellectuals and general public opinion. According to Rozman, the decade of hate (1945-1955) resulting from the Soviet behavior in the summer of 1945, was followed by a decade of rebuilding relations (1955-1965.) During this period the public opinion towards the Soviet Union became more tolerant, even on the verge of favorable, due to the popularity of Russian culture and the "discovery that Soviets are not very different from other people"(1992, 90-91.)

The decade of improved relations (1965-1975), during which the intellectual left "abandoned its twenty-odd years fascination with the Soviet Union"(1992, 91) ended with the Czechoslovakian invasion, which completely destroyed the Soviet's peace loving image. As a result, towards the end of the "decade of improved relations", the Northern Territories issue became the focus of bilateral relations and the "entire Japanese political spectrum united against Soviet foreign policy"(1992, 91.) However, the bilateral relations continued to improve and favorable public opinion toward the Soviet Union reached its peak in 1974.

In the decade of tense relations (1975-1985), the perception of the Soviet Union became the most negative due to what Rozman sees as Soviet arrogance in bilateral relations, Soviet power politics, and the growing Japanese pride reinforced by its growing economic might.

Japanese perceptions of the Gorbachev era, which are the main subject of the book, are explained on four new levels: public opinion, the intellectuals, the government and the bureaucrats. The perceptions are divided into three cycles: 1985-1987, 1987-1989 and 1989-1991(1992, 99-170.) During these cycles, the discourse revolved along the following points: the nature of the domestic change inside the Soviet Union and the "new thinking", the genuineness of Moscow's intentions and its motives and the developments in East-West relations and the desired response by Japan. During the third cycle, the debate turned towards a large question regarding the death of the socialist model, reflecting not only the developments in the USSR, but also in the communist China.

While the questions examined in each cycle are different, with some generalizations, it can be concluded that after a brief optimism about change, things "went back to normal" in 1991 after the Soviet crackdown in the Baltic republics and the lack of progress on the territorial issue after Gorbachev's visit. Again, it is rather hard to find a clear linkage between the interpretative "lenses" and the perceptions' dynamics as Rozman does not provide any explanation on how the perceptions relate to the previously described origins of Japanese worldview.

To summarize, Rozman provides a valuable and detailed description of the way the various groups in the Japanese political spectrum responded to the changes that were occurring the Soviet Union under the leadership of Gorbachev. The numerous and changing categories, the lack of clear relationships between them and the mainly descriptive introduction of the groups and their perceptions, turn the book into a valuable source of data, but lacking in clear and comprehensive analysis of the discourse. For the purpose of this thesis, the most important arguments that can be found in Rozman's work are: 1) that the "center of right" came to be the dominant group in the discourse and, 2) that after a brief period of expectations and revaluation, the perceptions of Soviet Union/Russia returned to being generally negative.

Most of the scholarly works that examine the broader Japan-USSR/Russia bilateral relations in the post-WWII era note the continuously negative nature of Japanese perceptions of Russia and point out the territorial dispute as being its main cause (for example, Glaubitz 1995, Hasegawa 2000a, Kimie 1998.) Some, like Kimura Hiroshi, whose work will be examined in detail in Chapter V as one of the main producers on identity discourse on Russia, believe it to be an objective reflection of the injustice done to Japan by the Soviet Union. However, other, more critical scholars, note that the Japanese government has been playing an active role in keeping the problem alive in the public memory. "Northern Territories Day" is probably the most obvious example of the governmental attempt to preserve the memory of the loss of the islands and the aspiration of their return. It was introduced first in 1981, on the 7th of February, the day Japan and Russia concluded the Shimoda Treaty in 1855, as an attempt by the government to enhance the "patriotic mood" regarding the islands. The commemoration has become a national event, with the respective Prime Ministers undertaking a tour of inspection of the islands and all forty-seven of Japan's prefectures conducting annual events (for example, Glaubitz 1995, 88.) Tsuyoshi Hasegawa argues that mutual perceptions and misperceptions have played a larger role in determining the bilateral relations than (rational) national interest in the bilateral relations and precluded the solution of the Northern Territories issue (2000b, 274 brackets added.)

Hasegawa examines Japanese perceptions of Russia as visible in the public opinion polls conducted from 1960 until 1999, which asked the respondents to name three countries they like and dislike the most. Hasegawa concluded that not much changed over the years, with the popularity of the Soviet Union/Russia being consistently low and its unpopularity always higher than that of the US and China (except for 1967). Like Rozman, Hasegawa notes that during the perestroika years, the unpopularity slightly decreased, but climbed back during the Yeltsin years and continued to be rather high, coming second after North Korea (2000b, 278.)

Importantly, Hasegawa observes that the continuity of the lack of popularity of Russia after the collapse of the Soviet Union proves that unpopularity was unrelated to the communist ideology. Like many other commentators, Hasegawa notes that the WWII related issues (i.e., the Soviet breach of neutrality pact, the brutality towards

Japanese civilians and military personnel in Manchuria, Sakhalin and the Kuriles, the capture and forced labor of the Japanese POWs and the Northern Territories) are the main issues in the Japanese perception of the Soviet Union and Russia.

Hasegawa explains the centrality of this collective memory in the bilateral relations partially as the lack of contact between the two peoples, and partially as the sense of victimization achieved through a narrow perception of the Soviet invasion divorced from the broader picture of bilateral relations and from the broader picture of WWII. He also notes the lack of debate in Japan regarding the responsibility of the wartime leaders in delaying the termination of the war, which would have prevented the Soviet invasion and the suffering it caused to the Japanese population. To a certain extent, Hasegawa's argument is consistent with the general constructivist framework in that it emphasizes the importance of collective identity in determining national interests and foreign policy.

Unlike Rozman and Kimura, Hasegawa refutes the claim that the unfavorable Japanese feelings towards Russia were a result of the direct experience in summer 1945. He explains that the NTs, the main issue in Japan's continuous claims vis-à-vis USSR/Russia, were to a large extent a creation of the US administration in the 1950s, as part of its grand Cold War strategy.

The creation of the territorial problem was a successful attempt to prevent Soviet-Japanese rapprochement and to direct Japanese nationalism away from the US, who continued its occupation of Okinawa until 1972 and maintained military bases in Japan proper. This strategy was also very convenient for Japan's conservative government, which needed an enemy to consolidate the nation in order to recover from the political and economic defeat of the Pacific War (2000b, 302-303 and Wada 1999, 9.) This understanding of the origins of the Northern Territories issue and the negative perceptions of USSR/Russia was supported by government related publications published in Japan during the occupation and by a number of scholarly accounts (for example Hara 1998 and Wada in Rozman ed. 2000.)

In general, it can be plausibly argued that in the immediate postwar years, the Soviet breach of the neutrality pact and the occupation of the islands were not treated as undermining principles of universal justice as it was in the later years. Partially, this could be related to the fact that practically until the decision to attack the U.S in

Pearl Harbor, the Japanese ruling elite planned to invade the Soviet Union and to occupy the Soviet Far East (for example, Koshkin 2004, 114-149.)

A book for young readers titled "The Story of the Soviet Union" (*Soren no hanashi*) published by the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1948 provides an interesting insight into the official perceptions of the situation in Japan immediately after the defeat, when the Cold War structure was only taking shape. In the book, the part that discusses Soviet relations with Japan makes no reference to the violation of the neutrality pact, as probably it did not seem to be of any relevance at that time. The Soviet participation in the Pacific War and the following occupation of Southern Sakhalin and the Northern Territories are described as a natural result of the Yalta agreement. While the text states that these territories "are occupied," there is no separation between Sakhalin, Southern and Northern Kuriles (Chishima in Japanese) and they appear on the attached map with other "newly acquired" Soviet territories including Königsberg, the Baltic States, Moldavia and other territories in the European part (MoFA 1948, 100-101.)

Furthermore, even during the mid 1950s, when the Cold War structure was already intact and Japan was firmly located in the Western camp, American government affiliated Japan watchers had been worried about the possible spread in pro-Soviet sentiment among the Japanese citizens. On one side, they have noted that the Japanese lacked the actual exposure to the "evils" of Soviet occupation. On the other, they were worried that the memories of American occupation combined with the continuous presence of American military bases, nuclear testing in the Pacific and the American pressure to rearm Japan, could bring about a wide spread positive sentiment towards Russia which might promote itself through the Japanese Communist Party and its "subsidiaries" as standing for "peace, independence and democracy" (Langer in Borton et al 1957, 62-67.)

This fear was also shared by the Japanese conservative elite for whom the fear of a rise in pro-Soviet sentiment was one of the reasons for opposing the normalization of relations with the Soviet Union (Wada 1999, 9.) Particularly, the "peace" promoted by the Soviet Union was seen as having a strong attraction for the Japanese (Jorden in Borton et al 1957, 260.) While Jorden also mentions that Russians are the people Japanese hate the most, stating the usual reasons related to the Soviet entry

into the Pacific War, the results of opinion polls published in the same book show that this sentiment could have been shared by the political elite, but were not widely spread among the population.

The polls (Wilbur in Borton et al 1957, 299-312) were conducted in the period before and after Japan's regaining its independence and finding itself firmly based in the Western camp of the Cold War system. In 1951, days before the San Francisco Peace Conference, polls show that attitude towards Russians is divided with 64 points (not percentage but a rather complicated method of measurement) for positive and 68 for negative (compared with 10 and 219 for Chinese and 296 and 3 for Americans respectively.)

The evaluation of Russian national characteristics got more negative responses, but it was far from an overwhelming majority: positive 116 and negative 253 (compared with 448 and 36 for the most highly respected Americans, and 27 and 403 for the most despised Koreans.) The evaluation of Russian culture was split in half (60 positive to 79 negative), placing Russian culture between the negative Asia (Korea 3 to 198, China 12 to 170) to the positive West (US 268 to 3 and England 248 to 1.)

At the same time, Russian attitude towards Japan and the Japanese was perceived by the majority of respondents as negative (267 to 33 positive), and similar to the perceived attitudes of Chinese and Koreans (186 to 57 and 308 to 44 respectively.) In 1954, the Soviet Union received the highest score of disliked countries (37.3%), but was closely followed by South Korea (30.3%) and Communist China (21.3%) At the same time, a large majority of those polled were in favor of promoting economic ties with both Soviet Russia and China (76.7% to 5%)

From the results of these polls we can conclude that Russia was not a popular nation among the Japanese, but the overwhelmingly negative attitude (like the change to positive feelings towards China) were a product of later years and developed within the context of the Cold War.

In terms of perceptions, it is also important to note that for the politically and economically defeated Japan, the Soviet Union, along with the US and Western Europe, was a country towards which the Japanese felt inferior in terms of economic and military power (Jorden in Borton et al 1957, 269.) This view is confirmed by the

above mentioned book on the Soviet Union published by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1948. It devotes two chapters to the Soviet economy, science and military, and engages in an admiring evaluation of the Soviet achievements (MoFA 1948, 46-82.)

In this context, the account of Soviet progress in terms of national identity discourse, written by an Asahi Shimbun reporter in the same period, provides a good illustration of the dynamics of identity discourse and its dependence on the political and the economic environment. Maruyama Masao (not the famous political scientist and philosopher of the same name), was stationed in Moscow from 1932 until 1947, has extensively traveled through the Soviet Union, and published a number of books on it. In a book titled *The Impressions of the Soviet Union*, published in 1948 before the institutionalization of the Northern Territories "syndrome" and when Japan's economy was in ruins, Maruyama described the political, economic and social dimensions of the Soviet Union. His first chapter was devoted to Russian national characteristics. Russia was portrayed as traditionally inferior to the West in terms of "material culture" (*busshitsu bunka*), meaning technological progress. This inferiority stems from the agrarian nature of the society which suffered from "natural laziness" and which lacked practical sense. Hence, noted Maruyama, originally the Soviet industrialization plans where seen as a reflection of another part of Russian mentality, characterized by daydreaming and lack of realism (1946, 3-4.)

Here, reflecting on the Soviet industrial successes, Maruyama stated that national characteristics, which emerged from centuries of societal development, could not be changed overnight but, at the same time, were not absolute values. As a result of the "time flow" and the changes in the political and social conditions, and a strong will of the leader to change the national characteristics, they could be gradually changed and developed. In Maruyama's view, the industrial development achieved by the Soviet Union could be seen as evidence of the transformation of the traditional Russian national identity into a more advanced "Soviet man" identity (1948, 4-6.)

No doubt that this kind of approach had been influenced by the predominant discourse of the New Soviet Man that had been an important part of the Soviet ideology of the 1940s and 1950s (Hopf 2002, 69-81.) At the same time, it seems that

Maruyama's interpretative framework also reflects the contemporary political and economic situation in immediate postwar Japan.

As a result of Japan's rapid recovery and economic growth, by 1970s, she had firmly secured the place of the world second largest economy. The Japanese newly acquired economic power added a new dimension to the Japanese perception of the Soviet Union. From 1970s, the dislike and feeling of victimization created and disseminated after the San Francisco conference was augmented with contempt towards the economically and technologically inferior nation (Hasegawa 2000b, 298-299.)

Notwithstanding the earlier dynamics of the discourse, since mid-1970s the number of respondents expressing unfavorable feelings towards the Soviet Union was consistently over seventy five percent and this tendency continues to the present day (PM Office HP.) Over the last three decades the number of respondents that have expressed lack of affinity towards Russia has been just below 80 percent, with the numbers dropping below 70 only in 1991, reflecting Gorbachev's perestroika and his visit to Tokyo that same year (PM Office 2002, 11.) The numbers are similar for the post-war and young generation as well, which could hardly be contributed to direct personal experience.

It can be concluded that from 1970s, the Japanese nationalism vis-à-vis USSR/Russia has evolved around two master paradigms. On one side, it was the sense of national victimization when the then weak Japan of 1945 was invaded by the Soviet Union, had her territory stolen, and her people abducted and used as free labor. On the other side, it was the sense of economic and technological superiority of the rapidly growing Japan.

The coexistence of these two trends has survived until today. In a brief survey of Japanese images of today's Russia, Ide describes the dominant images of Russia as "undeveloped country", "expansionist and military threat," "communist" (this more than a decade after the collapse of the Soviet Union!) and "lawless" (in Yokote ed. 2004, 255-268.)

3. Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the background of Japan's relations with Russia since the end of World War II and the major developments in bilateral relations since the collapse of the Soviet Union. In spite of the dissolution of the Cold War structure and the disappearance of communism as state ideology, the two nations have failed to resolve the territorial dispute and to conclude a peace treaty. The review of literature related to Japanese perceptions of Russia shows that the general Japanese sentiments towards Russia continue to be overwhelmingly negative. However, this chapter has also argued that the territorial problem, which is seen as the main factor behind the negative perceptions of Russia, is not a result of a direct experience on behalf of the Japanese population, but a product of the Cold War structure. Furthermore, this chapter has also argued that contemporary images of Russia combine the sense of victimhood with a sense of contempt for an economically inferior nation.

Chapters V and VI will examine the structure of national identity discourse that emerged in late 1970s which validates and utilizes Japan's victimhood and superiority in terms of unchanging national characteristics. The next chapter is devoted to examining the Japanese school history textbooks, which in the recent debates on Japan's nationalism have been perceived as the main locale for historical memory, and hence, national identity construction.

Chapter IV: Identity, Historical Memory and School Textbooks

1. Introduction

As it was shown in Chapter II, the construction of Japan's national identity vis-à-vis Asia emerged within the historical discourse on the origins of the Japanese nation and its development in the Asian and universal context. Likewise, the Japanese perceptions of USSR/Russia are noted to be the product of the historical memory of Japan's interactions with Russia and, particularly, the Soviet seizure of the disputed islands, the forced labor of the Japanese POWs and other related events. At the same time, the previous chapter explained that the creation of this memory was not a product of a direct experience by a large portion of the population or a view that emerged spontaneously in society, but rather has been to a large extent the product of the Cold War structure. Unfortunately, the scholarly works discussed, approach this memory as a historical given and do not provide any further hints regarding the actual societal locales where this collective memory has been produced and reproduced.

At the same time, a different construction of contemporary historical memory in Japan, namely the narratives on her colonial and imperial past, have been widely discussed and debated. The focus has been mainly on school history textbooks as the locale of historical memory construction. The history textbooks problem first drew international attention in early 1980s as an issue in Japanese relations with China. Since then textbooks have been widely debated in the domestic realm, in the regional and international media, and in academia alike (Pyle 1983, for relations with China see Dirlik 1993.)

In the last decade, the controversial new history textbooks published by the revisionist Japan Society for Textbook Reform (*Atarashii Rekishikyokasho o Tsukuru Kai* or *Tsukuru kai* for short) were the focus of a number of academic works, which mainly engage in criticizing Japan for the whitewashing of its history (for example, McCormack in Hein and Selden eds. 2000, Nelson 2002 and Rozman 2002.)

In spite of the importance of the issue, it seems that the approach taken by the English language academia, and the broader media alike, was rather monolithic in its critical stance regarding Japan's re-writing of the dark parts of her recent history. However, this approach exhibits a number of major epistemological problems and, therefore, leads to misleading conclusions about the nature of the history textbooks and the general historical memory construction in Japan in general.

By focusing purely on the controversial textbooks, the dominant "critical" approach conflates two different aspects of the historical textbooks problem. The first is the actual politics and the second is the actual construct of historical memory in Japanese school education. Without a doubt, these aspects are interrelated. The approval of the controversial textbooks by the Ministry of Education is a political statement serving as further proof for the strong relationship between politics and the education system. However, it is important to bear in mind that an official approval of a certain textbook and its adaptation by a school are completely separate processes. While the former is a function of a special committee of the Ministry of Education, the latter has been conducted on a more local level, by the individual schools in case of high school textbooks and by the regional Educational Committee (*kyoiku iinkai*) in the case of junior high textbooks. Committee decisions are usually based on recommendations of sub-committees composed of local school teachers or decided by

schools representatives voting (Nakamura 1997, 86-87), and therefore a direct intervention from the central government is systemically impossible.

Hence, not only the official approval, but also the extent of the actual usage of a particular textbook in the education system, is of vital importance for analyzing the dominant narratives in Japan's historical memory construction. Since its first approval in 2001, the usage of the controversial "revisionist" textbooks was limited to 0.0039% of the junior high school students (*Mainichi* 17.09.2001, 4) and, in spite of various alarmist predictions, in 2005 the number rose only to 0.4%, considered as non-alarming even by the progressive and critical *Asahi Shimbun* (07.10.2005, 3.) Therefore, unlike what the article of James Brooke (2005) and other sensationalist publications suggest, they can hardly be seen as representative of the historical narrative provided through school education[10].

Obviously, in order to grasp the actual construction of historical memory in school textbooks it is important to examine the historical discourse in the books that are actually used by the majority of Japanese schools. As the overall number of history textbooks officially approved for usage by schools was rather high (according to the Ministry of Education website 8 junior high school and 18 high school textbooks were approved in 2005 and 2002-2003 respectively), this chapter will focus only on the most widely used textbooks that combined account for more than 50% of the history textbooks used in Japanese junior high schools and high schools. At the end, a comparison will be made with the narrative in the controversial textbook, published by the *Tsukuru kai*.

The main argument of this chapter is that school textbooks in general, and particularly in the context of the narrative on Russia play a minor role in the construction of historical memory and national identity. Furthermore, while the discourse regarding the colonial misdeeds vis-à-vis China and Korea has deepened over the last two decades, the discourse on Russia/Soviet Union has been continuously minimalistic and purely factual. However, the examination of textbooks

---

[10] Rozman's work mentioned above, deals with the broad Japan-Korea relations, and in this sense, the revisionist textbooks are definitely an issue in the bilateral relations and need to be examined. However, the other works mentioned, while claiming to inquire into historical memory construction in Japan, devote most of their attention to the revisionist books, which as shown above occupy a marginal place in the history education.

is important. Paradoxically, the textbooks have been often considered as an important locale for Japan's historical memory construction but the actual texts have never been subjected to an academic scrutiny[11].

2. Analytical Framework

Developing an analytical framework for the evaluation of historical memory construction is a complicated task as there is no objective yardstick for measuring the contents of the narrative. The case of Germany and its dealing with the Nazi past has been consistently the sole yardstick for the normative evaluation of the range of issues related to contemporary Japan's construction of its imperial past in academia (besides the works of Katzenstein and Berger discussed in Chapter I, also Buruma 2002) and also in the political discourse (Chinese FM Lee comparing Japanese PM Koizumi's visit to Yasukuni shrine like "commemorating Hitler" in *Asahi* 16.11.2005.)

However, the critical engagement with Japan's dealing with her past measured solely by the German standards of "narrating the past", seems to be problematic, bearing in mind that Japan's colonial policies, the narratives of which are at the center of criticism, were modeled mainly on Western colonialism (for example, Umemori 2006.) Hence, contemporary Japan's historical memory could be legitimately compared not only with the German discourse, but also with British, French, Dutch, Belgian and other ex-colonial powers' dominant discourses regarding their involvement in Asia and Africa. This kind of comparative analysis would probably result in a substantially different normative evaluation, than the comparison with Germany.

Furthermore, in the case of the narrative on Russia, a comparison could probably be made with narratives of victimhood in the Baltic states, Eastern European nations and even Germany that lost part of her territory to the Soviet Union after WWII, but the differences in geo-political and historical circumstances, and the facts debated

---

[11] In the context of Japan's images of Russia, one of the recent Russian academic publications, points out the history textbooks as one of the main locales of Japan's Russia related memory (Strel'zov in Dmitrievsky ed. 2004, 82.) The article however, does not provide any empirical evidence to support this claim.

would render this comparison meaningless.

In order to avoid these ideological traps, instead of comparing Japan's history textbooks with other nations and their historical memories regarding past misdeeds or other nations' narratives on Russia, in this thesis the choice has been made in favor of a comparative analysis from within the broad historical narrative on Japan's 20th century in the most widely read Japanese textbooks. This kind of approach "from within" seems to provide the most bias free account of the construction of various historical narratives, through comparing them with each other. In other words, this chapter aims to evaluate the history textbooks narrative on Russia/USSR not through a comparison on other narratives on Russia, but in the context of the broader historical narrative provided by the Japanese textbooks. In this analysis "from within" the narrative on China and Korea seems to serve as the most suitable discourse for a comparative evaluation of Japan's historical memory (and hence, identity) construction vis-à-vis the Russian "other." As already mentioned, in domestic discourse Japan is generally perceived as the historical victim of the Russia/Soviet Union expansionism, while China and Korea are seen as the victims of Japan's colonial expansion. In other words, the two discourses compliment each other and the construction of one of the discourses can be used to evaluate the depth and thickness of the other. In other words, the construction of Japan's "criminality" can serve as a yardstick for measuring the construction of her victimhood. The examination is conducted based on comparing the textbooks' depictions of modern Japan's history with China and Korea (the victims) on one side and Russia/USSR (the perpetrator) on the other. After all, there are a number of striking similarities between Japan's history of interactions with Russia on one side and with China and Korea on the other in the first half of the 20th Century.

In both cases, the history has been that of mutual suspicion and conflict, invasion and occupation. However, in the case of Russia, Japan's history is perceived to be that of a victim of the Russian southward expansion, but more importantly, of Soviet traitorous invasion in 1945. In the cases of China and Korea, in general, Japan is perceived as the aggressor, while the gravity of Japan's misconduct and its extent being widely debated. As the conservative Ito Ken'ichi, whose writings on Russia will be discussed in the next chapter, put it in a speech at one of the public seminars,

"In case of the Asian countries we [the Japanese] have caused inconvenience (*meiwaku o kaketa*) but Russia has acted as a cowardly thief (*kaji dorobo*) in the last days of the war" (at the International House of Japan conference on Japan's relations with Korea, October 2000.) Hence, we could expect the two narratives to compliment each other, with the latter being a history of Japanese aggression, and the former, as all the commentators agree, being the victim (Rozman 1992, Kimura 1999, Hasegawa 2000b, Glaubitz 1995.)

Furthermore, it is important to define the criteria for this evaluation and comparison of the two historical narratives. The most obvious one is the quantitative one that includes the actual references to the events, the amount of space devoted and its location on the page, i.e., the body of the text or just a footnote. However, as already mentioned in the *Introduction*, historical narrative is expected to provide broad interpretations of the past events that combined constitute a certain interpretative lens for evaluation of the national past, present and future. Hence, the qualitative criteria applied in the analysis, involves the examination of the normative language used to explain the historical events.

3. Period Examined

In order to trace the changes in the discourse, the historical narrative is examined and compared in the most popular textbooks used in the mid 1980s and in the most recent books (mainly, 2002 and 2003.) The early 1980s were an important time for both of the historical narratives examined. As already mentioned, Japan's textbooks became an international issue in 1982 after the local media reported that in one of the textbooks Japan's "aggression vis-à-vis China" of the 1930s had been replaced with the softer and vaguer term "advancement into China." As the result of the wide domestic and international critique and Chinese protests, what has been called a "neighboring countries clause", prescribing particular sensitivity to the feelings of "neighboring countries" (meaning basically the Asian victims of Japanese aggression and colonization), was inserted into the official guidance for the examination of textbooks (*kyokasho kentei kijun.*)

In the context of the narrative on Russia, as noted in the previous chapter, since the

mid-1970s, Japan's relations with Russia entered the decade of "tense relations", during which the perceptions became the most negative. Furthermore, in 1981 a governmental decree established an official Northern Territories Day to "deepen the Japanese people's knowledge and understanding of the issue" (http://www.hoppou.go.jp/gakusyu/27/index.html) This has been probably the most explicit governmental attempt to deepen and to disseminate the narrative on Japan's victimhood vis-à-vis Russia and could be expected to be reflected in the school textbooks.

For the purpose of this thesis, historical discourse on China and Korea broadly defined would be examined starting from the year 1905 at which time Japan gained de facto control over Korean Peninsula. The inquiry into the narrative on Russia would also skip the pre-20th century interactions, and start with the Russo-Japanese war. The events that are perceived to have shaped the contemporary Japanese perceptions of the Soviet Union and Russia (Hasegawa 1998a, 37 also Burton quoted in Kimura 1999, 226, Shimizu 2002, 36-40, Togawa 1990, Kimura in Goodby et al 1995, 57) will be the main object of analysis.

These are mainly the events related to the Soviet participation in the Pacific War, namely the Soviet "territorial expansionism" (i.e. the Northern Territories issue) and the "Siberian interment" which signifies the interment and forced labor of around 600,000 Japanese soldiers by the Soviet Union. Also, the narratives on the Russo-Japanese War and on Japan's intervention in Siberia during the Russian civil war, which was another major conflict between the two nations (one of the "four wars" the nations have fought according to Wada 1999), will also be examined.

4. Textbooks Examined

The books examined are listed below. Data was obtained from *Kyokasho repoto* 1984, 82 and *Kyokasho repoto* 2002, 77-83 [12]. In brackets are the market shares of the respective books.

a) Junior high school textbooks

Atarashi Shakai-Rekishi (New Social Studies-History, Ukai 1984) by Tokyo Shoseki publishing house (34.9% in 1984)

---

[12] Additional statistical data was provided by the staff at the library of the National Institute of Education Research.

Chugakko shakai-rekishteki bunya (Junior High school Social Studies-History, Kodama 1983) by Nihon Shoseki (20%)

Nihon no ayumi to Sekai-rekishi (Japan's Path and the World-History) by Chukyo Shuppan publshin house (14.2%)

Atarashii shakai: Rekishi (New Social Studies: History by Tanabe et al 2002) by Tokyo shoseki (51.3 in 2002 and 41.1% in 1997)

Chugaku shakai-rekishiteki bunya (Junior High School Social Studies: History by Atsuta et al 2002) by Osaka shoseki (14% in 2002 and 19.3% in 1997)

Chugaku shakai-rekishi:mirai o mitsumete (Junior High School-History: Looking at the Future by Sasayama et al 2002) by Kyoiku shuppan publishing house (13% in 2002 and 17.8% in 1997)

Chugakusei no rekishi-nihon no ayumi to sekai no ugoki (History for Junior High School-Japan's Path and the World Changes by Kuroda et al 2002) published by Teikoku shoin (10.9% in 2002 and 1.9% in 1997)

b) High school textbooks

Shinshosetsu nihonshi (New Detailed History of Japan 24.6% in 1989 and 26.9% in 1990)

Shosetsu nihonshi kaiteban (Detailed History of Japan, Revised Edition 11.9% and 10.1%)

Yousetsu nihonshi saikaiteiban (Outline of Japan's History 7.6% and 6.7%), (all three published by Yamakawa Shuppan publishing house and edited by Inoue Kosada et al.)

Koko nihonshi sankaiteiban (High School Japan's History: Third Revised Edition 9.3% and 8.6%) published by Jikkyo Shuppan publishing house.

In 2002, the top three high school history textbooks are by Yamakawa shuppan (38.8% for Japan's History A and 77% for Japan's History B[13]) Jikkyo shuppan (17.9% and 77%) and Tokyo shoseki (17.8 and 23% for two books.)

---

[13] History A is used mainly in trade high schools and ones that do not prepare their students for university entrance exams. History B is a more detailed version used mainly in competitive high schools, whose program is oriented at preparing their students for university entrance exams.

5. The Narrative on China and Korea

In general, it can be argued that the contemporary narrative on Japan's colonial misdeeds in the textbooks has become deeper and longer, if we compare the textbooks, most widely used today with those of the 1980s.

5.1 1980s Narrative on China and Korea

5.1.1 High school textbooks

The texts from 1980s contain limited references related to Japan's colonial rule and imperial involvement in China and Korea. For example, all of the high school textbooks published by Yamakawa shuppan and edited by Inoue, which combined have covered over 30% of the market, provide very brief reference to the numerous incidents related to the Korean and the Chinese struggle against Japan and the wording in rather vague.

For example, the reference to Chinese mass protests against Japan being granted the German colonial rights as the post-WWI settlement (5.4 movement) is made in a footnote. It portrays the anger not as directed at Japan, but as demanding the return of the rights to China, and is followed by two lines description of the independence demonstrations in Korea in 1919 (3.1 movement) stated in very neutral wording, without any reference to its suppression by the colonial government (Inoue 1988, 300-301.) The Korean struggle for independence in general is described in a footnote as a rather ambiguous "guerrilla struggle" (1988, 289) and the invasion of China is described as an "advancement to China" (1988, 300.) However, there is a three lines description of the killing of Korean and Chinese residents after the Kanto earthquake in 1923 and a very brief reference to government involvement in it (1988, 306.) The notorious Nanking massacre is also mentioned very briefly in a footnote, stating that at the time of the occupation of Nanking, the "Japanese army has killed many Chinese, including non-combatants" and this "has become a big problem during the Tokyo trials" (1988, 324.)

Only one out of the four top high school books engages in an extensive evaluative narrative of Japan's past misdeeds. *Koko nihonshi* (Ishiyama 1990) devotes a whole

sub-chapter to the annexation of Korea (1990, 265-267), stating that the government managed to suppress anti-annexation demonstrations both in Japan and Korea through forceful measures. In the context of granting German colonial rights to Japan, one paragraph cites the statement by the Chinese representative to the Washington Conference that criticizes the giving of German rights in China to Japan as inflicting great suffering on the Chinese people (1990, 279.) It also mentions, that "at least 6,000 Koreans and Chinese killed" in the post-earthquake riots in 1923 (1990, 296.) The book also devotes one paragraph to the "Nanking massacre" during which "for about one month after the occupation, Japanese soldiers have killed at least over 100,000 Chinese including women and children" (1990, 307.)

5.1.2 Junior High School Texts

Compared to the high school textbooks, the books used at junior high schools devote more space and engage in much stronger interpretative construction. Only the *Nihon no ayumi to sekai (rekishi)* (Aoki et al 1983) is similar to Yamakawa shuppan books in its minimalistic and mainly factual reference to the incidents in question.

The other books, while still containing no references to incidents like the notorious Unit 731 experiments conducted on POWs, forced labor or comfort women[14], engage in more in-depth normative evaluation, in addition to the factual references that appear in the high school books.

For example, *Atarashi Shakai Rekishi* (Ukai et al 1984) mentions the "fierce resistance" of Koreans to Japanese colonization and its suppression by the army (1984, 237.) One paragraph describes the loss of land by Koreans, the "Japanization" policies and the strengthening of discriminative perceptions of Koreans in Japan (1984, 237.) Over one page is devoted to "Korean people suffering under Japanese colonial rule" and the Korean 3.1 independence movement that was suppressed by the Japanese army and police. (1984, 259-260)

---

[14] While the misdeeds of unit 731 and the forced labor were known and described by the progressive camp for a few decades, the issue of comfort women has surfaced for the first time in the early 1990s and therefore the lack of reference in the textbooks that were written a decade earlier is rather understandable.

Again, the Nanking massacre is mentioned briefly as a footnote, in the context of Japanese aggression against China in 1937 during which "over a few weeks, Japanese army has murdered numerous Chinese." The number of civilian casualties, including around 70,000-80,000 women and children, is stated to be over 200,000. It also mentions the Chinese estimates of 300,000, which are contested by most Japanese historians. At the same time, it must be noted that the innocence of the general Japanese population is emphasized, as the text states that, "while this incident was widely condemned internationally, the Japanese people did not know about it" (1984, 278.)

Along similar lines *Chugakko shakai-rekishiteki bunya* (Kodama et al 1983) has a whole chapter titled "Japanese aggression against the continent and the changes in Asia" (1983, 216.) A whole page is devoted to the depictions of the annexation of Korea, the loss of land and the forceful introduction of Japanese language at schools (1983, 217.) Strong Chinese opposition to the 21 demands of Japan is mentioned briefly (1983, 231), but a whole paragraph describes in a very strong language the pro-independence 3.1 Movement in Korea and its suppression by the army (1983, 238.) As the same time, in a chapter titled "Japan's Aggression against China", the reference to Nanking is made in more ambiguous language, stating that the massacre was the result of numerous incidents of Chinese in civilian cloths shooting at Japanese soldiers (1983, 258.)

5.2 Contemporary Narrative on China and Korea

5.2.1 High School Textbooks

The narrative in high school books used in 2002 differs greatly between the textbooks published by Yamakawa shuppan that account for over one third of Japan's History A class and just below two thirds for Japan's History B class, and the other two publishers. Compared to other publishers, Yamakawa books are still very thin in normative evaluations and interpretations, but compared to the books published by Yamakawa in the previous decade, the narrative has become thicker in normative evaluations.

For example, in *Koko Nihonshi B* the description of the road to the annexation does not involve any value laden terms, and it is only noted that as the "expansion of Japanese landowners, has led to the demise of the peasantry" (Ishii 2004, 210) and the brief reference to the Nanking massacre states only that "the Japanese army has killed many Chinese, including non-combatants" (2004, 260.) *Shosetsu Nihonshi B*, which is a more detailed version of the same book, engages in the description of the "peaceful" 3.1 Movement in Korea that was suppressed in a "severe way." However, it also states that there were certain improvements in the colonial rule made (Ishii 2003, 305) and the evaluation of the Japanese colonial response is rather ambiguous. At the same time, the reference to Nanking is more detailed and has more value laden terms in it. The compulsory drafting of soldiers from Taiwan and Korea as well as the issue of comfort women are also briefly mentioned in a footnote. (2003, 342 also Torikai 2003, 122)

Shin Nihonshi (Ootsu 2004) is similar to the other Yamakawa books in its ambiguous construction. While it devotes a whole page to Korea under Japanese colonial rule, it states that the harsh food conditions resulted from the extensive export of rice that was conducted both by Japanese and Korean landowners. Also, while admitting that most of the high level managers and owners of newly built industrial facilities were Japanese, reference is made to Koreans that worked as middle level managers and contributed to the post-independence industrialization of Korea.

In the context of education policies, one sentence mentions the gap between the mainland and Korea and refers to the education being conducted in Japanese. The rest of the text refers to the benefits the introduction of the Japanese education system brought to the Korean people. (2004, 320) However, the other two publishers, Jikkyo Shuppan and Tokyo Shoseki, provide a much deeper narrative, both in terms of actual incidents mentioned and in terms of their normative evaluation.

For example, *Nihon Shi A* by Jikkyo Shuppan (Miyahara et al 2003) devotes a whole chapter to "Colonization of Korea" (2003, 96-97) with reference to opposition to "Japan's aggression" and its "brutal suppression" that includes some detailed descriptions of the atrocities committed by the army. Two pages are devoted to "National Independence Movements in Korea and Asia, and Japan" (2003, 108-109.)

The detailed description of the Nanking massacre is made in a dedicated paragraph and provides the Chinese estimates for the victims as the absolute ones. However, here again, the innocence of the general Japanese population is underlined, through an emphasis on the lack of knowledge about the incident among the "Japanese people" at that time (2003, 121.)

Two pages are devoted to "Contemporary Japan and Korea (ROK)" in which a detailed description of differences in the perceptions of colonial rule between ROK and Japanese governments and the historical road to reconciliation (2003, 158-159.) The book also devotes a whole chapter to demands for war reparations from the Asian victims and the "comfort women" issue[15] (2003, 176.) The narrative in other books edited by Miyahara (2003a) is similar, as well as Okuta and Ooyama (2003) and Tanaka (2003.) The latter two also mention the usage of poison gas on the Chinese front and the production and sales of opium to the Chinese population by Unit 731 (Okuta and Oyama et al 2003, 328 Tanaka 2003, 147.)

Nihon Shi A by Tokyo Shoseki (Tanaka et al 2003) goes further than the rest of the textbooks by letting the Korean "other" communicate with the students through its text and by bringing up contemporary issues. It provides a clear link between the past and the present. One page, written by a Korean resident of Japan, is devoted to a detailed description of the Japanese and Korean pan-Asian movements, describes Japan's "betrayal" of pan-Asianism and her "aggression" towards Korea (2003, 103.) Furthermore, a whole page engages in a comparison between Germany and Japan in their "dealing with the past" in which a rhetorical question, "Have the Japanese made an effort to clarify their own responsibility for the war of aggression?" is posed to the students (2003, 177.)

5.2.2 Junior High School Texts

As it was shown above, there exists a sharp difference in the depth of narrative among high school books used in 2002/2003. Compared to the high school texts, all of the popular junior high school textbooks engage in a much deeper narrative, as compared to the 1980s. The narrative on the Nanking massacre is still brief and

---

[15] In this context, one line reference is made to the issue of reparations for Japanese soldiers that have been detained and engaged in forced labor in the Soviet Union.

emphasizes the innocence of the general Japanese population. All the textbooks refer to "aggression against China", the forced labor of Chinese and Koreans during the war, who were "low paid" and worked under and lived in "harsh and cruel conditions" (for example, Tanabe 2002, 175.)

Atarashii shakai: Rekishi (Tanabe et al 2002), which has been used in over half of the junior high schools in 2002, is still rather brief as only one paragraph is devoted to the annexation of Korea and the following colonial rule. However, strong normative language is used, such as descriptions of the Japanese "rule by force", "loss of land" on behalf of the Koreans, "social and economic discrimination" against the Koreans (2002, 144) and "liberation movement" that was suppressed by "brutal force" (2002, 157.)

Chugaku shakai-rekishiteki bunya by Osaka Shoseki (Atsuta et al 2002, 134) and *Chugakusei no rekishi-nihon no ayumi to sekai no ugoki* by Teikoku Shoin (Kuroda et al 2002, 170-171) devote one page to the annexation of Korea (2002, 134) also with strong wording such as "the Korean state was deprived of the right for diplomacy", "fierce resistance" of Korean people, "forcing Japanese language and history" on Koreans and "negating the customs and culture" of the Korean people, and "superiority feelings" of the Japanese toward Koreans.

Chugaku shakai-rekishi:mirai o mitsumete (Sasayama et al 2002) by Kyoiku shuppan goes further. It devotes one and a half pages to the annexation of Korea and engages in detailed descriptions of the discrimination against Koreans on institutional and individual levels, the forced labor of Chinese and Koreans and the Japanese occupation of China (2002, 162-163.) In addition to the normative language used above, there is an "attempt by the Japanese to take away Korean national identity and pride" and reference to the discrimination of those Koreans who had moved to Japan proper. Also Japan is described as inflicting "pain that is impossible to explain" on the Korean people over the 36 years of her colonial rule. The 3.1 demonstrations are described as a "peaceful movement", which were "suppressed by force" and "resulted in many victims" (2002, 177.) It also mentions the forced labor of Koreans and Chinese in the context of contemporary compensation claims and the need for Japan to address these claims is emphasized (2002, 221.) *Chugaku shakai-*

rekishiteki bunya also mentions the Korean and Chinese victims of the atomic bombing. (Atsuta et al 2002, 176.)

China is described as being "forced" into accepting most of the 21 demands (Kuroda et al 2002, 186) and while the reference to Nanking is still brief, it is mentioned that it has been seen by the nations of the world as "Japanese barbarism." At the same time, like the other textbooks, the emphasis on the general population not knowing about it is also made (2002, 202.)

The students are also encouraged to understand the position of the "other" as one of the suggested discussion topics is: "if you were Korean or Taiwanese at the time of colony, what would you think about Japanese colonial rule and aggression?" (2002, 207) Furthermore, all the texts mention the killings of Korean residents in the aftermath of the 1923 earthquake and emphasize the Japanese government's involvement in organizing and inciting the mobs (for example Tanabe 2002, 162 Atsuta et al 2002, 154 Sasayama et al 2002, 185.)

6. The Narrative on Russia/USSR

As there are certain similarities that cut across the textbooks in depictions of Russia related historical events, this section is divided along the events, and abandoning the high school and junior high school separation used in the previous section. In general, it argues that the narrative on Russia/USSR in the school textbooks did not change much over the last two decades and at best, contains some factual information about the main conflicts between the two nations in the 20th Century. However, normative interpretations are rare and "thin" and cannot be regarded as constituting an interpretative lens regarding Russia/USSR and the bilateral relations.

6.1 The Narrative in 1980s

1) Russo-Japanese War

In general, the space devoted in junior high school textbooks to the Russo-Japanese War is quite impressive as all of them devote around two pages to descriptions of the causes of the war, the war itself and the peace settlement. At the

same time, compared to the narrative on China and Korea, the description of the war and of the other historical events is purely factual with very little normative interventions that could provide an interpretation of the event. Furthermore, over the years, there have been only minor changes in the narrative as compared to a much thicker discourse on colonial misdeeds.

For example, *Atarashi Shakai Rekishi* (Ukai et al 1984) devotes two pages to Russo-Japanese war and the narrative has a brief reference to Japan becoming an imperial power as the result of defeating the "mighty Russian army" (1984, 235) and also to the victory of a "small, Asian country Japan" that has given hope and confidence to Asian people (1984, 236).

Chugakko shakai-rekishteki bunya (Kodama et al 1983) also devotes two pages to the Russo-Japanese war which is described as the first war "among imperial powers", where Russia is portrayed as "one of world's great powers" (1983, 214) and is the only textbook that goes further in its depiction of the war.

However, the narrative that follows is internationalist and generally exhibits anti-war sentiments. Not only is "Japan" not juxtaposed with "Russia", but the narrative actually creates a different binary of the "people" and the "State." This is done through an extensive depiction (one page) of the general suffering of the "people", including depictions of life in both Japan and Russia. This suffering of the population is described as the main factor in both states' inability to sustain the war effort (1983, 215.)

In a similar fashion, the high school textbook *Koko nihonshi* (Ishiyama et al 1990) devotes a whole sub-chapter to the suffering of the Japanese population during the war under the title of "Russo-Japanese War and the People" (1990, 256-258.) However, here also the focus in not on "Russia" as the cause of the suffering, but on the Japanese government that mobilized the people and engaged in heavy taxation. In other words, the Japanese state is presented as the entity that bears responsibility for the suffering of the people. The other high school textbooks (all of Yamakawa Shuppan books are edited by Inoue and provide a similar narrative) devote much less space to the Russo-Japanese war and the narrative is usually limited to about two paragraphs of mainly factual descriptions of the main events in the war.

2) "Siberian Intervention"

The narrative on the Japanese involvement in the Entente attempts to crush the Bolshevik revolution, known in Japan as the "Siberian military expedition", is brief in all the textbooks, both high school and junior high school, and does not exceed one paragraph in any of them. In junior high school texts, the narrative mentions that the expedition met "a strong resistance of Russian people" (Ukai et al 1984, 25) and that it failed because of "guerilla warfare and the winter cold" (Kodama et al 1983, 233) but otherwise there are no normative evaluations. In high school texts, the "Siberian Expedition" is described in two lines. The only value laden statement is usually directed at Japan, stating that the prolonged presence in Russia of Japanese forces was criticized by the international society as Japan's policy of expansionism (for example Inoue et al 1988, 297.) Here again *Koko nihonshi* (Ishiyama et al 1990) stands out as it provides a whole paragraph devoted to the Siberian expedition, stating that it resulted in failure after heavy losses and great expense. As with the discourse on Russo-Japanese war, the focus is on the policies of the Japanese government as the cause for the suffering (1990, 276.)

3) WWII and After

As already mentioned, the most important events in shaping Japanese perceptions of Russia/USSR are usually regarded to be the events related to the Soviet participation in the Pacific War, the Northern Territories and the prolonged imprisonment and exploitation of Japanese POWs, and the Cold War. However, the narrative in both high school and junior high school texts is very limited in quantity and contains very few evaluative statements.

In general, the description on the Soviet invasion of Manchuria, the occupation of the Northern Territories and the so-called "Siberian internment" of Japanese POWs is limited to one or two lines stating that the USSR has declared war in spite of the validity of the neutrality pact and invaded Manchuria (Ukai et al 1984, 289 and Kodama et al 1983, 267.) Furthermore, *Atarashi Shakai Rekishi* even seems to provide a certain sense of legitimacy to the Soviet seizure of the islands. It seems to

115

contradict Japan's official position, by stating that the occupation of the islands was conducted according to the Yalta agreement. (Ukai et al 1984, 289)

The reference to the Northern Territories appears only in two junior high school texts and provides a very brief description of the issue. *Chugakko shakai-rekishteki bunya* states that the islands are inherently Japanese territory but at the same time also presents the Soviet position without making any judgment regarding the validity of either of the positions (Kodama et al 1983, 283.) *Nihon no ayumi to sekai (rekishi)* (Aoki et al 1983, 298) is the only text that engages in an evaluative description of the issue stating that the four islands are Japan's inherent territory and are occupied by the Soviet Union. However, the actual text is very brief and is provided as a footnote in "Japan's Foreign Relations" section.

The narrative in the high school textbooks does not differ much. While the narrative contains some evaluative descriptions, the text is very brief and usually is provided in the form of a footnote. For example, *Shinshosetsu nihon shi* (Inoue et al 1988) devotes only two lines to the Soviet participation in the Pacific War stating that the USSR ignored the neutrality pact, declared war and invaded Manchuria and Korea. A footnote states that following the Soviet invasion of Manchuria, the Kwantung army was annihilated. As a result many Japanese "pioneers" were killed, many suffered during their return to Japan, and also many children were left behind (1988, 333-334.)

The issue of the Northern Territories is usually mentioned briefly in the context of the Soviet-Japanese Declaration of 1956 as paving the way for Japan's membership in the UN. Furthermore, the footnote text is limited to a purely factual explanation that presents the positions of both governments (for example Inoue et al 1988, 348, Ishiyama et al 1990, 335.)

The Cold War bipolar rivalry placed Japan firmly in the Western camp and has been the major source of the Soviet military threat perception described by Burton and affirmed by Kimura. However, this important event is described in a purely factual fashion both in junior high school and high school texts, and regarded mainly as a European event without any references to Japan (for example Kodama et al 1983, 278-279 Aoki et al 1983, 298 Inoue 1988, 343). Furthermore, the US-Japan security alliance, which has become the corner stone of Japanese post-war foreign policy, is

mentioned in one to two lines and also bears no reference to the Soviet threat (for example, Kodama et al 1983, 282 Inoue 1988, 346, Ishiyama et al 1990, 334.)

6.2 The Contemporary Narrative

In the last two decades there have been a number of important domestic, international and systemic changes. Changes have also occurred in the ranking of the popular textbooks that have brought different writers, editors and publishers as the builders of the new generation's historical knowledge and national identity.

Notwithstanding these longer-term changes, the discourse on Russia/USSR in 2002-2003 has experienced only minor modifications. The space devoted by junior high school books to the Russo-Japanese War has decreased from the average of two pages to a couple of paragraphs (Atsuta et al 2002, 132-133 and Kuroda et al 2002, 168-169) with only one book devoting a page and a half to the war (Sasayama 2002, 159-160.) This could be perceived as the reflection of the decline in the importance of Russia, but, at the same time, the high school textbooks continue to engage in an extensive description of the war. They devote around two pages to the Russo-Japanese War, the narrative continue to be mostly factual, with occasional descriptions of the victory as the "newly emerging Asian country Japan has defeated the great Caucasian power Russia" (Ishii 2004, 208-210 and Ishii 2003, 272-273) or as destroying the myth of "invisibility of the white man" (Torikai et al 2003, 65.)

In general, the description of the Siberian expedition, the Soviet entry into the Pacific War and related issues, as well as descriptions of the beginning of the Cold War, have not changed and still are brief, factual, providing very few evaluative descriptions. The reference to the end of the Cold War is also purely factual. Only one of the texts has a reference to the reason for the US-Japan alliance and the establishment of SDF to be "the threat from USSR and China" (Kuroda et al 2002, 217). Most contain a footnote reference to the Northern Territories in the context of the 1956 bilateral declaration (Kuroda et al 2002, 217 Atsuta et al 2002, 189 Ishii 2004, 81 Ishii 2003, 366.)

The description of the Soviet entry into the Pacific War in high school texts is similar to the junior high text books in its brief and purely factual description with

occasional reference to the suffering of the Japanese colonizers in Manchuria, the returnees and the "left behind children." (Ishii 2003, 345) However, the reference to the "Siberian internment" has made an appearance in the narrative (Sasayama et al 2002, Ootsu et al 2004, Komura et al 2003.) The reference is made in a form of a footnote or a two-three lines body of text, but states that six hundred thousand Japanese troops stationed in China were taken prisoners and sent to Siberia, where they were forced to engage in harsh labor, as a result of which many died. Some books provide concrete figures of the dead to be around 60,000. (Sasayama 2002,Ootsu 2004, 354, Komura 2003, 177, Torikai 2003, 123, Miyahara et al 2003, 336)

To conclude, there have been slight changes in the historical narrative on Russia but, compared with the overall deepening of the discourse on colonial misdeeds, they are negligible. In order to emphasize the limited nature of the main textbooks discourse on Russia, an outline of the notoriously famous the revisionist textbook is provided in the following section. The (in)famous *Atarashii Rekishi Kyokasho* (New History Textbook by Nishio et al 2001), which has the explicit intention of providing the "patriotic" view of history, is a good example of how the narrative in the textbooks could have been constructed.

7. The Revisionist Discourse

The "revisionism" or "whitewashing" of Japan's imperial and colonial history in *Atarashii Rekishi Kyokasho* (New History Textbook) has been discussed in the already mentioned academic and journalistic fora, which renders the repetition of the argument superfluous. For the sake of precision, it must be noted that the narrative does not engage in a revolutionary re-writing of history that negates completely the dominant discourse. While omitting several important issues such as the Nanking massacre and the comfort women, the descriptions of "negative" Japanese colonial policies are present, but the argument is limited in space and written in ambiguous language that avoids the clear cut dichotomies that could construct negative perceptions of "Japan." For example, the 3.1 demonstrations in Korea are described as "demanding independence" and as being "suppressed through force" by the

"Korea Government General" (*chosen sotokufu*) without explicit reference to the Government General being appointed by the Japanese government. Furthermore, it states that as a result of the demonstrations, the " rule [of Korea] was amended" (Nishio et al 2001, 249.) Notably, passive language was used to avoid explicit reference to Japan as the "ruler" of Korea.

The killings of civilians conducted by the Japanese army are mentioned, but put in the context of war in general and presented as a cruel but universal reality of war. Furthermore, while the Japanese misdeeds are mentioned in two lines and in very general wording, the massacres conducted by Nazi Germany are described in much more detail and followed by a description of cases when Japanese officials assisted Jews escaping the Holocaust (2001, 288.)

On the other side, the narrative on Russia and the USSR is much deeper than the brief factual descriptions in the popular textbooks and provides a binary construction of positive "Japan" and negative "Russia." Compared to the average of two pages in other textbooks, the New Textbook devotes four pages to the Russo-Japanese war (Nishio et al 2001, 220-223.) It is rich in expressions like "small island nation Japan" for which concluding an alliance with a "major power" (Britain) was the "only way of surviving."

"Interventionist" and "ambitious" Russia, whose state budget and military power exceeded that of Japan by "ten times", was defeated in Tsushima naval battle due to the "high morale of the Japanese troops" and their "skillful strategy." The war is portrayed not as a clash of two imperial powers, but as a war of self-defense for the "survival of Japan." Needless to mention, the victory is described as a victory of a "colored nation" against a "white nation" that gave hope of independence to the "oppressed nations of the world."

The Siberian intervention (2001, 246-247) is ambiguously described not only as an attempt to expand Japan's influence to Siberia, but also as an attempt to "rescue the Czechoslovak corps" (which was the official excuse of the Entente). The prolonged presence in Siberia is portrayed as a righteous battle against communism. The text attempts to dilute the negative interpretation of Japanese crimes by providing a broader historical perspective and Russia is used as a convenient "other" for the allocation of the guilt. For example, in a column asking the students to think

about modernity and war (2001, 288-289), it is explained that the atrocities committed by Japanese soldiers against the civilian population are no different from other acts of violence during a war. Examples cited include, the "killing, looting and rape" of Japanese civilians by the Soviet soldiers after the invasion of Manchuria as well as the "60,000 Japanese that included POWs" who were taken to Siberia and subject to "harsh labor."[16]

The Soviet Union is mentioned on numerous occasions and the text makes a number of references to "mass murders under Stalin" (2001, 289), "mass executions", "cruel forced labor" and "enormous number of victims" (2001, 260-261.) It is also mentioned that communist China and USSR have concluded an alliance against Japan as the potential enemy (2001, 297) in 1949 and "the Soviet threat" is brought up as one of the main factors guiding the policies of the first post occupation Prime Minister Yoshida Shigeru, including the creation of the Self Defense Forces (2001, 298.)

8. Conclusion

The basic "progressive" position can be summarized in the words of Ienaga Saburo, the symbolic hero of the progressive textbooks cause[17], who complained that "there is not enough remorse for the past, as this is a fault of the textbooks approval bureaucracy of the Ministry of Education" (quoted in Kuroha 1995, 6 also Ienaga 1993.) The remorse in this context means an in-depth knowledge about the "aggression, infliction of damage and resistance" in the context of Japan's past involvement with the Asian nations, the role and responsibilities of the Showa emperor and the "war responsibility" of the people of Japan in general (Sakai and Oomori 1995, 118-119 also Fuwa 2001.)

This prescriptive statement is based on a certain perception of the Japanese society, which goes beyond the concrete textbooks issue. The Japanese society is

---

[16] Surprisingly, only two lines are devoted to the Northern Territories issue and the narrative is similar to other textbooks.

[17] Ienaga's textbooks related trial which started in 1965 has been regarded as the beginning of the domestic debate (Ienaga 1971)

seen as being "lethargic" in the sense of a general lack of interest in the political and, while opposing the State intervention in the education, the progressives are campaigning for a "thicker" knowledge of Japan's negative past to be transmitted to students (Nagahara 1982, 122 also Nagahama 1986, 203-206.)

Interestingly, the progressive Nagahara worries about the "growing conservativism of the young generation" (1990, 97-98) do not mean a conscious preference for the conservative ideology by the public, but the growing passive disinterest in the political and social in general (1990, 107.) In Nagahara's opinion, the purely factual approach to history education, that emphasizes memorizing facts and does not encourage students to think, plays a decisive role in this social phenomenon (1990, 122.) He also explains that learning Japanese history means building "self-understanding" as Japanese among the young generation.

Paradoxically, the conservative political establishment's basic conception of the history textbooks problem bears a striking similarity to the progressive one. It is worried about the decline in national consciousness[18] and also complains about the "disappearance of the State" from the textbooks (Morimoto et al 1981 also Saaler 2005, 13-38.) In a slightly more radical conceptualization of the problem, it is worried about the disappearance of the "Japanese view of history" from the textbooks, which has been replaced by a combination of American and Soviet perceptions of history (Nishio 2001, 14.) The works of the revisionist *Japanese Society for History Textbooks Reform*, which is behind the controversial textbook, and plausibly has a strong support among the conservative establishment (Saaler 2005, 80), are meant to address these worries.

While the progressives emphasize the need to deepen the narrative regarding the negative conduct of the State and the people, the numerous texts produced by the members of the History Textbooks Society, are attempting to bring the "positive" State back into the popular consciousness. This is achieved by replacing what one of the ideologues of the group calls the "masochistic perception of history" (Fujioka 2000), with a different historical narrative, which presents Japan as the liberator of

---

[18] "National consciousness" in the conservative context means national pride and patriotism.

Asia and aims at relativizing Japanese misdeeds through comparisons with Europe, US or Asian countries (for example see Fujioka 1999.)

As can be seen from the above, in spite of opposing ideologies, both the progressives and the conservatives are driven by the same *problematique* in their critique of the main textbooks' historical narrative. As numerous academic works argue, purely factual description of certain historical events (what is usually known as *history*) can provide a sense of "common experience." However, it will lack the unifying character of historical memory, as it will not provide the tools necessary for communal orientation that can be achieved only through the construction of an interpretative framework, which is used to evaluate the past and the present of the "self" community (Hopf 2002, 25, Barnett 2002, 6 and Bloom 1990, 47.) In this sense, both camps in the domestic debate on history textbooks, seek to deepen the students' emotional identification with the nation and the state through value laden historical narrative regarding the Japanese "self" interactions with the "others."

Analyzed from this perspective, the most widely used history textbooks examined in this chapter constitute a compromise between the two camps, slightly leaning towards the progressive vision of "proper" historical narrative.

It can be argued that the dichotomous structure of either "negative" or "positive" Japan that has been shaping the textbooks debate, accounts for the factual and non-evaluative narrative on interactions with Russia. Combined with the negative narrative on Japan's past, an extensive and negative depiction of the Russian "other" in the context of interactions with Japan would constitute a deviation from the binary structure.

Furthermore, the importance of the textbooks in the construction of historical memory should also be put into perspective. There is no doubt that generally speaking education plays an important role in shaping national identity (Saaler 2005, 17) and its role in pre-1945 Japan as one of the main locale for identity creation is beyond doubt (for example, Yoshino 1999, 13-14.) No doubt that the contents of the textbooks do reflect certain trends in the broader society and therefore deserve close public and academic scrutiny.

However, there are a number of issues that question the ultimate importance of textbooks in the context of today's Japan. Besides the obvious question on how

closely the teachers actually follow the textbooks, the amount of time dedicated to history education should also be kept in mind. The number of history classes (for both Japan and world history) in junior high school education, has declined from 140 of history classes over two years of school (Kyokasho repoto 1986, 103) to 105 as a result of education reform implemented in 1998 (Ministry of Education 2003.)

In high schools, as a result of the high school education reform of 1989, Japanese history has become a non-mandatory subject, and students have to choose one subject among either History of Japan A, History of Japan B, Geography A and Geography B (Ito 2002, 438.) Therefore, it is possible to graduate from high school without taking any classes in history and, judging by the experience of some schools, this option is not purely theoretical, as the lack of interest on behalf of the students has resulted in the suspension of history classes in some schools (Sase 1995, 28.) Furthermore, in the context of the present analysis, it is plausible to argue that the textbooks at least reflect the social consensus regarding the imperial misdeeds vis-à-vis China and Korea.

However, in case of the narrative on Russia, the textbooks no only do not shape perceptions, but they do not reflect the social consensus as well. In spite of the neutral and limited narrative in the textbooks, which has not changed much over the last two decades, as the previous chapter has mentioned, the public opinion has been consistently unfriendly to USSR/Russia. Hence, it can be concluded that the construction of historical narrative vis-à-vis Russia/USSR, does take place and is rather dense. However, it occurs outside of school textbooks and the next step of this thesis is to explore the actual locale where the general discourse on Russia is constructed. The following two chapters will analyze the two narratives of Russia that seem to reflect the public opinion and, at the same time, seem to engage in the reproduction of the perceptions.

Chapter V: Constructing Russia and Japan

1. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the construction of the Japanese national identities that emerged from the contemporary discourse on the identity of the Russian "other." The texts examined in this chapter, as well as Shiba Ryotaro's historical discourse discussed in the following chapter, belong to what Rozman has classified as "views of Russian heritage" component of "building blocks of perception." Rozman asserts that the trend of characterizing other nations in terms of personality traits is a uniquely Japanese quality (1992, 173-176.) Edward Said's *Orientalism* probably serves as the most well known empirical evidence that production of stereotypical images of the "other" is not a Japanese invention.

Furthermore, Said's work, as well as the works of Stephan Tanaka and Oguma Eiji discussed in Chapter II, has shown that the construction of the national "self" is conducted, to a large extent, through the image of the "other." While Rozman limits himself to briefly introducing the assumptions of the works in question, here I will attempt to show the broad construction of the master identity discourse and the dichotomies around which it evolves. Unlike the constructivist works examined in Chapter I, the analysis conducted here and in the following chapter does not attempt to establish a positivist relationship between the identity discourse and foreign policy. It locates the emergence of the discourse in a particular nexus of domestic and international, long-term and short-term trends that have facilitated the emergence of the discourse and shaped its structure.

In terms of identity construction, the most important commonality between the two nations is that, both Japan and Russia have been subjected to "othering" practices by the broadly defined "West", and at the same time, the "West" (or, in case of Russia, often it was "Europe") have been a central point of reference in the modern identity discourse of both nations (the importance of the "West" in Japan's identity discourse was shown in Chapter II. For Russia, see Neumann (1998) and (2000.) Hence, over the last century, Russia often served as the mirror or as anti-image in the construction of the Japanese self-image. This construction has adopted the Western practices of "othering" in an attempt to locate Japan within the realm of universal civilization and utilized the Western discourse on Russia. At the same time, the utilization of "Russia" was made easier by the numerous conflicts between Japan and Russia, as the construct also contributed to the "othering" and dehumanization of an enemy.

As already mentioned in the *Introduction*, during the Russo-Japanese War, Japan was often presented as a "white" nation, the defender of the universal civilization from the Asian and barbarian Russia. In 1920s, Japan managed to become one of the great powers in Asia and the world, while the newly born Soviet Russia was weak, recovering from the prolonged civil war, revolution and Entente intervention (in which Japan took an active part.) In the early 1920s, in spite of the perceived ideological threat of communism, the mainstream discourse on Russian national character approached the Russian inherent expansionism and the ultimate belief in

military power as a quality of the past, which had disappeared with the tsarist regime. At the same time, this earlier quality was described in a rather admiring than negative tones. Interestingly, Russian relations with other nations were examined not in the weak versus strong perspective (as in a discourse examined below), but in her ability to assimilate inferior cultures (like the natives of Siberia) and inability to assimilate higher cultures, like Poland (Minami 1997, 310-330.) This was the period when Japan's national identity discourse, as depicted in Stephan Tanaka's work, was being constructed as a fusion of the superior Western culture and the best of Asian qualities.

However, over the next two decades, the discourse on Russia changed drastically. Japan's militarization was increasing and in 1931, Japan invaded Manchuria and established the puppet state of Manchukuo, drawing a strong international criticism that resulted in Japan's withdrawal from the League of Nations in 1934. It is interesting to note how the discourse on Russian national character changed under those circumstances.

In a book on the Soviet Union published by the Ministry of Army in 1937, the year the full-scale invasion of China has started, the readers are warned that at first sight Russians seem to be "extremely" humane and virtuous. But due to the low level of culture and civilization, they lack self-restraint and tend to shift from one extreme to another, often becoming brutal and aggressive. This national character is traced to the historical experience of Russian explorers/hunters during their conquest of Siberia, which was full of hardships and cruelty, while striving to survive the harsh conditions of this vast land. The narrative emphasizes the atrocities of Russian conquerors towards the Chinese population and the continuity of this homicidal trait after the revolution and the birth of the Soviet Union. In a narrative, almost identical to the one examined below, the text depicts the Russians as vigorous and aggressive towards a weak opponent and submissive towards strength. It also traces these traits to the historically consistent despotic nature of the Russian government. Again, Russian natural tendency to lie is mentioned, and the Japanese, who belong to a peaceful and naïve "island nation" are called not to believe to Russian lies about their need for military buildup in the Far East to balance the Japanese one. The author also shows admiration for the recent Soviet technological and industrial achievements, which are traced to the Russian national tendency to act daringly, but the general aim

is to warn the reader about Russia.

The normative implications are obvious and clearly stated: Japanese military build up and continuous military presence in Manchukuo is necessary to confront the Soviet threat and the people need to awake from their traditional peaceful and naïve illusions about the possibility of peaceful relations with Russia [19] (Ouchi 1937, 138-145.)

The discourse examined here also emerged partly as an attempt to construct Japan's normalcy through allocation of the "otherness" to Russia. It has also carried very clear normative implications for the domestic audience. However, it has emerged within a particular domestic and international environment, which is briefly examined below.

1.1 Domestic and International Environments

As already mentioned, the contemporary identity discourse on Russia and Japan emerged within a particular political, economic and social environment. It developed not only within the narrow context of tense bilateral relations as argued by Rozman (1992), but also within a broader domestic and international context of the late 1970s and early 1980s. At the same time, like the discourse on the national homogeneity and the creation of the Orient explored by Oguma and Tanaka, the identity discourse has in turn become a lens, a cognitive framework, for understanding and interpreting Japan's history, and the contemporary political situation, done carrying very clear normative prescriptions.

Most importantly, the identity discourse examined in this chapter has emerged within the broad context of Cold War rivalry and Japan's economic and technological progress and her ascent to the status of economic world power in 1970s. It is hard to pin point the exact moment of the emergence of the discourse. It was probably in late 1970s early 1980s, when the first texts on Russian national identity published by established academics, like Tokyo Foreign Languages University Professor Shimizu Hayao's *Nihonjin wa naze soren ga kirai ka* ("Why do the

---

[19] The Japanese government did conclude a neutrality pact with the Soviet Union in April 1941 after the Japanese Kwantung Army has suffered two defeats in border clashes with Soviet and Mongolian forces in 1938 and 1939 on Mongolian border.

127

Japanese hate the Soviet Union?" first published in 1979) and Hokkaido University Professor Kimura Hiroshi's *Soren to roshiajin* ("The Soviet Union and Russians" published in 1980) that the present discourse started to take shape. This is not to say that the debate on Russian national character did not exist in the previous decades. While the academic discourse dominated by left leaning scholars was preoccupied mainly with Russian history and socialism of the late 19th and early 20th century, a number of autobiographical articles and books by Japanese POWS depicting their experience in the labor camps and their impressions of the Soviet Union and its people were published in 1960s. However, the academic and quasi-academic debate that provided a general image of Russian national characteristics (re)emerged in later years, following the upsurge in the popularity of *nihonjinron* on one hand and scholars' exposure to the Western (mainly, U.S) research on the Soviet Union on the other.

There is no doubt that the Soviet foreign policy and the various incidents in the bilateral relations also played an important role in the worsening of the Soviet image. As the result of the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, the image of the Soviet Union as a peace loving country was badly damaged (Rozman 1992, 91.) In bilateral relations, the moves towards political rapprochement and the negotiations in 1973 did not bring any meaningful achievements towards the conclusion of the peace treaty. Further cooling in Japan's relations with the Soviet Union occurred after the 1976 landing of Soviet MiG 25 on Hokkaido, whose pilot expressed a will to defect to the U.S., and the conclusion of Japan's Peace Treaty with China in 1977, which has included the "anti-hegemonic" clause in spite of the Soviet pressure to refrain from this wording (Iokibe 2001.) However, the discourse was not simply a Japanese repetition of the "evil empire" rhetoric of the Cold War. Rather, it has emerged in relation to other debates peculiar to Japanese context.

1.2 War Responsibility

It can be argued that, the general debate on the "last war" (*saki no senso*) fostered the emergence of the perceptions of the traitorous and expansionist Soviet Union, framed as Russian persistent national character by the identity discourse. The critical debates on the war, the origins of which can be traced to the American policy during

the occupation, and which were shaped to large extent by the emerging Cold War politics, focus mainly on the responsibility of starting the war of aggression. The debate evolves mainly around issues such as whether the imperial and colonial war in Asia should be treated differently from the war against the US and European colonial powers and the postwar responsibility vis-à-vis the Asian nations (Yoshida 1994.)

Quite often, critical domestic analyses of Japan's postwar policy of reconciliation in Asia compare Japan's failure with Germany's successful reconciliation and reintegration into Europe. Obviously, this comparison is based on the wartime alliance and the common cause pursued by the two states during WWII. However, even the harshest critics of Japan's postwar policies vis-à-vis Asia rarely go further and examine the suffering inflicted by the Soviet participation and the occupation of the Northern Territories as part of a larger war of the Allies versus the Axis powers (with a notable exception of Tokyo University's Wada Haruki cited in Rozman 1992, 84.)

Furthermore, as Hasegawa has noted, the debates tend to focus on the responsibility for starting the war and ignore the responsibility of Japan's leaders to terminate the war earlier and prevent Soviet participation (2000b, 302-303.) This tendency could be plausibly traced to the question of Emperor's responsibility, which is still to a large degree an issue that rarely appears in the Japanese public discourse.

To summarize, the debates regarding Japan's war responsibilities have focused narrowly on the war in the Pacific and have rarely put it in the context of the broad WWII. This has contributed greatly to shaping the negative perceptions of Russia as a cowardly thief that stole Japan's "inherent territory" and kidnapped her people when the nation was at its weakest.

1.3 Domestic Political Environment

In the domestic political environment, two immediate trends seem to be of particular relevance to the emergence and the structure of the identity discourse. One was the official embrace of *nihonjinron* ideology discussed in Chapter II, by the conservative mainstream. PM Oohira's (1978-80) declaration of the "coming of the age of culture" at the Diet Policy Speech conducted on in January, 1979 and the establishment of a " Study Group on the Age of Culture" which was headed by one

of the main writers of *nihonjinron*, Yamamoto Shichihei, can be seen as the first official postwar declaration of Japan as not only an economic superpower, but also a nation of unique culture. The report produced by the group, like other *nihonjinron* texts of that time, did not engage purely in a cultural debate. It attempted to establish a dialectical relationship between culture and economics, implying that, Japan's economic success expressed an underlying cultural superiority (Study Group on the Age of Culture 1980.) Ironically, capitalism, which during the war with the US was seen as a negative and corrupting system which had led to the erosion of the initially positive American values and was juxtaposed with Japanese spiritual and cultural superiority (Shillony in White et al 1990 194-195), became an integral part of the same cultural superiority after Japan's ascent to the status of second largest economy in the Western camp.

The other important trend was PM Nakasone's (1982-1987) nationalism and strong anti-Soviet stance, further reinforced by the Soviet downing of the Korean Airlines jet in 1983 whose passengers included 28 Japanese nationals (Iokibe 2001, 198-200.) Nakasone's policy was characterized by strengthening the relations with the US on one side and at the same time increasing Japan's defense capabilities. During his visit to Washington in January 1983, he proclaimed the need to turn Japan into an "unsinkable aircraft carrier" to stave off any possible Soviet invasion, further enhancing Japan's commitment to the alliance with the US in the struggle to preserve international peace and democracy. At the same time, Nakasone has also followed the "cultural" line established by Oohira, and continued to call for building Japan as a state with uniquely "strong culture and welfare" (Policy Speech at the Diet 3.12.1982.)

1.4 International Environment

It is important to note that Nakasone's strong nationalist stance and the attempts to further increase Japan's military capabilities were viewed with strong suspicion by China and Korea. Nakasone's visit to the Yasukuni shrine in 1985, after the controversial enshrining of the A class war criminals, resulted in strong protests from

China and Korea. He caused another scandal by proclaiming that Japanese economic success was achieved due to her racial homogeneity as a nation, causing strong protests from the Korean residents. The 1986 military budget that exceeded the 1% of GNP ceiling and the granting of the ownership rights over Chinese students dormitory in Kyoto University to Taiwan, resulted in serious political frictions with China and mutual criticism between Japanese and Chinese officials (Iokibe 2001, 207-209.)

However, suspicion and frictions resulting from historical memory were not limited to the Asian neighbors. In the second half of 1980s and early 1990s, the increasing trade frictions between Japan and Western nations (mainly, the US) on one side and the growing rapprochement with the Soviet Union on the other, resulted in a revival of the "yellow peril" like discourse regarding the Japanese threat in the West (Campbell 1992, 226-240.) In a number of opinion polls conducted in late 1980s and early 1990s, an overwhelming majority of Americans have pointed out Japan as the biggest threat to the U.S., bigger than that of the Soviet Union (Campbell Ibid, 224.) Numerous publications, including governmental ones, expressed serious worries about Japan's "absolute desire to conquer the world" and her "amoral, manipulative and controlling culture" (Littlewood 1996, 208-210.) As such, over the 1980s and the early 1990s, Japan's political mainstream continuously faced the need to prove Japan's "normalcy" to her neighbors and to the Western nations and to the domestic public, which was still quite skeptical about the need to increase the defense budget (Tanaka 1997, 236.)

It is within this complex nexus of numerous discourses on Japan, her past and place in the contemporary international society, that the late Cold War identity discourse on Russia has emerged. Importantly, the discourse was directed towards domestic public, in the context of almost non-existent bilateral relations (Hara 1998, 150.)

The continuity of Japan's economic superiority after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the lack of significant progress on the territorial issues, which will be discussed in further detail in Chapter VII, have in turn sustained the validity of discourse as the only provider of a general image of Russia till the present day. The latest of the works on Russian national character examined in this chapter were

published in late 1990s and early 2000s. The argument does not differ greatly from the one in earlier texts.

Furthermore, the direct exposure of Japanese to Russia and Russians remains very limited and most of contact is conducted between academic and professional experts (Shimotomai et al 2005, 24.) Without doubt, the fact that the main source of information in Japan about today's Russia continues to be a media, that focuses mainly on negative and sensationalist aspects of the Russian politics and society (and, it must be admitted, that Russia can supply those in plenty), sustains the validity of the discourse (Ide in Yokote 2004.)

1.5 The Main Producers of the Discourse

The majority of the writers examined below belong to the conservative political mainstream. While Shimizu Hayao of Tokyo Foreign Languages University was probably the first to produce an academic inquiry into Russian national character, Kimura Hiroshi and Hakamada Shigeki are the two scholars that have played a central role in the production and reproduction of the contemporary identity discourse.

Kimura Hiroshi, a specialist with international reputation in Japan-USSR and Japan-Russia relations holds a PhD in Political Science from Columbia University. He had held teaching positions at the Slavic Research Center at Hokkaido University and International Research Center for Japanese Studies (Nichibunken) in Kyoto and in recent years has been affiliated with the Institute of World Studies at Takushoku University. Kimura has published widely in the leading political and general interest journals in Japan and has produced numerous works on Japan-Soviet/Russia relations in Japanese and English. His *Distant Neighbors*, published in 1999, is probably one of the most detailed and authoritative contemporary works in English on the Soviet/Russian relations with Japan since Brezhnev. Kimura has been also closely affiliated with Japan's policy making vis-à-vis Soviet Union and Russia. Among other activities he has advised the LDP Foreign Affairs Committee and has been a

regular participant in various bilateral conferences and workshops organized by the government or affiliated agencies.

Hakamada Shigeki, a professor and the Head of International Politics Department at the prestigious Aoyama Gakuin University, also happens to be a half-brother of the chairman of the Russian pro-reform "Our Choice" Party, Irina Hakamada. No doubt that this unique personal relationship with Russia has boosted his authority as Russia specialist, especially in the post- Cold War era. Known as the only Japanese specialist with direct ties to Russian politics, he is also probably the only one of the mainstream Russia specialists who has studied in Russia, where he has spent a few years in early 1970s. Hakamada, according to his homepage, specializes in modern Russian studies and Russian society and is a regular commentator on Russian affairs and bilateral relations in specialized and popular journals and newspapers. He has also been a regular participant in numerous bilateral conferences and workshops.

Both Kimura and Hakamada have also been regular members of the Council on National Security Problems, a non-official policy group, which, until the death of its leader, Suetsugu Ichiro in 1998, was the most influential non-governmental organization in Soviet and Russia related policy making (Rozman 1992, 34.)

Other writers that have continuously contributed to the identity discourse include Ito Kenichi, an ex-diplomat who served in Moscow for a number of years. After early retirement and unsuccessful attempt to launch a carrier in politics, Ito has served as the Head of MoFA affiliated Japan International Forum and has lectured at the International Politics Department of Aoyama Gakuin University.

Morimoto Yoshio served as *Yomiuri Shimbun*'s reporter in the Soviet Union, and Head of Yomiuri's Washington office. He has taught at St Andrew's University in Osaka and has published a number of books on Russia and the Soviet Union and numerous articles in general interest journals on Soviet/Russian politics in 1980s and early 1990s.

Kawato Akio, a senior diplomat, served as a cultural attaché in Russia between 1990 and 1993 and as the Japanese ambassador to Uzbekistan in 2002 and 2003. He has published a number of books and articles on diplomacy in general and Russia.

In addition to the works of the above writers, articles published in, mainly

conservative, general interest journals and newspapers are used as material for analysis.

1.6 The Immutable Nature of National Characteristics and a Scientific Approach

In general, as it can be seen in the general *nihonjinron* literature, the "national character" lens presupposes the persistent and unchangeable nature of national identity, both the positive qualities of Japanese character and the negative qualities of the "other" it is defined in relation and contrast to. Hence Russian national characteristics, which are referred to as national identity, or political culture, or patterns of behavior, are presented as historically consistent and static. This can be contrasted with the focus on state ideology, which provides an evaluation based on existence of the "right" values on the state level. This approach allows for a certain mobility of the "other" when the values, which a perceived to constitute normality, are adopted by the state. Depending on the political orientation, actual introduction of democracy and the rule of law can be seen as bringing Russia closer to Japan (Kishino 1992, 2-3) or, from a hawkish position, unclean elections, state pressure on the media, immature civil society and democracy can be used to identify Russia as an abnormal authoritarian dictatorship or a developing country (Takizawa in *Shokun* November 2000, 103.)

However, the national character lens is firmly based on the notion of continuity and perceives it as not amendable by state policy or ideology. As Hakamada explains, disregarding the ruling ideology, be this tsarism, communism or perestroika, the national characteristics remain unchangeable throughout the years (1996, 19-20.) In the words of Kimura, there has been no change in the Russian bellicose, expansionist and greedy mentality since the tsarist era and, he claims, nothing is going to change in the next 50 or 100 years (Voice June 1993, p. 75-76.) There is no differentiation between Soviet and Russian leaders (for example, Suetsugu Ichiro in *Sapio*, 11.26. 1997, 10-13) or between the Soviet citizens and Russian people (Kimura 2000a, 122-157), as they all represent the same and historically consistent "other."

It should be noted that less sophisticated narratives regarding national patterns of behavior are often structured as a simplistic tautology. National characteristics are discerned from certain patterns of negative behavior and than used to explain the same negative behavioral patterns, only applied to different situations. For example, Russia's national tendency to steal is deduced from its "historically proven" tradition of copying and stealing technology and ideas from the West. In turn, this "tradition" is seen as explaining the "abduction" of the POWs and their labor, the "stealing" of Northern Territories and the persistent refusal to return the stolen property to Japan. Japan's historically positive traditions are contrasted with this Russian negativity. Ironically, Japan's own experience of colonialism and imperialism are seen as a temporary and insignificant deviation from the normal (*Sankei* 16.12.1998.)

However, the works that are examined below have been consistently positivist and scientific, providing a much more sophisticated framework than a simple tautology. All of the authors emphasize the limitations of the cultural factor in international politics. Both Kimura and Ito explicitly admit the limited applicability of the "national" or "cultural" lenses in analyzing state's behavior. Kimura (1980 and 1995) notes that the political culture model has its limitations and is only one in the array of analytical models that can and should be applied to the studies of Soviet/Russian politics and foreign relations. At the same time, however, he also notes that it is probably the most effective framework to explain contemporary Russia's inability to establish real democracy, developing instead a "mix" of pluralism and authoritarianism. Ito (1987) also admits the validity of criticism of an overemphasis on historical continuity of Russia's foreign policy and he also acknowledges the dangers of essentialism. However, stressing the general limitations of the social sciences to "prove" things, Ito's aspires to establish an analytical framework for interpreting the dry facts regarding Russian/Soviet policies.

Hakamada (1985) takes a different approach and appeals to the inherent subjectivity of social analysis in general, emphasizing the culturally relative basis of the key paradigms (such as the notion of totalitarian society) used as analytical tools in the social sciences. Hence he calls for an original Japanese approach to the Soviet Union, based on the uniquely Japanese cultural and social psychology, which will reveal certain aspects of the Soviet society, invisible to the Western scholars. As such

he aims to contribute to the universal body of knowledge by providing the uniquely Japanese perspective. At the same time, Hakamada also warns about the biased nature of many of the Western sources and appeals to the need to "correct" it, implying the superiority of the Japanese knowledge of Russia to the Western one.

Ironically, the analytical frameworks that are used by Hakamada to explain Russian national character are of purely Western origin. For example, he employs Weber's framework to explain the difficulties of modernizing Russia. Russia is contrasted "spiritually" with the West and, since it lacks the Protestant ethic, Hakamada argues that it is very hard for Western style capitalism and civil society to take deep roots in Russia (1996, 48-49.)

Any reservations expressed by the writers regarding the universal applicability of the identity lens in explaining a state behavior do not undermine the validity of the identity discourse. Rather the admittance of the explanatory power limitations actually enhances the legitimacy of the "objective" depiction of national identity traits, as the question regarding the validity of the argument is shifted from the nature of the national characteristics to explanations of state behavior.

Stefan Tanaka (1993), whose work was reviewed in Chapter II, provides an excellent analysis of the ideological nature and the normative implications of "objective knowledge" about China and the West in prewar Japan's historiography. There is little doubt that postwar Japan (probably, just like any other modern society) has continued to be a society governed by what Lakoff and Johnson called the "myth of objectivism," in which "people who get to impose their metaphors on the culture get to define what we consider to be true-absolutely and objectively true" (quoted in Tanaka 193, 183.)

The appeal to objective and scientific methods has been a prerequisite for participation in contemporary Japan's discourses on history, culture and politics. It can be observed even in ultra-nationalistic cartoons of the (in)famous Kobayashi Yoshinori and others, as they attempt to provide a "truly" objective view of Japan's imperial and contemporary history by using (carefully selected and presented) "factual" descriptions, dates and names of historical figures. In one of the most recently published nationalistic comic book on Japan's history of relations with Korea, (Ken Kan Ryu by Yamano Sharin 2005) one of the Japanese characters is

depicted desperately calling the Korean people to approach the history of Korea's relations with Japan according to objective historical facts and not to be swayed by emotions. The conclusion of the objective analysis that follows is that Japan's annexation of Korea was done according to the will of the Korean people and actually it is the Koreans that have continuously discriminated against the egalitarian and altruistic Japanese.

In a similar fashion, the conservative *Sankei Shimbun* stresses the deep and true knowledge of Russia that the Japanese possess, gained through over a hundred years of interaction. This appeal is followed by the description of the "real" traits of Russian collective mentality, which are lying, cheating, threatening and lazy. (*Sankei* 14.01.1994)

Shiba Ryotaro, the popular historical novelist, whose discourse on Russia and Japan will be examined in the following chapter, was obsessed with "objectivity" and "realism", and has engaged in detailed depictions of historical events and historical figures. This devotion to "objective history" at least partially accounts for his works being accepted not as a purely literary works but as "proper history."

Furthermore, extensive but selective citations of Russian writers (Dostoyevski, Gorki and others) and authoritative Western sources, such as the American Sovietologist Richard Pipes and the British historian Harold Nicolson further strengthen the academic character of the narrative and the universal relevance of the conclusions.

To summarize, by admitting the limitations of explanatory power regarding state's policy and its relativity, the identity discourse depicted below establishes itself as a "proper" scientific inquiry. The limitations of the explanatory power are noted only in the context of explaining state behavior and the depicted national identity traits are presented as a scientifically objective truth. The affirmation of its adherence to objective and scientific analysis validates its right to serve as, what Maruyama Masao has called a "lubricant oil" (1961,125) in understanding of the "self" and the "other." As in the comics mentioned above, subjective value judgment and personal feelings are explicitly denied validity, and the aim of the discourse is "simply to describe the cultural climate in the Soviet Union" (Ito 1987, 144) or to

contribute to a "comprehensive understanding of the Soviet Union" (Kimura 1980, 26-29.)

The following section analyzes the identity discourse. In brief, Russia is constructed as the negative opposite of the universal "self." To a great extent, the discourse replicates the American Cold War discourse (which also has its roots in the "traditional" Western discourse on Russia) of the struggle between the "civilized" and "normal" on one side and "barbarian" and "pathological" on the other (Campbell 1992, 195.) The discourse is framed not in the language of ideological confrontation, but in cultural and civilizational difference drawing on the language and paradigms used in both the positive and the negative *nihonjinron*.

However, the most important point is that in the case of Japan it plays another role besides the ideological construction of the normal West and the abnormal communist bloc. By allocating the negative national characteristics that were attributed to Japan by the domestic and Western (Anglo-Saxon) critics of her national character, it rescues Japan from the difference ascribed to it and locates it firmly within the realm of normality. However, like with the discourse on the Orient, it provided for Japan the vehicle for claims of equivalence with the West, but at the same time also created the potential for sameness between Japan and the West. Hence, it became necessary to find difference and to establish Japanese uniqueness (Tanaka 1993, 271.)

In case of the discourse on the Orient, this was achieved through a historical discourse of Japanese uniquely superior assimilation and transformation of many pasts (Tanaka Ibid.) In case of the contemporary discourse on Russia, Japanese uniqueness is constructed through an emphasis on certain similarities between the Japanese "self" and the Russian "other," as opposed to the West. However, in this discourse, Japan is constructed as uniquely superior to the West, while Russia is constructed as uniquely inferior.

2. Constructing Identity

In terms of the sources of Russian national identity, the discourse is firmly located within the paradigms established by the *nihonjinron* literature. The process of creating an inferior and abnormal Russia using the same negative *nihonjinron*

language used to explain and criticize the emergence of Japan's prewar nationalism, militarism and fascism, simultaneously created Japan as an integral part of the realm of universal normalcy, not only in economic, but also cultural and civilizational terms.

Hence, the discourse on Russia has served a dual purpose. By creating a peaceful and normal Japan through a process of contrast with the historically unchanging jingoistic and abnormal Russia, it abolished the need to discuss the negative aspects of Japan's past with herself, her neighbors and certainly with Russia. As the same time, the hidden conservative discourse implied in this creation of Russia was the need for Japan's more active development of its defense capabilities.

The presence of "Japan" in the depictions of Russia is most obvious in Morimoto as he uses distinctly Japanese terms and concepts, such as *fukoku kyouhei* (wealthy nation, strong army), *honne tatemae* (real intentions and outside appearance) and *naniwa bushi* (duty and humanity) to depict the Russian society (1989, 36-28). Kawato, an ex cultural attaché to Russia, also uses concepts like *nemawashi* (informal consultations before a decision is reached,) *dashin* (sounding out a person) and *giri* (obligation,) noting that these particularly Japanese notions have their equivalents in the Russian one as well (Kawato 1995, 4-5.)

In general, Russia is depicted as schizophrenic, lacking rationality and realism, backward, worshiping power, and possessor of other negative qualities, all of which can be found in the celebrated *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword* written by the American anthropologist Ruth Benedict (1946) assigned by the US Army during the Pacific War as a study into Japanese national character. The book was translated into Japanese as early as 1948, with the latest edition coming out in 2005. To the present day it continues to be a compulsory reading in many Japanese universities (from personal experience). Hence, it has been influential in shaping the perceptions of Japanese national characteristics not only in the US or the broader West, but also in Japan as well. The critical argument that, the overall body of Japanese self-images has been a modification or an incorporation of the Western images of Japan (Harootunian and Myoshi 1993, 7) definitely carries a large degree of validity.

The negative national traits ascribed to Japan can be also found in the domestic discourse as well. The best example, is, a much more sophisticated and nuanced

inquiry of Maruyama Masao, probably the most celebrated Japanese postwar intellectual and social scientist, into Japan's history and history of political thought. Maruyama, who has engaged in an extensive critique of Japan's prewar nationalism and fascism, has traced the origins of these ills to "particular social organization, political structure and cultural patterns" of the Japanese society (1963, 136.)

Maruyama's critique was not limited to pre-1945 period, but extended to Japanese society in general, as he criticized the pre-modern structure of power and remnants of feudalism in Japanese society. Often criticized for "worshipping of the West" (Hiraishi 2003, 241) Maruyama has classified Japan as belonging to an "octopus pot" society as contrasted with a Western "bamboo whisk" society, in the sense of Karl Popper's dichotomy of open and closed societies. Maruyama has engaged in an extensive and critical examination of the history of Japan, paying special attention to her geopolitical location, interactions with the outside world and the transformations in the Japanese worldview. He depicted Japan as a country with an "open culture". This meant Japan was always ready to accept new ideas and beliefs to which it had become exposed as a result of external impact, but which had also remained continuously a "closed society" in terms of social organization and religious beliefs (Maruyama 1984.) In his pursuit to achieve the real modernity in Japan, Maruyama engaged in extensive research aimed to objectify the body of primordial attitudes and values rooted in the Japanese minds, which are hampering the development of a "truly universal spirit" of ethical individualism and genuine democracy (Bellah 2003, 140-149 and Hiraishi 2003, 241-242.) While not being as orientalistic as Benedict and other Western commentators on Japan's peculiar national identity (for example, Karel van Wolferen 1989), Maruyama's discourse has also located Japan on the fringes of universal/Western normality, lacking the proper norms and attitudes.

2.1 Sources of National Identity

As mentioned in Chapter II, Japan's unique geopolitical position, climate, nature and historical development are perceived within *nihojinron* discourse as the sources of the uniquely Japanese national characteristics, positive or negative, depending on

the narrator. The same strategy is used to explain the Russian national character, which is seen as shaped by the forest and the steppes, a geopolitical location that lacks natural barriers, the harsh climate and the history of invasions and conquests, etc. For Kimura, this is Russia's "political culture"'- a complex of values, beliefs and modes of behavior that exert strong influence on the actual practice of politics (1995, 13.)

The main historical factors that have shaped Russian national character are usually seen as the cultural influence of Byzantine Empire, and the political and administrative influence of the Mongolian rule. Both of these factors have encouraged the emergence of strong autocracy and submissiveness of the people, non-existence of individualism and rationalism (Ito 1987, 136-142, Kimura 1980, 46-55, Kimura 1995, 13-15, Hirooka 2000, iv-vii.)

2.2 The National Character

In Benedict's work on Japan's national character, Japan is perceived as schizophrenic, embodying the personalities of both the chrysanthemum and the sword. The chrysanthemum stands for positive values like aesthetics, politeness, adaptability and hospitability while the sword represents Japanese militarism, rigidity, conservatism etc. Russian national schizophrenia, along with an implied irrationality, is presented as resulting from the "exit from the forests" to the steppes (Ito 1987, 136.) Russians are perceived as embodying two contradicting traits: the "plains character" and the "forest character." The former is symbolized by extremism, hedonism and the desire for freedom from any authority, which gave birth to anarchism in Russia (the anarchists Kropotkin and Bakunin are presented as epitomizing this national trait in Shimizu ([1979] 1992, 240.) The "plains character" represents silence, abstinence and mysticism according to Morimoto (1989, 22)- what Kimura called an inherent insecurity regarding the self and the outside (1980,56.)

This schizophrenia results in drastic changes in behavior from passive submission to extreme violence. Kimura explains this not only by an anthropololgical framework, but also by a cultural one, emphasizing the presence of two cultures in Russia. The

European identity of Russia stands for virtue, respect and freedom, and the Asian one which stands for a primitive, animal like and fanatic Russia (Kimura 1980, 56-67.) Obviously, by allocating the negative Asian characteristics to the Russian "other", Japan is placed within the European realm of civilization or, as in the discourse on China explored by Tanaka, as having inherited only the positive values of the Asian culture.

Unquestioning respect of power, the hierarchical structure of the Japanese society and the hierarchical construction of the world with Japan at the top that Benedict (1946) and Maruyama (1963) saw in pre-1945 Japan also were transformed into and projected onto Russian national character. The Russian "deep rooted tradition of inordinate respect of force" is seen as explaining Soviet negotiation tactics, which are characterized, among other negative qualities, by bluffing, threats and display of force (Kimura 2000a, 127 also in Shimizu 1992, 277-283. Similar argument in forwarded by Sato Masaru, member of the Suzuki trio in Sato 2005,82-83.) Kimura argues that the vast territory and the struggle with nature and the climate have resulted in a Russian obsession with anything big. This can be seen in the desire for greatness and might, and an ultimate respect of strength and power. This constitutes a complete opposite to Japanese and American attitudes (Kimura 1980, 68-76.)

Furthermore, derived from the climate and the natural conditions, "struggle" is seen as the norm and physical might as the supreme value in the Russian mentality. From this mentality, the norms of respect and obedience to a strong leader emerged as the only way to maintain order. Individuality, creativity and factual arguments are not perceived to be useful are not respected and suppressed by the society. Any dispute is perceived only in terms of friend or foe, and there is no place for compromise (Kimura 1980, 35-42 and 1995,13-15.)

The Japanese inherent obsession with honor and respect, and ultimate sensitivity to insults (Benedict 1946, 145-175) can be found in the Russian messianic spirit and the inherent and persistent desire to conquer the world. The historical memory of the Mongol yoke is perceived as the cause of various nationalistic ideologies and the continuous sense of threat, which, in turn has given birth to the uniquely Russian messianic spirit and the "Great Russia" ideology (Hirooka 2000, iv-vii.) Communism is perceived as being only a tool for Russians in their attempt to control the world

and therefore, no difference is assumed to exist between the post-communist Russia and USSR and the perception (*Sankei* 14.01.1994.)

Other negative national traits, like innate aggression, savageness and cunningness, which are still a common feature of the images of Japan in the West (Littlewood 1996, 163), have also become part of the Russian identity. A "long tradition of Russian xenophobia", which is seen a product of Russia's unique geo-political position, is perceived to be the source of the Soviet mistrust of alliance and reliance on self-help. Combined with Marxist-Leninist doctrine, the geo-political location has also provided for Soviet "suspicions, hostility and distrust of foreign nations"(Kimura 2000a, 41.)

Russian traditional expansionism is traced to the obsession with the idea of establishing buffer zones, of which the seizure of the Northern Territories is just one example. Buffer zones have become the only means of providing security to the Russian "exit" from the forests to the steppes, which has not provided any natural barriers like the British channel or the Alps. This has resulted in the emergence of Russian expansionism, which, unlike with the European colonial powers, has continued to exist till today (1987, 136.)

In order to illustrate the similarities with the negative "Japan", the following quote from Maruyama's depiction of the historical background for the emergences of Japan's nationalism, is indicative:

Consequently, when the premises of the national hierarchy were transferred horizontally into the international sphere, international problems were reduced to a single alternative: *conquer or be conquered*. In the absence of any higher normative standards with which to gauge international relations, *power politics is bound to be the rule and yesterday's timid defensiveness will become today's unrestrained expansionism*. Naturally, *a psychological complex of fear and arrogance* holds sway here as a primitive attitude towards the unknown (1963, 140 emphasis added.)

2.3 Establishing Japan's uniqueness

In the discourse, Japan's negative traits ascribed to her by the Western and domestic discourses of "unique negativity" are either marginalized or relativized as a "lesser evil" in comparison with the greater negativity of Russia. Alternatively, the sameness is used to narrate the difference, which locates both of the nations outside of the Western sphere, seen as a yardstick for measuring normality. In this case,

Russian inferiority to the West is used to emphasize Japan's superiority and unique position of being outside yet in crucial ways "more Western than the West." Both nations are seen as sharing certain cultural similarities, like the spirituality, prevalence of the communal interests over the individual, uniformity and harmony in the community as the ultimate values. Even inferiority complexes vis-à-vis the West are seen as common features of both nations (Sankei 14.10.1993, Okazaki in *Voice* December 1993, 163-169 and *Yomiuri* 19.07.2000.) Both nations are also ascribed similar uniqueness in their developmental paths. Both are presented as haunted by the question of whether they belong to Europe or Asia, embarked on the road to modernization in mid-19th century with the abolition of serfdom in Russia and Meiji Restoration in Japan. In both nations, high levels of industrialization and mass education were achieved by the 1930s. Furthermore, both nations perceive each other as rivals in attempts to reach the developmental level of the West (Kawato 1995, 227-229.)

In the conception of the norms or human rights and democracy, Russia and Japan are also brought together as representing a communalism different from the West and unable to adopt the precise Western model of civil society, democracy and capitalism (Hakamada 1996, 55.) Kimura also explicitly refers to the similarity between the Japanese and Russian national characters in his discussion of negotiation behavior. Drawing on the writings of one of the most famous writers of *nihonjinron,* Nakane Chie, he concedes that neither the Japanese nor the Russians perceive the other party as equal as in the idealized Western concept of negotiation. On the international stage the Japanese tend to regard themselves as inferior vis-à-vis "the Western nations and USSR" and as superior vis-à-vis the "smaller Asian countries." The Russian culture is similarly very hierarchical, and like the Japanese, the Russians also regard other individuals or nations in terms of either superior or inferior. (Kimura 2000a, 137-138.)

Furthermore, both the Russians and the Japanese do not believe in give-and-take bargaining, what Kimura regards as the common Anglo-Saxon practice, and tend to swing with their demands or concessions "almost without limit" depending on the toughness of the other side. They also share a negative approach to a compromise, as both strongly believe in their righteousness. However, when a compromise is the

only solution, both sides favor an ambiguous statement that can be interpreted in various ways as a face saving technique (Kimura 2000a, 138-139.)

These deviations from the Western model of normalcy, some of which, like the lack of individualism are considered to be of crucial importance in negative *nihonjinron*, are marginalized by an extensive construction of hierarchical difference between Japan on one side and Russia and Japan on the other, achieved through the tools of the positive *nihonjinron*. Japan, where the economic interests take priority over the political ones, is juxtaposed with Russia, where the political interests are supreme. Japan is portrayed as a small, peaceful "merchant" nation that relies on the US for protection, and perceives its role as a great power in purely positive terms as a contributor to the peace and prosperity in Asia Pacific. This image of Japan is contrasted with autocratic and nepotistic Russia, with its vast territory and rich natural resources, where the basis for state power is military and its rationale purely political. Russia is described as still suffering from the "Cold War thinking" and convinced in her ability to force her opinion on others. Derived from this tendency are the strong elements of threat and propaganda in Russian diplomacy and lack of respect for laws (Kawato 1995, 221-230.)

Compared with Russian cunningness and tactics of lies and *pokazhukha* (an impressive outward display with little real substance), the Japanese are portrayed as naïve and sincere (Kimura 2000b 50-51, also Clarke 1992.) They tend not to believe in tactics and other Machiavellian concepts to be employed during negotiations, especially when they believe in the righteousness of their position. For the Japanese, diplomacy and negotiations are presented as matters of goodwill or good intentions. Interestingly, the inherent childishness of the Japanese, as presented classically in Benedict's work (1946, 26) is turned into a positive characteristic through juxtaposing Japan with Russia. In complete opposition to the Russians, the Japanese believe that right is might and are quite optimistic and naïve believing that the true intentions can be conveyed through sincerity, patience and persistence (Kimura 2000a, 123-125.)

The *nihonjinron* discourse that uses the Western binaries to juxtapose Japan and the West are employed to underlie Japan's difference and cultural and social superiority vis-à-vis Russia. The "amazingly homogenous and harmonious" Japanese

145

society where "peace, harmony and stability" prevail, is contrasted with the Russian jingoism, instability and conflict (Kimura 2000a, 26.)[20]

Hakamada uses Benedict's dichotomy of Japan's shame culture and Western guilt culture to construct Russian abnormality. He asserts that Russia does not belong to either of the cultural patterns, but to a new category of "fear culture" and going into extensive description of the reign of fear in the Russian society (1996, 121-125.) Elsewhere, this division into three categories of the West, Japan and Russia is transformed into the categorization according to contract, trust and low trust societies. The US, representing the West, is described as a contract society where all laws need to be strictly enforced to preserve the social order and which has a certain aspect of police state. Japan, compared to the US, is a trust society where the legal provisions are treated more as a standard setting tool for societal behavior. Both systems are presented as having their pluses and minuses, but superior to the "low trust" societies of Russia and China where even the law is not functioning and contracts can be easily changed or abolished (Hakamada 2000, 16-20.)

Contrasted with Russia, Japan is also presented as a pluralistic democracy of an ideal type where the political chaos caused by competition among political parties is avoided. Japan's model is described as superior to other two Western models: one of the US and UK were two main parties alternate in power and the other of France and Italy were there are too many political parties that often lead to political instability (Kimura 2000b, 64.)

The similarity between Japan and Russia are utilized to underlie Japan's superiority. The perception of both nations as latecomers to modernization, their tremendous losses during WWII, some similarities in political and economic systems and the means adopted to achieve industrialization-all are used to underlie Japan superiority and success compared to Russian backwardness and failure. Not only Japanese economic success, but also the superiority of its political system, is stressed by showing that all the goals and reforms that Gorbachev aspired to achieve in the Soviet Union, were implemented in postwar Japan (Kimura 2000b, 72-73.)

---

[20] Sato Masaru, MoFA's "Rasputin", also refers to Russian inherent imperialistic tendencies (along with China and the US) that stem from her multi-national character (Sato 2005, 117.) There is no explicit reference to Japan in the text, but the silent presence of the "homogeneous" and hence " non-imperialistic" Japan seems to be quite obvious.

Russian inherent backwardness is also an integral part of the discourse and often compared to Japan's overall superiority. The relatively late encounter between Russia and Japan, in spite of their geographic proximity, is explained by the fact that Russia, whose only contribution to the world civilization is the *samovar,* has always lacked "civilization" that could attract "Japan" (Shimizu [1979] 1992, 277-278.) In post-Cold War Russo-Japanese relations, Japan is portrayed as the one that occupies the position of strength, based on her economic and technological superiority. Japan has almost everything that Russia has to offer and can do without Russia, while there are many things Russia wants to get from Japan (Kimura 2000b, 110.) The deterioration of the economic situation in the Soviet Union in the last years of its existence, and the need for financial assistance is perceived as an evidence of Russian inherent backwardness and inferiority (*Jiyu* 1990, 32(6) 31.)

Hakamada uses the experience of Russian POWS in Japan during the Russo-Japanese war of 1904–05 to underline Japanese civilizational superiority. He points out the Russian POWs were impressed by Japan's higher levels of literacy, superior military training and discipline, and the clean and orderly villages to the degree that they realized that they were the barbarians compared to Japanese. To emphasize continuity in national characteristics, Hakamada goes on to describe personal experience in Soviet Russia before returning to the Russo-Japanese war (similar technique used by Shimizu shifting from tzarist Russia to the Soviet times, from Vitte to Brezhnev [1979] 1992, 278). He describes his visit in 1967 as a similar "culture shock", but of the completely opposite nature. He notes that, while the cultural level of the small intelligentsia class was higher than that of the Japanese, most of the Russian people turned out to be stupid and leading a "natural" life as natural anarchists (*shizenjin*). (Hakamada 2000, 21-24 also similar analysis in Shimizu [1979] 1992, 239-240 and *Chuo koron* 1.2.2004, 54.)

In terms of military, Russian inherent backwardness is reflected in the qualitative weakness of the army, which has been consistently inferior in management and technology. The Russian/Soviet victories in numerous wars are attributed solely to the "tenacity and excellent fieldcraft" of the peasant-soldiers and to the overwhelming quantitative superiority over the enemies (Ito 1987, 136-139.)

2.4 The Territorial Dispute

The Northern Territories dispute is also seen as a product of different national attitudes toward territory. The Japanese adherence to the notion of "inherent territory" is traced to the unique geographical position of Japan. Since the sea separates Japan from other countries it resulted in a nation that natural, racial, linguistic and cultural boundaries must coincide with the political ones. As a result of this construction, Japan's expansion during the 18th and 19th centuries that resulted in the annexation of the Ryukyu Kingdom in the south and the Ainu lands in the north, as well as the later annexations of Korea and Taiwan, are erased from Japan's history. Japan is presented as lacking the experience of fundamental changes of borders, which is seen as the main factor in Japanese difficulty to understand that borders are political creation.

On the other side, the Russian notion of "inherent" territory, which is again the product of distinct geographic location and historical background, is the opposite of the Japanese one. Since the Soviet borders were very much a product of conflicts with neighboring countries and the territory has been·expanding and contracting, for Russians, borders are defined as the product of conflict (Kimura 2000a, 55-63.)

Here the peaceful Japan and the violent Russia binary is strengthened further. The Japanese belief that national boundaries can be changes only through peaceful discussions and negotiations based on international law is juxtaposed with the Soviets/Russian justification of their possession of Northern Territories as war spoils taken from defeated Japan. (Kimura 2000a, 63-67.)

However, uniqueness also implies particularity and in the context of Japan's claims to the Northern Territories, this can impede the universality of the Japanese argument. Hence, in order to enhance the validity of Japan's position on the islands, a unique notion of inherent territory is conflated with universal notions of justice.

Thus, the Japanese preoccupation with the Northern Territories, derived from the unique notion of inherent territory, is described as a universally just and normal wish for the return of legitimately claimed territory. The return of the islands is seen as a confirmation of the universal validity of the guiding principles of the post-war international society: the principle of territorial sovereignty, diplomacy of trust and

peaceful negotiations (Kimura 2000a, 67-71.) Hence, acceptance of the Russian occupation of the islands is perceived as a denial of these universal values and a confirmation of the validity of "victor's justice" (Kimura 2000b, 20.) To emphasize Japan's representation of the universal, Russian preoccupation with territorial gains and rising nationalism is portrayed as contradicting universal logic. Kimura asserts that worsening economic conditions would *normally* result in loss of interest in territorial gain (2000b, 133 emphasis added.)[21]

2.5 The Inevitability of Russian Abnormality

The inherent inability of Russia to achieve universal normality is present even when Russia is not treated as a monolithic entity and difference of opinions and attitudes within Russia is admitted. For example, Hirooka Masahisa (2000) of Kyoto Sangyo University discusses the options for a new unifying ideology for post-Soviet Russia. He presents the variety of opinions within Russia by outlining the options. The first scenario is, what Hirooka calls "neo-Sovietism." It means a return to the imperial ideology but envisages a number of important changes in the ideological sources. Unlike Soviet ideology it is being based not on ethnicity but on territory, not atheism but secularism, and its political philosophy replaces Marxism-Leninism with patriotism, and such messianic ideas as Great Power and Eurasianism (Russia as unifying both the West and the East.) The second scenario is a reactionary pan-Slavism based on ideas gathered from the past like the "Russian idea", national characteristics, and spirituality; one which places the church at the spiritual center and strives to unify the Slavic nations of the ex-Soviet Union.

The third option presented by Hirooka is the Great Russia ideology that can be seen throughout Russian history and is common both to the tsarist and to the Soviet Russia. According to Hirooka, this statist ideology is not supported by the intelligentsia, but is quite popular with the people and the officials, and exercises the strongest influence on actual politics. The fourth option is the liberal-democratic idea that is can be traced to the historical trends in 19th early 20th century Russia. This

---

[21] It is hard to avoid mentioning the fact that the worsening economic conditions had a similar effect (rise of nationalism) on Japan in 1930s and, as some commentators may argue, also in 1990s. Here one could also argue that losing wars "normally" (historically) has resulted in the loss of territory.

ideology places Russia as part of the West, and, according to Hirooka, is criticized for being ahistorical and traditionally and culturally foreign to Russia. However, after presenting the multitude of ideas and opinions within Russia, Hirooka eliminates pan-Slavism for lack of realism and liberalism for the lack of deep roots of liberal democracy in Russia (2000, 22-26.) Hence, the only possible development of Russia is either neo-Sovietism or the Great Russia ideology, both of which imply continuous difference, and inevitability of conflict.

It must also be noted that in the media this juxtaposition of the normal "West" with abnormal Russia and the reliance of cultural factors to explain the difference, is not limited to right wing publications. An article carried by the Japanese *Economist* in the year of Yeltsin's confrontation with the Duma also compares Russia with Western Europe and the US, where democracy and human rights are considered to be the supreme values. It argues that in Russia it is impossible to avoid authoritarian regime due to various cultural, traditional and psychological reasons (*Economist* 20.4.1993.) An article in the liberal *Asahi Shimbun* also depicts Russian mentality as of people under siege, dominated by fear of being invaded and insecurity, resulting from historical experiences such as the Kulikovo battle (14th century battle in which the Russians defeated the army of the Golden Horde), and the Napoleonic and Nazi invasions. The "siege" mentality was further intentionally enhanced during the Soviet times. Thus, the Soviet map shows the Soviet Union in the center being surrounded by enemies-China, Western Europe, North America and Japan. In spite of the collapse of the Soviet Union, it is noted that the mistrust of the neighboring countries remains *(Asahi Shimbun* 14.10.1993.)

3. The Parallel Discourse

The discourse examined above is the only one that provides a general and historically consistent image of Russia. However, it should be noted that this is not the one that prevails in the purely academic discussions. The broad academic research on Russia has been dominated by historical positivist research of the new left that has originated in the 1960s student movement and has focused mainly on the revolutionary movement, the 1920s and the emergence of Stalinism. In 1960s, as most of the scholars were sympathetic to the revolutionary cause, they attempted to

"rescue" the revolution and hence focused on the years before Stalin or explored the causes of the emergence of Stalinism. The narrow scope of inquiry, lack of primary sources and the generally inadequate conditions for research have resulted in most of the contemporary authoritative scholars to pursue their studies overseas (Rozman 1992, 190-196.)

There is little doubt that the left oriented intellectuals continue to play a leading role in Japan's social sciences in general and Russia related scholarship, many of them are based at the prestigious Tokyo University (Rozman 1992, 259.) In the pre-1945 period, Imperial Tokyo University was the main center of authoritative knowledge related to history and politics (Tanaka 1993, 192), and was closely associated with the official discourse from the time of its creation. After the war, under the leadership of the progressive Nanbara Shigeru, Tokyo University gradually became a center of progressive intellectuals (for example, Takeuchi 2005.) This resulted in a kind of paradox since Tokyo University continued to be the main source of the bureaucratic elite, but, at the same time, many of its leading scholars established a critical distance from the mainstream politics and continuously confronted it (Maruyama Masao is probably the best example but also more recently Wada Haruki and Kang San Jun, both affiliated with the Social Research Institute.)

However, the sophisticated argument of the leftist scholars has remained mainly within the esoteric circles of academia. As Harutoonian has noted in the context of the discourse on emperor, the left in general was incapable "to take seriously the discourse on culture" (Harootunian 2000, 625-626) and to engage the conservative discourse. The leftist scholars have continuously criticized the negative perceptions of USSR/Russia as a construction from above (for example Shiokawa in Rozman 1992, 191.) However, while providing a high quality empirical research on the Soviet/Russian history, politics and society, as well as bilateral relations with Japan, these scholars have failed to address the construction of difference of Japan and Russia that has been successfully assembled and disseminated by the identity discourse.

This is not to say that there have been no attempts to address the issue of images. Wada Haruki, professor emeritus of Tokyo University and a leading authority on Russian history, has attempted to address this by a critical examination of the

territorial dispute as a historical clash of two imperial expansionisms over Ainu land and by an objective review of the history of wars between the two nations. He mentions the existence of the "Russia as a neighbor" image during the Meiji era and stresses the need for the re-emergence of this perception of Russia. Emphasizing Japan's need for a real partnership with Russia, he proposes a realistic solution for the territorial issue that in will move away from a zero sum game and designate the islands as a special administrative region which will be developed jointly by Japan and Russia (Wada 1999.)

The attempt to enhance understanding of the Russian "other" has been visible in other publications on Russia and bilateral relations. In a book aiming to introduce the Japanese reader to modern Russia, one chapter discusses the positive perceptions of Japan among Russians and to the Russian view of the territorial issue. One chapter in devoted to outlining the Russia related historical sites in Japan and the Russian influence on Japanese literature and political thought (Shimotomai and Shimada eds. 2002)

However, the perception of national identity as a purely political concept which is a reflection of the objective state of affairs and a devotion to scientific positivism have precluded the majority of Russia specialists from engaging the national identity discourse. For example, Shiokawa Nobuaki of Tokyo University harshly criticizes the "popular view of Russia", but his critique targets the false and sensationalist information regarding Russia provided by the media and some scholars, and does not extend to the national identity discourse. In the same book in a chapter titled "National identity crisis," the crisis is discussed in very vague terms, but the general impression is that is perceived as an objective product of the political and economic turmoil (Shiokawa 1994.)

Shimotomai Nobuo of Hosei University, who has been classified by Rozman as belonging to the center of the political spectrum, is another prominent scholar of Soviet and Russian politics. He has written extensively on Russian politics and in recent years has often appeared in the media as a commentator on Russian affairs. He is the only Russia specialist represented in the bilateral Wise Men Conference[22]

---

[22] A group comprised of academics, politicians and business leaders from both nations, established by

However, the discussion of the identity crisis in the post Soviet republics in general is the only instance where he engages the debate on Russian identity. Like in Shiokawa's work, national identity is perceived as a function of the political and the economic created by the State. It is closely related to the definition of national interest. Shimtomai locates the origins of the present crisis in the lack of clarity and stability in the concept of "ethnos" in the post-Soviet states. The resulting decrease in the international importance of Russia, has led to emergence of, what Shimotomai calls, "false great power consciousness" in Russia. (1999, 40-42)

He traces the origins of the problem in the uniqueness of the Soviet Union as a "nation", where the uniting principle was the socialist ideology that did not belong to a specific geographical territory and did not embody any specific and unifying symbols, language, history, culture or people (1999, 287-292.)

Wada, Shiokawa and Shimotomai differ in their political orientations and the special issues in Russian history or politics they chose to explore. However, in regard of national identity they see it as a purely political construction from above. Hence, they fail to provide an alternative image of Russia to the one created by the identity discourse. This explains the present situation in Russia and the state of bilateral relations in Japan through national characteristics.

To a certain extent, the improvement in bilateral relations and the change in the Japanese stance vis-à-vis Russia has been followed by state's attempt to influence the broad discourse. Wada Haruki was invited to speak in front of the Diet Commission of Okinawa and Northern Territories (11.7.2002) on Russo-Japanese relations and, as already mentioned, Shimotomai Nobuo was the only Russia specialist member of the Wise Man Conference.

However, the positivist approach does not engage the need for collective image (McSweeney 1999, 78) that could provide an alternative lens for the one constructed by the discourse examined above. Here must be mentioned an interesting but rare

---

PM Koizumi and President Putin with the purpose of strengthening the bilateral relations and search for a possible solution for the territorial issues.

attempt to understand the Russian "other" that was conducted through a comparison with Japan's past, but which does not involve the "othering" of Russia through dichotomous differentiation.

In an editorial in *Asahi Shimbun*, post-Soviet Russia is compared to post-war Japan, where, in a similar way, the value system has been changed overnight and where the Western liberal-democratic model has been imported. The case of Japan is presented as different, but not as a function of national character, and instead due to external factors, mainly the presence of such a supra-legal body as the GHQ (the American occupation authorities.) Its presence is seen as the main factor that prevented the emergence of chaos and secured a smooth economic recovery. The article notes that, since Russia lacks the equivalent of the GHQ, so the people are still uncertain about the preferable political and economic system, and the debates and uncertainties continue. The author is calling for the Japanese to show understanding of the general confusion in Russia and to the rise in nationalistic feelings in the context of the Northern Territories (*Asahi* 11.03.1992, 2.)

This rare attempt to enhance understanding of Russia and the Russian position based on drawing similarities between the Japanese experience and the situation in post-communist Russia is an interesting example of the possibilities of constructing a discourse of sameness in the context of the two nations. However, the media in general is more interested in differences which produce more sensational news. There is little doubt that contemporary Russia can provide those in plenty. Hence the violent events, mainly related to the Chechen conflict, accidents like the oil spill caused by the Russian tanker *Nahodka* in the Sea of Japan in 1997, and the sinking of the nuclear submarine *Kursk* in 2000 are the main news that make it to the Japanese newspapers and TV channels. This only enhances and perpetuates the discourse on difference.

4. Conclusion

The identity discourse depicted in this chapter has emerged within the domestic and international context of the last stage of the Cold War. It can be argued that by relocating the negative Japan of the past outside of its borders, the discourse on

Russia has engaged in, what PM Nakasone called, in his famous speech on Japan's new "national identity" (*shutaisei*), the "comprehensive settlement of postwar politics" (*sengo soukessan*) (Speech at Karuizawa seminar, 27.7.1985.) Nakasone also emphasized the need to wipe out the memories of past humiliation, to do away with the postwar taboos, and to work towards a creation of a proper place for Japan as a state and a nation in the contemporary world.

At the same time, the discourse examined here is quite similar to the discourse on Russia in pre-1945 Imperial Japan. In making this statement the author is not in any way trying to impute intention on the part of Japan's conservative establishment to resurrect the Great Empire of Japan (*Dainihon teikoku.*) This is just to underline the limited number of discursive constructions that have been available or utilized in Japan's pursuit of normalcy since her incorporation in the modern international system, and internalization of the Western practices of difference, of which the discourse on Russian otherness has been an integral part.

Similar to the previous debates on Russian national character, the contemporary identity discourse on Russia is also targeting domestic audience and contains numerous normative prescriptions, which are most explicitly stated in Hakamada's writings. Hakamada notes that Japan's advanced development has turned her into the safest place on Earth. However, the side effect of superior civilization has been a "civilizational disease" which has caused the Japanese to imagine that all the problems in international affairs can be solved by peaceful means (1996, 191-195.)

Writing a few years later, he expresses concern about the applicability of the unique Japanese norms of trust to the contemporary international society. Referring to Sept 11th events, he predicts international disorder and recommends importing some "realist" elements from societies like Chinese, Russian and American, in order to enhance Japan's ability to deal with this. He states that Japan does not need to become a police state, but needs to learn proper crisis management and become a responsible member of international community (2000, 16-20.) It is beyond the scope of this thesis to evaluate the impact of these concrete normative prescriptions on the Japanese society. However, it can be argued that the dichotomous and hierarchical construction of Japan and Russia has not been limited to the conservative academia and media.

The following chapter examines the discourse on Russian and Japanese history in the writings of one of the most popular contemporary historical fiction writers, Shiba Ryotaro. It will show that Shiba's narrative on the two nations and bilateral relations is relying on the same master dichotomies like the discourse examined here.

Chapter VI: The Original Forms of Japan and Russia

> Last night I saw a dream....Every room had a bed,
>
> in every bed there was a man who was
>
> dreaming....exactly the same dream as mine.
>
> Orhan Pamuk, *The Black Book*

1. Introduction

This chapter continues from the previous one and explores the historical narrative on Japan and Russia in the works of the novelist Shiba Ryotaro, undoubtedly one of the most dominant figures in the discourse on Japanese identity. In general it argues that Shiba's literary account of Russian history and Russo-Japanese relations is an integral part of the hierarchical construction of the two national identities examined in the previous chapter and serves the same purpose of rescuing Japan from the "abnormality" ascribed to her by the Western and domestic discourses.

Shiba, born in Osaka in 1923 as Fukuda Tei'ichi, majored in Mongolian studies at

the Osaka University of Foreign Languages and served in an Imperial Army tank division in Manchuria during the last two years of the war. After the war he worked for a few years as a newspaper reporter, while writing also fiction. After receiving the prestigious Naoki Prize in literature for his novel *Owl's Castle* in 1961, he retired from his job at *Sankei Shimbun* newspaper and became a fulltime novelist.

From then on, Shiba devoted himself to writing historical novels and became probably the most widely read Japanese writer of the historical novel genre till the present day. His works, including historical novels, essays, travel writings and conversations are still widely read. As of 2005, the 600 books which carry Shiba's name as their author, have sold over one hundred and eighty million copies (*Asahi*, 12.2.2005.) Shiba has written on a variety of subjects but in one way or another all of his works were related in Japan's national past or present. Even when Shiba was writing about a different country, the actual narrative is about Japan (Sekikawa and Funabiki 2006, 110.)

Shiba's essays have been published (and re-published) in the most popular magazines and two of his historical novels, one related to the Russo-Japanese War and the other to the Meiji Restoration, are currently all-time bestsellers[1]. In 1999, one of them, titled "The Cloud on Top of the Hill" was chosen by the readers of the popular magazine *Bungei Shunju* as the most valuable book to be left for the future from all the books written in the 20th Century and was chosen to be the best historical book on Japan by the "representatives of the intelligentsia" (quoted in *Chuo Koron* 1.2.2004, 61.) Shiba's works have become a source of inspiration to many politicians and important public figures and have been quoted in Diet Policy Speeches by at least two Prime Ministers . His views and interpretations of Japan's history and Japan's national character (*kuni no katachi* discussed in detail further below) are often presented as supportive arguments in parliamentary interpolations. Current PM Koizumi and former PM Obuchi have referred to Shiba in their general policy speeches in the context of the correct vision of Japan's past, present and future (House of Representatives, 19.01.1999

---

[1] The novels mentioned are *Saka no ue no kumo* (The Cloud on Top of the Hill) and *Ryoma ga yuku* (The Path of Ryoma.) Information provided by the publishing house *Bungei Shunshu* to the author via e-mail on March 22nd, 2005.

and 26.09.2003.) Shiba's depictions of Russia and Russo-Japanese War were cited on a number of occasions in parliamentary debates regarding Japan's relations with Russia (for example Sasahara Junichi MP, at the House of Councillors, Foreign Relations Committee, 4.11.1993 and Akamatsu Masao MP, House of Representatives, Security Committee, 17.0.4.1998.) Hence, while not attempting to establish a positivist connection between Shiba's writings and Japanese politics, it can be argued that his views of history have continuously influenced the political elites. Furthermore, it would be no exaggeration to argue that Shiba's view of Japan's history is shared also by a large . part of the population, especially those that reached maturity during the 1970s and 1980s, when Shiba's popularity reached its peak. As of early 2005, 600 books authored or co-authored by Shiba have sold over 180 million copies (*Asahi*, 12.2.2005.) As the previous chapter has shown, school textbooks present little more than a limited number of dry facts. Hence we can concur with the argument that Shiba's books have become one of the main sources of historical knowledge for the lack of better alternatives (Ozaki in NHK 1998, 17.) This in spite of his own and other occasional calls to consider his works as literary fiction (Matsumoto 1996, 22-36.) Many Japanese people would also concur with the title of a "leader of civilization" that was bestowed on Shiba by another prominent writer (Sekikawa 2003, 64.) For the last two decades, Shiba has been the ultimate point of reference in numerous public discussions related to Japan's national past, present and future, and his influence cuts across political affiliations (for example, the left leaning and critical Prof Kang Sang Jung of Tokyo University citing Shiba in his testimony in front of the House of Representatives, Constitution Investigative Committee, 22.03.2001.)

Shiba's ideas and perceptions of Japan's history have been juxtaposed with those of the celebrated Maruyama Masao, briefly introduced in the previous chapter, as the "rescuer" of Japanese history from the negative and critical view of the latter. However, Shiba cannot be classified as a conservative in the conventional meaning of the term in Japanese context, as his views on the period in Japan's history between the Russo-Japanese War and the defeat in the Pacific War were highly negative and critical

(Ishihara and Nasu 2002.)

Surprisingly, in spite of the obvious influence of Shiba's writings on the Japanese society, his works have so far been denied the scholarly attention by both domestic and international scholarship. Probably the length of Shiba's novels (for example, *The Cloud on Top of the Hill* consists of eight volumes) and the absence of English translations have contributed to the lack of attention. At the same time, the search for the sophisticated and exotic, and the rigid inter-disciplinary border delimitations that leave literature beyond the reach of political and historical inquiry, have probably been the most important factors that have kept Shiba and his works in the waiting room of the broadly defined Japanese studies.

2.Shiba's "History"

A much more famous and internationally acclaimed master of historical novel, the Russian Lev Tolstoy, denied the possibility of scientifically rational inquiry into history and the ability of individuals to fully understand the course of events (Berlin 1999, 16-20.) Unlike Tolstoy, Shiba has firmly believed in the objective historical inquiry, which, if not tainted by any ideological biases, can achieve the goal of retrieving the truth.

Shiba has persistently criticized the usage of various ideological "tools" in understanding Japanese history, and was promoting what he called a "hand digging enquiry" into history, meaning an objective search for history as it was, unaffected by any pre-conceived ideas. He explicitly rejected the validity of such subjective and value laden terms as "justice" and prefers the objective "realism" or search for objective facts (Sekikawa 2003, 14-15.)

For Shiba, "ideology" has been an anathema, which he equated with alcohol, as it provides nothing more than illusions to those who indulge in it (1976, 111-113.) Ideology has been seen as the source of illusions not only in historical inquiry, but also in politics. Shiba has argued that the Japanese state has abandoned political realism, which has had its basis developed in Edo Japan's politics and was gaining momentum in

160

the aftermath of the Meiji Restoration. The departure occurred in the aftermath of the Russo-Japanese war and the replacement of realism with dogmatic ideology was seen by Shiba as the main reason for the disastrous adventures of Japanese militarism and subsequent defeat in the Pacific War (Shiba 1995, 9-10.)

Ironically, like Maruyama, who has engaged in an extensive critique of Japan's historical development, Shiba, the "rescuer" of Japanese history, has also idealized the "West", mainly for its adherence to realism. Unlike the Japanese, Shiba once noted, the Europeans have had the realism implanted in them since ancient Greece and this has been one of the main reasons for Western success (Shiba 1995, 60.) Neither Shiba nor Maruyama, both of whom reflect negatively on the era of Japan's militarism, have ever bothered to engage the question of whether one should interpret the disastrous European wars of the 20th century (or one could easily expand the scope to the last 2 millennia) as a departure from the "original form" (explained below) or as an integral part of the "European rationality."

Shiba has never provided a clear definition of the term "original form" (*genkei*), which he uses quite often in his writings as applied to a nation. However, it can be derived from his numerous speeches and essays on the topic that the "original form" stands for a certain set of national characteristics that were acquired at the time of the initial "nation building" that throughout the subsequent history have continuously shaped and influenced the social, political and economical aspects of the respective nations (for example, *Shukan Asahi* 10.8.1998 84-113 and 15.2.1999, 52-53.) Ironically, it bears a striking resemblance to Maruyama's "basso ostinato" or the continuous body of attitudes and values firmly rooted in the Japanese society and persistently influencing its development. However, unlike the critical Maruyama, which perceived the era of war, fascism and militarism as a logical continuation of Japanese history, Shiba has criticized the same period as a deviation from the "normal." Shiba has admired the scientific method and objectivity, which he has found in Edo and Meiji Japan and compared these periods favourably to the "egocentric" Showa era, during which the Japanese have become too "germanised" (Shiba 1992, 20-21.) Shiba argued that Meiji Renovation,

unlike the French or the Russian revolutions that benefited a certain class, created a totally egalitarian society through a process during which all the previously existing classes have gone through a painful process of readjustment. All this happened in order to create a modern nation state and to prevent Japan from turning into a colony (2003, 84-95.) However, this process has been destroyed by the dogmatism of Showa era and led to the shameful defeat in the Pacific War.

Notwithstanding his admiration of the West, Shiba has dedicated himself to Japan's history and culture. He has been fascinated with the unique and historically continuous way of Japan's historical path, which has never been governed by any ideology, be it Buddhism, Confucianism or Marxism [2]. According to Shiba, all these dogmatic ideologies came from outside of Japan and never managed to penetrate the society, remaining only on the surface in the form of philosophical inquiry or "writings" (shomotsu) (Shiba 2003, 9-20.) For Shiba, the true Japan has always been ruled by political realism (in the context of the state meaning non-ideological assessment of national interests and state's power) and most of his works are dedicated to uncovering this cultural tread.

Paradoxically, he is trying to discover this already pre-determined and highly estimated "realism" in the national character, by applying a normative framework that constitutes the same "realism." "Realism" had been an obsession for Shiba. He has perceived himself (Shukan Asahi 15.2.1999) and has been perceived by numerous others to be an impartial observer. While adding some "flowers" to the narrative, he is really looking from the position of an objective observer at history (Nakamura 1986, 289-29.) Donald Keene, one of the leading Western specialists on Japanese literature, has also commented that Shiba's writings are based on proper historical facts (Keene 2004, 89.)

---

[2] Most of the references made by Shiba refer to the nationalist ideology of Mito school and Marxism, but also to Buddhism. His definition of "ideology" (shiso) seems to refer to the broadly defined ideology as a system of thought that claims to explain the world and to prescribe proper behavior. At the same time in his discussion of "original form", Shiba positively examines religion (in case of China-Confucianism) as a tool used intentionally to "tame" the people, i.e. to unify them and to restrain their natural barbarianism with a certain moral code. (Shukan Asahi 8.10.1998)

While at times commentators conceded that some historical facts might be omitted or changed, Shiba's narrative was generally perceived as not tainted by any ideology but shaped purely by aesthetics (Matsumoto 1996, 37-39.) One of the leading Japanese scholars on Russia has described Shiba's approach to history in general and to Russia in particular, as being characterized by "political realism", defined as a search for truth without any ideological or emotional biases (Numano in Shiba 1999, 8-9.) This perception of Shiba's writings is widely shared by the general audience as well. The list of comments on Shiba's writings on Russia on the Japanese website of Amazon.com and Yahoo Japan reveals that all the commentators approach his works as a "proper" historical narrative[3].

3. The Texts and the Argument

This part analyzes the identity discourse in Shiba's writings on Russia, drawing mainly on the collection of essays titled *On Russia-The Original Form of the North* (Shiba 2002) originally published in 1986 and for which he received the prestigious Yomiuri Prize For Literature the following year. This collection of essays, as Shiba himself states in the *Introduction,* is the crystallisation of his perception of Russia that has developed over the years, while writing the popular *The Cloud on Top of the Hill* and *The Open Sea of Rape Blossoms*.[4]

This chapter also draws on other articles and interviews published by Shiba during his life and after his death in books and popular journals where some of the relevant arguments are further developed and clarified. As it will be shown below, Shiba's writings belong to same discursive formation on Russia and Japan as the works examined in the previous chapter, and contribute to the creation of a hierarchical binary between the two nations. In spite of claims for a unique national identity and a uniquely

---

[3] Fukui Yuzo's article in *Chuo koron* (1.2.1998, 61-72) is one of the rare attempts to question the factual validity, the interpretations and the broad impact of Shiba's work, focusing on Shiba's description of the battle for Port Arthur in " The Cloud on Top of the Hill."

[4] My translation of *Nanohana no oki.*

Japanese perception of Russia, the discourse is constructed similarly to the one discussed in the previous chapter, by using the dichotomies, perceptions and values that have been an integral part of the Western "policy of othering" (Campbell 1992) and have been an integral part of the Western discourse on the Russian "other."

In this sense, Shiba's identity discourse, repeats the construction of the Asian values debate. As one of the leading Japanese scholars observed, the proponents of distinctly Asian values actually use the same concepts that represent the "Western intellectual hegemony" and construct Asian uniqueness through an argument "tainted by the spell of Orientalism" (Inoue 1999.)

This interpretation contradicts the popular claim that the various ambiguities and contradictions that are often visible in Japan's identity discourse are the result of the fusion of the "Eastern" and the "Western" elements (for example Davidson 1983, Armour ed 1985, White, Umegaki and Havens eds. 1990.) As will be shown below, these contradictions do not stem from the ambiguous nature of Japan's identity. Here they are interpreted as the result of applying the Western othering discourse to the "self" and the "other" to a nation that has developed in completely different historical and geopolitical circumstances. Furthermore, it is applied to a nation, which has been (and still is) "othered" in the Western discourse using the same techniques. However, the result is a hierarchical construction of the self and the other, in which the self represents the universal and the superior.

Another important argument made in this chapter, is that the discourse on Russia is not just an "othering" discourse regarding an external other or, as often claimed, simply an objective reflection on the history of numerous conflicts between the two nations (for example, Burton quoted in Kimura 1999,226.)

Like the identity discourse in the previous chapter, Shiba's narrative "rescues" Japan from the shadows of its negative history and provides a reassurance to the domestic audience about the peaceful and superior nature of the Japanese nation. However, here this task is achieved not only through the othering of Russia, but also through a suppression of discourse on another important other in the construction of the Japanese

nation-the native inhabitants of Northern Japan, the Ainu.

4. Shiba's "Russia" and "Japan"

4.1 Constructing Japan's Universalism

Like Hakamada who appeals to the culturally relative basis of social inquiry and to uniquely Japanese understanding of Russia which compliments the Western view (1985, 321-322), Shiba also emphasizes the difference in perceptions of Russia as seen from Europe and as seen from Asia, where he locates his own (Japanese) perceptions. He does not contradict the European view but believes that both of the views compliment each other, and combined, should provide the complete picture, constituting the whole body of truth (*Shukan Asahi* 15.2.1999, 54)

In general, the construction of the discourse in "On Russia-The Original Form of the North" is rather simple. Most of the book is a series of descriptions of the Russian conquest of Siberia, Russian exploitation of the local population and resources, and Russian attempts to establish trade relations with Japan with some reference to the Russians suffering under Mongol "yoke" and much more under their own rulers.

These descriptions are occasionally interrupted with, what Shiba has called "idle talk" interventions. The interventions provide snapshots of Edo Japan (1603-1867) as a tool of comparison of Russian history with the state of affairs in Japan in the parallel period. By using this technique, Shiba smartly exploits his position as an amateur and not a "professional historian" (Shiba 1995, 77 also Sekikawa 2003, 20) to provide the reader with contrasting comparisons of the Japanese "self" and the Russian "other."

The "snapshots" of Edo Japan are mostly positive in the normative sense. For Shiba, Edo Japan, while not being built on the principle of a "social contract" but rather through a policy of "taming the human beasts", still represents the uniquely positive society where stability and peace have prevailed (Shiba 1976, 108.)

A passage that talks about the needle and lacquer ware trade among the Ainu, natives of Kamchatka and the Japanese seems to be the best example of this strategy. At first

reading it seems to be a random thought rather out of place in the narrative. However, this passage intervenes into a story of conquests, greed and oppression that characterized the Russian relations with the natives, and provides a striking contrast by emphasizing the peaceful nature of Japan's historical interactions with the Ainu (2002, 74.)

The indirect comparison of both nations' navies is structured in a similar way. Shiba discusses the Russo-American Company and in a very detailed fashion, he describes the non-professional nature of the sailors and the cruel conditions that they worked under (2002, 114-119.) This description is preceded by a narrative on the Japanese merchant navy of the same period, and mostly devoted to describing the positive role it has played in the economy of Edo Japan (2002, 100-102.)

Again, jingoism and expansionism are presented as the main national characteristics of Russia. The historical continuity between USSR and tsarist Russia is affirmed by emphasising the persistently expansionist nature of the nation (2002, 10-11) and the similarities of her leaders such as Stalin, Lenin and Ivan the Terrible's beliefs in the supreme value of military power in providing security for Russia (2002, 54.) Like the other writers discussed in the previous chapter, Shiba also notes a continuous Russian perception that any domestic or international problem can be solved by military force. (2002, 199)

The origins of these national characteristics are traced to the Mongolian influence on the formation of the Russian state and nation in the 16th century (Shiba 2002, 22.) Here Shiba's narrative repeats the socio-medical discourse of differentiation or the normal/pathological dichotomy, which has constituted one of the main modes of constructing difference in the Western discourse on the "self" and the "other" (Campbell 1992, 92-101.) Russia is depicted as exhibiting a pathological deviation from normalcy. Hence the "*abnormal* fear" of foreign invasion, the "*pathological suspicion*" of other states and the potential "*lust of conquest and an abnormal belief*" in military force, are believed by Shiba to be the cultural genes that constitute Russia and emerged as a result of the rule of (the Mongolian) Kipchak Khan and the prolonged Russian subordination to this rule (2002, 25-26 emphasis added.)

Contrasted with Russia's pathologies, Japan also has a "culturally genetic" fear of Russia. However, this "illness" is historically justified as it has originated from the actual experience of the cruel and mercantile policies of the Russo-American Company towards its own workers and the natives (2002, 142.)

The main Russian interest in Japan (and China) that has been consistent since the 17th century until the present day is the supply of food provisions that has been needed in order to ease the development of Siberia (2002, 80-81.) Shiba explains the lack of interest in Japanese and Chinese territory solely by the inability of imperial Russia to engage in military conquests in such distant places. The reason for "clinging" to and "abducting" Siberia was the easiness of conquering a land with small, scattered and non-unified communities of natives. Shiba sees the same policy of using the weakness of the locals in Russian expansion to the West as well (2002, 81.)

Unlike Russian's ruthless and cynical expansionism, militarism and pathological fear of invasion, Japan's "original form", which has survived until the present day, is a somewhat childish "pacifism." Just like Edo Japan had no arms and required all foreign ships to submit their gunpowder, contemporary Japan shares a similar attitude to nuclear weapons (2002, 160.)

The element of "childishness" plays an important role here, as, like in Hakamada's narrative, while locating Japan as morally superior to Russia and the rest of the world because of its adherence to pacifism, it also provides a warning that pacifism can constitute a dangerous idealism in Japan's dealing with the rest of the world.

Edo Japan is portrayed as an exquisite and sophisticated "maritime civilization" in which the gap between the poor and the rich was much smaller than in neighbouring China, India and other Asian countries (2002, 44-46.) Furthermore, Shiba notes that the mercantilist economy of the Edo period was not only an advanced economic system but also influenced the development of objective and advanced scientific thinking. As a proof Shiba brings the example of Kudo Heisuke, the first Japanese scholar that wrote on Russia and who is classified by Shiba to be the typical scientist of the second half of Edo period. The superior nature of this society, based on mercantilist economy further

emphasized by the societal ability to evaluate "things" and knowledge, based not only on the subjective perception but also through a comparative analysis (2002, 84.) The belief in the supreme value of commerce is also visible in Shiba's argument that establishing trade relations with the Russian Far East in the 18th century would have helped to avoid in the future the mutually suspicious and complicated situations between Russia on one side and Edo Japan (actually Matsumae fiefdom) on the other. (2002, 91)

The Japanese medieval economy is portrayed by Shiba as basically functioning through a market mechanism with a complex distribution network that enabled commodities from various parts of Japan to circulate all through the country and the society having an almost universal literacy rate. Shiba explains that as the result of a market economy the society of Edo Japan was dominated by humanism, rationalism and rejection of religious authority. In Shiba's discourse, these concepts are not products of the Enlightenment and imported from the West during the period of modernisation, but inherently Japanese values, an integral part of the Japanese "original form."

Unfortunately, the victory in the Russo-Japanese war resulted in the "original form" being disfigured and transformed into the monstrous "Japanese modernity" which is a "not Japan" (*nihon de wa nai.*) This period of deviation from Japan's normality, during the period of forty years between the Russo-Japanese war and the defeat in the Pacific War is considered as the "occupation of Japan by the military" (in Sekikawa 2003, 16-18.) Here Shiba saves the national history from criticism by shifting the responsibility for these years from "Japan" as a nation to the military, considered to be outside of the normal "Japan."

Not surprisingly, like with other identity discourses, Shiba's uniquely Japanese construction of Russia and Japan, in its creation of Japan's normality, replicates the "traditional" European identity discourse on Russia. This discourse has continued to dominate the European discourse in one form or another until at least the 20th century (Neumann 1998, 65-112) and is still present in a number of Western writings on post-Soviet Russia (Foglesong and Hahn 2005.)

Ironically, Marx and Engels-whose ideology Shiba, along with other Japanese

168

cultural determinists, loathed and vigorously denied its applicability to Japan (for example, *Shukan Asahi* 1998, 44)-also shared the perception of Russia as an economically and socially backward "barbarous power" (Neumann 1998, 96-97.)

The construction of Russia in Shiba's discourse repeats almost pedantically this construction including the doubts regarding the Russian ability to depart from its barbaric state and to achieve civilization through internalising the values of the European (universal, in case of Japan) civilization. Furthermore, the Enlightenment based dichotomy of Russia as composed of "body and nature" compared to the European "mind and civilization" (Neumann 1998, 80) is also repeated with Japan replacing Europe as the civilized, the rational and the cultural.

Obviously, an application of the Western "othering" discourse to a nation, which herself has been the "other" for the West and which historically and geographically has been located outside it, is bound to result in tensions and contradictions within the construct. In the discourse discussed in the previous chapter, these contradictions are avoided by employing two techniques. The otherness of Japan in the hierarchical construction of normal/abnormal is either silenced by avoiding references to Japan's history or marginalized through an emphasis on the greater difference in the form of Russia. Alternatively, the otherness is emphasized by presenting Japan and Russia as both different from the "normal" West, with Japan being located in the positive realm of difference (being more faithful to the Western ideals than the West), and Russia in the negative.

However, Shiba, who strives to create Japan's unique superiority on any occasion, is forced into self-contradictions when he conducts his "hand digging" search for European Enlightenment in Japan's history. On one hand, as has been shown above, the reader is presented with a medieval Japanese society that was egalitarian, mercantile, scientifically advanced and with a functioning market economy. At the same time, elsewhere, Shiba admits that modernity was introduced to Japan during Meiji Restoration in the second half of the 19th century (for example, Shiba and Inoue 2004, 44) and by this renders meaningless the implied modernity of pre Meiji Japan.

4.2 The Asian Japan

Shiba often uses the racial element, which has been one of the important ones in the European discourse on Russia. The conception of Russia as the "barbarian Asian" occupies a place of honour in the Western discourse (Neumann 1998, 89-90) and has also been used by Kimura Hiroshi, who, wisely enough, avoided the question of Japan being considered an Asian nation as well by limiting his narrative to Russia.

Like Kimura, Shiba traces not only the abnormal fear of foreign invasion, but also the pathological suspicion of other states and potential lust of conquest and the belief in the supreme value of military force to be the cultural genes left by the rule of the Mongols (2002, 25-26.) However, a few pages further in the text and elsewhere, the Asian/Mongol other becomes conflated with the Japanese "self", serving the same purpose of constructing Japan's superiority. Shiba shows admiration to the "magnificent" culture of the natives of Siberia (Shukan Asahi 15.2.1999, 56) and for their bravery in fighting the Russian colonizers (2002, 195-199.)

This is not an admiration of the "other" or of a noble savage, as Shiba creates a conflation of this civilization with Japan through identifying it as the "civilizational ancestor" of the Japanese, by providing a description of similar religious rites (2002, 180 and *Shukan Asahi* 15.2.1999, 56) and similar physical features (2002, 49.) With barely hidden pride, Shiba describes the Asian superiority to Russians by noting that only 10,000 Mongols (who looked like "us") ruled the entire, vast Russian territory (2002, 23.)

Shiba continues to deepen the identification of the Japanese "self" with the Mongols, by noting that the Japanese facial features are similar to those of the Kipchak (Batu) Khan aristocracy-the former conquerors and rulers of Russia. He goes even further in his attempt to present the persistent superiority of the "self" and observes that even the rulers of modern Russia look like the Asian "us", as seen in examples of Stalin (who was of course, of Georgian origin) and the former Russian PM Chernomyrdin (2002, 58.)

4.3 The West as the Standard of Normality

The "West" is continuously present in Shiba's discourse, not only as the silent supplier of the tools for the construction of the discourse, but also as the explicit yardstick for measuring the level of civilization. Russian history, juxtaposed with the West places it in the realm of universal inferiority.

Shiba notes that at the time Europe was experiencing the "blooming" of the Renaissance, in Russia, the Mongols were destroying the urban culture. He also emphasizes that even if the ideas of the Renaissance would have reached Russia, it would have been impossible for them to adopt such a "mature system of thought" (2002, 24-25.)

While continuously emphasizing the unique nature of Japan's civilization, Japan is often allocated a place within the Western course of development and modernization. For example, it is noted that while Russia has suffered under the Mongolian yoke, both Japan and the West have undergone important socio-cultural developments that "prepared" them for modernity (2002, 22 and *Shukan Asahi* 7.8.1998, 56-58.)

Russia, in general, is negatively contrasted with the West. Russia's system of serfdom is described as of a more cruel nature than its European equivalent. Russia's pre-revolutionary socio-political structure, consisting only of the tsar and the serfs, is depicted as way more simplistic than the "complex" Western one (2002, 31-34.) Russia's "youthfulness" as a nation is perceived to be one of the reasons for its ferocious roughness and is contrasted with "old nations" like France. There, notes Shiba, the original barbarian spirit tends to be diluted (2002, 12.) Probably for the same reason, the relative "oldness" of Japan as a nation is emphasized throughout the book.

The only instance where Russia is located within the West is in the negative context of European colonialism and the Russian conquest of Siberia. The actions and significance of Yermak, the conqueror of Siberia, are compared to Columbus (2002, 66) and the colonization of Siberia is compared to European colonialism of the 15th-17th centuries (2002, 30.)

The process of Russian modernisation/Westernisation that started in the 18th century

is positively evaluated and Shiba respectfully notes the Europeanization of the high culture (2002, 162-170.) At the same time, he is quick to remind the reader that this process involved only the Russian aristocracy, while ninety percent of the population continued to carry the "original form" of the "barbarian nomads" (2002, 170-171.) Like in the case of Japan, whose possible alterations of the superior "original form" are denied by placing the negativity solely in the military, Russian mobility as a nation is denied by locating the "modernization" only in the small minority of the aristocracy.

Similarly to the writings examined in the previous chapter, occasionally Russian and Japanese similarities are underlined in order to emphasize the hierarchical difference. For example, Shiba notes that in the 16th century in both Japan and in Russia the process of national unification took place. Furthermore, the usage of cannon fire and the new strategy to defeat horse riding warriors was used for the first time almost simultaneously both by the Russians in their campaign against the Siberian Khan and in Japan by Oda Nobunaga (2002, 49 and 57.) However, here the similarity gives way to difference. While in Russia the "unification" gave birth to the severe dictatorship of Ivan the Terrible, in Japan the previously mentioned "exquisite and sophisticated" Edo period began (2002, 49.) Two centuries later, when Russia was still heavily influenced by the barbarian style of the nomads, Edo period Japan had already embraced the modern "principles of commerce" (2002, 138-139.)

One could suggest that the hierarchical dichotomies and the practices of difference that we tend to associate with Enlightenment and further Western developments have simultaneously and independently developed also in Japan. However, a glimpse into the "othering" discourse that existed in pre-Meji Japan, i.e. before the exposure to and the incorporation of Western paradigms of modernity shows this proposition to be wrong. While the creation of hierarchical differences between the "self" and the "other" has existed, the dichotomies employed were of a completely different nature.

The pre Meiji discourse on the Ainus serves as a good example of "pre-modern" policies of "othering." The "Japanese" (more precisely, *wajin*) superiority to the "barbarism" of Ainu, the natives of what is now northern Japan, was based on the

framework provided by the Chinese worldview of normality. The hierarchical nature of the construction of the self and the other is similar to the European discourse in stipulating the civilized and the barbarian. However, the discourse has relied on such factors as the existence of a common written language and the moral superiority of the Japanese derived from their adherence to Confucianism. Furthermore, different customs of eating (for example eating birds and meat meant barbarism), dressing (for example, the fact that Ainus tied their garments on the left side), hairstyles, the custom of wearing earrings and no knowledge of the five grains (rice, millet, barley, wheat and soybeans) by the Ainus were used to construct Japanese superiority (Siddle 1996, 28-42.)

4.4 The Ainus

As already mentioned, in the context of the Ainu, the narration of the Japanese "self" vis-à-vis the Russian "other" based on the European model serves another important role in the construction of national identity in cotemporary Japan. In contemporary Japan's dominant discourse on her past, the term "Japan's colonialism" is used only in the context of Asian colonies acquired since the victory in Sino-Japanese War in 1895. The earlier expansion to the North (and the South) is viewed as "pioneering", "development" and "enlightenment" of the native Ainus and their land.

As Chapter IV has shown, the dominant historical discourse critically reflects on the years of militarism and colonialism of the Showa era. However, Japan's expansion to the North (and especially the Northern Territories) is presented as a process of a "daring and challenging development of inherent territory" (Koizumi ed 2003, 35 also Nemuro city office pamphlet 2003.) While some official or semi-official material on the history of Northern Territories does not mention Ainus at all (for example, *Hopporyodo modai taisaku kyokai* pamphlet 2003), most of the more detailed material provides a narrative similar to the one written by Shiba.

Just like in Shiba's writings, the Edo period Japanese (*wajin*) and the Ainus are portrayed as having peaceful trade relations (Koizumi ed 2003, 68-73) that gradually evolved into "development policies", which resulted in the "rise of living standards of

the Ainus" (Ibid 84-85.) This is contrasted with the Russian expeditions to the Kuriles, that "suppressed the resistance of the Ainus" and "exploited" them starting from the beginning of the 18th century (Ibid 76-78.)

No doubt that the fact that most of the Ainus have been assimilated into Japanese society and do not constitute a vocal minority plays a certain role in this construction of the discourse. More important is the foundation for Japan's continuous claim to the Northern Territories that until mid 19th century were inhibited mainly by Ainus. As the notion of "inherent Japanese territory" serves as the main moral and legal argument (for example, see MoFA website for Japan's official position) the discourse on the Ainus as the original inhabitants, can severely undermine the validity of the argument.

Hence Shiba's discourse not only saves Japan from the negative narrative on its national characteristics that resulted from Japan's 20th century experience. The already mentioned passages in Shiba's writing on the peaceful trade of the medieval Japanese with the Ainus (with Edo Japan presented as having all the basic features of modern society as opposed to the Russian violent and oppressive conquest of Siberia) serve a dual purpose.

Besides the hierarchical construction of the normal Japan, they also provide a historical support to the dominant discourse on Japan's enlightened expansion to the north and suppress the counter-discourse of another instance of Japan's colonialism, conducted before the four decades of the temporal deviation from the "original form."

However, Wada Haruki, mentioned in the previous chapter, is not the sole scholar that depicts Japan's northward expansion as a colonial one. Other critical historical scholarship reveals that the interactions between the Japanese (*wajin*) and the Ainu before and during the Edo period were not as peaceful and purely commercial, and there has been a long history of violence, subjugation, exploitation and resistance (for example, Siddle 1996, Emori 1987.)

The "enlightened" Meiji reforms have resulted in the Ainu lands being administered as a proper colony, this in spite of the various laws whose purpose seemed to be the protection of the native people (Akami 2005, 11.) The results of the rapid "development"

174

and "modernization" of the Northern Japan that started during the Meiji era, in a way resembles the European settlements in Latin America and Australia. The gradual expropriation of the land, the destruction of the traditional way of living as well as the introduction of diseases such as tuberculosis that the natives lacked the immunity and the alcohol that was brought by the Japanese (*wajin*), have had an almost genocidal effects on the population, reducing its numbers greatly and making the Ainus a minority in their own land (Emori 1987, 124-125.)

However, this narrative of Japanese history remains safely contained within the academia and rarely it makes and appearance in the broader public discourse. In a rare critique of the "inherent territory" paradigm, Kayano Shigeru, the first (and probably, the only) Japanese Member of the Diet of Ainu origin stated, that the Northern Territories have been Ainu territory and now, two strong states, Russia and Japan, are debating the future of the islands "above the heads" of the "original owners." (At House of Councilors, Committee on Okinawa and Northern Territories, 02.12.1997.) Not surprisingly this argument has been ignored by other Diet members and can hardly hope to find its way into the public discourse since, besides the critical academics, the interest group is very small. The number of residents of Hokkaido, where most of the Ainus reside, that identified themselves as Ainu in an official population survey has been around 23,000 (as of 1993) around 0.5% of the island's population (www.pref.hokkaido.jp)

5. Conclusion

Once, in a talk regarding his perceptions of Russia, Shiba explicitly stated that because he does not adhere to any ideology, he does not have any prejudice or preconceptions related to Russia. (*Shukan Asahi* 15.2.1999.) Shiba's explicit efforts to adhere to objective "realism" and impartiality are quite visible in the narrative examined here. He expresses understanding of the imagined patriotic feelings Soviet teenagers must have when they see the map of Siberian conquests (2002, 71-72.) He also shows understanding and admiration of one of the Russian naval explorers, Kruzenshtern (2002,

133.) After a very unfavourable description of the sailors of Russo-American Company, he attempts to avoid generalisations by concluding that this perception cannot be applied to the Russian navy in general (2002, 119.)

Shiba also positively evaluates the Russian policy of "enlightenment" towards the ethnic minorities in Siberia conducted through building schools in the newly acquired territories. On this rare occasion, Russia is juxtaposed with China, Japan, and Asia as a superior and an enlightened nation. (2002, 231-232.) At the same time, Shiba believed in the importance of comparison and relativity when discussing historical events (*Shukan Asahi* 15.2.1999, 96-98.) In his pursuit of establishing a relative place for Japan's history within the universal modernity, he has probably engaged in a universal practice of creating a hierarchical difference between the Japanese "self" and the Russian "other."

Like the writings examined in the previous chapter, Shiba's narrative was a product of its time. It is interesting to note the way "objective history" and Russian "original form" that are the focus of Shiba's narrative, have been interpreted and perceived by other Japanese writers. The narrative on the Russian threat composed by the medieval intellectual Kudo Heisuke in 1780s, whom Shiba admires and quotes as the first scientific account of the Russian threat, has been interpreted in a rather different way from the one Shiba does. Kudo, in his description of the Russian conquest of Siberia he writes that Russians were requested to intervene in the local war by one of the Siberian leaders and their intervention has brought law and order to Siberia. Furthermore, he notes the locals were so pleased with it and asked to be annexed to Russia (Akitsuki 1987, 3.) Hence the threat from Russia has been seen not as a military one but as a cultural one and whose expansion is based on its superior level of civilization.

This reading of Kudo's narrative is supported by the recommendations found in the report of an "inquiry commission" sent by the *shogunate* in 1798 to the northern frontiers of Japan and areas inhibited by Ainus (present day Hokkaido.) The investigation resulted in the area being taken away from the control of the Matsumae fiefdom and put under the direct rule of the central government in order to execute a

176

more effective control over the area. One of the reasons listed was that the Russian's amicable treatment of the natives, as contrasted with the cruelty of Matsumae, had led to a growth of an appreciation of Russia among the "stupid natives" and their desire to "become nationals of the other country" (Akitsuki 1987, 8.) Hence, unlike in Shiba's account, it is plausible to recon that originally Russia was perceived in Japan not as a threat from "nomadic barbarians" but as one posed by a more advanced civilization.

The perception of Russia in the immediate years after Japan's defeat in the Pacific War also provides an interesting glimpse on how Russian "original form" was seen in Japan that had just been defeated and occupied by the US.

Maruyama Masao (not the celebrated scholar by the same name) spent over fifteen years in the Soviet Union as a reporter for *Asahi Shibmun* from 1932 till 1947. His stay almost overlapped with the Fifteen Years War (another common term for the war Japan fought in Asia, referring to the period 1931-1945), which resulted in Japan's total defeat. In a book published in 1948, after his return to a devastated Japan, he summarized his perceptions and impressions of Russia. It is interesting to note, how the history and the national character of one of the main Allies look different to a Japanese belonging to a defeated and humiliated nation that failed in its attempt to assimilate the colonized people and to create a colonial empire. In many ways the narrative is similar to the one discussed here as it takes the West (Europe) as a standard, but it goes beyond the dichotomies of civilization/barbarism and normal/abnormal. One of the reasons for this could be the difficulty to locate the defeated Japanese "self" in the realm of universal normality and to ascribe abnormality to the Soviet Russia, one of the three major victorious Allies.

Like Shiba and the other writers Maruyama locates the origins of Russian national characteristics in geopolitical and historical factors. He also notes the relative shallowness of the European influence on Russia and perceives the Russian nation as combining both Asian and European elements.

However, comparing Russia with other more Westernised Slavic nations (like the Czechs and the Poles) that achieved "cultural development" earlier than Russia, he notes

admiringly that it was only Russia that was able to build a powerful state (1948, 6-7.) Maruyama admires the Russian's rapid increase in population, Russian flexibility and adaptability to any environment and their high level of endurance.

Russia's successful colonization of the "primitive peoples of Asia" (the natives of Siberia) is also traced to its skilful adaptability through which Russians managed to "russify" and internalise the natives. He also notes the "dual personality" of Russians that has emerged from this fusion of Europe and Asia, but along with fatalism he notes the Russian friendliness and carelessness, sociability and communalism as the positive Asian features of the Russian character (1948, 10-18.)

The creation of the Russian "other" in immediate postwar Japan could not proceed through the conflation of the Japanese "self" with the West, as it was Japan that has been the "other" for the Western nations and the dichotomies of the Cold War structure were still in an embryonic state. Hence, Maruyama manages to avoid the hierarchical dichotomous construction of the universal "self" and, while still using the paradigms of progress, civilization and modernization, engages in a much less totalising discourse.

However, Shiba in his quest for rescuing Japan from the negative qualities attributed to its national character and whose cognitive framework has been shaped by the rapid economic growth on one side and the Cold War on the other has been incapable or unwilling to address these possible variations of his "objective realism."

While aspiring to find a unique "original form" of Japan and a uniquely Japanese understanding of Russia, there is very little uniqueness in the perceptions, ideas, structure and functions of Shiba's narrative. The "unique" ideas of the continuity of the nation, the search for this "original form" that evolves around hierarchical construction of the self vis-à-vis other nations and dominated by dichotomies such as civilized/barbarian, peaceful/jingoistic, free/unfree, West/East among others, have continuously been present in one form or another in the discourses of European national identities (Neumann 1998, 103.)

Shiba's narrative divides the world into "us" and "them" and produces a hierarchical construction of Japan vis-à-vis Russia, at the same time engaging in normative.

prescriptions that are consistent with the "original forms" of the two nations. Also, through the homogenisation of the "Japanese nation" and the simultaneous conflation of Japan with the West, it conceals the fractures and divisions within "Japan" herself (in this context, the existence and the history of colonization of Ainus) and the need to engage the negative aspects of Japan's past.

The narrative on Japan and Russia examined here and in the previous chapter, has been an integral part of the political discourse on bilateral relations during the Cold War, when the "threat from the North" and the "stolen territories" have been the main concepts that defined Japan's interactions with the Soviet Union.

However, the Soviet Union has ceased to exist at the end of 1991 and bilateral relations have become more diversified and dynamic. The following chapter will examine Japan's foreign policy and policy discourse in the post-Cold War years and analyse the cognitive framework within which the policy formation takes place.

Chapter VII: The Post-Cold War Policy Discourse

1.Introduction

This chapter examines the conduct of Japanese policy and the nature of its policy discourse on Russia between the years 1992-2005. The first part of the chapter outlines briefly how Russia has been perceived in the general political discourse.

The main part focuses on the specific policy discourses. As mentioned previously this research seeks to examine the identity discourse separately from the practice of foreign policy in order to avoid the need to fit data into a predetermined framework. This

chapter analyzes the cognitive framework which has shaped the policy discourse and examines it in comparison to the identity discourse's construction of "Russia" and " Japan."

The three previous chapters were devoted to the analysis of national identity discourse, its structure and functions. This chapter examines the discourse of foreign policy along three dimensions: economic, military and the territorial dispute, arguing that identity functions differently in all three cases. Identity does not matter for the economic sphere, where the search for profits overrides concerns related to territory and history. Identity is vaguely visible in the security discourse as seen in the lack of long-term trust of Russia's intentions among the members of the security community. In the context of the NTs, identity shapes and, at the same time, is shaped by the policy related to this dispute. Hence, this chapter argues for a "case by case" approach to a relationship between identity and foreign policy. A comprehensive theoretical framework that will account for the relationship of identity and foreign policy is bound to result in either an essentialist definition of foreign policy or in exclusion of certain aspects of foreign policy from empirical analysis.

The previous chapters have demonstrated that the identity discourse on Russia emerged within a particular political, economic and societal environment. Hence, it could be argued that the identity discourse belongs to (but should not be reduced to) the same discursive formation as the political agenda of the 1980s. However, while the hierarchical identity construction of the two nations has remained unchanged (emphasizing the persistent nature of national character), Russia, as a state, and her relations with Japan have changed considerably since the collapse of the Soviet Union.

In spite of the continuous stalemate on the territorial dispute, and since the emergence of, what in the Japanese discourse has been referred to as "newly born Russia", Japan's policy has "thickened", becoming much more diversified. In terms of Japan's assistance to Russia, the policy includes a number of programs including cultural exchange programs aimed at building the capacity of public workers, assistance with the disassembling of nuclear submarines and, in cooperation with the US, EU and other

countries, the engagement of Russian scientists previously involved in weapons related research in non-military research projects under the auspices of the International Science and Technology Center. The information about these projects is readily available from the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs website.

It is beyond the scope of this chapter and thesis to engage in the detailed description or evaluation of such initiatives. Instead, this chapter examines the way Russia has been perceived in the policy community and how it is represented in government policies. However, on two occasions, the analysis slightly departs from the orthodox definition of foreign policy as "the sum of official external relations conducted by an independent actor (usually a state) in international relations" (Hill 2003, 3.) The economic policy analysis examines the private business perceptions of Russia, in addition to the official discourse. Since the main interest of this chapter is the relationship between identity and foreign policy, the perceptions and conduct of the private business present an interesting case study for observing this relationship. Furthermore, the last part of the chapter deals with the perceptions of the territorial dispute and examines the domestic policies related to the dispute. As this part will argue, domestic policy is an integral part of the broad quest for the return of the NTs and is inseparable from its international dimension.

The analysis conducted here relies heavily on the analysis of parliamentary interpolations and also uses the various governmental publications and analytical works. It also uses secondary sources and reflects on interviews conducted with government officials, academics and activists involved in the formation of bilateral relations.

2. The General Political Discourse on Russia

While the identity discourse examined in the previous chapters does not differentiate between the Soviet Union and Russia, when it comes to the making of policy there is a clear separation between the two entities. It must be noted that there are occasional references to Russian national character or historical continuity as a justification or explanation of a certain policy, which, at times, are not directly related to Russia. For example, Kanemaru Shin, one of the "gray cardinals" of Japanese politics, who served as

the Vice-Secretary General of the LDP in 1992, stated that the reason for Japan's reluctance to provide financial aid to Russia, in his talk with US President George Bush Senior, is that Russians are "lying and traitorous" (*Yomiuri* 27.06.1992.) In the context of relations with Turkey, Kawashima MP (Japan's Socialist Party) appealed to the need to strengthen bilateral relations, noting the historical similarities between the two nations as both have been victims of Russian and Western imperialism (at House of Representatives (Reps), Foreign Affairs Committee (Com). 21.04.1993.) Similar reference in also made in the context of relations with Poland, which like Japan has been a victim of Russian aggression (Hachiro Yoshio, Head of Japan-Russia Friendship Association of Diet Members, DJP MP from Hokkaido at House of Reps, Budget Com, 12.2.2004.)

At times, there are also references to Russian "traditional" paranoia and its fear of being besieged (Kawai Katsuyuki MP at House of Reps, Com on US-Japan Defense Cooperation Guidelines 24.5.1999.) Sato Masaru, a member of the so-called Suzuki trio, also explained NATO's eastward expansion and its perceived confrontation with Russia, in terms of a civilizational confrontation between the Byzantine and the Western Roman civilizations (Sato 2005, 254.)

However, this kind of reference to national characteristics and historical narratives is anecdotal and rarely makes an appearance in the policy discourse. In general, since the introduction of market reforms and democracy, Russia has been regarded as a new country, fundamentally different from the Soviet Union. In the 1990s, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russia was often referred to as "newly born Russia" (*shinsei roshia*) to emphasize the discontinuity with the Soviet Union (for example FM Hata at House of Reps, 14.10.1993 also PM Hashimoto, Policy Speech at CSIS 24.09.1996.) The distinction between Russia and the Soviet Union was made clear already in 1993 by PM Miyazawa when he contrasted the "expansionist" Stalinist policies of the Soviet Union with the "new Russia", which was seen as being on her way to becoming a true member of the international society (Speech on occasion of elections to the House of Representatives 10.7.1993.) In a similar fashion, Suzuki Mueno MP, one of the most important actors in Japan's policy vis-à-vis Russia during the post Cold War years,

continuously emphasized that Russia is changing and the need to differentiate between the "nyet saying" USSR with "new" Russian which is in the process of democratization and transition to market economy (for example, at House of Reps, Foreign Affairs Com 15.10.1993 and 28.11.1994.)

Russia's (relative) integration into the camp of "democracy and market economy" also resulted in concrete changes in Japan's overall stance vis-à-vis Russia. The containment of the Soviet Union was replaced by the pursuit of Russia's integration into the international system. In 1997, Japan supported Russia's full integration into the G-7 elite club, which from the 1998 Birmingham summit onwards officially became the G-8. Japan's support of Russia's full attendance[5] cannot be reduced purely to the Russian change of political and economic ideology and to a large degree resulted from pressure by other members of the G-7, most importantly U.S President Clinton (Valliant in Ivanov and Smith eds 1999, 162 and Hashimoto 2000, 30-31.) However, it can be argued that a common language and the shared ideologies of "liberty", "democracy" and "market economy", as well as the actual policies pursued by the Russian government, induced Japan's support for Russian integration into international institutions. The common language provided a sense of shared interests and "common direction" for Russia and the members of the "West", including Japan (Tanba 2000, 38-29.)

Japan further continued to pursue the policy of Russia's integration through an active support of Russia's membership in APEC during the Vancouver APEC summit in 1997, as a result of which Russia was admitted along with Peru and Vietnam (Hashimoto 2000, 32.) In the Japan-Russia Action Plan signed by PM Koizumi and President Putin in 2003, out of six "pillars" only one is devoted to the peace treaty negotiations and the territorial issue (Diplomatic Blue Book 2004.) Otherwise, the Plan provides for a wide range of cooperation between "strategic partners" in a number of bilateral but also international areas, including trade and economy, arms control, regional security and particularly the issue of North Korea. It also includes other areas, such as environmental protection and the development of tourism.

---

[5] Russia is still excluded from some of the economic meetings.

It can be argued that while Japan's relations with Russia are still in the embryonic stage, the general political framework of bilateral relations does not exhibit the "otherness" of the Cold War identity discourse. Instead, relations have developed from the confrontation of the Cold War era to (relative) acceptance of Russia within the realm of "normalcy". The following part will examine the perceptions of Russia in three particular policy discourses, in order to examine the functions of the national identity construct in these specific areas of foreign policy.

3. The Economic Dimension

The first part of this section examines private business perceptions of Russia. The second part examines the recent trends in Japan's state-level economic policy vis-à-vis Russia. It argues that the national identity construction and related perceptions of Russia have played no role in case of the private business involvement in Russia, and only a minor role in the case of government policy.

3.1 Private Business

Kimura Hiroshi has argued, with a slight sense of dissatisfaction, that politics do not affect the business sector, as Japanese business people are eager to pursue a business opportunity anywhere in the world driven only by the will to make a profit (1999, 231-232.) The empirical evidence supports this argument. Already in the early 1990s, a large number of Japanese-Russian joint ventures had been established, operating mainly in the Russian Far East. Interestingly, the peak of Japan's direct investment cases in Russia during the 1990s was in 1991, before the collapse of the Soviet Union (Imoto 2003, 5.) Many of these joint ventures and direct investment enterprises were short lived and Japanese investors left Russia within the next few years, unable to gain profit in the unfavorable investment environment. The Russian economic crisis of 1998 also played an important role in further reducing Japanese investment (Bury 2004, 10 and Lavrentiev 2005, 7.)

In the economic discourse, post-Soviet Russia was perceived as a "special country", resembling the construction of "abnormal" Russia conducted in the identity discourse.

185

However, the conception of "special" refers only to the unsuitable investment environment, while the transformation of Russia into a "normal" country is perceived as stemming from various investment-related legal reforms (Takaki 2002, 12.) This understanding of Russia is reflected in business leaders' responses to a questionnaire conducted by the Kiedanren (Japan Business Federation) in 2000 which lists the complicated and confusing bureaucratic environment, lack of clarity about legal procedures, low predictability and the low financial potential of Russian business counterparts as the main impediments to Japan's investment in Russia (in Imoto 2003, 6-7.) It must also be noted that these critical perceptions of the Russian economy and investment environment were not purely subjective reflections, but have also been shared by many Russian economists (for example, Simonia in Ivanov and Smith eds 1999, 27-28.)

It is only in the last few years that the volume of bilateral trade has started to show signs of significant and steady growth. By 2003, Japanese investment in the Russian Far East and Zabaikal regions had grown almost eight times from $103.61 million in 2000 to $820.8 million (in Bury 2004, 12.) In the same year, the overall trade volume reached $6 billion, an increase of 41.8% from the previous year (Hattori 2004, 41-42.) In the following year, it reached $8.8 billion dollars for the first time ever and was expected to reach $10 billion in 2005 (Lavrentiev 2005, 5.)

Also in 2004, reflecting the recovery of the Japanese economy and appreciation of the Japanese yen, Japanese cumulative investment in Russia totaled $1.9 billion and direct investment was at $1.35 billion, putting Japan in sixth place among the nations investing in Russia (Bury 2004, 12.) In the same year, Japan's imports from Russia almost doubled from 108 billion yen in 1998 to 204 billion yen (Japan Statistics Bureau database.) Russia's growing economic stability and the numerous legal reforms in the customs duty and tax administration, as well as the creation of legal mechanisms to protect foreign investment, are seen as the main factors in the growth of economic relations (Takagaki 2002, 8 and Ivanov 2005, 10.) To summarize, the business sector's conception of Russia's "normalcy" and business relations have been unrelated to the discourse on Russia's

national character and have focused solely on the nature of the investment environment and the expected profit to be made.

Specialists on both sides are optimistic about the future of the economic relationship. For example, one of the leading Japanese economic journals *Keizai Trend*, in its September 2004 issue, had a special focus on Japan-Russia economic relations and included a number of articles and interviews by Japanese executives and specialists on bilateral trade and investment issues. All of the contributors noted the favorable trend of deepening Japanese economic involvement in Russia and predicted further growth in Japanese investment.

Elsewhere, Anzai Kunio, The Head of the *Keidanren* Japan-Russia Economic Committee, in his discussion of the bilateral relationship, noted favorably the dynamism of Russia's transition to a market economy and that Russia is "moving forward" by swiftly adapting to the "conditions of globalization." He noted positively the almost doubling of Japan's investment in Russia since 2003, citing the lack of relevant laws and their implementation as the only impediment to investment. Anzai also emphasized the growing interest in Russia on behalf of the Japanese interest, noting that 80% of the firms questioned replied positively to the question whether they have interest in doing business with Russia. (Interview with Tokyo Foundation, 29.3.2005 http://www.tkfd.or.jp in Russian)

Alexander Lavrentiev, the Russian Trade Representative in Japan, provided a similarly optimistic evaluation of the bilateral economic relations. Like Anzai, he also emphasized the rapid growth of the bilateral trade in the last few years. Lavrentiev also predicted a further growth, mainly in the field of energy resources and Japan's direct investment in Russia, which has received a considerable boost after one of the world largest car manufacturers- Toyota Motor Corporation opened an assembly plant near Saint Petersburg (Lavrentiev 2005, 5-6.)

As of 2005, Japan-Russia economic relations and the volume of the bilateral trade are still very small compared to Russia's trade with Western Europe and Japan's trade with China or the US. However, in the context of this specific bilateral relationship, Japanese

economic involvement in Russia has grown and expanded significantly and is expected to continue to grow. Hence it can be argued that neither the identity construction of the Japanese "self" and the Russian "other", nor the lack of progress in the territorial dispute, influences the policies of the Japanese private business sector.

3.2 State Level Economic Relations

3.2.1 Japan's Aid to Russia

In terms of the state level economic policy it is hard to agree with Kimura's claims that the "psychological dissatisfaction" among the Japanese people with Russia influences the governmental decision making process. Kimura argued that this psychological factor accounts for governmental reluctance to use taxpayers' money to promote the trade between the two nations and to provide extensive economic aid (1999, 231-232.) In the last part of this chapter, the author argues that the "psychological dissatisfaction" is to a large extent created by the state from above. However, there are a number of important factors that challenge Kimura's claim.

It is true that Russia does not receive any economic aid through the Official Development Assistance (ODA) program and that Japan's humanitarian assistance to Russia mainly involves professional capacity building projects. The official reason for this has been along the lines of Kimura's argument and states a "lack of understanding" on behalf of the "people of Japan" for provision of large scale assistance to a country that does not have peace treaty with Japan (for example, Foreign Minister Watanabe at Foreign Affairs Commission, House of Representatives 26.2.1992.)

However, the non-existence of ODA aid can be also explained by a number of other factors. First, Russia unlike China, which until recently has been the largest recipient of ODA, is not only a permanent member of the UN Security Council but since the 1997 Denver Summit, has also become a full member of the G-8. In spite of the obviously strong political considerations behind Russia's inclusion in the elite club of the world's major industrial democracies, the provision of ODA to a member of the G-8 would put in question the very conception of the G-8 as an elite club of the world's leading developed

188

nations and problematize the whole notion of development assistance. Furthermore, it was pointed out that Japan's development assistance has been closely linked with Japan's business interests in the recipient nation (Hook et al 2005, 17.) In this context, the embryonic state of Japan's economic relations with Russia, particularly during the 1990s, when the Russian government was actively seeking economic assistance, could also account for the lack of large scale development assistance. At the same time, it should not be forgotten that since 1992 Japan has provided what has been called "humanitarian assistance" to the Russian residents of the disputed islands. In 2001, the accumulative amount of aid provided reached 8.8 billion yen (Honda 2002, 212.) Bearing in mind that the population of the islands is only around 14,000 people, this figure should not be easily dismissed and can be seen as further evidence for the close relationship between Japan's development assistance and Japan's broader national interests.

Furthermore, Japan also provided low interest loans aimed at accelerating Russia's economic reform, channeled though Japan's Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC), one of the main development assistance related institutions. As of 2000, the overall amount of loans has reached $1.175 billion (MoFA website.) Loans and investment insurance extended to Russia accounts for over 40% of JBIC overall activities in Europe (JBIC 2005, 18.) Japan has also been one of the main contributors to the IMF loans extended to Russia, committing $6 billion out of the overall $19.8 billion provided by the IMF between 1993 and 1999 (Yoshida in Ivanov and Smith eds 1999, 232.)

As already noted, since 1997, Japan has modified her general strategy of the "expanded equilibrium" policy in which the economic policy was tied to political progress on the territorial issue. The newly introduced "multilayered approach" meant a separation of economic assistance and governmental promotion of trade and investment in Russia from the progress on the territorial issue.

In recent years, in spite of the lack of considerable changes in perceptions and the continuous stalemate in the territorial dispute, a number of state-level bilateral agreements aimed at enhancing economic ties have been concluded. The institutional and legal framework for bilateral investment cooperation was established in 1998 during the

visit of the late PM Obuchi to Moscow and the signing of the Russo-Japanese Investment Protection Agreement. Further development was achieved by the signing of the Japan-Russia Action Plan during PM Koizumi's visit to Moscow in September 2003, in which further cooperation in trade and investment based on the principals of trust, action and mutual benefits was affirmed. Hence, the bilateral economic ties are getting deeper and proceeding independently from the territorial dispute, which has not experienced any significant progress.

3.2.2 The Energy Factor

The recent developments in Japan's energy policy vis-à-vis Russia also show that the identity lens does not play an important role in the conception of important economic interests and policies. The need to diversify the sources of oil has been present in the Japanese policy discourse since the oil shocks of the 1970s. However, during the 1980s and 1990s the low prices of crude oil have resulted in the demise of the importance of the energy issue in the policy agenda. The ongoing war in Iraq and the growing competition with China, India and other nations over energy resources have brought back the need to overcome Japan's dependence on Middle Eastern oil as one of the most important issues on the governmental agenda (Toichi Tsutomu, Head of the Institute of Energy Economics http://www.fpcj.jp/j/mres/briefingreport/bfr_203.html.) In the policy discourse regarding the diversification of suppliers of energy resources, Russia has been designated as the most important potential alternative supplier of oil and natural gas (for example, Togo and Kayama in Ivanov 2005a.) For example, the report on the future of energy market produced by Japan's Agency for Natural Resources and Energy emphasized the continuous growth of Japan's oil consumption and Japan's need to diversify her sources of supply (at present 87% of Japan's oil is imported from the Middle East.) The development of oil fields and related infrastructure in Russian Siberia are noted as the most important policy in the effort to diversify sources and to achieve stability in the energy market (Agency for Natural Resources 2004, 165 also METI Vice Minister Hosaka at House of Reps, Economy and Industry Com, 11.6.2004.)

The potential of Russia as an alternative to Middle East oil has been discussed continuously in the Diet commissions since 2002. On none of the occasions has the question of the Northern Territories, Russia as a potential threat, or anything else that can be related to perceptions or the construction of the "self" and the "other" appeared in the debates. The parliamentary debates regarding economic relations with Russia, especially over oil, gas and the construction of a pipeline that will deliver Russian oil to the Pacific Coast, have evolved purely around economic cost/benefit calculations. The only problem noted as a possible obstacle in the delivery of Russian oil is Russian bureaucratic procedures that unnecessarily prolong the implementation of projects (Kono Hirofumi, Head of Natural Resources and Energy Agency (House of Councilors, Economy and Industry Com, 18.07.2002.) There is no reference to the territorial dispute or anything that could be traced to the perceptions established by the identity discourse (for example, Kobayashi Yutaka MP and Tase Deputy-Director General for Policy Coordination of the METI Secretariat, House of Cons, Com on Intl Affairs 24.4.2002)

Furthermore, energy is becoming increasingly tied to the issue of national security (for example the *Defense White Paper* 2005). In this sense, Russia, which has been constructed as a persistent threat to Japan in the identity discourse, is perceived as a contributor to Japan's "energy security" (for example, Minister of Economy, Trade and Industry Hiranuma, at House of Reps, Com on Economy and Industry 30.5.2003 and Toichi Tsutomu at House of Reps, Com on Economy and Trade 2.7.2002.)

Recently, even in the parliamentary Commission on Okinawa and the Northern Territories, which has traditionally made appeals for the return of the territories, Russian oil is discussed as an issue in Japan's energy security that is unrelated to the territorial issue (for example, House of Reps, 30.11.2005 also similar approach by Hosoda Hiroyuki ex Minister of State for Okinawa and Northern Territories Affairs at House of Reps, Com on Economy and Trade 17.05.2002.)

In terms of the actual implementation of policy, as of 2005 Japan has been providing investment support for the Russian Sakhalin oil and gas projects (Sakhalin I and II.) The Japanese utility companies have proved their strong interest in the projects by committing

themselves to purchasing annually 3 million tons of LNG from Sakhalin II, expected to start producing in 2007 (Toichi 2004, 8.)

In December 2004, the Russian government officially announced its decision to build a pipeline that will deliver East Siberian oil to the Pacific coast, thus easing its transportation to Japan. During the talks between President Putin and Koizumi in Tokyo in November 2005, both leaders signed an agreement in which Japan has pledged to provide assistance for the construction of the pipeline. This is perceived as an important step in reducing Japan's dependency on Middle Eastern oil (Toichi 2004 and Kanekyo 2005.) The actual details regarding the size and nature of Japan's assistance are still to be worked out in the future, as the Japanese side still seems to be uncertain about the profitability of the project (*Asahi* 15.1.2005, 4.) However, the state-owned Japan Oil, Gas and Metals National Corporation (JOGMEC) has already established a task force to provide research and development support for the exploitation of Russian oil and gas and to upgrade the transport infrastructure (JOGMEC Business Report 2005.)

To summarize, in light of the acute need to diversify and secure new sources of oil, Japan is pursuing a policy of extensive and growing cooperation in the energy field with Russia. The decision making process is based on the strategic need to secure alternative sources of energy and economic profitability. In this context, the perceptions of threat from Russia, lack of trustworthiness and Russian irrationality constructed by the identity discourse do not play a visible role in the discourse and in shaping the actual policies.

4.The Threat from the North

This section examines the perceptions of Russia in the Japanese security establishment. In general, it can be argued that during the post-Cold War years the perception of Russia as a military threat diminished greatly as compared to the Cold War discourse on the Soviet Union. Russia and Japan did not become close allies and Japan's relations with Russia cannot be compared to the intimate security partnership of the US-Japan alliance. However, the open animosity of the Cold War years has disappeared and given way to a limited, but consistently growing, cooperation in the security area. It can be plausibly

argued that the security experts and relevant policy makers believe that, in the foreseeable future, the Russian Far Eastern military will not pose a threat (Nakano in Iwashita ed 2005, 43.) However, as the last part of this section argues, the residual long-term mistrust of Russia still exists in the security discourse. Its presence could be at least partially attributed to the identity discourse, in which Russia is constructed as an inherently jingoistic and irrational nation.

The change in perceptions of threat from Russia can be traced to a number of factors, besides obviously the most important one - the collapse of the Cold War structure. The changes in the international security environment (mainly the growth of threat perception from China and North Korea, the events of 9.11 and the war on terror), the Russian reduction of troops in the Far East and the continuously growing bilateral "defense dialogue" are probably the main factors that account for the change.

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to engage in a comprehensive analysis of all the changes in the international security environment. As stated on numerous occasions by scholars and Japanese policy makers, as well as in the Defense White Papers, the alliance with the US continues to be the main pillar of Japan's security policy. Obviously, the improvement in US relations with Russia (particularly since the launch of the "war on terror") has been an important factor in the demise of threat perception from Russia in the Japanese security discourse.

However, this section does not engage the broad and well known developments in the international system, but focuses on the immediate developments in the bilateral security relations and on the rise of new regional threats, namely China and North Korea. It argues that the threat from Russia has been less acute as the result of the emergence of what came to be perceived as more immediate threats. However, it also argues that the possibility of a long-term military threat from Russia still resides in the background of the discourse.

4.1 Troops Reduction and Military Dialogue

Since the end of the Cold War, the Russian military in the Far East has undergone significant reductions. The withdrawal of troops and weapons from the disputed islands

had already started during the last two years of the Soviet Union. By 1997 the Russian military presence on the islands had been cut to 3,500 troops (Valliant in Ivanov and Simth eds 1999, 159.) The Russian military build up in the Far Eastern mainland has also undergone significant reductions. As of 2001, the ground forces have been reduced by over 30%, the navy by half and the air force by 60% compared to 1992 (Kan 2001.) The Russian reduction of troops has been continuously mentioned in the security discourse as a sign of positive change in the Russian military posture (for example, *Defense White Paper 2004.*)

Over the period of 2005 to 2009, as part of the new defense doctrine introduced in the *National Defense Program Guidelines for Financial Year 2005 and After* and the *Mid-Term Defense Program,* Japanese troops in the Northern Military District are scheduled to be reduced as well. In general, the new defense doctrine emphasizes the low probability of a direct invasion of Japan and stresses the emergence of new acute threats to Japan's security, namely terror, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the stationing of ballistic missiles in the region. In geographical terms, the defense priorities have been shifted from "defending the North" to remote (and rich in natural resources) islands in Southwestern Japan, where the interests of Japan and China clash. The reduction of troops facing Russia is to include a one third reduction of tanks and artillery and reduction of the 11th brigade (7200 troops) stationed on Hokkaido to the size of a brigade (2 to 4 thousand troops) (*Asahi Shimbun* 11.12.2004, 4.) After this reshuffle of troops, the actual Japanese military posture is going to correspond to the security discourse, which does not perceive Russia as an imminent threat.

While the reduction of the Japanese military is only about to be implemented, the "defense dialogue" between the two militaries had already started to develop in the 1990s.It gained momentum in 1997 after the Tokyo visit of Russian Defense Minister Rodionov and the Krasnoyarsk summit between PM Hashimoto and President Yeltsin. The "defense dialogue" was institutionalized in a memorandum signed by Russian Defense Minister Sergeyev and Head of Defense Agency Norota during the latter's visit

to Moscow in 1999. It was re-affirmed in the Action Plan signed by PM Koizumi and President Putin in 2003.

Between 1996 and 1998, there were two visits by the Head of Japan's Defense Agency (equivalent to Minister of Defense) and one by the Chief of Staff to Russia. Furthermore, in 1996, Japanese navy (MSDF) vessels participated in a tri-centennial celebration of the birth of the Russian navy and the visit was reciprocated by the visit of a Russian destroyer to Japan the following year. The two navies have also conducted two joint exercises. This exercise was very symbolic, being the first time that the Japanese navy has conducted exercises with a foreign navy besides the US (Izuyama 2001, 17.)

Since 1998, the exchange of visits has steadily continued. It has included visits by the Russian Chief of General Staff, commander of the Russian Pacific fleet, and reciprocal visits of Head of Defense Agency, Chairman of the Joint Staff council, goodwill visits by Russian and Japanese naval vessels, participation in bilateral search and rescue exercises, and defense research exchanges (*East Asian Strategic Review2000,* NIDS 2000, 254-255.)

In Japan's security community, these developments have been interpreted as positive and important steps in the normalization of bilateral relations (for example, Ogawa et al 1999, 30-35 also Head of Defense Agency Kawara at House of Reps, National Defense Com, 13.4.2000.) Furthermore, since 2003, mutual visits between military personnel from Ground SDF of the Northern Military District, which is the one that is facing Russia and "traditionally" the most suspicious of Russia[6] and Russian Far Eastern Military District officers have been implemented. In 2004, an unprecedented visit of the Head of the Northern Military District to the Russian Far East and a meeting with his counterpart has taken place (*Defense White Paper* 2005.) As such, the dialogue between the two militaries has continued to progress steadily from symbolic visits by top officials and navy vessels to reach the level of commanders of the military units that would be immediate enemies in the case of any military clash. In light of these developments it can

---

[6] This was pointed out in conversations with National Defense Academy staff conducted in July 2005 and NIDS researcher, conducted in February 2006.

be argued that mutual trust between Japan and Russia in terms of military relations has reached a historical high, especially compared to the animosity of the Cold War years.

4.2 New Threats and the Demise of the Threat Perception from Russia

The change in the Japanese threat perception was gradual and developed rather slowly, compared for example with the US approach to Russia. The American military conducted joint military exercises with the former enemy as early as 1994.

In the early 1990s Japan's security community continued to view Russia with strong suspicion in spite of the significant changes that had taken place with the fall of the Soviet Union and, since 1992, in Russia. For example, in 1991, the annual *Defense of Japan White Paper* published by the Defense Agency argued that the (then, still Soviet) reduction of the military build up in the Far East is nothing but a strategic maneuver, which actually meant the reorganization, modernization and rationalization of the military. The overview of the Soviet forces emphasized that the military force deployed in the Far East is more than is necessary for defense, implying aggressive plans on behalf of the USSR. The section on the Soviet Union positively evaluated the various domestic and international factors that suggested it would be difficult for Russia to engage in an act of aggression. However, it also noted that the military situation surrounding Japan remained unchanged as the Soviet ground, naval and air forces in the Far East had actually been reinforced and modernized and were highly active in the area (Defense Agency 1991, 44-46.) It must be remembered that this was written when the Soviet Union was undergoing a severe domestic economic and political crisis and was on the verge of collapse.

A similar report written in 1992, immediately after the collapse of the Soviet Union, also showed uncertainty about the Russian defense policy and the future of her army, emphasizing both her military capability and the fluidity of the domestic political environment after the collapse of the Soviet Union (Defense Agency 1992, 16-21.) The report also emphasized the difference between Europe and the Far East, namely the might and the quality of the Soviet military buildup in the Far Eastern region that exceeded purely defensive capabilities. It concluded by stating the need to "follow closely the

196

developments" in Russian politics and the military build up (Ibid, 50-61.) Hence, it can be argued that the Japanese security establishment continued to view Russia with strong suspicion in spite of the significant changes the country was undergoing.

In general, the position of the security establishment in the first years after the collapse of the Soviet Union was quite ambiguous as it continuously referred to the potential danger, but also noticed the positive changes in Russia's military posture. This ambiguity can be demonstrated in a statement made to the Diet Inquiry Commission on International Issues (17.12.1992) by the Defense Advisor Nishihiro Seiki. In his evaluation of the Russian military posture, he noted that due to domestic chaos, the possibility of Russia engaging in an act of military aggression in Europe is minimal. At the same time he was critical of the American and Western European optimism. He noted that in spite of all the foreign aid, Russia was not going to change over night. In a more blunt fashion, Miyahara Asahiko, the Parliamentary Vice Minister of Defense, noted that it is "impossible" for the threat from Russia to decrease drastically, mainly because of her being a successor of the Soviet Union and her policies (House of Reps, National Security Com, 14.04.1992.) Nevertheless, the emergence of new threats, combined with the above mentioned reductions in the Russian Far Eastern military and confidence building measures (CBMs) did result in a gradual demise of the threat perception.

4.2.1 North Korea, China and the War on Terror

Since the end of the Cold War, Russia has been gradually replaced by North Korea and China on Japan's security agenda. In the *National Defense Program Guidelines for Financial Year 2005 and After* published in December 2004, both North Korea and China were officially pointed out as a "threat" to Japan's security. This was the culmination of a process that had started a decade earlier. What has become known as the "North Korean nuclear crisis" started in 1993 with North Korea's withdrawal from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in response to IAEA demands for special inspections of suspected nuclear sites. North Korea's nuclear program came to be perceived as a "great threat" to Japan's security by the political elites (Hughes 1999, 88-89.) Japan's threat perception has been further aggravated by North Korea's 1998 test fire of a ballistic

missile, which passed through Japanese air space, the lack of considerable progress in North Korea's negotiations with the US, and a number of ambiguous declarations coming from Pyongyang regarding possession of nuclear weapons.

Several other incidents have firmly placed North Korea on the top of Japan's security agenda. These include a number of intrusions by North Korean suspected spy ships into Japan's territorial waters (one of the ships was sunk by Japan Coast Guard in December 2001) and Kim Jong Il's admission of kidnapping a number of Japanese civilians by the North Korean special forces during PM Koizumi's visit to Pyongyang in September 2002.

In 2003, the Six Party Talks that include US, Russia, China, Japan and the two Koreas were established as a new framework for resolving the nuclear impasse. The last round of talks conducted in Beijing in September 2005, resulted in North Korea's promise to give up its nuclear ambitions in return for energy assistance and diplomatic normalization. However, as of January 2006, interpretation of the agreement remains purely theoretical. The threat from North Korea thus remains high on Japan's security agenda.

The "China threat" gradually emerged (or reemerged) in the early 1990s, as Japan's China watchers became increasingly concerned about the steep rises in military expenditure that accompanied China's rapid economic growth, combined with a lack of Chinese transparency. The emerging threat perception was further aggravated by Chinese nuclear tests conducted between 1994 and 1996 in spite of pleas from Japan and the large scale military exercises China conducted in the Taiwan Strait on the eve of Taiwan's presidential elections in 1996 (Drifte 2003, 43-48.) The growing rivalry between Japan and China over leadership in Asia, historically related issues and the territorial dispute in the East China Sea have deepened the conflict (for example, Curtin 2005.) In spite of growing economic ties, as of 2005, the state of political bilateral relations is at its worse since the normalization of bilateral relations in 1972.

Besides the emergence of these two (real or perceived) threats, the events of September 11th 2001 and the following developments in the international arena have placed Japan firmly within the 'coalition of the willing' in the War on Terror. The Koizumi cabinet initiated and adopted a number of laws that opened the door for Japan's

SDF participation in the wars in Afghanistan and in Iraq. In spite of no history of foreign terrorist attacks on Japanese soil, the growing perception of a terrorist threat is reflected in the new Defense Guidelines and also in public opinion polls. According to a public opinion survey conducted by MoFA in 2002, 51.8% of those questioned chose "terror" as the biggest threat to Japan (in Nishioka 2004, 51.) As the result of the emergence of these new acute security threats over the years, the perception of a threat from Russia has become less acute in security discourse. The following section traces the gradual change in the importance of Russia in the security discourse. However, it will also argue that although the perception of Russia as a threat has become less acute, in the long term mistrust is still a theme within the discourse.

4.2.2 Changes in the Perceptions of " Russian Threat"

Until 1994, the Soviet buildup in the Far East was made a top priority on the first page of the analysis section of the annual Defense White Papers. Since then, the first page has been allocated to the "military developments on the Korean Peninsula", reflecting the above stated change in threat perceptions (Nakano in Iwashita ed 2005, 42-43.)

However, until 1996, while the "Russian threat" had lost its centrality it was still vividly present in the security discourse. Russian military might combined with domestic political uncertainty was often stated to be a continuous factor for instability in the Asia-Pacific region (for example, Minister of Defense Usui, at House of Reps, National Security Com 23.2.1996.) In spite of the various changes in Russia and in the international environment, the need to continuously watch her the development of her future policies was often pointed out in security related debates. Russia's strong military, strong nationalism and lack of predictability about the future political course were seen as the main factors behind the need to continue Russia watching (for example, MP Machimura at House of Councilors, Sub-committee on Asia Pacific, Com on Foreign Relations 10.4.1996.)

However, since 1996, the discourse changed significantly. In this year the Taiwan straits crisis occurred and the focus of the security discourse was shifted to China. Also, in this year the Russian Defense Minister Rodionov paid a historical visit to Tokyo and

established the beginning of the "security dialogue" between the two militaries. As a result, Russia's defense policies came to be favorably compared to those of China. A month after the crisis, Russia (and other Eastern European nations) were praised for their security cooperation with the West, as opposed to China (Akiyama Head of Defense Bureau at House of Councilors, Sub-committee on Asia Pacific, Com on Foreign Relations 10.4.1996.)

From 1996 onwards, Russia has been discussed mainly in the context of China and North Korea. This is in terms of Russian arms sales to China and the possibility of a military alliance between the two nations in case of the former, and the suspicion of Russian scientists involved in North Korea's nuclear program in the latter case (for example, Yamazaki Councilor of Defense Agency at House of Councilors, Cabinet Com 24.04.1997 and House of Reps, Defense Com meetings in 1999, also Mie 1998, 76-77.) The suspicious view of Russia's military cooperation with China is still reflected in the security discourse and the "Russia-China security alliance" is perceived as contributing to the tensions in the region (Kaneko et al 2003, 64.) However, Russia as a threat per se, has almost disappeared from the security related parliamentary debates and from defense related analytical reports. Defense analysts affiliated with the Defense Agency have described it as the "fading away" of the "threat from the North." (Kawakami 1998, 43.)

It must be noted that the Northern Territories problem is continuously portrayed as one of the sources of tension in the region, but its importance has diminished greatly in comparison to the situation on the Korean peninsula and China-Taiwan relations. The territorial issue is not seen as a cause of a possible military confrontation, but more as a problem of mistrust between Japan and Russia (Ogawa et al 1999, 10-11.) Also, the annually published *Defense of Japan White Paper* has continued to refer to a lack of transparency in Russian politics, the economic situation and the lack of clarity regarding the future of Russian military reform. However, it seems that the real concern of the defense community is not immediate developments in Russia but possible future changes in the Russian military posture.

After Yeltsin's resignation, defense analysts have expressed their worries about the

generally unpredictable nature of Russian policy, especially with a change of President and the recovery of her political and economic strength (Ogawa et al 1999, 35.) The long-term possibility of military confrontation with Russia still resides in the background of the security discourse and occasionally makes an appearance in debates and publications. It has often been pointed out that when the Russian economy recovers it will once again become a "great power", just like China (for example, Prof Soiya Yoshihide in front of House of Councilors, Com on International Affairs 7.3.2001.)

In 2002, Moriya Takemasa, Head of the Defense Bureau, Defense Agency, in his evaluation of the Russian military posture, emphasized that the Russian army still maintains a large buildup in the Far East, including a nuclear capability. He positively noted the significant military reduction compared to the Cold War Years and pointed out that the probability of the Russian military returning to the size and posture of the Soviet Army during the Cold War years is low. At the same time, Moriya noted that the Defense Agency has a "great interest" in the developments related to the Russian military in the Far East. This interest was attributed mainly to Russian cooperation with China combined with the lack of clarity regarding the domestic political and economic situations (House of Councilors, Com on Okinawa and NTs 18.03.2002.) Furthermore, one of the recently published National Institute for Defense Studies (NIDS affiliated with Defense Agency) analytical papers, that provide possible scenarios for the long term changes in Russian military stance in the Far East, even mentions the possibility of a Russian confrontation with the U.S in the Far East (and by implication also with Japan) resulting from a clash of interests in the region (Mii 2003.)

To summarize, the threat perception from Russia has been significantly weakened over the years. The emergence of more acute security threats and the growing defense dialogue with Russia has resulted in her almost disappearing from the security discourse. However, the long-term mistrust of Russia and anxiety regarding her future policies still resides in the background of the security discourse. This could be at least partially attributed to the untrustworthy image of Russia constructed within the identity discourse.

5. The Northern Territories

The territorial dispute over the four islands has continued to be the main stumbling block in the final normalization of bilateral relations and the central issue in the political agenda of Japan's relations with Russia. This section examines the conception of the problem by the Japanese foreign policy establishment and some of the policy initiatives directly related to the territorial issue. It argues that the problem and its related polices has been conceived through the cognitive lens of the identity discourse and, simultaneously aimed at preserving the national identity construction.

5.1 "Inherent Territory"

Since the end of the Cold War, there have been a number of plans proposed by the Japanese government as the possible solution to the territorial issue. The Japanese position has changed from the Cold War era "return of all the four islands at once" (*yon to ikkatsu henkan*) demand to less harsh wordings of the official position. However, in spite of variations in wording and approaches, not once has the Japanese side considered the possibility of a compromise on the return of all four islands.

The Japanese media recently revealed that as early as 1992 the Russian side came up with a secret proposal for the solution of the territorial dispute. The proposal was conveyed by the Russian Foreign Minister Kozyrev during his visit to Tokyo and included a proposition to conclude a peace treaty for the transfer of the islands of Habomai and Shikotan to Japan (as envisaged in the 1956 Declaration). It also included plans for continued negotiations regarding the remaining two islands of Kunashiri and Etorofu. This proposal constituted not only a radical departure from the Soviet position of "no existence of the territorial issue", but also a concrete plan for the solution of the dispute and complete normalization of bilateral relations. Furthermore, during this period, the US administration pushed Japan towards finding a solution for the territorial dispute as part of the broader policy of Russia's integration into the world economy. However, in spite of the favorable change in the Russian position and the American pressure, the

202

Japanese side declined this proposal, persistently insisting on Russian *a priori* recognition of the Japanese sovereignty over the other two islands (*Asahi* 21.5.2002,4 and 29.05.2002,4.)

Since 1993, a number of general concepts were introduced in bilateral agreements and in unilateral declarations that were supposed to guide the solution of the territorial problem. In the Tokyo Declaration, which since its conclusion in 1993 by Russian President Yeltsin and Japan's Prime-Minister Hosokawa has been perceived in Japan as the basis for the resolution of the territorial dispute and the conclusion of peace treaty, the two sides have agreed to work towards the resolution of the dispute regarding sovereignty over the four islands, based on historical and legal facts, bilateral agreements and the principles of law and justice. In 1997, PM Hashimoto introduced the policy of "expanded equilibrium" and the three principles of trust, mutual benefit and long term perspective to guide Japan's policy vis-à-vis Russia. He also proposed to aim for a solution of the territorial issue, which was not based on the winner/loser dichotomy. During the Kawana summit with Yeltsin in 1998, he proposed to approach the territorial dispute as a "border demarcation" issue.

In 2001, during the Irkutsk summit between PM Mori and President Putin, the Japanese position changed to a "two islands first" (never meaning giving up the other two) scenario promoted by the Suzuki trio. However, after the explosion of the "Suzuki affair" during which the "two island first" solution was portrayed as undermining the national interest, the Japanese foreign policy vis-à-vis Russia entered the period of hibernation and the position returned to the Cold War era simple demand of "return of the four islands" (Iwashita 2005a, 10-14.)

However, notwithstanding this variety of new concepts and plans, the demand for Russian acceptance of Japanese sovereignty over *all* of the four islands has never been dropped (*Asahi* 22.5.2002, 4 also Sato 2005a, 65.) In other words, the conception of the notions of law, justice and mutual trust by the Japanese policy makers never envisaged a possibility of compromise and understanding of the Russian position and Russian national sentiment. Hence it can be argued that the territorial dispute along with the guiding

concepts was conceived through the cognitive lens provided by the hierarchical construction of the national identity discourse, in which Japan represents the universal values and the inferior Russia is located outside of the realm of universal normalcy.

Before proceeding further, it is important to note that the author is not trying to attribute the lack of progress in the solution of the territorial dispute solely to the Japanese side. No doubt the Russian side has not shown a tremendous amount of flexibility and eagerness to find a solution either. However, compared to the Cold War years, the Russian position has changed drastically from the total denial of the existence of the territorial issue to an implicit agreement to return two of the islands as envisaged by the Joint Declaration of 1956. At the same time, the Japanese position has changed only from "all together return" (*ikkatsu henkan*) to acceptance of the possibility of gradual return of all the four islands. As Iwashita Akihiro of Hokkaido University convincingly argues in his recent book on the Northern Territories problem (2005a), compromise is possible when the two sides approach each other as equals and depart from the self-centered position. As an example, Iwashita cites the successful "fifty- fifty" solution of the border issues between Russia and China, whose relations were also dominated by three decades of mutual suspicion and hostility.

One could argue that vital economic or strategic interests account for the Japanese lack of willingness to compromise. However, there is little evidence to support this argument. Cutting across the political spectrum in Japan, the return of the islands is portrayed as a national mission and hence there is no public debate regarding the strategic or economic benefits to be achieved as the result of restoring Japan's sovereignty over the territory. As one of the leading activists stated, "we aspire for the return of the islands because we are Japanese. We do not expect to gain any material benefits from it" (interview with Fukiura Tadamasa, General Director of Tokyo Foundation 14.12.2005.) The lack of considerable economic benefits to be gained from the return of the islands was also confirmed by one of the leading Japanese academic experts on Russia, who criticized Japan's rigidity and noted that it is cheaper for Japanese business to buy the marine products (that originate

from the sea surrounding the islands) from Russia than to engage in fishing and collection of seaweed by themselves (interview with Professor Ueno Toshihiko 27.06.2003.)

As for strategic benefits, it is hard to imagine (or to assume that anybody in the Japanese policy making community believes) that Russia will ever agree to any kind of settlement that will allow for the stationing of Japanese troops or military related equipment on the islands if they are ever transferred to Japanese jurisdiction. Furthermore, as the "China threat" perception continues to grow within Japan's defense and political establishment, it can be argued that Japan can gain important strategic benefits from complete normalization of relations with Russia through a territorial compromise.

One could also argue that domestic public opinion and pressure groups do not allow a compromise on the notion of "inherent territory." However, the below section will show that this is not the case and that the "national" quest for the return of the islands is mostly created by political elites and that this national quest also serves the purpose of sustaining the national identity construct.

5.2 The "National Mission"

As already mentioned in previous chapters, internationally, the Northern Territories problem was to a large extent a product of the Cold War bipolar rivalry. However, the grass-root movement for the return of the islands existed from the first days of the Soviet occupation under the leadership of the mayor of Nemuro[7], Ando Ishisuke.

Between 1945 and 1947, Ando organized a small group of activists and wrote a number of petitions addressed to General MacArthur, calling his attention to the cruelties of the Soviet occupation, emphasizing that all of the occupied islands are "inherent Japanese territory", and requesting to place the islands under American occupation (Hopporyodo mondai taisaku kyokai 1998, 42-47.) In 1950, what is known today as the Alliance for Realization of the Return of the Northern Territories (Northern Territories

---

[7] Nemuro is a small fishermen port town (today's population of 40,000) in the Northeastern part of Hokkaido. Before the Soviet occupation, Habomai archipelago belonged to the Nemuro administrative district. Many of the Japanese residents of the islands settled in Nemuro after escaping from the Soviet occupation in 1945 and after the forced deportation 1947-1949.

205

Alliance, or *hoppo domei* in Japanese, was established in Nemuro with the purpose of spreading its activities to the rest of Hokkaido.

A few years later, in 1955, the Alliance of Residents of Chishima and Habomai Archipelago (Chishima Alliance or *chishima renmei* in Japanese) was established. Comprised mainly of former residents of the islands, the main purpose of this organization was to foster the return of the territory and to provide assistance to fellow former residents, most of whom were forced to leave all their assets behind when they were deported from the islands. As such, the actual grass root activities have always been located mainly on Hokkaido and have never expanded to a nation-wide movement. The Association for Countermeasures Related to the Northern Territories Problem (*hoppotaikyo*), established in 1969, is the only organization which actively engages in nation-wide activities, the most important of which is mobilization of the public opinion through "enlightenment activities" (Nakamura 2000, 95-96.) However, this organization is affiliated with and financed by the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications and can hardly be considered to be a grass-root organization.

At present, the actual activities conducted by the former residents have a very low profile. Furthermore, the lobbying activities focus more on expanding Japanese governmental support to the former·residents and less on fostering the return of the islands. A number of reasons account for the demise of the grass-root movement and for the limited scope of its activities. The number of first generation residents of the four islands has decreased from 17,000 at the end of the war to 8600 in 2002 (*Asahi* 24.5.2002, 29.) Many of the former residents have given up the hope (or the wish) to return to the islands and their main goal has become a visit to their ancestors' graves. Furthermore, a large number of members of the second generation do not show much interest in the activities and the mission as they have their lives established on the "mainland" (Nakamura 2000, 96-97.)

Personal visits by the author to the grass-root organizations on Hokkaido and interviews with activists conducted in July and August 2003, have confirmed the suspicion that the number of activists and their activities are on demise. As Professor Arai

Nobuo of Hokkaido University, who has worked closely with the grass-root organizations, has noted, the movement is sustained from above and without extensive support from the state it faces extinction (interview 2.7.2003.) Most of the interviewed activists from the Alliances (former residents of the islands who were expelled by the Soviet troops) expressed their worries that the young generation is not interested in the issue and that the movement might die with them. Even those members of the second generation who do engage in activism, have established their life on Hokkaido and do not have concrete plans to move to the islands, even if Japan regains her sovereignty over them. Furthermore, the activists were also worried about the "reverse effect" of the "no-visa" visits (discussed below.) Instead of raising the patriotic consciousness among the young generation, many seem to feel affection towards their Russian hosts and loose whatever patriotic zeal they had before conducting the visits to the islands (interviews conducted in Sapporo and Nemuro, 2.7-7.7.2003 also similar argument in Nakamura 2000, 98-99.)

It seems that even the residents of Nemuro, the center of the return movement, show more interest in improving their economic situation (mainly through trade with Russia) than in pursuing the national mission. The reelection of Suzuki Muneo to the Diet in September 2005 serves as the best proof for the lack of NTs related nationalist sentiment among the Nemuro electorate. Suzuki was portrayed as the "traitor" in the media and even reported to have once said that Japan does not need the islands[8]. At the same time, as one of the key figures in Japan's policy vis-à-vis Russia, he has brought considerable economic benefits to his constituency. He played a central role in promoting and securing a local level fishery agreement in 1998, between Nemuro and Russian Sakhalin district that opened the way for legal fishing by the Japanese boats in the waters around the disputed islands (Honda 2002, 216.)

At the national level there is not much interest in the territorial issue. It is true that over the years the "return movement" has managed to collect 7 million individual signatures across the nation, demanding the return of the islands. However, the actual activities and

---

[8] A number of publications have pointed out that this statement was taken out of context and purposefully leaked to the media by Suzuki's enemies in MoFA (for example, Honda 2002.)

people's participation did not go much beyond this (Nakamura 2000, 101-102.) Consistent with the political establishment's need to show popular support for the return of the islands, the majority of the Japanese people have consistently chosen the "return of four islands" option in the various governmental polls. However, the formulation of the question and the possible answers do not explain the positive and negative consequences for any of the choices and hence the return of the four islands is presented as the most beneficial option for Japan.

In public opinion polls related to respondents' feelings towards various nations, the popularity of Russia continues to be quite low (around 15% compared to 75.4% for US and 45.6 % for China.) However, this could be attributed not only to a strong anti-Russian sentiment among the general population, but more to lack of knowledge and interest. The scholars that examine Japanese public opinion polls rarely note that the number of respondents that have expressed "positive feelings" towards the Middle Eastern nations or ex-Soviet republics, has been even lower than for Russia (12.4% and 10.3% respectively in Strelzov 2004, 77.) These nations do not have any disputes with Japan but are not widely known among the general population and are not popular travel destinations. Hence it can be argued that the lack of knowledge and interest seems to play an important role in the low popularity of a certain nation or region. In general, it seems that public opinion has been continuously negative, but also indifferent and passive towards Russia and the territorial dispute.

Because of the increasingly low interest among the Japanese "people" in the islands and the growing indifference, there has been a sense of an acute need to create the "people" on behalf of the government. Already in 1992, Minister of Internal Affairs, Iwasaki Junzo, admitted the need to mobilize and to build up the "popular movement" that demands the return of islands. "Enlightening activities" on state and local levels have been continuously perceived as the most efficient tool to achieve this target (At Cabinet Com 03.09.1992 also at House of Reps, Com on Okinawa and NTs 16.04.1992.) The need to increase the interest in NTs among the Japanese people has been an integral part of the governmental discourse and has been expressed by other successive Ministers of Interior

(for example, Yamaguchi Tsuruo at House of Councilors, Com on Okinawa and NTs 10.3.1995 and Muto Kabun at House of Representatives, Com on Okinawa and NTs 19.2.1998.) However, the enlightenment activities are not directed only towards the Japanese people, but also towards the Russian population, mainly the residents of the disputed islands. In a rather symbolic fashion, Minister of Interior Iwasaki, noted in the above mentioned statement regarding the need to enlighten the domestic population combined with the need to enlighten the Russians with the "real knowledge" regarding the history and circumstances of the NTs problem. Hence, the Japanese government is simultaneously engaged in the creation of the "people" that demand the return of the islands and in spread of the "truthful knowledge" among the Russian residents. In terms of actual policy, this hierarchical construction of the Japanese "self" and the Russian "other" is most visible in the conception of the role of the "no visa" visits.

5.3 "No Visa" Visits

The 'No Visa' program, initially proposed by the Soviet President Gorbachev during his visit to Tokyo, provides for organized exchanges of visits between Japan and the NTs without the need to obtain an entrance visa[9]. From the Japanese side the individuals that can participate in the program include the former residents of the islands and their relatives, members of the media, activists in the "return movement", other related professionals and members of the Diet. From the Russian side, the program provides an opportunity to the current residents of the islands to visit their counterparts in Japan. According to the MoFA website, as of November 2005, over 6,500 Japanese citizens and 65 Members of Diet have visited the islands and over 5,300 Russian residents have visited Japan.

The official purpose of the "no visa" visits was to enhance dialogue, mutual trust and understanding between the Russian residents of the islands and the Japanese people, and,

---

[9] In case of Russian residents the visa waiver simply simplifies the procedures of travel. However, in case of Japanese nationals the visa waiver plays an important role as Japan does not recognize Russian sovereignty over the islands and officially prohibits visits to NTs as the act of obtaining a visa can serve as an implicit recognition of Russian sovereignty.

through this, to foster the solution of the territorial dispute (http://www.vizanashi.net/index01.htm.) However, as can be seen from the parliamentary discussions, the "dialogue" and "mutual understanding" actually amounts to a monologue advocating the enlightenment of the Russian residents and their conversion to the Japanese understanding of history and truth. The main theme that dominates the parliamentary discourse on the program is the need to correct the misperceptions and the insecurities of the Russian residents of the disputed islands, and to bring the return of the "inherent territory" one step closer (Nomura, Head of Eurasia Bureau MoFA at House of Councilors, Com on Okinawa and NTs 02.06.1993.)

The theme of "mutual understanding" often appears in the discourse, but it is explained mainly in terms of "mistrust and misunderstandings" on behalf of the Russian residents of the islands (for example Nakanishi MP, at House of Councilors, Com on Okinawa and NTs 7.5.1996.) This interpretation of the purposes of the program is also shared by local level organizers. As one of the Japanese delegation leaders noted, the cultural exchange envisaged in the program is important. However, the main purpose of the visit is to enhance understanding regarding the return of the islands among the Russian residents (www.vizanashi.net/sub3/kisyakaken.) In this conception of the problem, Japan is perceived as not only pursuing its national interest but also as representing the benefits and prosperity of the "free world", which the Russians are expected to admire and learn from (for example, Arai Satoshi MP from Hokkaido, House of Reps, Com on Okinawa and NTs 27.03.1995)

MP Sasano, who participated in the visit to the islands, has provided the most vivid illustration of the hierarchical construction of Japan and Russia. She has noted that the visit has made her realize the gap between Japan and Russia, not only in material terms, but also in culture and science. Hence, she stated clearly, it is much more important and meaningful for Russians to understand what Japan stands for, than for Japanese to understand Russia (Sasano MP at House of Councilors, Com on Okinawa and NTs, 6.4.1998.)

Recently, Sato Masaru, the member of the Suzuki trio, has provided a theoretical explanation for this hierarchical construction and for the convergence of the national with the universal. He has argued that the "national interest" should be perceived as a medium for realizing "universal values" such as humanity, peace and love. As such, Sato argues, Japan's rigid position vis-à-vis Russia of the national mission for recovery of the islands is nothing less than a pursuit of universal values (Sato 2005, 80-83.) Obviously, the Russian national interests are located outside of the universal values and are located in an inferior realm.

To summarize, the conception of the territorial dispute and related policies has been closely related to Japan's national identity construction vis-à-vis Russia. It corresponds perfectly to Campbell's definition of foreign policy as a "specific sort of boundary-producing political performance" (1992, 69) which, in this case, is performed by the Japanese elites both domestically and internationally. The unwillingness to compromise on the return of the islands on one side and the introduction of principles such as history, truth, law and justice on the other, excludes Russia from the realm of the universal represented by such principles and sustains the hierarchical national identity construction of a superior Japan and an inferior Russia.

6. Conclusion

This chapter has examined the Japanese policy discourse and related polices in the context of Japan's relations with post-communist Russia. Its main focus has been to explore the relationship between national identity construction and the making and implementation of policy, rather than to provide a detailed analysis of the policies in these areas. The conclusions to be drawn will be outlined in the following chapter. However, it must be mentioned that most of the arguments regarding Japan's policy vis-à-vis Russia presented in this chapter are well known and compatible with the mainstream arguments on the state of bilateral relations. Japan's economic relations with Russia are growing and expanding swiftly as both economies have emerged from years of recession. Japan's interest in Russian oil and gas are also well known and related articles often appear in the

Japanese press. Japan's insistence on the return of all of the four islands as well as the need to correct Russian misunderstandings and misconceptions regarding the past, present and the future of the bilateral relations can be confirmed by any MoFA bureaucrat and can be found in the relevant official publications.

The only argument that could probably be contested is the claim that the military threat from Russia still resides in the background of the security related discourse. The author has found it rather difficult to come up with solid evidence to support this claim. However, informal conversations with SDF members and Japanese academics with close ties to the defense establishment have confirmed the assumption that mistrust of Russia and her future policies is still present among the members of the defense community. It is hard to believe that this sentiment will disappear in the near future, as it seems to be deeply ingrained in the various parts of the defense establishment. As an illustration it can be added that one of the interviewed analysts mentioned that a popular marching songs of Defense Academy cadets during their training glorifies the heroic killing of a few hundred Russian soldiers.

Conclusion

The analysis conducted in this thesis is located within two sub-fields of Japan related IR scholarship, namely the inquiry into Japan's national identity and the study of Japan's relations with Russia. By bringing analytical tools provided by Japan related critical scholarship, this thesis aims to provide a new perspective both on Japan's identity construction and Japan's relations with Russia.

This thesis argues that the existing IR scholarship related to Japan's national identity is characterized by two important constraints. First, it is constrained by the search for general and monolithic cultural (or normative) structures. Second, it is constrained by the need to establish a causal relationship between identity and foreign policy on the other. This results in an essentialization and simplification of both identity and foreign policy. At the same time, in the scholarship that focuses on Japan's relations with Russia, Japanese perceptions of Russia are often considered to be an important factor in the bilateral relations, but in general are treated as a historical given. So far, the nature of these perceptions and their sources, as well as their relationship with Japan's foreign policy vis-à-vis Russia have not been thoroughly examined from the perspective of Japan's national identity discourse.

The analytical framework adopted in this thesis has two main differences from the existing IR scholarship on Japanese identity, the shortcomings of which were outlined in Chapter I. Firstly, the focus is shifted from the search for general norms and cultural structures to one particular socio-cultural identity discourse in which the Japanese national "self" is constructed vis-à-vis the Russian "other." By using the analytical tools found in critical scholarship on *nihonjinron* and the works of Stefan Tanaka and Oguma Eiji, this thesis examines the way "Russia" was utilized in the construction of Japan's identity. Special attention was paid to depictions of the Russian national character, Russian history and the history of Japan's relations with Russia. This thesis argues that Japanese perceptions of Russia should not be reduced to the historical experience of dealing with Russia and to the traditional fear of Russia, which is often noted by

213

academics and experts on bilateral relations. It argues that "Russia" has been used in the domestic discourse in order to construct Japan's belonging to the realm of universal civilization and, at the same time, to construct her unique superiority, not only vis-à-vis Russia, but also vis-à-vis the "West." This thesis also argues that, the construction of national identity has proceeded through appeal to the "scientific", the "rational" and the "universal" and not based on irrational emotions, as often argued by scholars of nationalism.

The last part of this thesis examined the functions of the national identity construction in Russia related foreign policy discourse in the post-Cold War years. So far, the constructivist scholarship has focused on Japan's security agenda in an attempt to establish a causal relationship between national identity and defense related policies. This preoccupation with security is not limited to constructivist scholars. David Campbell's post-structuralist work on foreign policy as a political practice of boundary creation between the "self" and the "other" is also devoted to (American) security discourse and pays special attention to the functions of notions such "danger" and "threat" in creation of boundaries.

This thesis argues that the creation of boundaries through practices of "othering" is not limited to security discourse. It has focused on a broader foreign policy discourse in the search for its relationship with national identity. In the last chapter, Japan's foreign policy vis-à-vis post-communist Russia was examined along three dimensions: economic, military and the "Northern Territories" territorial dispute. The analytical framework employed in this thesis has avoided pre-theorization regarding the nature of the relationship between identity and foreign policy. This was done with the purpose of avoiding the need to provide empirical findings that will either confirm or contradict the pre-established theoretical relationship between the two discourses. This thesis has argued that the national identity lens does not matter in defining Japan's economic policy vis-à-vis Russia on both the governmental and private sector levels. Furthermore, it proposes that the identity lens plays a minor role in the defense discourse on the military threat from Russia. However, it has also argued that the definition of the

territorial dispute with Russia and related polices are in fact conceived through the identity lens and simultaneously enhance the hierarchical construction of the Japanese "self" and the Russian "other."

To summarize, the main contributions of this thesis to Japan related IR scholarship are as follows. Firstly, this thesis shifted the focus from general normative and cultural structures to a particular identity construct of the "self" vis-à-vis the "other." This approach avoids the normal/unique and pacifist/militarist dichotomies that dominate the constructivist scholarship. It provides a more nuanced analysis of Japan's identity construction and traces it to a number of factors that will be explained in further detail below. It also argues that the Japanese perceptions of Russia cannot be reduced simply to the history of bilateral relations but are related to the unique place that both Japan and Russia occupy in the Western discourse. Secondly, this thesis argues that it is not security policy that has an intimate relationship with national identity construction in the case of Japan's relations with Russia, but the territorial dispute. Unlike the constructivist works of Berger and Katzenstein this thesis has argued that an analytical shift to a particular identity discourse and departure from simplistic "pacific/militarist" dichotomies in evaluation of both identity and policy shows that security discourse has a very weak relationship with identity. In this particular case study, it is the conception of the territorial dispute and related policies that share the same cognitive framework created by the identity discourse. The Northern Territories related policies sustain and re-create the boundaries between the hierarchically constructed Japanese "self" and the Russian "other."

Furthermore, the research focuses mainly on primary sources, written in Japanese. Some of the texts analyzed here (especially the writings of Shiba Ryotaro) have been largely ignored by the Western scholarship, in spite of their central role in the construction of Japanese identity. The author believes that the lack of theoretical constraints combined with critical analysis of previously unexplored texts has enabled this thesis to make an important contribution to the broader field of Japanese studies.

In this concluding chapter, the author hopes to outline the conclusions that can be drawn from the empirical analysis of the identity discourse and foreign policy. He also hopes to bring them together in an assessment of the relationship between Japan's national identity and her foreign policy vis-à-vis Russia.

1. Japan's National Identity

The constructivist scholarship examined in the first chapter is devoted to uncovering the general normative or cultural structure of contemporary Japan, which will explain Japan's deviation from the "normal" behavior of major powers on one side and the change from her militarist past on the other. As such, Japan is presented as possessing a uniquely pacifist identity, which is contrasted with her pre-1945 militarism. Simultaneously, it is contrasted with the contemporary normal identities of major powers, which occasionally resort to military force in the pursuit of their national interest. Furthermore, the emergence of the new identity is traced to a single event, namely defeat in the Pacific War.

On the other hand, *nihonjinron* related critical scholarship provides a more nuanced examination of the origins of the discourse, its dynamics and societal functions. However, the identity is also perceived as unique and deviating from the norms of universal "normalcy" (this approach is most visible in Dale's work.)

This thesis argues that the identity discourse examined here contains both "universal" (Western) and unique components. However, it attributes this uniqueness not to Japan's unique cultural heritage and geographical location, or her location between the East and the West, as often argued by proponents of Japanese uniqueness. This thesis traces this need to establish uniqueness to the special place Japan has played in the Western discourse. Furthermore, the approach taken here has enabled the author to observe the relationship between this particular identity discourse with 1) historical responses of Japanese society to integration into international society, 2) the particular political,

216

cultural and economic environment of the 1970s and the 1980s and 3) Japan's foreign policy vis-à-vis Russia in the post Cold War years.

In terms of historical responses, this thesis has argued that contemporary Japan's identity construction of the "self" vis-à-vis Russia is not a direct product of traditional fear and mistrust of Russia, as often claimed by students of bilateral relations. Rather it is related to a much broader, century long process of Japan's integration into the modern system of states.

Before the process of modernization/Westernization that Japan's new ruling elite implemented during and after the Meiji Restoration, Japan could hardly be considered as a "nation" in the conventional meaning of the word. This was because she lacked the social and political institutions that constitute the modern nation state (Ravina 2005, 87.) Along with the construction of the modern Japanese state (through the introduction of institutions such as a national currency, a national taxation system, a national army and national symbols, modeled on the European equivalent) the construction of modern Japan's national identity has also proceeded through adoption of the Western "practices of difference" as tools of national identity construction.

As was shown in the analysis of the discourse on the Ainus in Chapter VI, the practices of "othering" existed in Tokugawa Japan. They were based on the creation of borders between the civilized Japanese (or more precisely, the *wajin*) and the "barbarian" natives of the North. However, the creation of differences based on universalism and modes of "othering" based on modern master dichotomies (such as modern/barbarian, rational/irrational, and the quasi medical discourse of normal/abnormal) was a product of Japan's embracing of Western modes of thought and modes of differentiation. After all, one of the early slogans of the Meiji reforms was "civilization and enlightenment."

It was the most famous Enlightenment thinker of Meiji Japan, Fukuzawa Yukichi, who first introduced the clear cut division of the world that distinguished the "civilized" nations of the West from the "semi-civilized" nations (Japan, Russia, Spain and Latin American nations) and the "uncivilized" nations of Asia and the rest of the world. Since

217

then, one of the main task of the Japanese elites has been to prove to the world, but also to themselves, that Japan has achieved "civilization and enlightenment", and deserves an equal place among the major (Western) powers of the international society. As was mentioned in the Introduction, even by the time of the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-1905, the Western discourse on Russia as a barbarian nation of the East was being used by Japan's elites to construct Japan's own sense of belonging to the realm of civilized and modern nations.

In theoretical terms, this internalization of the Western practices of difference can be explained by the ideational aspect of European expansion in the late 19th Century. This was the belief that, "modern civilization" (with its implied superiority over other modes of socio-political and economic organization of human life) became synonymous with European civilization (Watson 1984, 27.) It can also be explained by the emergence of a similar world culture theory, which focuses on the need for certain institutional and conceptual uniformity among the members of the international system as a common basis for interactions (Ravina 2005, 90-91.) If we consider modes of "othering" as an integral part of this global cultural structure, this theoretical explanation could be plausibly applied to Japan's construction of national identity.

Using either of these theoretical frameworks, it can be argued that since her entry into the modern international system, Japan's national identity construction has proceeded through the internalization of Western universalism and its practices of "othering." In this sense, Japan's national identity is not unique as depicted by the constructivist scholarship. The identity discourse does not differ greatly from those found in the Western nations. Japan's identity discourse employs the same master dichotomies in order to establish the belonging of the "self" nation to the realm of universal normalcy and engages in the same usages of the "other" in the pursuit of this endeavor. These findings contradict the argument that the Japanese national identity (or nationalism) has never embraced universalism and hence has always maintained a fundamental difference from the Western constructs (for example, Matsumoto 1971, 51.) Most of the Japanese depictions of Russia examined in this thesis are also present in the Western discourse on

218

the Russian "other", as analyzed by Iver Neumann (1998.) Just like in the Western discourse, Japan is constructed as belonging to the universal realm of "normalcy", "rationality", "peace" and " civilization" as opposed to the "abnormal", "irrational", "barbarian" and "jingoistic" Russia.

However, there has always been one important difference between Japan and the original members of the "international society", known collectively as 'the West." Ever since the first exposure of Western travelers to Japan, (and with much more intensity since the beginning of the process of her integration into international society) she has been subjected to practices of "othering" based on cultural, civilizational, religious and racial paradigms.

Hence, along with the quest for equality, the Japanese thinkers were engaged in establishing Japan's uniqueness. This was mainly because in Western definitions, Japan never became part of the "self" and continued to be part of the Asian "other" (Tanaka 1993, 271.)

The "othering" of Japan in the Western discourse continued through the first half of the 20th Century and reached it apogee during the Pacific War. Japan's successful postwar integration into the Western "liberal order" (Deudney and Ikenberry 1993/94, 17) did not mean complete integration in the civilizational and cultural community of the "West." As the works of David Campbell (1992), Ian Littlewood (1996) and others show, Japan's "otherness" continued to reside within the Western (American) discourse. It emerged with full strength during the trade frictions period of the early 1990's, which also coincided with the gradual disappearance of the communist "other." Since then, "Islam" and China have taken the place of the most important "others" in the Western discourse. However, this means only the demise in the importance of Japan's otherness and not its complete disappearance.

Deemed to be the "other", Japanese thinkers continue to face the need not only to establish Japan's normalcy, but also her positive uniqueness to replace the negative uniqueness attributed to her by the Western discourse and its domestic followers.

219

Ironically, the construction of positive uniqueness has also continuously relied on Western paradigms.

In this context, the role of Russia in the Japanese discourse has been somewhat similar to that of China in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Russia, has been a traditional "other" for the West like Japan, and has served the purpose of affirming Japan's belonging to the universal realm of normalcy. "Russia" did this by allowing Japan to internalize the Western discourse of Russian difference and simultaneously establish a uniquely superior place for Japan in the modern world. Through this process, the negative uniqueness attributed to Japan by the Western discourse has been transformed into Russian "otherness." Hence national schizophrenia, irrationality, worship of power and other negative traits attributed to the Japanese national character, have all become part of the portrayal of the Russian national character in the Japanese discourse.

Simultaneously, the similarities between Russia and Japan as the "others" in the Western discourse, has been used to create Japan's unique superiority, not only vis-à-vis Russia, but also vis-à-vis the West. In this construct, both Russia and Japan were located outside of the "West", with Russia occupying the uniquely inferior place and Japan the uniquely superior one. In this case, Russian inferiority to the West is used to emphasize Japan's superiority and unique position of being outside. Ironically, the construction of positive uniqueness has also continuously relied on Western paradigms and in crucial ways, Japan has been constructed as "more Western than the West" (this construction is most visible in Shiba's writings examined in Chapter 6.) For example, both nations are presented as communal and hierarchical as opposed to Western individualism and egalitarianism. However, a peaceful, harmonious and stable Japanese society is contrasted with Russia's national jingoism, societal instability and continuous domestic conflict. Contrasted with Russia, Japan is also presented as a pluralistic democracy of an ideal type where the political chaos caused by competition among political parties, not only in Russia but also in the Western democracies, is avoided.

This utilization of "Russia" in the contemporary domestic discourse is quite similar to the usages of "Russia" in the domestic discourse during the Russo-Japanese War and in the 1930s, which were times of conflict with Russia and the Soviet Union respectively. As with the discourse examined here, during these times, Russian "otherness" was employed by the Japanese elites to establish Japan's "civilized" normalcy for the domestic and international audience. Interestingly, in this discourse Japan was always constructed as an inherently peaceful nation that is forced to confront Russian jingoistic expansionism. This provides a slightly different perspective on the "pacifist Japan" discourse from the one claimed by Berger and Katzenstein in their works on Japan's postwar pacifist norms and culture (discussed in Chapter 1.) It can be argued that the postwar pacifist discourse has its origins not only in the defeat in the Pacific War, but also in a much longer quest for normalcy and uniqueness.

This said, the identity discourse examined in this thesis is not solely a product of Japan's internalization of the Western discourse on modernity and the quest for a respectable place in the international system. There is no doubt that the Soviet occupation of the Northern Territories and the detention and forced labor of Japanese POWs in the last days of the Pacific war, but, most importantly, the rivalry with the Soviet Union under the Cold War structure, facilitated the emergence of the discourse.

Furthermore, the discourse examined here also reflects how it emerged in the particular environment of the 1970s and 1980s. The status of economic superpower achieved by Japan in the 1970s and the intensification of the Cold War after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan facilitated the emergence of a discourse with its immanent fear and contempt of the "non-civilized" but powerful "other."

Also, the discourse makes extensive usage of concepts and paradigms that existed in the *nihonjinron* literature of the 1970s and 1980s that engaged in depiction of Japanese cultural, social and civilizational uniqueness. In the best fashion of *nihonjinron,* the discourse on Russia establishes an implicit connection between economic development and cultural superiority. The presence of *nihnojinron* paradigms is most visible in the writings of Shiba Ryotaro, examined in Chapter VI.

Geo-ecological differences are utilized to construct hierarchical difference between the "island nation" of Japan and the vast and continental Russia, which has no natural borders. Japan is presented as an inherently peaceful, culturally and economically advanced nation, as opposed to Russia's inherent jingoism, expansionism and low level of culture. In this sense, the construction of Japan's identity vis-à-vis Russia as analyzed in this thesis is also a reflection of the particular social, economic and political conditions of 1970s and 1980s.

This thesis argued that, in spite of the changes in the international system that came with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the emergence of new Russia, the identity discourse constructed by the texts examined here continues to dominate the debates regarding the national characteristics of the two nations. A number of factors account for this state of affairs. As already mentioned, the "otherness" of Russia established by the Western discourse serves as a convenient tool in Japan's own attempt to establish her normalcy and uniqueness. However, there are also a number of other, similarly important, factors.

As the last chapter argued, the territorial dispute formulated by the Japanese as a quest for the return of her *inherent* territory is constructed through the identity lens and simultaneously enhances the national identity construction (this point is explained further below.) Furthermore, the "Soviet watchers" of the Cold War era still exercise a considerable influence on the public and academic debates related to Russia and Russo-Japanese relations. Other mainstream scholars like Shimotomai Nobuo, who over the last decade has become one of the main figures in the academic and public debates on Russia, engage in positivist research into Russian politics and show little interest in general images of national character. Hence, the identity discourse constructed and perpetuated by Kimura, Hakamada and others does not face any competition.

Additionally, the actual contact between the two peoples remains very limited. The number of Japanese tourists visiting Russia is very small compared to those visiting, for example Western Europe or the USA. The actual exposure of the Japanese people to Russia and her people is limited to occasional visits of the Bolshoi and Mariininski

ballet troops and classical music concerts. Otherwise, printed and visual media that focus mainly on sensationalist events are the main sources of information. The images of violence and misery that are conveyed through these reports provide further validity for Russian abnormality and inferiority.

To summarize, the analytical approach taken by this thesis has enabled it to go beyond the dichotomous (and essentialist) depictions of Japan's identity as either pacifist or militarist, normal or abnormal. Furthermore, this thesis has traced the origins of the discourse in the complex interaction of century long process of Japan's assimilation into the modern international society, the Cold War and the particular domestic environment of the 1970s and 1980s.

"Japan" that emerged from this analysis is both unique and shows Japan as a nation that adheres to the universal standards of a "civilized nation." The practices of difference and the master paradigms that are employed in the construction of the Japanese "self" vis-à-vis the Russian "other" originated in the Western discourse and can be found in any modern discourse on nationalism. "Civilized", "cultural", "modern", "rational" and "law abiding" Japan is not different from Britain, France or the United States.

However, at the same time, Japan is unique in the fact that she has been continuously denied the place in the realm of universal normalcy by the Western discourse. Even parts of her own domestic discourse have continuously criticized Japan's "abnormality." Hence, Japan has never become part of the West, but still continues to measure and construct herself using the West as the standard for normalcy. "Russia" has been utilized by the Japanese elites to establish a uniquely superior place for Japan by using the Western "othering" discourse on both Russia and Japan. Hence, "Japan" is also constructed as a uniquely harmonious society, based on trust, with a unique democratic system. Japan is constructed as a society where economic interests prevail over political ones, and one that does not believe in military solutions for disputes.

2. Japan's National Identity and Foreign Policy

Most of the IR works that examine national identity establish an *a priori* relationship between identity and foreign policy. Japan related constructivist scholarship examined in Chapter 2 argues that Japan's foreign (mainly national security related) policy has been defined by her "pacifist" identity. Hopf's examination of Russia's identity and foreign policy has also established a close relationship between Russian national identities and her policy. Prior to conducting the actual empirical work Hopf has argued that self-understanding of a nation and her national interests are produced within the same discourse. Campbell's deconstruction of American "foreign policy" (which he defined as a general creation of boundaries) has argued that foreign policy (in its conventional meaning) is nothing more but one of the many political practices of difference aimed to create a boundary between the "self" and the "other."

The analytical framework used in this thesis did not engage in any *a priori* theoretical assumptions regarding the nature of the relationship between national identity and foreign policy. The approach taken in this thesis argues for an inductive analysis in examining the relationship between identity constructs and State's policies. Instead of assuming that national interests are derivable from identity (or vice-versa) this thesis undertook separate examinations of both Japan's identity and its policy discourses vis-à-vis Russia. Furthermore, the examination of foreign policy did not focus purely on the security discourse but also examined Japan's economic policy vis-à-vis Russia and the special policy discourse related to the territorial dispute. This approach enabled the thesis to discover a more complex relationship between perceptions of the Japanese "self" and the Russian "other" on one side, and Japan's foreign policy towards Russia on the other.

It was found that Japan's Cold War era security interests have facilitated the emergence of the identity discourse, which has outlived the end of the bipolar rivalry and the collapse of the Soviet Union. As already mentioned, Japan's Cold War policies played an important role in the emergence of the identity discourse on Russia. Japan's

Cold War alliance with the US gave birth to the Northern Territories problem and her belonging to the camp of "freedom, democracy and market economy" has facilitated the construction of the "jingoistic", "irrational" and "barbarian" Russia, which has been traditionally ruled by fear.

However, it should be stressed that Japan's Cold War alliance was not the sole factor, and it should therefore be examined in combination with other factors. In the case of the present discourse, Japan's economic superiority, official endorsement of *nihonjinron* ideas, and the place both Japan and Russia have occupied in the Western discourse, have also played important roles in the emergence of a particular discourse and its structure.

As this thesis has argued, the identity discourse emerged in the 1970s and 1980s but continued to dominate the debates on Russian and Japanese national characters after the end of the Cold War. Hence, the second important question is whether the cognitive lens established by the identity discourse has influenced the national interests and the preferred foreign policies after the collapse of the Soviet Union. The disintegration of the Soviet Union resulted in the emergence of (relatively) democratic Russia, which has pursued the transition to market economy and has been cooperating with the "West" in a number of important security issues, such as the war on terror and the North Korean nuclear program.

The last chapter examined the policy discourse and the actual policies vis-à-vis Russia in the post-Cold War years along three dimensions: the economic policy, the perceptions of a military threat from Russia and the Northern Territories territorial dispute. If one is to assume that national interests are derivable from identity, then we can expect that Japan would continuously feel a security threat from the jingoistic, expansionist and irrational Russia. Furthermore, we could expect minimal economic interactions and investment in a nation whose social structure is governed by irrationality and fear. However, the actual policy analysis reveals a more complex relationship between the definition of national interests and the identity discourse. It can be argued that state level economic polices, as well as private business activities, are conceived within the rational cost/benefit framework in which the identity lens does not

play an important role. Japan's limited economic involvement in Russia during the 1990s stemmed from the poor investment environment and was not related to any perceptions of the national "self" and the "other." The various legal reforms that the Russian government started to implement in order to attract foreign investors, the growth of the Russian economy and the growing international competition for energy resources lead to a gradual expansion of the economic ties between the two nations, both at the levels of the state and of the private sector. This process continued to gain momentum in spite of the stalemate in the territorial dispute and the continuously negative perceptions of Russia as a nation among the Japanese.

The security discourse and mainly the perception of a military threat from Russia was a more complex issue. The last chapter argued that in spite of the demise of the perception of the Russian threat and the growing cooperation between the two militaries, the long-term possibility of threat revival resides in the background of the security discourse. As early as 1996, the Russian government had assured the Japanese security establishment that neither the Japanese SDF nor the US-Japan Alliance was viewed as a threat by Russia. Yet the reduction of the SDF troops in the north of the country is only about to be implemented within the framework established by the *National Defense Program Guidelines for FY 2005*, over a decade after the end of the Cold War. This belated revision of the defense posture, however, is more related to the crystallization of new threats (China, North Korea and terror) within the framework of the Japan-US Alliance and the planned restructuring of US forces in Asia than to a radical change in the threat perception of Russia. Furthermore, the slowness of Japan's bureaucratic machinery in changing established policies and the importance of the SDF presence on Hokkaido as a provider of jobs in one of the least developed regions of Japan, were pointed out in discussions with Japanese defense analysts, as important factors that slowed down the reduction of Japanese troops facing the Russian Far East.

As the last chapter argued, the change in perceptions was slow and during the early 1990s the Japanese security establishment continued to view Russia with strong suspicion. The slowness of the change could be partially attributed to the viewing of the

relationship through the national identity lens, but the actual political situation in Russia during this period must also be remembered. Yeltsin's armed conflict with the Duma in 1993, the demise in his popularity, the reemergence of the nationalistic communist party as a considerable political force, the ultra-nationalist Zhirinovsky phenomena, and other domestic conditions also provided enough food for thought about the future of Russia as a state and her foreign policies.

The importance of Russia in the Japanese security discourse has been declining gradually since the mid-1990s and perhaps no member of the Japanese security community now believes in the possibility of a military confrontation between Russia and Japan in the present or the near future. Since 1996, with the growth of the perception of a China threat, "Russia" has almost disappeared from the security discourse. However, although the notion of a military threat from Russia has been diluted greatly over the years, it has not disappeared completely from the cognition of security experts. The possibility of a long term military clash with Russia in the distant future when she will have achieved economic stability, resides in the background of the discourse and appears occasionally in speeches and analytical papers. This thesis argues that, at least partially, this residual mistrust of Russia could be attributed to the identity lens that created the inherently jingoistic, expansionist and irrational "Russia" that is bound to remain outside of the realm of universal "normalcy."

However, the presence of the identity discourse is most visible in the conception of the Northern Territories issue and the policies aimed to facilitate the return of the islands. The hierarchical construction of the Japanese "self" and the Russian "other" continues to shape the policy discourse even after the disappearance of the Soviet Union. This is visible in the non-compromising conception of the problem combined with introduction of concepts such as justice, law and historical facts as the basis for negotiations and the final solution of the dispute. This combination leads to a conflation of the national with the universal and deprives the Russian position of any validity, as it is located outside of the realm of the universal. This construction of the "self" and the "other" is also visible

in the policies that aim to enlighten the Russian residents of the islands regarding the universal truth, reason and justice that "Japan" stands for.

The "national mission" for the recovery of "inherent territory" is constructed through the cognitive lens provided by the identity discourse,. At the same time it also embodies a practice of "foreign policy" (as defined by David Campbell in *Writing Security*), which constructs national identity through practices of difference. This policy sustains the conception of Japan as a modern nation that, in her quest for the return of inherent territory, represents the laws of universal rationality and justice, as opposed to the barbarian and abnormal Russia.

This interpretation of the Northern Territories problem helps to explain the domestic aspect of government policies, namely the continuous effort on behalf of the ruling elites to enlighten the Japanese people about their "national mission" combined with the suppression of the discourse on the Ainus, briefly outlined in the discussion of Shiba's views of Russia. For example, the annual budget for the 2003-2004 financial year of the Association for Countermeasures Related to Northern Territories Problem (*Hoppotaikyo*- which is affiliated with the Ministry of Internal Affairs and is the main organization in charge of domestic enlightenment activities) was around 850 million yen. This sum is negligible in the context of the overall annual state budget, but is 120 times larger than the budget of the Foundation for Research and Promotion of Ainu Culture (*Ainu bunka fushin zaidan*), which is also sponsored by the government (Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport, Ministry of Education and Hokkaido Prefecture.) The Foundation's mission is quite similar to *Hoppotaikyo* as one of its goals is to engage in the dissemination of knowledge regarding Ainu culture and history among the Japanese people.

This supremacy of the Northern Territories related enlightenment activities over knowledge of the Ainu history (and the related history of the Japanese conquest) is obvious if we approach the quest for the Northern Territories as a policy that constructs Japan's national identity. The discourse and the policies related to the Northern Territories constitute the Japanese nation through a construction of hierarchical

difference between the homogeneous "Japan" and "Russia." However, the discourse on the Ainus undermines this identity questioning not only the homogeneity of "Japan" and the validity of the notion of inherent territory, but also the ultimately positive meaning of "modern" and "civilized" Japan.

In light of these findings, it can be argued that, in the context of Japan's policy vis-à-vis Russia, national identity does matter. However, it is not the notion of danger and national security discourse that have an intimate relationship with national identity as argued by Campbell. Rather it is the conception of the territorial issue between Japan and Russia and related policies that is important for the construction of Japanese identity. The territorial dispute is defined through the identity lens and plays a specific role in the construction of Japan's identity as a modern nation. The conception of the islands as inherently Japanese territory and the enlightenment activities directed at both the domestic and Russian public are a "boundary-producing political performance". It creates a hierarchical border between the Japanese "self" and the Russian "other."

To summarize, this thesis refutes the realist conception of foreign policy by arguing that there is an important relationship between national identity and foreign policy. However, such a relationship in this particular case study is to be found not so much in the conception of security threats and related policies as argued by the constructivist scholarship but more in the special case of the Northern Territories territorial dispute. Like the origins of this dispute, the emergence of the identity discourse can also be partially attributed to Japan's Cold War policies of alliance with the US and containment of the Soviet Union. Hence, foreign policy plays an important role in facilitating the emergence of a particular identity discourse. However, the discourse has remained intact in spite of the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the bipolar rivalry. In the post - Cold War years it has been in a symbiotic relationship with the policies related to the territorial dispute. The conception of the problem and the related policies, have been shaped through the cognitive lens provided by the hierarchical construction of the Japanese "self" and the Russian "other." At the same time, the policies of "enlightenment" of the Russian residents of the disputed islands and of the domestic

population have continued to enhance the construction of the "modern", "civilized" and "peaceful" Japan that represents the universal values of truth and justice as opposed to the inferior Russia whose claims regarding truth, history and justice are denied any validity.

In terms of general debates regarding the most suitable methodological framework to approach the relationship between national identity and foreign policy, obviously the argument of this thesis is supportive of Campbell's poststructuralist approach. The departure from positivism and the conception of foreign policy as potentially belonging to political practice of boundary creation (not limited to foreign "others") has enabled this thesis to bring together the identity discourses on the outside "other" (Russia) and domestic "other" (Ainu.) Furthermore, this analytical framework has enabled this thesis to relate these intellectual debates to the actual policy conducted by the Japanese ruling elites both on the domestic and international levels. However, this nexus was observed not in the security policies and the notions of "threat" and "danger" as argued by Campbell but in the territorial dispute and the hierarchical construction of the Japanese "self" and the Russian (and Ainu) "others." Hence, the author believes that the application of the framework should be inductive and not assumed *a priori* to the actual empirical analysis. At the same time the author believes that the poststructuralist framework that is not constrained by positivism and the clear cut boundaries between the domestic and international, State's policy and and national identity is the only approach that can fully encompass the various discourses of "othering" and bring them together.

3. Limitations of this thesis and further research agenda

The limitations of this thesis and the broad conclusions that can be drawn from it are as follows. As already mentioned in the Introduction, the analysis of the identity discourse focused solely on printed texts. The visual media and cyber space were not examined in spite of the growing importance of these media in terms of information provision in general, and hence in the shaping of perceptions and identities. Furthermore, Russia as the "other" for Japan presents only one case study in the multi-layered

construct of Japan's national identity. There are multiple "others" that exist not only outside of "Japan" but also within it. Analysis of Shiba's discourse revealed a connection between the Russian "other" and the domestic discourse (or lack of it) on the Ainus.

Furthermore, the "other" is not necessarily an existing nation and can be an idea or historical past of the "self". There is little doubt that the Great Japanese Empire is one of the most important "others" which construct today's Japan. Some of the issues related to the Imperial past were engaged briefly in this thesis. However, an in depth research into contemporary narratives on the Japanese Empire that will go beyond the pacifist/militarist or nationalist/internationalist dichotomies would provide important insights regarding contemporary Japan's identity. Also, further research that explores the contemporary identity construction and the political discourse vis-à-vis other "others", such as the former colonies in Asia and the US, might reveal master paradigms and the nature of the relationship between identity discourse and foreign policy that differ from what this thesis has suggested.

Additionally, this thesis has examined only the Japanese aspect of identity construction and foreign policy vis-à-vis Russia. A comprehensive analysis of Russian policies vis-à-vis Japan (and of both nations' relations with the US) is needed in order to get the full picture of bilateral relations. There is little doubt that the Russian position regarding the Northern Territories plays an important role in the current stalemate. Furthermore, an inquiry into the role of Japan in Russia's national identity discourse may reveal interesting similarities and differences in the identities of the two nations that had been "traditionally" subjected to practices of difference by the Western discourse.

However, in spite of these shortcomings, the author believes that this thesis provides some important insights regarding the nature of Japan's national identity discourse and its relationship with Japan's foreign policy. The main strength of this thesis is its attempt to go beyond the monolithic conceptions of Japan's national identity that have prevailed in IR scholarship and to provide a more nuanced understanding of the relationship

between national identity and foreign policy unconstrained by one particular theoretical approach or another.

Furthermore, the conception of national identity used in this thesis emphasizes the importance of the historical narrative in the "self" construction vis-à-vis the "other" nations. In recent years, Japan's history textbooks have been in the focus of academic and public debates regarding the nature of contemporary Japan's national identity, nationalism and historical memory. This thesis has argued that the role of school textbooks as a medium where historical narrative construction is taking place is largely overestimated. There is little doubt that approval of a certain textbook by the government is a political act and can become an important factor in Japan's relations with her neighbors. At the same time, the actual texts that are used at schools can be seen as a source of factual knowledge at the most. Instead, as this thesis has argued, the actual cognitive lens through which the past, present and future are examined is constructed elsewhere, outside of the secondary education system. It examined two of these locales: the academic and journalistic texts that discuss Russian national character and the writings of one of the most popular contemporary essayist and historical fiction writer, Shiba Ryotaro. So far, in spite of his tremendous popularity and an obvious impact on the Japanese understating of history, Shiba's writings and his views of history have been largely ignored by the Japanese and English language scholarship alike. This thesis hopes to provide an introduction to Shiba's construction of Japanese history and national identity.

By expanding the scope of locales where Japan's historical narratives and national identity discourses are constructed and reconstructed beyond the history textbooks, this thesis hopes to contribute to the further development of empirical inquiry into the nature of contemporary Japan's identity.

Bibliography

1.Internet Sources

Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, Prof Tanaka Akihiko database "Japan
  and the world"
http://www.ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp/~worldjpn/index.html

Japan Defense Agency, Defense White Papers
http://www.jda.go.jp/j/library/wp/index.html

Library of the Diet, Parliamentary Interpolations database
http://kokkai.ndl.go.jp/

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, *Diplomatic Blue Books* and Japan-Russia relations
http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/

National Institute of Defense Studies
http://www.nids.go.jp/

NHK public opinion surveys
http://www.nhk.or.jp/bunken/research/research_index.html

Prime Minister Cabinet Office, public opinion surveys
http://www8.cao.go.jp/survey/

TV Asahi opinion polls
www.tv-asahi.co.jp

2. Interviews

Prof. Tanaka Akihiko (Tokyo Univ), 23.06.2003

MoFA, Russian Desk (Kotsuki), 24.06.2003

Prof Ueno Toshihiko (Sophia Univ), 27.06.2003

Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido Univ (Profs. Arai and Iwashita), 2.7.2003

Chishima kaikan (Interviews with activists), Sapporo 3.7.2003

Northern Territories and International Divisions, Hokkaido Prefecture, *4.7.2003*

Nemuro Municipal Office, *7.7.2003*

Nipporo Hall, 7.7.2003

Chishima Renmei (Interview with activists), 8.7.2003

Prof. Hakamada Shigeki (Aoyama Gakuin Univ), *11.7.2003*

General Tamura, MP (Liberal Party), 28.7.2003

National Defense Institute (interviews with Russia specialists), 5.8.2003

Sankei Shimbun (Saito Tsutomu), 8.7.2003

Prof. Yamazaki Naomi (Defense Academy*), 24.06.2005*

Fukiura Tadamasa (Tokyo Foundation), *14.12.2005*

3. English and Russian Language Sources

Agawa, Naoyuki , Masaru Tamamoto, and Toshio Nishi. 2004. "The People Vs. Koizumi? Japan-US Relations and Japan's Struggle for National Identity." *Asia Program Special Report* (February).
Ahn, Byung-joon. 1993. "Japanese Policy Toward Korea." in *Japan's Foreign Policy After the Cold War*, ed. G. L. Curtis. New York.
Akaha, Tsuneo. 1985. "Japan's Three Nonnuclear Policy: A Coming Demise?"" *Peace and Change* 11 (1):75-89.
Akami, Tomoko. 2005. "Nation, State, Empire and War: Problems of Liberalism in

Modern Japanese History and Beyond." *Japanese Studies* 25 (2):1-22.

Anno, Tadashi. 2000. "Collective Identity as an "Emotional Portfolio"." in *Beyond Boundaries?*, eds. E. M. Doherty and R. Sil, 117-141. New York.

Aoyama, Tomoko. 1999. "Japanese Literary Responses to the Russo-Japanese War." in *The Russo-Japanese War in Cultural Perspective, 1904-05*, eds. D. Wells and S. Wilson, 60-85. New York.

Axelbank, Albert. 1972. *Black Star over Japan: Rising Forces of Militarism*. London.

Barnett, Michael. 2002. " The Israeli Identity and Peace Process." in *Identity and Foreign Policy in the Middle East*, eds. S. Telhami and M. Barnett. Ithaca.

Befu, Harumi. 2001. *Hegemony of Homogeneity*. Melbourne.

Bellah, Robert. 2003. *Imagining Japan*. London.

Bellamy, Alex J. 2002. "Pragmatic Solidarism and the Dilemmas of Humanitarian Intervention." *Millennium:Journal of International Studies* 31 (3):473-497.

Ben -Ami, Daniel. 1997. "Is Japan Different?" in *Cultural Difference, Media Memories*, ed. P. Hammond, 5-24. London.

Benedict, Ruth F. 1946. *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture*. Boston.

Berger, Thomas U. 1996. "Norms, Identity and National Security in Germany and Japan." in *The Culture of National Security*, ed. P. J. Katzenstein. New York.

Berger, Thomas U. 1998. *Cultures of Antimilitarism*. Baltimore.

Berger, Thomas U. 1999. "Alliance Politics and Japan's Postwar Culture of Antimilitarism." in *The US-Japan Alliance: Past, Present and Future*, ed. M. J. a. C. Green, Partick M. New York.

Berger, Thomas U. 2003. "Power and Purpose in Pacific East Asia: A Constructivist Interpretation." in *International Relations Theory and the Asia-Pacific*, eds. J. G. Ikenberry and M. Mastanduno, 387-420. New York.

Berlin, Isaiah. 1999. *The Hedgehog and the Fox*. London. Original edition, 1953.

Bloom, William. 1990. *Personal Identity, National Identity and International Relations*. Cambridge.

Borton, Hugh, Jerome B. Cohen, William J. Jorden, Donald Keene, Langer Paul F., and Wilbur Martin C. 1957. *Japan between East and West, Council on Foreign Relations*. Westport.

Braddick, C.W. 2000. "'The Waiting Game'-Japan-Russia Relations." in *Japanese Foreign Policy Today*, ed. T. Inoguchi. and P. Jain. New York.

Brennan, Timothy. 1990. "The National Longing for Form." in *Nation and Narration*, ed. H. K. Bhabha, 44-70. London.

Bukh, Alexander. 2004. Constructive Orientalism. Paper read at ISA Annual Conference, at Montreal.

Buruma, Ian. 1991. *The wages of guilt : memories of war in Germany and Japan*. London.

Bury, Anatoly. 2004. "The Current Status of Issues Concerning and Prospects for Investment Cooperation Between Japan and Eastern Russia." *Erina Report* 59:10-13.

Buzan, Barry. 1988. "Japan Future:Old History versus New Roles." *International*

Affairs-RIIA 64 (4).

Buzan, Barry, Ole W? er, and Jaap de Wilde. 1998. *Security : a new framework for analysis*. Boulder, Colo. ; London.

Campbell, David. 1992. *Writing Security: United States foreign policy and the politics of identity*. Manchester.

—————. 1996. "Violent Performances:Identity, Sovereignity, Responsibilty." in *The Return of Culture and Identity in IR*, ed. Y. a. K. Lapid, Friedrich. London.

Campbell, John Creighton. 1993. "Japan and the United States: Games that Work." in *Japan's Foreign Policy After the Cold War: Coping with Change*, ed. G. L. Curtis. New York.

Clammer, John. 2001. *Japan and its Others*. Edited by Y. Sugimoto, *Japanese Society Series*. Melbourne.

Clunan, Anne L. 2000. "Constructing Concepts of Identity." in *Beyond Boundaries?*, eds. E. M. Doherty and R. a. D. Sil, Eileen M., 87-116. New York.

Curtin, Sean J. 2006. *Sea of Confrontation: Japan-China Territorial and Gas Dispute*. Japan Focus 2005 [cited 2006]. Available from http://japanfocus.org/article.asp?id=426.

Dale, Peter N. 1986. *The Myth of Japanese Uniqueness*. Sydney.

Daniel, Deudney, and John G. Ikenberry. 1993/94. "The Logic of the West." *World Policy Journal* 10 (4):17-27.

Defense Agency. 1991. "*Defense of Japan*." Tokyo.

—————. 2000. "*Defense of Japan*." Tokyo.

—————. 2003. "*Defense of Japan*." Tokyo.

Devetak, Richard. 1996. "Critical Theory." in *Theories of International Relations*, eds. S. Burchill and S. Linklater, 145-178. London.

Dower, John W. 1993. *Japan in War and Peace*. New York.

—————. 1995. "Sizing Up (and Breaking Down) Japan (*Nihon o hakaru-eigoken ni okeru nihonkenkyu no rekishi jojutsu*)." *Shiso* 855-856:65-95, 67-89.

Drifte, Reinhard. 2003. *Japan's Security Relations with China since 1989, Nissan Institute/Routledge Curzon Japanese Studies*. London.

Duus, Peter and Okimoto, Daniel I. 1979. "Fascism and the History of Pre-War Japan:The Failure of a Concept." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 39 (1):65-76.

Edgar, Alistair D and Haglund, David G. 1993. "Japanese Defence Industrialisation." in *Japan's Military Renaissance?*, ed. R. a. M. Matthews, Keisuke, 137-164. London.

Edstrom, Bert. 1992. *Yoshida Shigeru and the "Yoshida Doctrine"*. Stockholm.

Egdar, A.D, and D Haglund. 1993. *Japanese Defence Industrialisation. Japan's Military Renaissance?* London.

Foglesong, David, and Gordon M Hahn. 2005. "Ten Myths About Russia: Understanding and Dealing with Russia's Complexity and Ambiguity." Argentine.

Funabashi, Yoichi. 1994. *Japan's International Agenda*. New York.

Gayle, Curtis Anderson. 2003. *Marxist History and Postwar Japanese Nationalism*. London.

236

Glaubitz, Joachim. 1995. *Between Tokyo and Moscow: The History of an Uneasy Relationship 1972 to the 1990s*. London.

Goertz, Gary and Diehl, Paul F. 1992. "Toward a Theory of International Norms: Some Conceptual and Measurement Issues." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 36 (4):634-664.

Goldstein, Judith, and Robert O. Keohane, eds. 1993. *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions and Political Change*. Ithaca.

Goodby, James E, Vladimir I Ivanov, and Nobuo Shimotomai, eds. 1995. *"Northern Territories" and Beyond*. London.

Gow, Ian. 1993. "Civilian Control of the Military in Postwar Japan." in *Japan's Military Renaissance?*, ed. R. a. M. Matthews, Keisuke. London.

Gray, John. 2002. *Two Faces of Liberalism*. London.

————. 2004. *Al Qaeda and What It Means to Be Modern*. London.

Green, Michael J. 2001. *Japan's Reluctant Realism*. New York.

Guillaume, Xavier. 2002. "Foreign Policy and the Politics of Alterity:A Dialogical Understanding of International Relations." *Millennium:Journal of International Studies* 31 (1):1-26.

Hadfield, Andrew. 1994. *Literature, Politics and National Identity*. Cambridge.

Halliday, Fred. 1996. *Islam and the Myth of Confrontation*. London.

Halliday, Jon, and Gavan McCormack. 1973. *Japanese Imperialism Today: "Co-prosperity in Greater East Asia"*. Harmondsworth.

Hammond, Phil, ed. 1997. *Cultural Difference,Media, Memories;Anglo-Amrican Images of Japan*. London.

Hara, Kimie 1998. *Japanese-Soviet/Russian relations since 1945: difficult peace*. New York.

Harootunian, Harry D, and Masao Miyoshi. 1993. "Japan in the World." in *Japan in the World*, eds. H. D. Harootunian and M. Miyoshi, 1-9. London.

Harootunian, Harry D, and Tetsuo Najita. 1988. "Japan's revolt against the West: political and cultural criticism in the twentieth century." in *The Cambridge History of Japan*, ed. P. Duus, 711-774. New York.

Hasegawa, Tsuyoshi. 1998. *The Northern Territories Dispute and Russo-Japanese Relations*. Berkley.

————. 2000a. "Why Did Japan and Russia Fail to Achieve Rapprochment in 1991-1996?" in *Japan and Russia: The Tortuous Path to Normalisation 1949-1999*, ed. G. Rozman. New York.

————. 2000b. "Japanese Perceptions of the Soviet Union and Russia in the Postwar Period." in *Japan and Russia:The Torturous Path to Normalization 1949-1999*, ed. G. Rozman. New York.

Hasegawa, Tsuyoshi, Jonathan Haslam, and Andrew Kuchins. 1993. *Russia and Japan: an unresolved dilemma between distant neighbors*. Berkeley.

Hattori, Michitaka. 2004. "Trade between Japan and Russia in 2003." *Roshia too boeki chosa geppo*:41-45.

Hayes, Louis D. 2001. *Japan and the Security of Asia*. Lanham, Maryland, US.

Hill, Christopher. 2003. *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*. London.

Hiraishi, Naoaki. 2003. "The Formation of Maruyama Masao's Image of Japanese
        Intellectual History during the War Period." *Social Science Japan* 6 (2):241-254.
Hirakawa, Sukehiro. 1998. "Japan's Turn to the West." in *Modern Japanese Thought*, ed.
        T. B. Wakabayashi, 30-97. Cambridge.
Hobsbawm, Eric, ed. 1983. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge.
Hogg, Michael A. 2001. "Social Identity and the Sovereignity of the Group." in
        Individual Self, Relational Self, Collective Self, eds. C. Sedikides and M. B.
        Brewer, 123-143. Ann Arbor.
Hook, Glenn D. 1988. "The Erosion of Anti-militaristic Principles in Contemporary
        Japan." *Journal of Peace Research* 25 (4):381-394.
. ———. 1996. *Militarization and Demilitarization in Contemporary Japan, The Nissan
        Institute/Rouledge Japanese Studies Series*. London.
Hook, Glenn D., Julie Gilson, Christopher W. Hughes, and Hugo Dobson. 2005. *Japan's
        International Relations*. second ed. New York.
Hopf, Ted. 2002. *Social construction of international politics: identities & foreign
        policies, Moscow, 1955 and 1999*. Ithaca.
Hughes, Christopher W. 1999. *Japan's Economic Power and Security: Japan and North
        Korea, Japanese Studies/Routledge Series*. London.
Huntington, Samuel P. 1993. "The Clash of Civilizations." *Foreign Affairs* 72 (3).
Igarashi, Yoshikuni. 2000. *Bodies of Memory*. Princeton, NJ.
Iida, Yumiko. 2002. *Rethinking Identity in Modern Japan*. London.
IISS. 2002. "The Military Balance." London.
Inoguchi, Takashi. 1992. Japan in Search of a Normal Role. Paper read at Asia's
        International Role in the Post-Cold War Era, 1993, at Seoul, ROK.
———. 1993. *Japan's foreign policy in an era of global change*. London. Original
        edition, London : Pinter, 1993.
———. 2005. Japan's IR: Significance of the International. Paper read at ISA Annual
        Conference, at Honolulu.
Inoguchi, Takashi and Purnendra Jain, ed. 2000. *Japanese Foreign Policy Today*. New
        York.
Inoue, Tatsuo. 1999. "Critical Perspectives on the "Asian Values" Debate." in *The East
        Asian Challenge for Human Rights*, eds. J. R. Bauer and D. A. Bell, 27-60.
        Cambridge.
Iriye, Akira. 1981. *Power and Culture*. Cambridge,Massachusetts.
———. 1992. *China and Japan in the Global Setting*. Cambridge, Mass.
Ito, Kenichi. 1987. "Continuity in the Pattern of Russo-Soviet External Behavior." in
        The Soviet Union in Transition, ed. K. Niiseki, 1301-1146. London.
Ivanov, Vladimir. 2005. "Russia and Japan Beyond 2005." *Erina Report* 66:10-16.
———. 2005a. "The 2005 Japan-Russia Energy Forum." *Erina Report* 64.
Ivanov, Vladimir I., and Karla S Smith, eds. 1999. *Japan and Russia in Northeast Asia:
        Partners in the 21st Century*. London.
Iwashita, Akihiro, ed. 2005. *Siberia and the Russian Far East in the 21st
        Century:Partners in the "Community of Asia", Crossroads in Northeast Asia*.
        Sapporo.

Izumi, Hajime. 1993. "Tokyo Policy Toward North Korea and Korea Reunification." in *Korean Penninsula Developments and US-Japan-South Korea Relations*, ed. G. W. Wong. Washington DC.

JGMOC. 2005. "Business Report." 27. Tokyo.

Johnson, Sheila K. 1988. *Japanese Through American Eyes*. Stanford.

Johnston, Alastair Iain. 1995. *Cultural Realism*. Princeton, New Jersey.

Kabbani, R. 1986. *Europe's Myth of the Orient: Devise and Rule*. London.

Kanekiyo, Kensuke 2005. Siberian Oil Pipeline and its Implications for Northeast Asia. Paper read at ICEED 32nd International Energy Conference, at Colorado.

Katzenstein, Peter J. 1996. *Cultural Norms and National Security-Police and Military in Postwar Japan*. Ithaca.

—————, ed. 1996. *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*. New York.

Katzenstein, Peter J., and N Okawara. 1993. *Japan's National Security*. Ithaca.

Katzenstein, Peter J, and Nobuo Okawara. 2004. "Japan and Asia-Pacific Security." in *Rethinking Security in East Asia*, eds. J. J. Suh, P. J. Katzenstein and A. Carlson, 97-130. Stanford.

Katzenstein, Peter J, and Rudra Sil. 2004. "Rethinking Asian Security: A Case for Analytical Eclecticism " in *Rethinking Security in East Asia*, eds. J. J. Suh, K. P. J and A. Carlson, 1-34. Stanford.

Katzenstein, Peter J., and Yutaka Tsujinaka. 1991. *Defending the Japanese State*, *Cornell Eat Asia Series*. Ithaca.

Kaztenstein, Peter J., and N Okawara. 2001/2002. "Japan, Asia-Pacific and the case for Analytical Eclecticism." *International Security* 26 (3):153-185.

Kaztenstein, Peter J., and Rudra Sil. 2004. "Rethinking Asian Security: A Case for Analytical Eclecticism." in *Rethinking Security in East Asia*, eds. J. J. Suh, P. J. Katzenstein and A. Carlson, 1-33. Stanford.

Kersten, Rikki. 2005. "The lament of progressivism: voicing war responsibility in postwar Japan." *IIAS Newsletter*, October 2005.

Kim, Samuel, and Lower Dittmer. 1993. "Whither China's Quest for National Identity?" in *China's Quest for National Identity*, eds. S. Kim and L. Dittmer. Ithaca.

Kimura, Hiroshi. 1999. "Politics and Economics in Russo-Japanese Relations." in *Understandings of Russian Foreign Policy*, ed. T. Hopf, 211-250. Pennsylvania.

—————. 2000. *Distant Neighbors:Japanese-Russian Relations under Brezhnev and Andropov*. Vol. 1. Armonk, New York.

—————. 2000. *Distant Neighbors:Japanese-Russian Relations under Gorbachev and Yeltsin*. 2 vols. Vol. 2. Armonk, New York.

Kishino, Hiroyuki. 1992. "Striking a Balance between Economic Assistance and Territorial Claim." 19. Tokyo.

Kissinger, Henry. 1985. "Threat to US-Japan Relations." *Seattle Times*, October 13.

Klein, Chrisitina. 2003. *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination 1945-1961*. London.

Klein, Susanne. 2002. *Rethinking Japan's Identity and International Role*. Edited by E. Beauchamp, *East Asia: History, Politics, Sociology, Culture*. London.

239

Koshkin, Anatoliy. 2004. *Yaponskii Front Marshala Stalina (The Japanese Front of Marshall Stalin)*. Moscow.

Kowner, Rotem. 2002. "Deconstructing the Japanese National Discourse: Laymen's Beliefs and Ideology." in *Exploring Japaneseness*, ed. R. T. Donahue. Westport.

Kubalkova, Vendulka, ed. 2001. *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*. Edited by V. a. O. Kubalkova, Nicholas and Kowert, Paul, *International Relations in a Constructed World*. Armonk, New York.

Kurino, Ohtori. 1982. "Thought and Ideas in the Post War Diplomacy of Japan: A Study of Causes for Confusion." *Kokusai Seiji* 71 (Diplomatic Thought and Ideas in Modern Japan):160-172.

Kuriyama, Shigeru. 1957. "Historical Aspects of the Progress of International Law in Japan." *The Japanese Annual of International Law* 1:1-5.

Kuzio, Taras. 2001. "Identity and nation-building in Ukraine." *Ethnicities* 1(3): 343-366

Langdon, Frank. 1993. "The Posthegemonic Japanese-US Relationship." in *Japan in the Posthegemonic World*, ed. T. A. a. F. Langdon. London.

Lapid, Yosef. 1996. "The Return of Culture and Identity in IR Theory." in *The Return of Culture and Identity in IR Theory*, eds. Y. Lapid and F. Kratochwil. Boulder,Colorado.

Lavrentiev, Alexander. 2005. "We Welcome Investment in Russia by Japanese Companies." *Erina Report* 66:5-9.

Lawrence, T.J. 1904. *War and Neutrality in the Far East*. London.

Littlewood, Ian. 1996. *The Idea of Japan*. London.

Maruyama, Masao. 1963. *Thought and Behavior in Modern Japanese Politics*. Morris, Ivan ed. London.

Matsumoto, Sannouske. 1971. "The Significance of Nationalism in Modern Japanese Thought: Some Theoretical Problems." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 31 (1): 49-56.

Maull, Hanns W. 1990-1991. "Germany and Japan: The New Civilian Powers." *Foreign Affairs* 69 (5): 91-106.

McSweeney, Bill. 1999. *Security, Identity and Interests*. London. UK.

Mendel, Douglas H. Jr. 1970. "Japan's Defense in the 1970s:The Public View." *Asian Survey* 10 (12): 1046-1069.

Messari, Nizar. 2001. "Identity and Foreign Policy: The Case of Islam in US Foreign Policy." in *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, ed. V. Kubalkova, 227-248. Armonk, New York.

Mochizuki, Mike. 1995. "Japan: Domestic Change and Foreign Policy."

Mohan, Uday and Maley III, Leo. 1997. "Orthodoxy and Dissent: The American News Media and the Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb Against Japan 1945-1995." in *Cultural Difference, Media Memories*, ed. P. Hammond. London.

Morris, I.I. 1960. *Nationalism and the Right Wing in Japan*. London.

Mouer, Ross and Sugimoto, Yoshio. 1986. *Images of Japanese Society*. Edited by Y. Sugimoto, *Japanese Studies*. London.

Murata, Koji. 2000. "Do the New Guidelines Make the Japan-US Alliance More Effective?" in *The Japan-US Alliance*, ed. M. Nishihara. Tokyo.

Nakao, Hidehiro. 2004. "The Legacy of Shiba Ryotaro." in *Japanese Cultural Nationalism*, ed. R. Starrs, 99-115. Folkestone.

Nandy, Ashis. 1988. *The Intimate Enemy*. Delhi.

Napier, Susan J. 1996. "Panic Sites: The Japanese Imagination of Disaster from Godzilla to Akira." in *Contemporary Japan and Popular Culture*, ed. J. W. Treat, 235-262. Richmond.

Neumann, Iver B. 1996. "Self and Other in International Relations." *European Journal of International Relations* 2 (2): 139-174.

Neumann, Iver B. 1998. *Uses of the Other: "The East" in European Identity Formation*.

Nitobe, Inazo. 1936. *Lectures on Japan*. Tokyo.

Nimmo, William F.1994. *Japan and Russia: A Re-evaluation in the post-Soviet era*. Connecticut.

Oguma, Eiji. 2002. *A Genealogy of 'Japanese' Self-images*. Translated by D. Askew. Edited by Y. Sugimoto, *Japanese Society Series*. Melbourne.

O'Hagan, Jacinta. 2002. *Conceptualizing the West in International Relations* New York.

Oonuma, Yasuaki. 2001. "Towards an Intercivilizational Approach to Human Rights." *Asian Yearbook of International Law* 7.

Otte, Max, and William Grimes. *Germany and Japan: Civilian Power, Traditional Power or Institutional Constraints* 1998. Available from: www.politik.uni-trier.de/forschung/workshop/OttePA.doc.

Ozawa, Ichiro. 1994. *Blueprint for New Japan*. Translated by L. Rubinfien. Tokyo.

Ozkirimili, Umut. 2005. *Contemporary Debates on Nationalism*. New York.

Petrov, Dmitri Vasilyevich. 1994. *Yaponiya i Mirovoye Soobshestvo (Japan and International Society)*. Edited by D. V. e. a. Petrov. Moscow.

Prizel, Ilya. 1998. *National identity and foreign policy : nationalism and leadership in Poland, Russia, and Ukraine*. Cambridge.

Purrington, Courtney. 1992. "Tokyo's Policy Responses During the Gulf War and the Impact of "Iraqi Shock" on Japan." *Pacific Affairs* 65 (2): 161-181.

Pyle, Kenneth B. 1992. *The Japanese question: power and purpose in a new era*. Washngton D.C.

Ravina, Mark. 2005. "State-Making in Global Context:Japan in a World of Nation-Sates." in *The Teleology of the Modern Nation-State: Japan and China*, ed. J. F. Fogel, 87-104. Philadelphia.

Reischauer, Edwin O. 1978. *The Japanese*. Cambridge, MA.

Rose, Caroline. 2000. "Japanese Role in PKO and Humanitarian Assistance." in *Japanese Foreign Policy Today*, ed. T. Inoguchi. and. P. Jain. New York.

Rozman, Gilbert. 1992. *Japan's response to the Gorbachev era, 1985-1991*. Princeton, N.J.

————. 2000. *Japan and Russia: the tortuous path to normalization, 1949-1999*. New York.

Saaler, Sven. 2005. *Politics, Memory and Public Opinion*. Munich.

Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. Vintage Books, October1979 ed. New York.

Sakanaka, Tomohisa. 1980. "Military Threats and Japan's Defense Capability." *Asian Survey-Japanese Perspectives on International Developments* 20 (7):763-775.

Shiba, Ryotaro. 1999. *O Rossii-About Russia*. Translated by S. A. Bykova and S. Kawamura. Moscow.

Shimazu Naoko. 2005. "Love Thine Enemy: Japanese Perceptions of Russia" in *The Russo-Japanese War in Global Perspective* Steinberg et al ed. Leiden.

Siddle, Richard. 1996. *Race, Resistance and the Ainu of Japan*. Edited by G. D. Hook, Sheffield Centre for Japanese Studies/Routledge series. London.

Sil, Rudra and Doherty, Eileen M., ed. 2000. *Beyond Boundaries? Disciplines, Paradigms, and Theoretical Integration in International Studies*. Albany, New York.

Smith, Anthony. 1991. *National Identity*. London.

Smith, Rober J. 1992. "The Cultural Context of the Japanese Political Economy." in *The Political Economy of Japan: Cultural and Social Dynamics*, ed. K. Shumpei and H. Rosovsky, 13-31. Stanford.

Soeya, Yoshihide. 1998. "Japan: Normative Constraints Versus Structural Imperatives." in *Asian Security Practice*, ed. M. Alagappa. Stanford.

Suh, J.J, Peter J Katzenstein, and Allen Carlson, eds. 2004. *Rethinking Security in East Asia, Studies in Asian Security*. Stanford.

Tachibana, Reiko. 1998. *Narrative as Counter-Memory*. Albany.

Takahashi, Sakuye. 1908. *International Law applied to the Russo-Japanese War*. London.

Takemae, Eiji. 2002. *Inside GHQ: The Allied Occupation of Japan and Its Legacy*. London.

Tamamoto, Masaru. 1993. "The Japan that Wants to be Liked." in *Japan's Emerging Global Role*, ed. D. Unger and P. Blackburn. London.

Tanaka, Akihiko. 1994. "Japan's Security Policy in the 1990s." in *Japan's International Agenda*, ed. F. Yoichi. New York.

Tanaka, Stefan. 1993. *Japan's Orient: rendering pasts into history*. University of California Press, Berkley.

Thayer, James R. 1951. "Japanese Opinion on the Far-Eastern Conflict." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 15 (1): 76-88.

Todorov, Tzvetan. 1984. *The conquest of America: the question of the other*. Translated by R. Howard. New York.

Toichi, Tsutomu. 2006. *Japanese Energy Policy and Regional Cooperation in Northeast Asia*. IEEJ 2004 [cited 2006].

Tsuchiyama, Jitsuo. 2000. "Ironies in Japanese Defense and Disarmament Policy." in *Japanese Foreign Policy Today*, eds. T. Inoguchi. and P. Jain New York.

Vogel, Ezra F. 1979. *Japan As Number One: Lessons for America*. Massachusets.

————. 1986. "Pax Nipponica?" *Foreign Affairs* 64 (4): 752-767.

Vogel, Steven K., ed. 2002. *US-Japan Relations in a Changing World*. Washington DC.

Wakaizumi, Kei. 2002. *The best course available: a personal account of the secret U.S.-Japan Okinawa reversion negotiations*. Edited by J. Swenson-Wright. Honolulu.

Watanabe, Akio. 1978. "Foreign Policy Making Japanese Style." *International Affairs* 54:75-78.

Wendt, Alexander. 1992. "Anarchy Is What States Make of It." *International*

Organisation 46 (2): 391-425.

————. 1994. "Collective Identity Formation and the International State." *American Political Science Review* 88 (2): 384-396.

————. 1996. "Identity and Structural Change in International Politics." in *The Return of Culture and Identity in IR Theory*, eds. Y. Lapid and F. Kratochwil. Boulder, Colorado.

————. 1999. *Social theory of international politics*. Cambridge ; New York.

White, James W., Michio Umegaki, and Thomas R.H Havens, eds. 1990. *The Ambivalence of Nationalism*. London.

Wilson, Sandra. 1999. "The Russo-Japanese War and Japan: Politics, Nationalism and Historical Memory." in *The Russo-Japanese War in Cultural Perspective 1904-1905*, eds. D. Wells and S. Wilson, 160-193. New York.

————. 2002. *Nation and Nationalism in Japan*. London.

Wolferen, Karel van. 1989. *The Enigma of Japanese Power*. London.

Yahuda, Michael. 2004. *The International Politics of the Asia-Pacific*. Second ed. Cornwall.

Yoshino, Kosaku. 1992. *Cultural Nationalism in Contemporary Japan : a sociological enquiry*. London.

————. 1999. "Rethinking theories of nationalism:Japan's nationalism in a marketplace perspective." in *Consuming Ethnicity and Nationalism*, ed. K. Yoshino, 8-28. Honolulu.

Yuan, Jing-dong 2005. " China seethes at US-Japan 'meddling'." *Asia Times Online*, 24.2.2005.

Zehfuss, Maya. 2001. "Constructivism and Identity: a dangerous liaison." *European Journal of International Relations* 7 (3): 315-348.

4. Japanese Language Sources

1. *Anonymous Newspaper and Magazine Articles*

"1984*nendo kyokasho saitaku no kekka* (Results of the 1984 textbooks selection)." 1984. *Kyokasho repoto* 28.

"*Gakushu shido yoryo 'kamoku' no henyo* (The changes of "subject" in Educational Guidelines)." 1986. *Kyokasho repoto* (30): 100-112.

"*Kanemaru shi wa 'roshiajin wa usotsuki'* (Mr Kanemaru "Russians are liars")." 1992. *Yomiuri Shimbun*, 27.06.1992, 3.

"*Sengo nihon ni niru roshia no seiso* (The similarity of Russian fineness and coarseness to postwar Japan)." 1992. *Asahi Shimbun*, 11.03.1992, 2.

"*Nichiro kankei kaizen no tameni purojekuto de sogorikai o* (in order to improve Japan-Russia relations furthering mutual understanding through a project)." 1993.

Sankei Shimbun, 14.10.1993.

"*Nichiro no fushin o nozoku dai ippo* (the first step to eliminate mistrust between Russia and Japan)." 1993. *Asahi Shimbun*, 14.10.1993, 2.

"*Roshia jin no shinri* (Russian mentality)." 1993. *Asahi Shimbun*, 14.10.1993, 1.

"*Nhon kakubuso "riten nashi"* (Japan's nuclear armament "no points in favor")." 2003. *Asahi Shimbun*, 20.02.2003.

"*Aratana kyoui e kiou jushi shin boueitaiko/ chukibo kettei* (Adaptation of the new Defense Guidleines and Mid-Term Defense Plan emphaszing response to new threats)." 2004. *Asahi Shimbun*, 4.

"*Chishima renmei sokai tairo gaiko ni fuman no koe* (The general meeting of Chishima Alliance expresses dissatisfaction with diplomacy vis-à-vis Russia)." 2005. *Asahi Shimbun*, 24.5.2002, 29.

"*Chugoku shuseki no yasukuni mondai hihan* (Critique of the Yasukuni problem by the Chinese chairman)." 2005. *Asahi Shimbun*, 23.05.2005, 2.

"*Kita chosen no kaku jiken "nai"* ("No" regarding the North Korea's nuclear test)." 2005. *Asahi Shimbun*, 25.5.2005, 1.

"*Sekai no kyokasho no senso kijutsu* (The depictions of war in world textbooks)." 2005. *Asahi Shimbun*, 18.06.2005, 17.

"*Shien no gutaika soten ni paipurain 'taiheiyo' rooto* (The "Pacific" pipeline focus on the details of the actual assistance." 2005. *Asahi Shimbun*, 4.

""*Tsukuru kai"*-joshikitekina saitaku kekka da (Tsukuru kai-common sensical adoption result)." 2005. *Asahi Shimbun*, 7.10.2005, 3.

"*Yasukuni sanpai "hitoraa tsuito" ni tatoe* (Comparing the visit to Yasukuni to "commemoration of Hitler")." 2005. *Asahi Shimbun*, 16.11.2005, 2.

2. Main Japanese Sources

Agency for Natural Resources and Energy. 2004. "2030 *nen no enerugi no jukyu tenbo* (Developments in energy supply and demand by the year 2030)." Tokyo.

Akitsuki, Toshiyuki. 1987. "*Edo idai ni okeru nijonjin no roshiakan* (Japanese view of Russia during the Edo period)." in *Nihon to Roshia*, ed. R. Yasui, 1-13. Tokyo.

————. 1990. "*Saharinto ni okeru nihonjin to ainujin* (Japanese and Ainu on Sakhalin)." in *Roshia to nihon*, ed. Y. Nakamura, 1-16. Tokyo.

Aoki, Kazuo. 1983. *Nihon no ayumi to sekai-Rekishi (Japan's path and the world-History)*. Tokyo.

Aoki, Tamotsu. 1999. *Nihonbunkaron no henyo (Transformation of nihonbunkaron)*. Tokyo.

Asashi Shimbunsha. 1988. *Za Nipponjin (The Japanese)*. Tokyo.

Atsuta, Isao. 2002. *Chugaku shakai-rekishiteki bunya (Social studies for junior*

highschool-History). Osaka.

Befu, Harumi. 1987. *Ideorogi to shite no nihonbunkaron (Nihonbunkaron as an ideology)*. Tokyo.

Chijima Habomai Shoto Ijusha Renmei. 2003. *Hoppo ryodo (The Northern Territories)*. Sapporo.

Clark, Gregory. 1992. "*Roshia ni wa sekinin kan wa nai* (Russia does not have any sense of responsibility)." *Voice* (169): 131-134.

Cui, Shiguang. 2004. "[i] no bunka to [jou] no bunka (The culture of [will] and the culture of [emotion])." in *[i] no bunka to [jou] no bunka (The culture of [will] and the culture of [emotion])*, ed. M. Wang, 196-211. Tokyo.

Dower, John W. 1995. "*Nihon, kono han seki* (Japan, the past half a century)." *Sekai*: 59-67.

Dower, John W. 1995. "Sizing Up (and Breaking Down) Japan (*Nihon o hakaru-eigoken ni okeru nihonkenkyu no rekishi jojutsu*)." *Shiso* 855-856:65-95, 67-89.

Edamura, Sumio. 1997. *Teikoku kaitai zengo (Before and after the collapse of an empire)*. Tokyo.

Emori, Susumu. 1987. *Ainu no rekishi-hokkaido no hitobito (History of the Ainu-the peoples of Hokkaido)*. Tokyo.

Eya, Osamu. 1999. "*Naze senshinkoku wa kono burakkuhoru ni kane wo sosogu no ka* (Why do the developed countries put their money into this blackhole?)." *Sapio*, 24.3.1999, 14-17.

Fujioka, Atsushi and Maruyama, Hiroyuki and Yamamoto, Takehiko. 1993. "*Nanko · suru gunmin tenko* (The problems of the conversion of the military personnel)." *Economisuto*, 06/04/1993, 90-96.

Fujioka, Nobukatsu. 1991. *Shakai ninshiki kyoikuron (Social cognitive theory of education)*. Tokyo.

————. 1999. *Kyokasho ga oshienai rekishi-jiyushugishikan, 21 seki ni mukete (History not taught by the history textbooks-liberal view of history, towards the 21st century)*. Tokyo.

————. 2000. "*Jigyaku rekishikan" no byori (The pathology of the "masochistic view of history")*. Tokyo.

Fukuda, Tsuneari. 1966. *Heiwa no rinen (The idea of peace)*. 7 vols. Vol. 6, *Fukuda Tsuneari zenshuu* (Collected works of Fukuda Tsuneari). Tokyo.

Fukui, Yuzo. 2004. ""*Saka no ue no kumo" ni egakareta senso no genjitsu* (The reality of war as depicted in "the cloud on top if the hill")." *Chuo koron*, 1.2.2004, 61-72.

Fuuma, Takeshi. 2000. "*Rroshia shidosha no tsua-ri shiko* (Tsarist ambitions of Russian rulers)." *Yomiuri*, 11.04.2000, 12.

Fuwa, Tetsuzo. 2001. *Koko ni "rekishi kyokasho" mondai no kakushin ga aru (This is the core of the "history textbooks" problem)*. Tokyo.

Hakamada, Shigeki. 1985. "*Soren shakai no kenkyu* (Studying the Soviet society)." in *Sobieto kenkyu (Soviet studies)* ed. H. Kimura, 309-343. Tokyo.

————. 1993. "Kaosu no naka de matareru "dai san no jinbutsu" ("The third person" waiting in the chaos)." *Economisuto*, 20.04.2003, 61-63.

245

————. 1993a. *Roshia no jirenma (The Russian dilemma)*. Tokyo.

————. 1996. "*Hayaky ugokidashita posuto erutzin* (The dynamics of post Eltsin) part 1." *Sekai Shuho*, 30.7.1996, 6-12.

————. 1996. *Shizumi yuku taikoku (Demise of an empire)*. Tokyo.

————. 1999. "*Roshia wa "shizen joutai" o kokufuku dekiru ka* (Can Russia overcome the "state of nature"?)." *Sekai Shuho* 1999:12-15.

————. 2000. "*Izen ryudoteki na roshia no tainichi seisaku* (Continiuos fluidity of Russian policy towards Japan)." *Sekai Shuho*, 30.5.2000, 14-15.

————. 2000a. "'*Jiko bunretsu' roshia e no taio* (Coping with schizophrenic Russia)." *Yomiuri Shimbun*, 19.05.2000, 23.

————. 2002. *Gendai roshia o yomi toku (Reading through modern Russia)*. Tokyo.

Hakamada, Shigeki, and Kazuo Kobayashi. 1999. "*Misairu ga pansuto ni yabureta hi* (The day missles were defeated by panty stockings)." *Shokun*, 11.1999, 136-145.

Handou, Kazutoshi, and Naoki Inose. 1999. "*Nomohan "haiboku no kenkyu"* (Studies of the defeat at Nomohan)." *Shokun*, September, 1999, 120-128).

Hasegawa, Chiaki. 1993. "*Ajia to nihon" "21seki no nihon"* ("Asia and Japan", "Japan of the 21st Century). Paper read at "ajia to nihon" "21seki no nihon", 28.9.1993, at Osaka.

Hashimoto, Ryutaro. 2000. "*Roshia to was kanzen na paatonaashippu o* (Towards a complete partnership with Russia) " *Gaiko Forum*: 30-35.

Hayashida, Hiroaki. 2004. "*Gendai ni ikiru nichiro sensou* (Russo-Japanese War: living in modern days)." *Yomiuri Shimbun*, 25.12.2004, 12.

Higuchi, Tsuneharu. 1993. "*Ikkoku heiwa shugi" no sakaku (Japanese Pacifism: Myth and Reality)*. Tokyo.

Hirano, Kenichiro. 1985. "*Sengo nihon ni okeru "bunka"* (The "culture" in post-war Japan)." in *Sengo nihon no taigai seisaku-Japan's post-war foreign policy*, ed. A. Watanabe. Tokyo.

Hirayama, Ichishiro. 1994. ""94 nen nippon saiko" mosukuwa hatsu "mono" chushin no tainichi kan ('94 Revisiting Japan: Mocow's materialistic view of Japan)." *Sankei*, 28.12.1994.

Hirooka, Masahisa. 2000. *Roshia-nashonarizumu no seijibunka (Russia-the political culture of nationalism)*. Tokyo.

Honda, Ryouichi. 2005. "*Toozakaru hopporyodo* (Northern territories going further away)." *Sekai* (June): 210-219.

Hyodo, Shinji. 2000. "*Renpo sisutemu kara mita shorai no roshia kokkazo* (The future of the Russian State in terms of the federal system)." *NIDS Security Studies* 3 (1): 65-79.

————. 2003. "*Taminzoku renpo kokka roshia no yukue* (Which way will go the multi-ethnic Russian Federation)." Tokyo.

Ienaga, Saburo. 1971. *Kyokasho hanketsu to saiban no dokuritsu (The ruling on textbooks and the independence of the court)* Tokyo.

Imano, Koukai. 1990. "*Tokyo samitto to tairo shien* (The Tokyo summit and assistance to Russia)." *Jiyu*.

Imoto, Tomofumi. 2003. "*Nihon kigyo kara mita roshia WTO kamei mondai* (Problems

related to Russian entrance to WTO as seen from Japanese business)." in *JBICI Working Paper*. Tokyo.

Inoue, Kosada, and et al. 1984. *Shosetsu Nihonshi (Detalied History of Japan)*. Tokyo.

————. 1988. *Shin shosetsu nihonshi (New detailed history of Japan)*. Tokyo.

————. 1988. *Yosetsu nihonshi (Introduction to Japanese history)*. Tokyo.

Iokibe, Makoto. 1999. *Sengo nihon gaikoshi (The diplomatic history of postwar Japan)*. Tokyo.

Ishida, Takeshi. 1961. *Sengo nihon no seiji taisei (The political system of postwar Japan)*. Tokyo.

————. 1968. *Heiwa no seijigaku (Political science of peace)*. Tokyo.

————. 1989. *Nihon no seiji to kotoba (Politics and language in Japan)*. 2 vols. Vol. 2. Tokyo.

Ishihara, Hooki, and Dakei Nasu. 2002. "*Maruyama shikan kara Shiba shikan made* (From Maruyama's view of history to Shiba's view)." *Shokun* (2): 242-259.

Ishii, Susumu et al. 2003. *Shosetsu nihonshi B (Detalied history of Japan B)*. Tokyo.

————. 2004. *Koko nihonshi B (Highschool Japanese History B)*. Tokyo.

Ishiyama, Hisao, ed. 1990. *Koko Nihonshi (Highschool Japanese History)*. Tokyo. Original edition, 1984.

————. 2002. "*Chugakko rekishi kyokasho wa do kakikaeraretaka* (How the junior highschool history textbooks were rewritten)." *Kyokasho repoto* 46:16-18.

Ito, Kenichi, ed. 1999. *Nihon no aidentiti-seiyou demo touyou nai nihon (Japan's Identity-Japan which is neither West nor East)*. Tokyo.

Ito, Ryozo. 2002. "*Shakaika kyoiku* (Social studied education)." in *Gendai gakko kyoiku daijiten (Encylopedia of modern secondary education)*, ed. T. Yasuhiko. Tokyo.

Iwashita, Akihiro. 2005a. *Hopporyodo mondai (The Northern Territories problem)*. Tokyo.

Izuyama, Marie, Shinji Hyodo, and Yoshihide Matsuura. 2001. "*2 kokukan koryu to anzenhosho-gunji koryu wo chushin ni* (Bilateral exchanges and security-focusing on military exchanges) " *NIDS Security Studies* 3 (3): 1-41.

JBIC. 2005. "*Chiiki betsu gyomu gaikyo* (The outilne of activities by region)." Tokyo.

Kageyama, Seishiro. 1995. "*Kyoiku jissen to kyokasho* (The practice of education and textbooks)." in *Nihon to chugoku-wakamonotachi no rekishininshiki (Japan and China-historical conciousness of the youth)*, ed. R. Hidaka, 108-115. Tokyo.

Kan, Ichiji. 2001. "Roshia no anzenhosho ni okeru kyuokuto roshia (The Russian Far East in Russian defence policy)." in *Poochin seikenka no tai ajia/taiheiyo gaiko (Russian policy vis-a-vis Asia Pacific under Putin)*, ed. H. Matsui, 76-87. Tokyo.

Kaneko, Yuzuru, Yoshiaki Sakaguchi, and Katsuhiko Mayama. 2003. "*Senryaku to shite no gunbikanri/gunshuku* (Weapons control and disarmament as strategy)." *NIDS Security Studies* 5 (2):31-67.

Kariya, Takehiko. 2005. "*Kyoukasho kentei o kangaeru* (Thinking about the school textbooks certification)." *Asahi Shimbun*, 15.4.2005, 13.

Kato, Kimiaki. 2001. "'*Kyoiku no mori'-rekishikyokasho mondai to wa* (The peak of education-what is the history textbooks problem) " *Mainichi Shimbun*, 17.09.2001, 4.

Kawakami, Takashi. 1998. "*Reisen go no senryaku kankyo henka to kurinton seisaku* (Post Cold War changes in strategic environment and Clinton's policy) " *NIDS Security Studies* 1 (2): 35-58.

Kawamoto, Shunzo, and et al. 2002. "*Seicho chugoku to teimei nihon* (Growing Japan and sluggish Japan)." *Asahi Shimbun*, 27.09.2002, 9.

Kawato, Tetsuo. 1995. *Roshia ni kakeru hashi (The bridge to Russia)*. Tokyo.

Keene, Donald. 2004. "*Rekishi to bungaku* (History and literature)." in *Nihon bunka e no manazashi (A glimpse into Japanese culture)* 87-97. Tokyo.

Kimura, Hiroshi. 1995. "*Nishigawa no tairo ninshiki no henka o kangei* (Welcoming the change in Western perceptions of Russia)." *Sankei*, 25.01.1995.

————. 1995. "*Roshia o do miruka* (How to look at Russia) " in *Motto shiratai roshia (Russia in depth)*, ed. H. Kimura.

————. 1995a. "*Nichiro hitojichi jiken shouri ni saitatsu sai* (The difference in dealing with hostage situation in Russia and Japan)." *Sankei*, 01.07.1995.

————. 1996. "roshia daitouryousen miyaburareta nishatakuitsu no mousou (Russian Presidential election seen through-the illusion of one choice out of two)." *Sekai Shuho*, 9.7.1996, 6-9.

Kimura, Hiroshi, and Kazuhiko Okazaki. 1993. "*Shuno kaidan wa niho zenshin* (Two steps progress in the summit meeting)." *Voice*, December, 158-169.

Kitazawa, Takuya. 2001. *Dokyumento nikkan rekishi no ima (Documents: the history of Japan's relations with Korea today)*. Tokyo.

Kodama, Yukikazu, and et al. 1983. *Chugakko shakai-rekishiteki bunya (Social studies for junior high school-history)*. Tokyo.

Koike, Yuriko. 2005. "*Okinawa no keizai, jiritsugata e* (Okinawa's economy, towards a self-reliance model)." *Asahi*, 8.11.2005, 4.

Komura, Naosuke, and et al. 2003. *Nihon shi A (History of Japan A)*. Tokyo.

Kosaka, Masataka. 1985. *Gaikoukankaku (The Sense of Diplomacy)*. Tokyo.

Kuno, Osamu. 1972. *Heiwa no ronri to sensou no ronri (The logic of peace and the logic of war)*. Tokyo.

Kurino, Ohtori. 1982. "*Sengo nihon gaiko no shiso* (Post-war Japan's diplomatic thought)." *Kokusai Seiji* 71 (*Nihon gaiko no shiso*): 160-172.

Kuroda, Hideo, and et al. 2002. *Chugakusei no rekishi (nihon no ayumi to sekai no ugoki) (Junior highschool students' history)*. 2002.

Kuroha, Ryoichi. 1995. *Kyokasho mondai to kingendaishi no yomikata (The text books problem and readingf the medieval and modern history)*. Tokyo.

Kyokai, Hoppryodo Mondai Taisaku. 1996. "*Hopporyodo: henkan undo 50 nen shi* (Northern Territories: 50 years history of the return movement)." Tokyo.

Liu, Zonghwa. 1995. "*Nihon no kindai rekishi kenkyu to rekishi kyoiku* (Research of Japan's modern history and history education)." in *Nihon to chugoku-wakamonotachi no rekishi ninshiki*, ed. R. Hidaka, 136-141. Tokyo.

Mabe, Suwako. 2005. ""*Akatonbo" o uttate kokkai e* (Singing the "Red dragon fly" and heading to the Diet) " *Asahi Shimbnun*, 23.11.2005,14.

Maruyama, Masao. 1948. *Soveeto no insho (The impressions of the Soviet Union)*. Tokyo.

————. 1961. *Nihon no shisou (Japanese Thought)*. Tokyo.

————. 1965. "*Kempou dai 9jou o meguru jakkan no kousatsu* (Some observations regarding article 9 of the Constitution)." in *Maruyama Masao zenshu-Collected Works of Maruyama Masao*, ed. M. Maruyama, 251-287. Tokyo.

————. 1984. "Genkei, kosou, hitsuyou teion (Prototype, foundation, basso ostinato.)" in *Nihon bunka no kakureta kata (The hidden form of Japanese culture)*, ed. K. Takeda, 87-152. Tokyo.

Matsui, Hiroaki. 2001. "*Poochin gaiko no kihon rinen to ajia/taiheiyo* (Putin's foreign policy and Asia Pacific)." in *Poochin seiken ka roshia no tai ajia/taiheiyo gaiko (Russian Foreign Policy vis-a-vs Asia Pacfic under Putin)*, ed. H. Matsui, 1-11. Tokyo.

Matsumoto, Yasushi. 1995. "*Nihon no wakamono no sensokan to kyokasho.*" (War perceptions of the Japanese youth) in *Nihon to chugoku-wakamonotachi no rekishi ninshiki*, ed. R. Hidaka, 200-231. Tokyo.

Matsuzaka, Komei. 1996. "*Taikoku shugi, minzoku shugi no takamari o kennen suru nihon* (Japan is worried about the rise of great-power ideology and nationalism)." *Sekai Shuho*, 30.7.1996, 20-21.

Mii, Mitsuo. 1998. "*Rochu kankei* (Russo-Chinese relations)." *NIDS Security Studies* 1 (2):56-77.

————. 2003. "*Kyokuto chiiki ni shozai surru roshia gun no shoraizo*(envisioning the Future of the Armed Forces of Russia in the Russian Far East)." *NIDS Security Studies* 6 (2):1-64.

Ministry of Education and Science. 2003. *Chugakko gakushu shido yoryo (Education guidelines for junior highschool education)*. Tokyo.

Mitake, Ichiro, Yoshitaka Nishizawa, and Masaru Kono, eds. 2001. *55 taisei shita no seiji to keizai (Politics and economy under the '55 system)*. Tokyo.

Miyahara, Takeo, Hisao Ishiyama, and et al. 2003. *Koko nihonshi B (High school History B)*. Tokyo.

MoFA. 1948. *Soren no hanashi (The story of the Soviet Union)*. Tokyo.

Mori, Yasuhiko. 2000. "*Konmei suru roshia no yukue* (Which way for the confused Russia)." *Yomiuri Shimbun*, 19.07.2000, 17.

Morimoto, Shinsho, and Toshihiko Takihara, eds. 1981. *Mondai darake no chugakko kyokasho (The swamp of problems of the junior high school textbooks)*. Tokyo.

Murata, Koji. 2003. "*Anata ni totte 'kokueki' towa nanika?* (What is national interest according to you?)." *Chuou Kouron* 7:45-52.

Myahara, Takeo, and et al. 2003. *Koko nihonshi A (Highschool Japanese History A)*. Tokyo.

Nagahama, Isao. 1986. *Showa kyoikushi no kuhaku (The vacuum of Showa education history)*. Tokyo.

Nagahara, Keiji. 1990. *Tenno sei, shinkokka shugi to rekishi kyoiku (Imperial system, new statism and the historical education)*. Tokyo.

Nagao, Yuichiro, Yoshiaki Sakaguchi, Tomonori Yoshizaki, and Shigeo Kikuchi. 1999. "*Kokunai rejimu no hensen* (Changing political regimes in the age of globalization)." *NIDS Security Studies* 2 (3):1-58.

249

Nakagawa, Yatsuhiro. 1977. *Nihon seiji bunkaron (The cultural theory of Japan's politics)*. Tokyo.

Nakamura, Kenichi, Hitoshi Oonishi, Yuji Suzuki, and Susumu Takahashi. 1982. *"Nihon no gunjika* (The militarization of Japan)." in *Boryoku to heiwa (Violence and Peace)*, ed. Y. Sakamoto, 155-214. Tokyo.

Nakamura, Minoru. 1986. "Shiba Ryotaro." in *Genron wa nihon o ugokasu* (The spoken word is changing Japan) ed. T. Mitani, 279-306. Tokyo.

Nakamura, Naohiro. 2000. *"Moto tomin/shison ni yoru hopporyodo henkan undo no keigaika* (The weakening movement for restoring the Northern Territories by former Islanders and their descendants)." *Jinmon chiri* 52 (5):90-106.

Nakamura, Yoshikazu. 1991. *Seika to kadai* (Results and issues). Paper read at *Roshia to nihon*, at Hachioji.

Nakane, Chie. 1997. *Tata shakai no ningen kankei (Human relations of vertical society)*. Tokyo.

Nakanishi, Terumasa. 1993. *"Hopporyoudo o mikagirunakare* (Never abandon the Northern Territories)." *Voice*, December, 171-179.

Nayuki, Masao. 1996. *"'Da-cha' sasaeru antei-'shizen' motomeru roshiajin* (The stability supported by "dacha"-Russians need of "nature")." *Sankei Shimbun*, 30.07.1996.

NHK,1998. *Shiba Ryotaro ni tsuite* (About Shiba Ryotaro). Tokyo.

Nishimura, Yo'ichi. 1993. *"Seki matsu roshia ni "kyokuu no kaze"*(The wind of supply in end of the century's Russia)." *Asahi Shimbun*, 24.12.1993, 6.

Nishio, Kanji, ed. 2001. *Atarashii kyokasho 'tsukru kai' no shucho* (The argument of the Society for New Textbooks). Tokyo.

Nishio, Kanji, and et al, eds. 2001. *Atarashii rekishi kyokasho* (New history textbooks). Tokyo.

Nishioka, Takashi. 2004. *"Kongo no boeiryoku seibi no arikata ni tsuite* (In regards of the maintanance of defense power from now on)." *Keizai Trend* September:50-53.

Nishitani, Tomoaki. 1993. *"Roshia koroshi enjo jigoku* (The Russian dependence on assistance)." *Voice*, June, 109-117.

Noda, Masayuki. 1999. *""Kizu tsuita taikoku"- roshia no kenkyu* ("The hurt empire"-study of Russia)." *Sapio*, 23.4.1999, 28-30.

Northern Territories Association. 2002. *Naruhodo! Nattoku! Hopporyodo (Thats's it! We are convinced! The Northern Territories)*. Tokyo: Northern Territories Issue Association.

Ochiai, Nobuhiko. 1999. *"Hopporyodo henkan o youkyu sureba suru hodo erutsin on wana ni hamaru."* *Sapio*, 24.03.1999, 10-12.

————. 2000. ""Berurin no kabe houkai" no tsunami ga higashi ajia wo, nihon wo nomikomu." *Sapio*, 26.7.2000, 86-89.

Ogawa, Shinichi, Yuichiro Nagao, Shinji Hyodo, and Tomohide Murai. 1999. *"Higash ajia senryaku kankyo no tenbo* (The developments in East Asia's strategic environment)." *NIDS Security Studies* 2 (1):1-51.

Oguma, Eiji. 2002. *Minshu to aikoku (People and Patriotism)*. Tokyo.

Ohta, Masakatsu. 2004. *Meiyaku no yami* (The shade of the pledge). Tokyo.

Okazaki, Kazuhiko , and Tadao Morimoto. 1993. "*Tsuyoi roshia wa iranai* (No need for strong Russia)." *Voice*, June 1993, 84-93.

Okuta, Osamu, and Kyohei Ooyama. 2003. *Nihonshi B* (Japan's history B). Tokyo.

Ookubo, Takaki. 2003. *Nihonbunkaron no keifu* (The genealogy of nihonbunkaron). Tokyo.

Ootsu, Toru. 2004. *Shin nihonshi* (New Japanese History). Tokyo.

Ootsuka, Takamsa. 1992. *Gaikou to nihonkoku kenpou-yoshida shigeru no kenkyu* (Diplomacy and the Constiution of Japan-Studies of Yoshida Shigeru). Tokyo.

Ouchi, Suguru. 1937. *Roshia wa dou deruka* (How is Russia going to act). Tokyo.

PM Office, Information Division. 1967. "*Gaiko/boei ni kan suru yoronchosa* (Public opinion survey regarding foreign policy and defence)." Tokyo.

————. 1976. "*Jieitai/boei mondai ni kan suru yoronchosa* (Public opinion survey regarding the SDF and defence problems)." Tokyo.

————. 1982. "*Jieitai/boei mondai ni kan suru yoronchosa* (Public opinion survey regarding the SDF and defence problems)." Tokyo.

————. 1991. "*Jieitai/boei mondai ni kan suru yoronchosa* (Public opinion survey regarding the SDF and defence problems)." Tokyo.

————. 2002. "*Gaiko ni kan suru yoron chosa* (Public opinion survey on foreign relations)." Tokyo.

Saburo, Ienaga. 1981. *Kyokasho saiban* (The textbooks trial) Tokyo.

Saito, Tsutomu. 2002. "'*Gaikokujin minna koroshi senso' no honshitsu* (The essense of the "kill all the foreigners war")." *Sankei*, 28.04.2002.

————. 2002. *Nichiro gaiko* (Japan-Russia diplomacy). Tokyo.

Sakai, Ayaki, and Naoki Oomori. 1995. "*Nihon no rekishi kyokasho ni okeru heiwa ishiki to chugoku ni tsuite no kijutsu.*" in *Nihon to chugoku-wakamonotachi no rekishi ninshiki*, ed. R. Hidaka, 116-126. Tokyo.

Sakamoto, Akira. 1997. "*Kyokasho no saitaku* (Selection of textbooks)." in *Kyokasho no hensan/hakko nado kyokasho seido no hensen ni kan suru chosa kenkyu*, ed. N. Nakamura, 390. Tokyo.

Sakamoto, Yoshikazu, ed. 1982. *Bouryoku to Heiwa* (Violence and Peace), *Asahi Sensho*. Tokyo.

————. 1991. "*Chikyu jidai ni ikiru nihon* (Japan living in the golbal age)." Tokyo.

Sakikawa, Noriyuki. 1998. "Gaiko wa kagakutekina rekishi bunseki de (Diplomacy should be done thoruogh scientific historical analysis)." *Sankei*, 16.12.1998.

Sasayama, Haruo, and et al. 2002. *Chugaku shakai-rekishi:mirai o mitsumete* (Social studies for junior high school). Tokyo.

Sase, Chikara. 1995. "*nihon no kokosei no chugoku kan* (Japanese highschool students view of China)." in *Nihon to chugoku-wakamonotachi no rekishi ninshiki*, ed. R. Hidaka, 27-34. Tokyo.

Sase, Masamori. 1980. "*Chonin kokka ron o haisu* (Getting rid of the "merchant nation" argument)." *Bungei Shunjuu*: 222-235.

Sassa, Atsuyuki. 1999. "Posuto erutsin ni wa kagakusha no [zuno kaishu] to [yobo gaiko] de sonaeyo." (Lets prepare to post-Eltsin through "collecting the brains" and "preventive diplomacy") *Sapio*, 24.3.1999, 26-27.

Sato, Masaru. 2003. "*Reisen go no hopporyodo koshou wa, nihon gaikou ni dono youna imi o motta ka* (The meaning of post-Cold War Northern Territories negotions for Japanese diplomacy)." *Sekai Shuho*: 253-264.

————. 2005. *Kokka no jibaku* (State's self-circumscribtion). Tokyo.

————. 2005a. *Kokka no wana* (State's trap). Tokyo.

Sawa, Hidetake. 1992. "*Hopporyodo ga kaette kuru* (The Northern Territories will be returned)." *Voice*: 124-140.

Sekikawa, Natsuo. 2003. *Shiba Ryotaro no 'katachi'* (The "form" of Shiba Ryotaro). Tokyo.

————. 2005. "*Shiba sakuhin iro asenu miryoku* (The everlasting charm of Shiba's writings)." *Asahi Shimbun*, 12.2.2005, 12-13.

Sekikawa, Natsuo, and Takeo Funabiki. 2006. "*Shiba Ryotaro no "katachi" o kangaeru* (Thinking about the Shiba Ryotaro's "form")." *Bungei Shunju*, February 2006, 104-114.

Shiba, Ryotaro. 1976. *Rekishi no naka no nihon (Japan in history)*. Tokyo.

————. 1992. "*Doitsu e no keisha (*The Leaning Towards Germany)." in *Kono kuni no katachi (3)*, ed. R. Shiba. Tokyo.

————. 1995. *Higashi to nishi (East and West)*. Tokyo.

————. 1998. "*Minzoku no genkei* (The original form of a nation)." *Shukan Asahi*, 10.8.1998, 84-113.

————. 1998. "*Shiba Ryotaro ga kataru nihon-roshia ni tsuite (part 1)* (Shiba Ryotaro is talking about Japan and Russia-part 1)." *Shukan Asahi*, 7.8.1998, 52-56.

————. 1998. "Shiba Ryotaro ga kataru nihon-roshia ni tsuite (part 2)." *Shukan Asahi*:44-51.

————. 1999. "*Bouei to nihonshi* (Defence and the history of Japan)." *Shukan Asahi*, 15.2.1999, 88-98.

————. 1999. "*Roshia ni tsuite* (On Russia)." *Shukan Asahi*, 15.2.1999, 52-62.

————. 1999. "*Uso no shiso (*The ideology of lies)." *Shukan Asahi*, 2.15.1999, 146-154.

————. 2002. *Roshia ni tsuite-hoppo no genkei (About Russia-the original form of the north)*. 16th ed. Tokyo. Original edition, 1989.

————. 2003. *Kono kuni no katachi (1) (The "form" of this country)*. Edited by R. Shiba. 25th ed, *Kono kuni no katachi*. Tokyo. Original edition, 1993.

Shiba, Ryotaro, and Hisashi Inoue. 2004. *Kokka, shukyo, nihnonjin (State, religion, Japanese)*. Tokyo. Original edition, 1999.

Shimizu, Hayao. 1992. *Nihonjin wa naze roshia ga kirai ka (Why do the Japanese hate Russia?)*. Tokyo. Original edition, 1979.

Shimotomai, Nobuo. 1992. "*Erutsin seiken no roshia to nihon no taio* (Eltsin's Russia and Japan's response)." *Ushio*, November, 1992.

————. 1997. *Roshia gendai seiji* (Contemporary Russian politics). Tokyo.

————. 1999. *Roshia sekai* (The world of Russia). Edited by T. Inoguchi, *21seki no sekai seiji*. Tokyo.

Shimotomai, Nobuo, and Hiroshi Shimada, eds. 2002. *Gendai roshia o shiru tameno 55 sho* (55 chapters to know modern Russia). Tokyo.

Shimotomai, Nobuo, Tasuku Takagi, Shigeyuki Yoshida, and Kuninori Matsuda. 2005.

"150 *nen no rekishi o aratana jidai ni tsunageru tameni* (Connecting the 150 years of history to a new era)." *Gaiko foramu*: 16-25.

Shiokawa, Nobuaki. 1993. *Shuen no naka no sorenshi* (Soviet history at its end*)*. Tokyo.

————. 1994. *Soren to wa nan dattaka* (What was the Soviet Union?). Tokyo.

Sono, Akira. 1994. *""Teikokufukko" o yume miru roshia jin* (Russians are dreaming of the Empire revival)." *Sankei Shimbun*, 14.01.1994.

Study Group on the Age of Culture. 1980. *"Bunka no jidai* (The age of culture)." Tokyo.

Suetsugu, Ichiro. 1997. *"Hopporyodo e no waga senryaku to shunen* (Our country's strategy and tenacity regarding the Northern Territories)." *Sapio*, 26.11, 10-13.

————. 2000. *Nichiro kosho no genjo to kongo no tenbo* (The present of future of Japan-Russia negotiations). Paper read at *Nichiro kosho no genjo to kongo no tenbo*, 28.11.2000, at Sapporo.

Sugiura, Shuichi. 1995. *""Kakko o motanai roshiajin" to " mirai o sakidori shita roshiajin"* ("Russians without a past" and "Russians that have taken the future before the rest"." in *Nashonaru aidentiti o megutte (National Identity)*, ed. A. Ito, 43-56. Sapporo.

Takagaki, Tasuku. 2002. *"Hokuto ajia keizai no shinhatten ni mukete* (Towards new economic development in Northeast Asian economy)." *Roshia too boeki chosa geppo*:1-13.

Takahashi, Sugio. 1999. *"Kyochoteki anzenhosho gainen no saiteigi to ajiataiheiyo "chiiki" no anzenhosho* (Redifinition of Cooperative Security and Rwgional Security in the Asia-Pacific)." *NIDS Security Studies* 2 (2):29-46.

Takahashi, Tetsuya. 2005. *Yasukuni Mondai (The Yasukuni Problem)*. Tokyo.

Takano, Yuichi. 1986. *Kokusaiho kara mita hoppo ryodo* (Northern Territories seen from International Law) *Iwanami bukkuretto*. Tokyo.

Tanabe, Hiroshi. 2002. *"Atarashii shakai: Rekishi* (New social studies: History)." Tokyo.

Tanaka, Akihiko. 1997. *Anzen hoshou (National Security)*. Edited by Y. Umeda, *20 seki no nihon*. Tokyo.

————. 2000. *Waado poritikusu (Word politics)*. Tokyo.

————. 2005. Panel II. Paper read at Co-existence on Korean Peninsula and Regional Cooperation in NE Asia, 23.05.2005, at University of Tokyo.

Tanaka, Akira, and et al. 2003. *Nihonshi A (gendai kara no rekishi) (Japan's History A)*. Tokyo.

Tanba, Minoru. 2000. *"Fukuganteki/ jusoteki nichiro kankei kochiku no tameni* (Towards multilayered and multidimensional Japan-Russia relations)." *Gaiko Foramu*: 36-41.

Tanizawa, Eiichi. 1997. *Shiba Ryotaro no okurimono* (The gift of Shiba Ryotaro). 3 vols. Vol. 3. Tokyo.

Tokita, Hideyuki. 2004. *"Gendai ni ikiru nichiro senso* (Living the Russo-Japanese War in modern days)." *Yomiuri Shimbun*, 28.08.2004, 11.

Torikai, Yasushi. 2003. *Gendai no nihon shi A (Japan's modern history A)*. Tokyo.

Ukai, Nobushige, and et al. 1984. *Atarashi shakai: rekishi (New social studies:history)*. Tokyo.

Umehara, Takeshi. 2001. "*Naze nihonjin wa shiba bungaku o aishitaka* (Why do the Japanese love Shiba's literature)." in *Shiba Ryotaro*, ed. T. Nishiguchi, 6-8. Tokyo.

Umemori, Naoyuki. 2005. "The Chrysanthemum and the Constitution:"Rightist" journalism under occupation in post-war Japan." *Intelligence* 6:4-17 (text in Japanese)

————. 2006. "*Hensou suru touchi* (Variations in governance)." in *'Teikoku' nihon no gakuchi* (The knowledge of Japan's "Empire"), ed. T. Sakai. Tokyo.

Ushiba, Akihiko. 1993. "*Roshia shienron e no shitsumonjo* (Questioning the assistance to Russia)." *Voice*: 58-83.

Wada, Haruki. 1992. "*Ima knoso nihon ga ryoudo seisaku o tenkan suru toki.*"(Now is the right time for Japan to change its territorial policy) *Sekai Shuho*, 13.10.1992, 10-15.

————. 1993. *Kuzureru kuni tsunagaru kuni: roshia to chosen nihon kinrin no daihendo* (Disintegrating states, connecting states). Tokyo.

————. 1999. *Hopporyodo mondai: rekishi to mirai* (The Northern Territories Problem: History and Future). Tokyo.

————. 2002. "*Sengo nihon heiwashugi no genten* (The Origins of Japan's Post-war Pacifism)." *Shiso* 944: 5-26.

Washida, Koyata. 2001. "*Shiba Ryotaro to rekishikan* (Shiba Ryotaro and perceptions of history)." in *Shiba Ryotaro*, ed. T. Nishiguchi, 26-30. Tokyo.

Watanabe, Akio. 1985. *Sengo nihon no taigai seisaku* (The Japanese post-war foiregn policy). Tokyo.

Watanabe, Osamu. 2002. "*dai san kyokasho kougeki no haikei* (The background of the third assult on textbooks)." *Kyokasho repoto* 46:4-10.

Yamazaki, Masakazu, and Natsuo Sekigawa. 2004. "*Jiyu na meiji no goriteki nihonjin* (The rational Japanese of the free Meji period)." *Chuo koron*, 1.2.2004, 46-60.

Yasumaru, Yoshio 2004. *Gendai nihon shisoron (Modern Japan's Ideology)*. Tokyo.

Yokote, Shinji, ed. 2004. *Higashi ajia no roshia (Russia of East Asia)*. Tokyo.

Yomiuri Shimbun 2002. *Nihon no seron* (Japan's public opinion). Tokyo.

Yoshida, Yutaka. 1994. "*Nihonjin no sensokan* (The Japanese views of war) " *Sekai*.

————. 2005. *Nihonjin no senso kan (The Japanese Perception of War)*. Tokyo.

Yuan, Zhiying. 2004. ""Oho" kara mita nihon (Japan as seen from "Gelbe Post")." in *[i] no bunka to [jou] no bunka* (The culture of [will] and the culture of [emotion]), ed. M. Wang, 212-240. Tokyo.